

Public Psychology: Introduction to the Special Issue

Asia A. Eaton¹, Patrick R. Grzanka^{2, 3}, Michèle M. Schlehofer⁴, and Linda Silka⁵

¹ Department of Psychology, Florida International University

² Department of Psychology, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

³ Interdisciplinary Program in Women, Gender and Sexuality, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

⁴ Department of Psychology, Salisbury University

⁵ Senator George J. Mitchell Center for Sustainability Solutions, University of Maine

Psychology's role in public life and social issues has been of longstanding concern throughout the discipline. In a historical moment of tremendous social, political, and economic strife and a global pandemic, this special issue of *American Psychologist* seeks to extend important discourse about the concept of public psychology. The articles included in the special issue address a range of interconnected themes, including: (a) centering social problems, (b) engaging diverse publics in knowledge creation, (c) communicating and democratizing psychological knowledge, and (d) rethinking what constitutes psychology. In this introduction, the guest editors contextualize the special issue, identify its aims, and highlight the key contributions of the included articles. The guest editors argue that realizing an expansive and transformative public psychology will require structural, substantive changes within the discipline to place community concerns at the center of psychology. Nonetheless, bolstered by the insights of the special issue's contributors, the guest editors conclude with cautious optimism that psychology has much to offer in addressing the most pressing social problems of the 21st century.

Public Significance Statement

In a time of extraordinary global crises and major threats to the legitimacy of psychological knowledge, this special issue invites psychologists to embrace the challenge of recommitting to publicly engaged and public-facing psychology. This article introduces the special issue and highlights key themes of an emergent public psychology framework.

Keywords: public psychology, citizen science, applied psychology, social justice, advocacy

The last few years have witnessed national and global health crises starving for evidence-based recommendations

Editor's Note. This is an introduction to the special issue "Public Psychology: Cultivating Socially Engaged Science for the 21st Century" published in the November 2021 issue of *American Psychologist*. Asia A. Eaton served as lead guest editor, and Patrick R. Grzanka, Michèle M. Schlehofer, and Linda Silka served as guest editors, with Alexandra Rutherford as advisory editor. Please see the Table of Contents here: <https://psycnet.apa.org/journals/amp/76/8>.

Asia A. Eaton  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5954-0541>

Patrick R. Grzanka  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7364-9965>

Michèle M. Schlehofer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3084-5632>

Asia A. Eaton and Patrick R. Grzanka contributed equally to the development of this article. We have no known conflicts of interest to disclose. We thank Helen A. Neville for her valuable feedback on a draft of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Asia A. Eaton, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th Street, DM 208 Miami, FL 33199, United States. Email: aeaton@fiu.edu

and interventions. Heightened awareness of the persistence of structural racism, the coronavirus pandemic, global threats to democracy, and the rise of advanced, largely unregulated information technologies, coupled with large-scale resistance movements such as #MeToo and Black Lives Matter, have provided openings for scholars to use their training and knowledge to improve the human condition. Indeed, in the face of lethal disinformation, pseudoscience, and prejudicial policy and practice, our obligation to serve the public has never been so important. It is with the urgency of these threats that we confront the challenge of public psychology with this special issue of the American Psychological Association's flagship journal, *American Psychologist*.

"Public psychology" lacks a consistent, finite definition (Chu et al., 2012). Scholars have used the term to emphasize the need to recruit and train psychologists who are mental health practitioners for public sector work (Chu et al., 2012), to describe psychology when applied to the development of public policy (Syme & Bishop, 1993; see also Siegel et al., 2021), and to refer to an outgrowth of community psychology generally concerned with applying psychology to public



Asia A. Eaton

affairs (Imber et al., 1978). In the present article, we turn to the definition originally provided by Miller in a classic article in *American Psychologist*, in which public psychology is psychology applied to solving social problems (Miller, 1969).

