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Abstract
The years since George Floyd’s murder in 2020 have been characterized by both a renewed attention to systemic racism and a backlash intended to silence conversations about race. Critical Race Theory (CRT), in particular, has become a larger part of the public discourse around race than ever before. Although CRT developed in the 1980s as a critical approach in legal studies and was incorporated into social psychology in the 1990s, psychology’s engagement with CRT has been much more limited than that of other fields. In two installments, this special issue aims to (re)introduce psychological researchers to Critical Race Theory (CRT), to underscore CRT’s importance and limitations in the context of psychological research, to feature novel applications and new directions in CRT, and to address the current political climate of opposition to discussions of CRT. The first installment looks inward to examine how psychology can more effectively advance racial equity within the field and the research we conduct by continuing to incorporate a CRT lens throughout higher education and research. The second installment looks outward to highlight psychological research that uses CRT frameworks to advance racial justice in society.
INTRODUCTION

On May 25th, 2020, George Floyd, a Black man, was brutally murdered while in police custody (Hill et al., 2022). The world watched as his murder was caught on video. Derek Chauvin, a White police officer, crushed Mr. Floyd’s neck under his knee for over 8 minutes. Onlookers called for help to no avail. His three fellow officers did not intervene. Mr. Floyd, handcuffed and face-down on the ground, cried out that he could not breathe. Paramedics arrived on the scene and Derek Chauvin kept his knee on Mr. Floyd’s neck for another 1 minute and 20 seconds (Hill et al., 2022). For communities where this violence is an all-too-familiar occurrence, George Floyd’s murder was one of many boiling points to reignite the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement, prompting calls to defund the police, and laying bare systemic racism in the United States (Adams, 2020).

For communities insulated from these atrocities through White privilege, this was a racial reckoning. Many businesses and organizations publicly acknowledged and condemned racism (Liu & Dinkins, 2021). They also promised to advance racial equity within their own ranks, often starting with workplace training on systemic racism (Norwood, 2021). Businesses also made efforts to patronize Black-owned vendors and donate to organizations with a racial justice mission (Jan et al., 2021). Within our own field, the American Psychological Association (APA) issued a number of racial-equity-focused statements and reports over the past four years, including a formal apology for its role in perpetuating racism (APA, 2021), a racial equity action plan (Akbar et al., 2022), and a report highlighting racial inequities in the faculty promotion and tenure process (APA, 2023). Researchers have also recently and crucially highlighted our need to create a more racially diverse psychological science, and have recommended a range of concrete actions to achieve this goal (e.g., tracking and stopping racial bias in the review process; Buchanan, 2021).

However, these kinds of efforts have engendered cultural backlash. The “All Lives Matter” movement countered the BLM movement, misinterpreting BLM’s core mission by claiming that no lives (i.e., Black lives) should be valued over others (i.e., White lives). Failing to recognize pervasive systemic racism, the “All Lives Matter” movement asserted that BLM devalued police officers, White lives, and U.S. history being built on the concept of all lives being equal. This ideology was largely adopted by the political right, with 87% of Republicans surveyed aligning with the All Lives Matter movement (Rothschild, 2020), and only 17% supporting the Black Lives Matter movement (Horowitz et al., 2023).

This backlash has also included efforts to silence explicit conversations about systemic racism and antiracism. These efforts have taken the form of a movement opposed to Critical Race Theory (CRT), which is a legal and academic theory highlighting both the socially constructed nature of race and the systemic nature of racism (e.g., Crenshaw et al., 1995). For example, while still president Donald Trump (2020) tweeted that CRT is “a sickness that cannot be allowed to continue.” In this tweet and in a White House press conference soon after (Trump, September 17, 2020), Trump condemned CRT and Nikole Hannah-Jones’ 1619 Project. Five days later, on September 22, 2020, Trump issued an executive order that banned any federally funded entity from teaching or receiving diversity training on “divisive topics,” including White privilege, systemic racism, unconscious bias, intersectionality, racial humility, and CRT. The order reads: to counteract “malign ideologies” that “misrepresent our country’s history and its role in the world” (E.O. 13950, September 2020). Between January 2021 and August 2022, over 150 bills were introduced to eliminate CRT and any related “divisive content”—that might make students feel discomfort—from school curricula and staff/faculty training in 36 U.S. states (PEN America, 2022). These efforts...
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continue today; between September 2020 and February 2024, various local, state, and federal governments have introduced 783 anti-CRT measures in 44 states (Schwartz, 2023), including “bills, resolutions, executive orders, opinion letters, [and] statements,” according to CRT Forward, a UCLA Law School initiative that tracks anti-CRT efforts (CRT Forward, n.d.).

