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Diversity Representation of Editorial Boards in School Psychology

Abstract

There have been numerous calls in school psychology to evaluate representation across leadership positions in editorial processes. While existing literature provides insights into supporting scholars from marginalized communities in research and publishing, there remains limited study and public awareness of diverse representation on editorial boards in school psychology. To address this gap, three studies in 2023 evaluated major journal boards in the United States. Study 1 analyzed 636 names collected from board websites to estimate the representation of scholars of color, women, and gender minorities. Study 2 surveyed board members to estimate the representation of scholars of color, women, gender minorities, sexual minorities, scholars with disabilities, and multilingual scholars. Study 3 employed a survey of editors. Findings revealed that scholars of color composed 23% to 29% of board members as of 2023. Women composed 56% to 61%, gender minority groups composed 0.2% to 0.4%, sexual minority groups composed 11%, scholars with disabilities composed 23%, and multilingual scholars composed 16% of editorial board members. One-third of board members had two or more intersecting marginalized identities. Scholars of color made up at least a quarter of members at each service level (e.g., editor, associate editor, and board member), and representation of scholars of color ranged from 9% to 56% by journal. The variation in marginalized scholars’ representation across service levels and journals underscores the need to address barriers to inclusion, tokenism, and professional and social exclusion affecting recruitment, retention, and representation of diverse scholars on school psychology editorial boards.
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Diversity Representation on Editorial Boards in School Psychology

This dissertation addresses the importance of diversity in the profession of psychology, particularly school psychology. It focuses on the significance of the inclusion and representation of marginalized identities on journal editorial boards. The implications of school psychology’s calls to engage in antiracist academic procedures and promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, will be discussed in relation to academia, practice, and the peer-review economy. Following, a review of previous studies’ methodologies in examining the demographic composition of editorial boards will be provided to conceptualize the aims of this dissertation.

The Marginalization and Inclusion of Scholars in Psychology and School Psychology

Some of the most prominent ways in which diversity is considered among professionals are related to race and ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and the intersectionality of these identities within the context of society. Across the history of psychology, professionals and organizations have contributed to systemic inequalities, racial discrimination, and the denigration of people of color (American Psychological Association [APA] Council of Representatives, 2021). For decades, psychology has attempted to reckon with its involvement in supporting racist, sexist, and discriminatory policies, ideas, and practices. APA’s apology to people of color in 2021 represents one of those reckonings in which, among many other things, APA acknowledged that “…psychology has minimized and marginalized psychologists from communities of color and their contributions to the field (Guthrie, 2004)…” Associations within the field of psychology have long been doing this work and making the effort to deconstruct the ideas and policies that APA used to perpetuate inequalities. The controversy of APA’s apology is highlighted in the Association of Black Psychologists (ABPsi) board of directors’ statement, “APA’s endeavor to be anti-racist misses the mark and exemplifies that their resolution and
apology is simply a means by which to absolve themselves of white guilt...” (ABPsi, 2021, p. 2), in which APA failed to consult with ABPsi and other ethnic associations whose communities are directly involved in this matter.

Prior to this apology, APA had established committees and action plans related to supporting marginalized groups and professionals in attempts to grapple with inequity within their field. The Committee on Women in Psychology was established in 1973 to ensure equality for women within the community of psychology and the larger society. In 1985, the Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology was established to promote psychological welfare and responsive service delivery models for people with disabilities, the awareness of disability issues in research, and the inclusion of knowledge about disabilities and disability issues. APA’s Committee on Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity (formerly the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns) was developed to support gender and sexually diverse psychologists, encourage unbiased research in gender and sexual diverse people, examine the consequences of inaccurate information, develop educational materials, and assist APA’s integration of these issues. In 2022, APA adopted a Racial Equity Action plan to support their mission of “advancing equity, diversity, and inclusion through psychological science that champions thought leadership, innovation and excellence” (APA, 2022, p. 10). Several other dedicated groups have been established within APA such as the Office on Aging, Health Disparities Office, Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs, Committee on Socioeconomic Status, and Violence Prevention Office.