In this bold treatise on the place of psychology in society, Miller (1969) discussed the revolutionary role individual psychologists and the APA *should* have in addressing social ills and promoting human welfare, noting that “any broad and successful application of psychological knowledge to human problems will necessarily entail a change in our conception of ourselves and of how we live and love and work together” (p. 1066). Much like our current time, Miller’s call to action was developed during an era of substantial global sociopolitical turmoil, including many of the issues we continue to face today: demands for racial justice and women’s rights, antiwar protests, movements for LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) equality, and more. In the 50-plus years since Miller’s famous charge for psychologists to “give psychology away,” psychology’s relationship to and with social problems remains a vexing issue in the discipline.

Psychologists have unquestionably contributed to positive social change efforts (e.g., contributed to socially transformative Supreme Court cases, advocated for reproductive freedoms, and developed paradigms for combatting racism). However, most psychological research remains ameliorative (Prilleltensky, 2008) and fails to focus on structural power dynamics (Christens & Perkins, 2008), which undermines the discipline’s ability to create lasting social change. More troublesome, psychologists have at various points

colluded in structural oppression by providing methods and justification for torture, discrimination, segregation, and violence (Prilleltensky, 2008). As an example, Galton’s eugenics movement created the framework for comparative intelligence and personality testing, the legacy of which continues to influence research practices today (Helms, 2015; Yakushko, 2019). Psychological knowledge is routinely deployed in the interest of individuating, capitalist, and specifically neoliberal agendas (Adams et al., 2019) that divert attention from the role of macrolevel, structural dynamics in the production of human behavior. Miller saw the great potential of psychology and psychologists to serve as agents of positive social change; it is our collective responsibility to ensure that we bring this potential to fruition.

There remains an unmet need for psychologists to contribute to efforts aimed at creating and sustaining transformative social change (Perkins & Schensul, 2017). We recognize the remarkable contributions of, in particular, historically excluded psychologists, many of whom have revolutionized public understanding of how systematic injustice produces mental health inequities (e.g., Bowleg, 2012). But given our very recent and extremely high-profile controversies sparked by the discipline’s involvement in state-sponsored torture (Eidelson, 2017), as well as the American Psychological Association’s (APA’s) new and controversial political action committee (Eidelson, 2021), any serious conversation about public psychology must confront the reality of psychologists’ fraught interactions with the public. Sometimes, when we have given psychology away in the past, has it truly been in the public’s interest—or in the interest of psychologists?

In this special issue, we hope to inspire, reconfigure, and reinvigorate psychologists’ efforts at public engagement. The articles in this issue reimagine psychological training, research, practice, and service with potentially transformational understandings of our discipline, ourselves, and each other by insisting upon a deeper and more critical relationship to the public good. If the “citizen psychologist” initiative encouraged psychologists to reimagine their individual responsibilities to pursue the public good, *public psychology* suggests a paradigmatic shift in how psychologists cultivate the complex relationship(s) between science and society. Public psychology should not just mean a rush for psychologists to give their expertise away or to inject public discourse with psychological knowledge. The crisis of scientific expertise (Eyal, 2019) and indeed, of modern democracy, necessitates a rethinking of the foundational ethical principle of psychology for the public good, as many of the articles in the special issue directly engage (Flynn et al., 2021; Lewis, 2021; Grzanka & Cole, 2021). We contend that public psychology is fundamentally about relationships: the relationship between science and society, yes, but also



Patrick R. Grzanka

between psychologists and diverse publics. Our emphasis in this special issue is purposefully as much on the public as it is on the psychological, as we insist that the future of the discipline is inextricably linked to our relationship with publics and the extent to which we will allow constituencies—particularly those historically excluded from the ranks of professional psychologists (Roberts et al., 2020)—to contribute to the future of psychology.

What Do We Mean by “Public”?