This anti-CRT movement has targeted not only policy and practice but also women of color in positions of power. In April 2021, Nikole Hannah-Jones was appointed the Knight Chair in Race and Investigative Journalism at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill Hussman School of Journalism and Media. However, Walter Hussman Jr., a major donor for whom the school is named, emailed UNC Chancellor Guskewicz, among others, including at least one board of trustees member, expressing concern about the UNC School of Journalism being associated with Jones and the 1619 project (Hoggard, 2021). Even though her colleagues submitted an approved tenure packet to the Board of Trustees, Jones’ tenure case was not reviewed and her appointment instead came with a 5-year fixed contract instead of tenure. This would be the first time this position came without tenure since 1980 (Zeisloft, 2021). UNC ultimately approved her tenure, but only after extensive faculty, student, and public activism. She rejected their offer. She is now the tenured Knight Chair of Race and Journalism at Howard University. Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson is another woman of color whose accomplishments were sidelined when others fixated instead on anti-CRT tactics. CRT took center stage at the confirmation hearing of Justice Brown Jackson when Senator Ted Cruz questioned the esteemed Justice, not on her qualifications, but on her position regarding CRT in K-12 education, particularly highlighting anti-racist children’s books and asking about her views on the content (Zhang, 2022).

These ongoing and highly charged events over the past few years, both within our field and within broader society, motivated the editorial team to explore the field of psychology’s engagement with CRT and its core tenets. Led by pioneering activists and legal scholars of color, such as Derrick Bell, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Richard Delgado, Neil Gotanda, Mari Matsuda, Patricia Williams, and others, CRT developed in the 1980s as a critical approach in legal studies to explain and intervene in the entrenchment of racism and other tools of oppression in law and in society (Crenshaw, 2011). CRT has expanded beyond legal studies over the past 30 years and has increasingly influenced both theory (e.g., Adams & Salter, 2011; Jones, 1998; Volpe et al., 2019) and research praxis in psychology (e.g., Areguin et al., 2020; Crossing et al., 2022). Scholarship identifying with CRT frameworks typically engages: (a) racism as a systemic force embedded in the structure of American society, rather than solely as isolated acts of discrimination or bigotry (e.g., Bell, 2000; Jones, 1998); (b) narratives of liberalism, individualism, colorblindness, choice, and meritocracy as tools that obscure the permanence and centrality of race, reproducing racism in society (e.g., Gotanda, 1991; Salter & Adams, 2013); (c) the hedging of progress or broad-based support of civil rights for People of Color unless it aligns with the interests of White Americans (i.e., interest convergence, Bell, 1980); (d) White identity (and its cultural manifestations) as a profitable possession that brings benefits to the bearer (e.g., Harris, 1995; Lipsitz, 2006); (e) the unique voices and lived experiences of People of Color and the practice of counter-storytelling as a tool for deconstructing the racialized bases of everyday society (e.g., Delgado, 2000; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002); and/or (f) experiences of oppression as intersectional (e.g., Crenshaw, 1991; Gillborn, 2015). Together, these core tenets and themes have provided critical directions for understanding how race is socially constructed and how racism manifests in contemporary society and in psychology itself.

One of the first (if not the first) social psychologists to engage CRT was James Jones, who offered a “Psychological Critical Race Theory” (PCRT) to explain why increases in positive racial attitudes...
and behaviors are not equivalent to increases in racial equality and social justice, a “new American dilemma” (Jones, 1998, p. 645). Jones highlighted the overlapping concerns of many Critical Race Theorists and social psychologists who were critical of over-interpreting improved racial attitudes as evidence that racism was no longer a problem. PCRT components, which explicitly drew on social psychological research to explain the impossibility of ignoring race, included: (1) the spontaneous and persistent influences of race on psychological experiences, (2) the racially divergent experiences of fairness and progress, (3) the asymmetrical consequences of race neutrality (e.g., color-evasiveness), (4) the paradox of racial group members being simultaneously distinctive from and similar to others, and (5) the salience of racial identity. There are at least one hundred citations of this paper referencing Jones’s insights on the stagnant state of race relations, America’s commitment to colorblindness, and the salience of race and racial identity (e.g., Plaut, 2010; Shelton, 2000; Verkuyten, 2005); however, until recently, not many specifically referenced PCRT (Boisvert & Barned, 2023; cf. Hodge et al., 2008). For comparison, psychologists in educational and school settings have a longer and more consistent engagement with CRT, as evidenced by the germinal contribution, “Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education,” by Gloria Ladson-Billings and Williams Tate in 1995, which has been cited over 14,000 times. Thus, Jones’s early work on CRT is undoubtedly under-cited and under-utilized by social psychologists (Boisvert & Barned, 2023).