For school psychology, similar commitments to supporting marginalized groups and antiracism have been made. In 2017, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) produced a position statement highlighting the ethical obligation of school psychologists to
contribute to safe, supportive, and affirming school climates for youth of diverse sexual orientations, gender identities, and gender expressions. In 2020, NASP adopted the Resolution Committing to Antiracism Action, (a) recognizing professional practices that were rooted in racism such as “the assessment and discipline practices that have contributed to disproportionate harmful outcomes for minoritized students” (NASP, 2020, p. 1) and (b) advocating for work that dismantles systemic inequalities such as increasing the representation of people of color in school psychology and NASP leadership. In 2022, NASP produced another position statement outlining the ethical responsibilities of school psychologists to contribute to the safe, supportive, and validating school climate for transgender and gender diverse students, even when school policies and state legislation mandate discrimination. Most recently, in March 2023, NASP released a statement in opposition to the censorship of diversity-related educational materials that government entities have been falsely branding as protecting “parents’ rights. Much of the advocacy and relations work within NASP has been the product of their diversity-focused groups. For example, the NASP LGBTQI2-S committee is a collaborator with other groups like that of the Gay, Lesbian Straight Education Network (GLSEN), Trevor Project, and others that monitor and promote research and legislative initiatives that support LGBTQIA+ students. The Multicultural Affairs Committee also promotes cultural awareness within the field of school psychology and supports the initiatives of other subcommittees for promoting effective practice and recruitment and retention in professional development within their respective community, like that of African Diaspora, Indigenous American Subcommittee, Bilingual School Psychology, and many others.
Marginalization and Inclusion of Scholars in School Psychology Academia and Training

In introducing the discussion of the inclusion of marginalized scholars on journal editorial boards, it is highly relevant also to describe the experiences of graduate students, trainees, and faculty in academic spaces. These academic spaces serve as the environments in which the peer-review and publication process takes place, and therefore, they shape the entry period for future editorial board members. In describing the effects of gender-related journal barriers on investments made by academic institutions, Silver (2019) highlighted the role that academic institutions play in the investment and return cycle of the editorial process. Large financial investments are made in hiring and supporting early-career faculty in publishing and leadership, which are critical to career advancement and compensation. When journal-level barriers are met, some scholars may leave the institution, or if they do persist, they may move up the ladder more slowly and not reach the highest levels (e.g., journal editor), resulting in an unfulfilled investment made by the institution (Silver, 2019). Due to this relationship between academic environments and the peer-review process, it is necessary to consider the marginalization of groups in school psychology academia and training to give context to the discussion of representation on editorial boards.

The underrepresentation of marginalized groups as academics and practitioners is influenced by historical and systemic barriers. These barriers include limited access and equity of higher education for women and people of color, segregation and underfunding of public institutions, and social climates that alienate marginalized groups (Franklin, 2016). In school psychology, the representation of racially marginalized groups among academic faculty is only 21% (Johnson et al., 2023). In discussing the relevance of diversification of school psychology in academia, Proctor et al. (2021) described the importance of diversifying school psychology in
academia and illustrated the barriers faced by students and faculty of color in their chapter, *Succeeding as a Person of Color in School Psychology*. Empirical data and personal experiences were used to illustrate some of these challenges including a lower sense of belongingness, higher emotional distress, and attrition for school psychology graduate students who experienced racial microaggressions (Clark et al., 2012; Proctor & Truscott, 2012). These challenges were shown to be especially prominent for Black male school psychology students (Proctor et al., 2018a).

Students of color also faced difficulties in finding mentorship from same-race faculty members, and faculty members of color experienced the “invisible labor” of diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives and mentoring of graduate students of color while also experiencing similar challenges themselves (Proctor et al., 2018b). The work of Settles et al. (2019) further describes this invisible labor within the paradoxical experience reported by faculty of color within academia. This intersection of invisibility and hypervisibility is described by faculty as a lack of recognition for their scholarship and achievements from colleagues while simultaneously being used to represent diversity within the institution’s initiatives and efforts and being under heightened scrutiny.