The articles in this special issue build the case for a public psychology that is more disruptive and challenging than simply aiming dominant, canonical, and mainstream psychological research and practice outward. Specifically, we (the editors and authors) suggest that fully embracing public psychology requires dissolving barriers between psychological scholarship and practice and the societies in which they are embedded. Notably, we did not issue our call for articles with a specific definition of public psychology in mind. Instead, we asked questions: about the role of psychologists in solving 21st century social problems, about the place of inter- and transdisciplinary projects in contemporary psychology, and about ways of reimagining psychological practice to be more inclusive of people and ideas that have been historically excluded. We wanted authors to consider what it means for psychologists to assume that the public needs or wants psychologists.

Generously, the articles in the special issue offer diverse answers to these pressing and difficult questions. However, the special issue does not offer a checklist for public

psychology, or an easy roadmap toward social transformation. To the contrary, we continue to insist that public psychology is an urgent and yet unfinished project. The special issue is a modest attempt to contribute meaningfully toward an architecture of public psychology: an aspirational and explicitly idealistic project that envisions psychology otherwise. We invite the reader to consider the myriad entry points into public psychology available to them, in light of the needs and strengths of the communities they serve, from researcher-policymaker partnerships (Crowley et al., 2021) to civil disobedience (Flynn et al., 2021).

The articles in this special issue indicate some key ways that psychology (as usual) is presently ill-equipped to manifest the kinds of critical, transformative projects that might fall under the umbrella of public psychology. In addition to incisive critiques that underscore the limitations of dominant psychological paradigms (Grzanka & Cole, 2021; Lewis, 2021), they also offer ways forward: examples, heuristics, case studies, and plans of action for cultivating public psychology. It is apparent, nonetheless, that the very definition of what counts as psychology will need to be expanded to acknowledge that it is not just “the study of the mind and behavior” (APA Dictionary of Psychology, 2021b) but this study *and its applications to human welfare*.

The articles in this special issue also build a case for public psychology beyond being just applied. Public psychology has a close association with, yet is differentiated from, applied psychology. While both public psychology and applied psychology include use of psychological research and practice to address social problems, public engagement is not a definitional component of applied psychology, a broad term that applies to a range of psychological research and practice activities designed to address practical concerns (APA Dictionary of Psychology, 2021a). Much of applied psychological research remains conducted in higher education settings, away from the public and without public participation. Applied psychology is a necessary first step for public psychology; however, while all public psychology is applied, not all applied psychology is public.

As we frame it here, public psychology is both inspired by and an extension of the recent “citizen psychologist” movement inaugurated by former APA President Jessica Henderson Daniel (APA, 2020). Citizen psychologists are those who are active in their communities and who contribute to “improving the lives of all” (APA, 2020, np.). Certainly, citizen psychologists have played a vital role in the cultivation of what we call public psychology. Our conceptualization of public psychology extends the citizen psychologist framework in at least two important ways. First, we extend the concept of “citizen psychologist” to not just recognize the contributions of individual psychologists for their community outreach and engagement, but as about transforming the discipline of psychology itself. By providing best practices, critiques, and evidence-based suggestions



**Michèle M.
Schlehofer**

for future praxis, the contributions in this special issue imagine a psychology in which citizen psychologists are typical examples of what psychologists do, rather than exceptions to the rule. Second, we use a more expansive “public” paradigm to direct attention away from individual psychologists and toward the diverse publics we seek to engage, including those communities who have a fraught relationship to or with the concept of citizenship.

To aspire toward public psychology, psychologists will need to enter into community and public spaces and embrace their roles as public agents whose work can be applied to personal, family, organizational, and institutional realms through advocacy, policy, education, practice, and more. In addition, public psychology requires that psychologists actively attract and embrace the public in these formerly closed and elite spaces, and to share research and practice with the public as experts and equals. Collectively, the articles suggest a model of public psychology will require: (a) that psychological research, teaching, and service activities engage with social problems by definition and design, not as potential consequence or future implications; (b) that academics actively and democratically involve the public in their work, from development to dissemination; and (c) that scholars be public-facing, engaging in public communications and collaborations. Finally, we contend that (d) practitioners and psychologists whose work lies primarily or fully in community settings, including health service providers and community psychologists working in practice settings, are central to the public psychology project and academics must join them in rethinking the

role of diverse publics in the implementation of psychological practice, outreach, consultation, and social justice advocacy.