In articulations of CRT in psychology that happened over 10 years after Jones, two social psychologists provided commentary on Kimberlé Crenshaw’s featured article, “Twenty years of Critical Race Theory,” where they argued that a “Critical Race Psychology” (CRP) was not yet born. In their contribution, Glenn Adams and Phia Salter described many of the same areas of potential overlap between CRT and critical subfields in psychology as Jones, but warned against an uncritical adoption of existing disciplinary conventions in psychology’s approach to studying racism (Adams & Salter, 2011). Like Jones, and many other scholars articulating CRT tenets in conversations with their field or research area, they identified five core tenets relevant for the theoretical development of CRP (see CRT themes “a”–“e” above; Salter & Adams, 2013). Amplifying and extending the call for critical applications of CRT in psychology, a team of interdisciplinary psychologists offered a vision for a critical praxis in psychology (PsyCrit; Crossing et al., 2022), emphasizing the need to build CRT insights into our practice with seven core tenets. Because CRT is not static, one can find a range in the number of key CRT tenets highlighted in the literature. Moreover, whether it’s “Psychological Critical Race Theory,” “Critical Race Psychology,” or “PsyCrit,” applications of CRT within psychology typically converge around two broad efforts: (1) applying psychological insights in line with CRT to explain contemporary manifestations of racism in society, and (2) applying insights from critical race theory to advance or intervene in the field of psychology.

In two installments, this special issue draws on strong theoretical and empirical foundations to (re)introduce psychological researchers to Critical Race Theory (CRT), to underscore CRT’s importance and limitations in the context of psychological research, to feature novel applications and new directions in CRT, and to address the current political climate in which there is opposition to discussions of CRT. The first installment looks inward to examine how psychology can more effectively advance racial equity within the field and the research we conduct by continuing to incorporate a CRT lens throughout higher education and all areas of psychological research. The second installment looks outward to highlight psychological research that uses CRT frameworks to advance racial justice in society. Together, this two-part special issue aims to both highlight the field’s accomplishments in this area and to challenge ourselves to continue building toward change.
The first installment of this special issue examines the field of psychology through a CRT lens. In the spirit of CRT, it begins by taking a critical look inward to examine ways in which the field of psychology has been complicit in upholding systems of White supremacy. It aims to draw insights from CRT that can prompt the field to broaden and improve its research and education practices. This installment includes four sections following this introduction: Section II: Critically Engaging Psychological Science with a CRT Lens, Section III: Methods for Psychological Research using CRT, Section IV: Understanding Opposition to CRT, and Section V: Higher Education as a Site of Resistance.

Section II: Critically engaging psychological science with a CRT lens

This section examines psychological research through a CRT lens. Nicolai et al. (2024) begin by examining tensions that arise when integrating CRT into psychology. They argue that largely unacknowledged “growing pains” emerge while learning to use CRT in psychology research due to a lack of training and mentorship on CRT, as well as inherent tensions between CRT, psychological theory, and previous research. They describe these tensions and conclude with actionable advice for scholars learning CRT, which can be applied to their psychological research.

Efird et al. (2024) continue this examination of psychological research through a CRT lens by pointing to the need for a more advanced study of whiteness. They describe how the concept of whiteness extends beyond identity to be transfigured into systems of domination and power. They then make the case for why it is necessary to study the racialized social system of whiteness. By cultivating a deeper understanding of whiteness within the field of psychology, they argue, researchers can design studies that account for the nuanced ways that macro-level systems affect mental and physical health, as well as beliefs and attitudes of both White Americans and minoritized populations.