Pertaining to the educational, training, and academic experiences of gender diverse and sexual minority students and faculty in school psychology, research is limited, and visibility and disclosure play a significant role (Shankle et al., 2003). A qualitative study by Sowden et al. (2016) offered some insight into the thoughts, feelings, and experiences of lesbian, gay, and transgender-identified school psychologists. Themes of improving graduate training and supporting gender diverse and sexual minority school psychologists included raising awareness of related issues among training faculty, eliminating discrimination and hostility in academic settings, and increasing NASP’s knowledge of transgender-specific issues (Sowden et al., 2016).
Limited research exists on the experiences of students and faculty with disabilities in school psychology, with similar issues of disclosure playing a role. Lund et al. (2014) found that most trainees with disabilities in clinical, counseling, school, and rehabilitation psychology did not disclose their disability and relied on informal accommodations. Furthermore, approximately 67% of participants reported experiencing the highest level of discrimination within their career thus far, to be during graduate school training, and 43% to 47% reported experiencing discrimination during the internship and postdoctoral phases (Lund et al., 2014). Extensive research has documented the disparities in the quality of higher education and the discrimination faced by marginalized students and faculty. These barriers and calls for support and diversity are not confined to academia and training alone but are reflected in various career-related activities, including the peer-review process.

The Call for Diversity in Journal Editorial Boards

Peer-reviewed literature is an essential source of evidence-based practices used by practitioners and school psychologists in the field. However, the content of scientific literature can be limited by a lack of diverse perspectives, resulting in a narrower scope that restricts generalizability and utility. Jimerson et al. (2021) suggested ways to broaden the scope to diversify journal leadership, prepare future diverse journal leaders, and establish a diverse student editorial board and journal action plan focused on advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Leaders in School Psychology Review have published calls to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion, including unified antiracism statements (García-Vázquez et al., 2020). APA Division 16, Trainers of School Psychologists, Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs, Society for the Study of School Psychology, the American Board of School Psychology...
Psychology, and NASP have contributed to this statement, demonstrating a commitment to supporting the diversity of journals and advancing research, practice, policy, and advocacy, through actionable plans.

We will actively recruit diverse voices for leadership positions within professional organizations and committees. We commit to ensuring that diverse voices are engaged and represented across issues before the field. We commit to ensuring that our scholarly outlets (e.g., journals, newsletters) regularly include science and research inclusive of voices and perspectives of scholars and communities of color (García-Vázquez et al., 2020, p. 211).

Editors and leaders of *School Psychology International* and *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* also detailed their commitment to promoting social justice goals in anti-racism and equity in the editorial and peer-review process (Newman et al., 2021; Noltemeyer & Grapin, 2021). In *School Psychology International*, the editors highlighted the lack of publications that take an anti-racism approach, specifically related to disrupting structural racism. In partnership with *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, the two journals committed to several 1-year action plans to identify areas for change and innovations. Of those, they committed to engaging:

- in additional efforts to ensure scholars of color and other marginalized voices are represented on the editorial board, in other leadership positions, in the scholarship published within our journals, and in broader efforts to shape the present and future vision of the journal (Noltemeyer & Grapin, 2021, p. 6).

Recently, publications have depicted the challenges disproportionately affecting scholars as a result of the impact of COVID-19 on publication activity and participation (Codding et al.,
Disparities in the submission rates for the journal *School Psychology* were discussed in a 2020 journal editorial and described preliminary data implying that parents in academia, compared to nonparents, were likely disadvantaged due to school and childcare closures (Codding et al., 2020; Minello, 2020). Women were found in other fields to also have low rates of journal submissions during the COVID-19 pandemic likely related to the increase in the burden of academic housekeeping, domestic responsibilities, elder care, and child care (Flaherty, 2020; Viglione, 2020; Vincent-Lamarre et al., 2020). In contrast, for researchers in school psychology, there were significantly more submissions by women than men during the initial phase of COVID-19 (Harris et al., 2021). However, no studies examining journal article submissions included an analysis related to caregiving responsibilities, per se, or other diversity characteristics, including race. Women scholars of color were predicted to be particularly impacted in relation to the well-documented disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on Black, Latinx, and American Indian communities due to structural racism (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021; 500 Women Scientists, 2020). Given the anticipated impacts on the scholarly output of marginalized scholars and the growing demand for greater diversity representation, it is crucial to investigate the present status of diversity representation on editorial boards of school psychology journals.