One of the most energizing parts of this special issue is the diversity of perspectives and agendas advanced by authors who are all speaking to what might on the surface appear to be the same thing: public psychology. However, their various approaches to public engagements or engagement with publics, theories of power and inequality, and ways of envisioning and implementing social transformation are all distinct, even as there are shared affinities across the articles. What follows is our attempt to distinguish the unique contributions of the articles across the four criteria we have already named: (a) *centering social problems*, (b) *engaging diverse publics in knowledge creation*, (c) *communicating and democratizing psychological knowledge*, and (d) *rethinking what constitutes psychology*. Please note that most of the articles touch upon aspects of all four criteria, none of which are intended to be mutually exclusive.

Centering Social Problems

Given the relevancy of applied psychology to public psychology, it is perhaps no surprise that articles in this special issue stressed the importance of building psychology around addressing social problems. Taken together, the articles present a comprehensive view of the diverse ways psychologists can anchor their work in social problems. It is evident from these articles that centering social problems means more than just using social issues of the day as inspiration for research projects—or as fodder for introductory paragraphs or implications sections. Rather, as a collective set, the articles highlight the importance of letting social problems guide the development of psychological science and practice, and in intentionally leveraging psychology to improve the mental health and well-being of individuals and communities. The articles provide guidance for how psychologists can accomplish these goals in both mental health practice and research settings, as well as provide suggestions for the future of undergraduate and graduate training centered around the application of psychology to better society.

Readers will be unsurprised that ethics are front and center in many of the articles in the special issue. Public engagement fundamentally necessitates careful consideration of psychologists’ ethical obligations and when social transformation and social justice efforts may be orthogonal to extant ethical and legal mandates. As such, the issue begins with a protracted meditation on the topic of civil disobedience and its place in the discipline. Flynn and colleagues (Flynn et al., 2021) boldly compel psychologists to consider the times when a commitment to social justice may grate against the law and when civil disobedience is



Linda Silka

imperative. Drawing heavily on the work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his 1967 address to the APA (King, 1968) that looms large across the special issue, Flynn et al. define civil disobedience as “intentional violation of policy or law in service of higher principles or interests.” They use the case study of Ohio House Bill 658, which would have compelled therapists to disclose children’s gender nonconformity or dysphoria to parents. Though the bill was developed under the auspices of protecting children, advocates (including Flynn and coauthors) view the law as a dangerous violation of children’s privacy that could have harmed transgender and other gender-nonconforming youth. Through a careful explication of the APA Ethics Code, intersectionality theory, and social justice movement organizing within and outside of psychology, Flynn et al. present a provocative four-point typology for promoting civil disobedience in the discipline that challenges psychologists to reconsider how they interact with institutional and bureaucratic systems that impede social justice.

Miles and Fassinger (2021) focus on graduate training in their contribution, pointing to the urgency of addressing persistent social problems such as racial violence, health, and economic disparities through engaged, critical psychology. The authors describe the divisive sociopolitical climate that makes the need for innovative and strong graduate training programs crucial if psychologists are to successfully intervene in complex social problems. They argue that it is key that graduate programs *across the discipline* combine training in science, advocacy, and practice. Though “scientist-practitioner-advocate” training models are somewhat established in applied psychology programs (e.g., Mallinckrodt et

al., 2014), this kind of training paradigm is effectively unheard of outside of counseling psychology. Further, “practice” is almost exclusively conceptualized in psychology as referring to counseling and psychotherapy. Advocacy, on the other hand, is still broadly considered to refer to activities beyond the quotidian duties of academic and professional psychologists. Nevertheless, the transferable and radical model the authors articulate, which builds on a long history of advocacy within organized psychology, shows great promise for application across psychological subfields. They provide examples of what advocacy looks like across various parts of the discipline, critically examine these examples, and conclude with recommendations for how a scientist-practitioner-advocate model for public psychology can succeed in uncharted disciplinary territory.