The remaining three papers in this section focus on specific sub-areas of research within psychology, examining through a CRT lens how research practices must evolve. Gonzales and Plaut (2024) argue that legal psychological research has generally ignored the influence of race, history, systemic racism, structural racism, and institutional racism on the legal system, legal actors, and the individuals they target. This oversight is surprising, given that CRT was first conceptualized within legal studies. The authors point out that, although legal psychology focuses on a system that has disproportionately affected Black Americans and other racially minoritized groups, research in legal psychology often appears to take a colorblind perspective. The authors present a comprehensive review of race and racism in legal psychology research and outline best practices for future research to embrace a critical race legal psychology.

Next, Carbajal et al. (2024) adopt a similar approach in examining the treatment of race in cognitive psychology. The authors draw on recent attempts to promote Critical Race Psychology in other subfields to provide a framework for how CRT can inform cognitive sciences. They then provide recommendations and suggestions for how CRT can be implemented through theory, methodology, and analysis in cognitive psychology.

Finally, Sheppard et al. (2024) examine the past and future role of CRT in human development and family studies (HDFS) research. The authors review how race and racism have historically played a role in HDFS. They then offer suggestions based on CRT and empirical evidence to
enhance the study of race in HDFS, better implement the goals of CRT in this context, and achieve racial equity in research and publication processes.

Section III: Methods for psychological research using CRT

This section follows the critical analysis offered in Section II of the issue with practical guidance for implementing CRT within the context of psychological research methods. Nguyen et al. (2024) explore testimonios on participatory action research (PAR) as a method for using counter-narrative to amplify the voices of minoritized peoples. The authors offer both first-hand commentary on their own discovery and exploration of these methods, as well as practical guidance for researchers interested in adopting these research tools. The authors also provide an example from their own research on the experiences of Southeast Asian Americans from refugee families.

Next, Vargas and Peet (2024) offer a primer on how researchers can use the quantitative methods with which many social psychologists are familiar in the context of Critical Race Psychology. They break down traditional quantitative analysis tools for researchers who may be more accustomed to qualitative methods and demonstrate how these tools can be used in ways that are compatible with and supportive of research that uses and promotes CRT.

Section IV: Understanding opposition to CRT

After Sections II and III of the issue make the case for CRT in psychological research, Section IV examines the sources of opposition to CRT itself. If researchers are going to be successful in building a Critical Race Psychology, we will need to understand and overcome opposition to CRT, both within the field and in society more broadly. This has become especially important in recent years, as CRT has emerged as a talking point among political elites. Sambaraju (2024) begins this section by examining how opposition to CRT is made through references to racial group membership and explores how these themes relate to opposition to CRT.

Richmond et al. (2024) conclude this section by offering an analysis of the relationship between the understanding of and opposition to CRT. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods, the authors examine predictors of White people’s support for CRT and the patterns that emerge when White Americans describe CRT in their own words. The authors conclude by testing whether an intervention that corrects misperceptions about CRT is effective in reducing opposition to it.

Section V: Higher education as a site of resistance

This section examines the role of CRT in psychology education, specifically highlighting the ways in which higher education serves as a site of resistance to systems of racial oppression.

Starck et al. (2024) begin by exploring and examining discussions of diversity in higher education through a CRT lens. Specifically, they argue that contemporary legal and policy discourse on diversity and affirmative action in higher education is consistent with the interest convergence hypothesis, originally articulated by Derrick Bell, Jr. (1980). The authors conclude by noting the importance of acknowledging that contemporary diversity discourse and practice correspond
most directly with White Americans’ preferences, and by arguing that pro-diversity norms of today do not primarily benefit racial minorities.

Finally, Laiduc et al. (2024) continue this critique of neoliberal diversity discourse in higher education by offering a study of students’ critical race college transition stories. The authors center the voices of students, using discourse analysis to explore how students articulate the role of, and importance of, diversity in educational settings. The authors describe important patterns of interest convergence and divergence that arise in students’ discussions of diversity. They conclude by noting that despite its framing as an apolitical social good, neoliberal “diversity” in higher education often serves to protect the material and psychological interests of whiteness. They argue that analyzing students’ diversity talk as they interact with color-evasive and critical stories offers a launching point for how universities may shift conversations about “diversity,” especially as they enroll a greater proportion of, and aim to more effectively serve, minoritized students.

CONCLUSION

Taken together, the articles in this first installment provide a critical examination of the field of psychology through a CRT lens and offer roadmaps toward a future in which psychologists might make better use of the insights and theoretical frameworks that CRT provides. This special issue challenges psychological researchers to take up the charge set forth in Salter and Adams (2013) to use CRT as “a conceptual lens through which to analyze all of psychological science.”
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