**Previous Studies Assessing Editorial Board Diversity**

Researchers from various academic fields have analyzed the diversity representation of leadership positions in journal editorial boards and professional organizations, with foci on women and racially/ethnically diverse individuals. Some of the fields that have examined the representation of women on editorial boards include broad sciences in Spanish journals (Mauleón et al., 2012), mathematical science (Topaz & Sen, 2016), criminal justice and
criminology (Lowe & Fagan, 2019), ecology and evolution (Fox et al., 2019), and psychiatry (Hafeez et al., 2019; Mun & Akinyemi, 2020). Other fields have focused on race and ethnicity, such as academic surgery (Nakayama, 2012), health sciences (Akers et al., 2021), medical education (Yip & Rashid, 2021), surgical research (White et al., 2021), cardiology (Lim et al., 2022), psychiatry and neuroscience (Shim et al., 2021), and applied linguistics (Bhattacharya et al., 2020).

There have been very few studies on representation in journal editorial boards within school psychology, with studies primarily focused on women. Alpert et al. (1988) provided a brief summary of women’s service indicating that there had yet to be a woman editor and, in all cases, women comprised less than 1/3 of editorial board members. Fitzpatrick et al. (2023) conducted a more comprehensive review, analyzing trends across 55 years of the field for women’s representation, and found an increase from 3.4% in 1965 to 54.8% in 2020. In other fields and within school psychology, previous research assessing editorial board diversity has predominantly employed three methodological approaches for collecting demographic information. They include direct anonymous surveys, internet searches (e.g., names, pronouns, and biographies/pictures), and name analysis. The strengths and limitations of these approaches are described in the following sections, in order of their level of required inference.

**Survey Methods**

Self-reported surveys present the most direct and potentially accurate method for collecting demographic information, as personal identities are self-identified. Surveys of editorial board demographics have been frequently used in recent evaluations of diversity representation (Akers et al., 2021; Greco et al., 2016; Shim et al., 2021; White et al., 2021). For instance, Akers et al. (2021) surveyed the racial, gender, sexual, and disability identities of
editorial board members, reviewers, and authors in the *Journal of the Medical Library Association* (JMLA). Their survey was unique because it was developed in collaboration with the JMLA equity workgroup, a team of JMLA editors and editorial board members focused on providing more equitable opportunities for minoritized individuals.

Anonymity and aggregated presentation of survey results reduce the risk of respondents being identifiable, however, there are some weaknesses associated with this method. Although surveys of editorial board demographics are more likely to be accurate, previous studies have yielded low response rates that may not be generalizable to the entire sample (13.53%, Greco et al., 2016; 53.5%, White et al., 2021; 54%, Akers et al., 2021). Additionally, these surveys may introduce the potential of selection bias, in which participants from underrepresented groups or respondents with particular interests in diversity, equity, and inclusion work may be more likely to respond (White et al., 2021). Smith (2008) suggested that women may also be more likely to respond to surveys than men. These low response rates present a significant challenge in determining the true representation of diversity on editorial boards. The use of a single self-report survey is limited in its ability to capture enough respondents, which can hinder drawing accurate conclusions.

**Internet Searches**

In an attempt to capture more persons for determining the representation of editorial boards, previous studies have used internet search methods to identify members’ race, ethnicity, and gender. These studies utilized publicly available names and cross-referenced them with biographies and pictures to determine gender, race, and ethnicity. For example, Lim et al. (2022) and Nakayama (2012) both used pronouns, surnames, and pictures from online biographies to determine the proportion of women and Asian American leadership representation in cardiology.
and academic surgery journals. In both studies, internet search methods allowed researchers to conduct an analysis of representation in an expedited and non-invasive way using publicly accessible information, allowing them to capture the majority of members. However, the use of pictures and surnames for discerning race relies on the subjective perceptions and experiences of the person viewing these data. This method can present issues for individuals who are perceived to be racially ambiguous, are mixed race, or have changed surnames (e.g., marriage, adoption, etc.) that are different from their ethnic background. Additional concerns for image-based methods stem from established research in social psychology, particularly that of own-race bias in facial recognition (Malpass & Kravitz, 1969; Meissner & Brigham, 2001), which indicates that people are more accurate in identifying faces of the race to which they belong.