Neville et al. (2021) similarly provide recommendations for training via their “Public Psychology for Liberation (PPL)” model, an innovative approach to undergraduate and graduate training that proposes to shift psychology’s mainstream training paradigms to the production of science that promotes equity and social, economic, health, and educational justice. Critical to the model is the centering of the perspectives, experiences, and collaborative involvement of members of the Global Majority, who are most significantly impacted by systems of oppression. By centering the involvement of those most marginalized in our global society, the PPL provides a critical lens into psychological science and practice, and ensures that the products of the discipline have real-world relevance and applicability. To achieve these goals, Neville and colleagues propose a slate of institutional and disciplinary changes, a common theme throughout the articles in this issue. Among their proposed changes are learning *from* community members, prioritizing researching processes of power and oppression from interdisciplinary perspectives, identifying and addressing past harms committed by psychology and psychologists, and creating mechanisms for us to be evaluated by and held accountable to the communities in which we work. The Public Science Project and Academics 4 Black Lives are provided as two examples of existing work which exemplifies the PPL, and demonstrates that liberatory public psychology approaches have value in addressing current social problems.

Raque et al. (2021) discuss aligning research practices in health psychology with public psychology goals using the Multicultural Orientation Framework (MCO). Specifically, the authors explain how MCO can help health psychology researchers work toward racial equity. After describing MCO’s components, the authors introduce questions researchers can use to guide self-reflexivity and the implementation of MCO into research focused on racial equity. These questions help researchers reflect on the sociocultural history of their work, relevant systems of oppression and privilege, and paths toward enacting social change, across the research process. Available in the journal

supplement, these questions consider, for example, values conflicts during study development, cultural attunement in the selection of methods, and how the data serves relevant stakeholders. To make the application of these questions clear, the authors present perinatal health research with Black women as examples of self-reflexivity during study development, data collection, and data dissemination.

Engaging Diverse Publics

The articles collectively destabilize the notion of a monolithic public, much less one that is waiting to be served by psychologists. Instead, the authors challenge psychologists to think seriously about how we interact with diverse communities, including those that may be skeptical about psychology and psychologists. Further, several articles identify limitations of existing academic bureaucracies, clinical institutions, and scientific infrastructures, many of which reproduce hierarchies and impede meaningful public engagement less organized by vertically stratified relationships.

In their contribution, coauthors [Jacquez et al. \(2021\)](#) make an argument for the need of a public psychology rooted in the values of liberation psychology (see also [Neville et al., 2021](#)). They identify the benefits of public psychology that incorporates liberation psychology as extending to the community, academics, social policy, and community practice. If change is to occur that reflects these values of liberation psychology, the authors argue that the methods used in research should be built around participatory partnerships. To illustrate this approach, the authors highlight work of a community research partnership between academics and individuals with lived experience as refugees. Every aspect of the research process is analyzed as an important element of public psychology research: the development of research questions and design, the data collection and analysis, and the dissemination and action planning. Community academic collaborations are highlighted that illustrate the strengths and concerns of diverse refugee communities and that demonstrate ways to have the research inform actions promoting civic engagement. Methods of codeveloping action plans based on research findings are illustrated, as is the process of translating research into meaningful action. The authors end by noting that public psychology has the potential not only to promote greater equity but also to improve science.

[Ozer et al. \(2021\)](#) discuss three case examples of community-research partnerships in the University of California system, each aimed at the reduction of inequities in educational systems. Across these cases the authors describe a variety of challenges and successes in performing community-engaged scholarship in service of public psychology. Principal among the challenges are the necessary institutional conditions needed to start and maintain such scholarship: supportive campus cultures, the creation of appropriate approval processes, funding, and faculty reward structures.

For example, all cases noted that their campuses lacked a central infrastructure to support and grow the number of partnered initiatives. These efforts nonetheless had a great number of successes, including the development of the following materials, available to readers in the journal supplement: Berkeley campus guidelines for community-engaged scholarship, a policy on elicitation of outside letters from Santa Cruz, and a partnership agreement from Berkeley-SFUSD. These examples contribute to the public psychology framework by helping researchers interested in forging long-term community partnerships anticipate and address common institutional challenges (e.g., aligning the faculty reward structure with public scholarship), and locate and utilize institutional opportunities (campus-level networks and incubators).

Communicating and Democratizing Psychological Knowledge

It has been argued that, to build the public trust, scientists must demonstrate that the values of scientists—and scientific endeavors—align with those of the public. In other words, scientists and science must be democratized ([Schroeder, 2018](#)). One way to accomplish this is through forming collaborative partnerships with the consumers of psychology, including policymakers.

To some extent, all the articles in the special issue attend to issues of how best to communicate with diverse publics and how knowledge can be created and shared more equitably. Crowley and colleagues ([Crowley et al., 2021](#)) best capture these goals with their description of findings from a randomized controlled trial of the Research-to-Policy Collaboration (RPC) model, which prepares researchers to respond to legislative requests for scientific evidence, and to develop working relationships with legislative staff. Over 300 social science researchers and 48 congressional offices participated in this trial, which involved assessing policymaker's needs, identifying and training researchers with relevant expertise, and engaging legislative staff and researchers in meetings and collaborations. As expected, those researchers assigned to the RPC condition demonstrated more engagement with policymakers, and had fewer concerns about federal support for research and about how policymakers use research. A needs assessment asking about policymakers' goals is available to readers in the journal supplement, and details on the RPC are available at <https://www.research2policy.org/about>. This article exemplifies the theme of communicating and democratizing psychological knowledge because it demonstrates how researchers, including Black, Indigenous, and people of color researchers, can be supported to engage in public policy development, including communicating knowledge for the creation of evidence-based legislation.

Rethinking What Constitutes Psychology

The issue concludes with two related, complementary articles that engage questions about the capacity for psychological science to actualize an expansive public psychology project despite the proverbial best of intentions. Both articles suggest major epistemic challenges that dominant psychology poses to the implementation of a wide-reaching public psychology framework or paradigm.

First, Lewis (2021) invokes the “basic” versus “applied” dichotomy and links the division of knowledge production enterprises in the discipline to the question of public engagement. Drawing on sociology of science and insights from feminist and antiracist science studies, Lewis outlines the stakes of what he perceives as battles over methodological legitimacy. In other words, Lewis argues that both basic and applied psychology have developed different methodological norms at least particularly motivated by perceived legitimacy; ironically, the entire discipline faces a crisis of legitimacy in the eyes of the public, thanks in no small part to the widely publicized reproducibility crisis. Using the question “who counts?” in what can be read as a bit of double entendre, Lewis probes the largely unspoken disciplinary norms that shape which kinds of knowledge are treated as legitimate in the discipline and then how those legitimacies are linked to certain kinds of people, social groups, and social issues. Echoing Black feminist observations that the concept of an intellectual has historically been used to exclude Black women and other marginalized groups from authoritative positions as knowledge producers (Collins, 1998), Lewis (2021) frames the stakes of public psychology accordingly: until we (psychologists) interrogate what we (gatekeepers in the discipline) view as legitimate, we are unprepared to meet the needs of the public, much of whom has been systematically excluded from contributing to scientific knowledge.