Another approach used in internet search procedures has been to categorize scholars using aggregated racial categories. For example, Bhattacharya et al. (2020) used subjective categories of “non-Caucasian” or “Caucasian” which allowed more individuals to be included in analyses with improved accuracy of sorting but depended on a crude account for race, limiting their ability to analyze representation beyond “non-White.” In response to this limitation, Bhattacharya et al. (2020) referenced the work of Delgado and Stefancic (2017) in which they describe the social construction thesis of critical race theory--that races are the “products of social thought and relations” and not “objective, inherent, or fixed, they correspond to no biological or genetic reality; rather, races are categories that society invents, manipulates, or retires when convenient” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017, p. 8). Where the use of two categories over-simplified the complex realities of representation that occur differentially across scholars of color, it improved their ability to be accurate and encompassing in their classifications.
**Name Analysis**

Studies from the public health and health services literature offer another method for determining diversity representation. Name analysis has been used for decades in this area, originally developed using the 1953 California Department of Public Health birth database to determine Hispanic ethnicity (i.e., the Generally Useful Ethnicity Search System [GUESS]; Perez-Stable et al., 1995). Several programs and databases have since been created such as the South Asian Names and Group Recognition Algorithm (SANGRA) by Nanchahal et al. (2001). What differentiates this particular process from the individual categorization of names noted above in internet searches is that it predicts the likelihood of a name’s association with a particular racial and ethnic group from a large dataset and machine learning, as opposed to individual subjective determinations. Fiscella and Fremont (2006) described in their review of name analysis the advantages to be that it is nonintrusive, quick, inexpensive, and unaffected by response bias. A significant limitation at the time was its lack of accuracy in inferring Black and White races as compared to Hispanic and Asian and its unknown accuracy in identifying Native American names. Other disadvantages they found were that it is less accurate for people who change their last names (e.g., adopted and married persons), for certain subpopulations (e.g., Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Filipinos, and Hawaiians), and multiracial groups.

In more recent years, researchers have aimed to improve name analysis tools’ abilities to make accurate inferences and have applied them to academic scholarly works. For example, APA presently recommends authors check their reference lists for a balance in gender and race and ethnicity representation as part of their inclusive reporting standards. They cited the work of Bertolero et al. (2020) and Bailey and Trudy (2018) demonstrating that Black women’s work is disproportionately under-credited as compared to that of White authors. Specifically, APA
encourages authors to reference Bertolero’s method of name analysis to screen citations for race and ethnicity representation before submission.

The code notebook from Bertolero et al. (2020) study was obtained from Sood and Laohaprapanon’s (2018) open-source Python package called “ethnicolr” (https://github.com/appeler/ethnicolr). This package is a database and machine learning model that predicts the race and ethnicity associated with a given name. It is trained on several databases including the 2000 and 2010 U.S. census data, the Florida voter registration database from 2017, and the Wikipedia dataset from Skiena and colleagues at Stony Brook University (2009) using neural networks for tasks using sequential data (Sood & Laohaprapanon, 2018). First and last names are used to predict the probability of a name’s association with a particular race and ethnicity category (i.e., Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, other). Bertolero et al. (2020) used “ethnicolr” to predict the racial and ethnic identity of authors cited in neuroscience reference lists, finding women of color authors to be significantly more under-cited than men of color and White men, and slightly more under-cited than White women. “ethnicolr” has also been used to examine the inclusion of authors of color in urban planning education syllabi, to estimate user demographics in a Twitter study of public opinion on the #STOPAAPIHate movement, and examine mental health discussions on Twitter during the COVID-19 pandemic (Lyu et al., 2023; Millard-Ball et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022). Limitations for “ethnicolr” are related to its training source of Census data, Florida voter registration data, and Wikipedia. There are historical disparities in what names are likely to be included based on those who are likely to respond to the U.S. Census, register to vote in Florida, and be written about in Wikipedia. Additionally, although these sources provide a rich and large dataset for machine learning, these sources do not calculate results for American Indian/Native Alaskan or mixed-race authors.
Because these datasets are not exempt from the influences of systemic racism, the “ethnicolr” model is trained in a way that shows to be slightly more sensitive to predicting White race probability. This procedure highlights the influence of structural and systemic barriers on developing inclusive and equitable technology and tools.