While Lewis’s (2021) critique focuses on what counts as good work in the discipline, Grzanka and Cole (2021) invert the analysis to foreground that which comes to be viewed as bad. In their article, which is both an institutional critique and an exercise in the sociology of psychology, Grzanka and Cole look to historical social movements (e.g., African American Civil Rights in the 1960s, AIDS activism in the 1980s and 1990s) for examples of how transformative movement leaders have reclaimed and repurposed stigmatizing labels in the interest of radical change. Drawing particularly on King’s (1968) “creative maladjustment” (see also Flynn et al., 2021; Neville et al., 2021) and queer theorist Michael Warner’s “bad queers,” Grzanka and Cole build an argument for “bad psychology.” They suggest that the epistemic architecture of the discipline is antithetical to the production of transformative public engagement, because a vast array of largely invisible mechanisms are designed to discipline and reject disruptive (i.e., “bad”)

ideas and practices. To illustrate their point that good intentions alone will not result in psychology intervening to alleviate social problems and human suffering, Grzanka and Cole trace the role of implicit bias and its associated trainings in the production of what they term the “no-fault racist actor.” By giving the insights of social cognition away, so to speak, psychologists may have inadvertently contributed to the proliferation of (a) ideas that racist behavior is automatic and so blameless, and (b) diversity and inclusion efforts that do little to change the systems they aim to transform. Promoting instead a version of psychology that can identify and nurture iconoclastic and revolutionary ideas, Grzanka and Cole turn again to social movements that rejected the logic of assimilation and normativities and instead envisioned brave, novel versions of justice and progress. Grzanka and Cole suggest those kinds of brave visions might inspire similarly brave public science.

Cautious Optimism for Revolting Times

As we developed this special issue over the past 2 years, the world has been and continues to be transformed. And during what Fine (2012) called these “revolting times” of astonishing suffering *and* exhilarating revolution, we were routinely inspired by psychologists and their allies doing remarkable work to address injustice. The authors included in the special issue represent the vanguard of public psychology. And they are joined by psychologists across the world who are leveraging the urgency of the novel coronavirus pandemic and the racial justice uprisings of 2020 to insist on a more critical, inclusive, and transformative psychology (e.g., Buchanan et al., 2021). We offer this special issue with a spirit of cautious optimism. The articles in this volume suggest that while psychology as a discipline has much to reconsider and to change, the opportunities for transformative work are multifarious. With these public psychologists as our guides, we are excited to see what happens next.

References

- Adams, G., Estrada-Villalta, S., Sullivan, D., & Markus, H. R. (2019). The psychology of neoliberalism and the neoliberalism of psychology. *Journal of Social Issues, 75*(1), 189–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12305>
- APA. (2020). *The APA citizen psychologist*. <https://www.apa.org/about/governance/citizen-psychologist>
- APA Dictionary of Psychology. (2021a). *Applied psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/applied-psychology>
- APA Dictionary of Psychology. (2021b). *Psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/psychology>
- Bowleg, L. (2012). The problem with the phrase women and minorities: Intersectionality—an important theoretical framework for public health. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(7), 1267–1273. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.300750>
- Buchanan, N. T., Perez, M., Prinstein, M. J., & Thurston, I. B. (2021). Upending racism in psychological science: Strategies to change how

- science is conducted, reported, reviewed, and disseminated. *American Psychologist*, 76(7), 1097–1112.
- Christens, B., & Perkins, D. D. (2008). Transdisciplinary, multilevel action research to enhance ecological and psychopolitical validity. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(2), 214–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20232>
- Chu, J. P., Emmons, L., Wong, J., Goldblum, P., Reiser, R., Barrera, A. Z., & Byrd-Olmstead, J. (2012). Public psychology: A competency model for psychologists in community mental health. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 43, 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026319>
- Collins, P. H. (1998). *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Crowley, D. M., Scott, J. T., Long, E. C., Green, L., Giray, C., Gay, B., Israel, A., Storace, R., McCauley, M., & Donovan, M. (2021). Cultivating researcher-policymaker partnerships: A randomized control trial of a model for training public psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1307–1322. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000880>
- Eidelson, R. (2017, October 13). Psychologists are facing consequences for helping with torture. It is not enough. *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/psychologists-are-facing-consequences-for-helping-with-torture-its-not-enough/2017/10/13/2756b734-ad14-11e7-9e58-e6288544af98_story.html
- Eidelson, R. (2021). Concerns about “Psychology PAC” and the American Psychological Association [Blog post.] <https://reidelson.medium.com/concerns-about-psychology-pac-and-the-american-psychological-association-16f12b3ea5e9>
- Eyal, G. (2019). *The crisis of expertise*. Polity Press.
- Fine, M. (2012). Resuscitating critical psychology for “revolting” times. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(2), 416–438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01756.x>
- Flynn, A. W. P., Domínguez, S., Jr., Jordan, R. A. S., Dyer, R. L., & Young, E. I. (2021). When the political is professional: Civil disobedience in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1217–1231. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000867>
- Grzanka, P. R., & Cole, E. R. (2021). An argument for bad psychology: Disciplinary disruption, public engagement, and social transformation. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1334–1345. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000853>
- Helms, J. E. (2015). A legacy of eugenics underlies racial-group comparisons in intelligence testing. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 5, 176–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01426.x>
- Imber, S. D., Young, C., & Froman, L. (1978). Public psychology: An extension of the community idea. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 6(1), 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00890101>
- Jacquez, F., Dutt, A., Manirambona, E., & Wright, B. (2021). Uniting liberatory and participatory approaches in public psychology with refugees. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1280–1292. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000835>
- King, M. L., Jr. (1968). The role of the behavioral scientist in the civil rights movement. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23, 180–186. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025715>
- Lewis, N. A., Jr. (2021). What counts as good science? How the battle for methodological legitimacy affects public psychology. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1323–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000870>
- Mallinckrodt, B., Miles, J. R., & Levy, J. J. (2014). The scientist-practitioner-advocate model: Addressing contemporary training needs for social justice advocacy. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 8(4), 303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000045>
- Miles, J. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (2021). Creating a public psychology through a scientist-practitioner-advocate model. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1232–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000855>
- Miller, G. A. (1969). Psychology as a means of promoting human welfare. *American Psychologist*, 24(12), 1063–1075. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0028988>
- Neville, H. A., Ruedas-Gracia, N., Lee, B. A., Ogunfemi, N., Maghsoodi, A. H., Mosley, D. V., LaFromboise, T. D., & Fine, M. (2021). The public psychology for liberation training model: A call to transform the discipline. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1248–1265. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000887>
- Ozer, E. J., Langhout, R. D., & Weinstein, R. S. (2021). Promoting institutional change to support public psychology: Innovations and challenges at the University of California. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1293–1306. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000877>
- Perkins, D. D., & Schensul, J. J. (2017). Interdisciplinary contributions to community psychology and transdisciplinary promise. In M. Bond, I. Serrano-Garcia, & C. B. Keys (Eds.), *APA handbook of community psychology: Theoretical foundations, core concepts, and emerging challenges* (Vol. 1, pp. 189–209). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14953-009>
- Prilleltensky, I. (2008). The role of power in wellness, oppression, and liberation: An integration of psychological and political dynamics. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(2), 116–136. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20225>
- Raque, T. L., Mitchell, A. M., Coleman, M. N., Coleman, J. J., & Owen, J. (2021). Addressing racial equity in health psychology research: An application of the multicultural orientation framework. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1266–1279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000888>
- Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(6), 1295–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927709>
- Schroeder, S. A. (2018). A better foundation for public trust in science. *British Journal for Philosophy of Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axz023>
- Siegel, J., Arenson, M., Mikytuck, A., & Woolard, J. (2021). Engaging public policy with psychological science. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 7(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000284>
- Syme, G. J., & Bishop, B. J. (1993). Public psychology: Planning a role for psychology. *Australian Psychologist*, 28(1), 45–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00050069308258866>
- Yakushko, O. (2019). Eugenics and its evolution in the history of western psychology: A critical archival review. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 17(2), Article e1495. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppi.1495>

Received August 1, 2021

Revision received August 8, 2021

Accepted August 13, 2021 ■