A recent publication offers the potential to address the sensitivity limitation noted by Fiscella and Fremont (2006) and Sood and Laohaprapanon (2018). The name analysis approach was expanded by Xie (2022) who developed a new R package, “rethnicity,” that improved the accuracy for identifying minority groups by adjusting the imbalance in the same datasets used to train the “ethnicolr” model. In comparison to “ethnicolr,” “rethnicity” was found to be significantly better at estimating Asian, Hispanic, and Black race name association, with slightly lower precision for White names. “rethnicity” also presented a more accessible method for estimating race and ethnicity name association. Whereas “ethnicolr” was designed for authors to consider the representation of scholars of color in their reference lists, requiring the use of a .bib file, “rethnicity” allows users to insert strings of names in R as opposed to Python which requires more extensive programming background knowledge. In an example of estimating race and ethnicity of names from the 2000 and 2010 Database on Ideology, Money in Politics, and Elections, “rethnicity” was found to reduce the error for identifying minority groups significantly. The total precision ratio for the Fullname model was 0.77 (i.e., 0.86 for Asian, 0.7 for Black, 0.83 for Hispanic, and 0.67 for White; Xie, 2022).

Whereas variations of surveys, internet searches, and name analysis tools have been used across several fields to determine the representation of historically marginalized groups in editorial boards and scholarly works, limited research in this area has been conducted for the field of school psychology. Fitzpatrick et al. (2023) conducted the most recent analysis of the
representation of women on school psychology journal editorial boards using the aforementioned methods of internet searches and name analysis (via genderize.io) and personal knowledge. In doing so, they explored the consistency across all three coding methods, finding a percent agreement rate of at least 98%. However, this analysis was limited in that it did not conduct direct surveys or consider an analysis of representation related to race, ethnicity, other marginalized identities, and intersectionality.

**Purpose of the Study**

This project sought to contribute to the social justice goals of editorship in school psychology by examining the current state of diversity on editorial boards. Specifically, the project determined the representation and inclusion of marginalized scholars on these boards. One of many explicit recommendations made by Buchanan et al. (2021) was for journals to increase the number of journal reviewers and editors of color, and they suggested that journals enact accountability by collecting information about their board’s diversity. Similarly, APA’s Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Toolkit (2021) recommended to editors that APA journals set goals to increase the diversity of their boards by 5% to 10% a year according to gender, race and ethnicity, disability status, and country of origin. In doing so, they specifically recommended to editors that associate editors and editorial board members be encouraged to complete the demographic questionnaires presented in manuscript submission and review portals.

To expand the examination of diversity representation on journal editorial boards in school psychology and to contribute to the social justice goals of editorship, three studies were conducted. Each study used different approaches for identifying and evaluating diversity. The goal of utilizing different approaches to examine diversity representation was to mitigate the
limitations of previous studies that relied on a single approach. Study 1 used lists of editorial board members and name analysis tools to estimate gender and race and ethnicity associations. Study 2 requested that editorial board members respond directly to an anonymous survey to obtain self-reported demographic and diversity information. Study 3 requested that current journal editors report demographic and diversity information of their board.

This dissertation aimed to address the following research objectives. The first objective was to determine the composition of editorial boards in terms of (1) race and ethnicity, (2) gender identity, (3) sexual orientation, (4) disability, and (5) language. The second objective was to examine intersectionality by determining the composition of editorial board members with two or more marginalized identities. The third objective was to investigate how diversity representation differs by journals and editorial positions, such as board member, associate editor, and editor.

Method

Journal Corpus

Across all three studies, seven active journals in the field of school psychology were targeted. The selection of these journals was based on those identified by Floyd et al. (2018) as the field’s most prominent generalist journals. Two journals with titles referring to “international” school psychology and including a substantial number of editorial board members with affiliations from outside of the United States (International Journal of School and Educational Psychology and School Psychology International) were excluded due to differences in terminology for categorizing race and ethnicity across the globe (White et al., 2021). The selected journals included Contemporary School Psychology, Journal of Applied School Psychology, Journal of School Psychology, Psychology in the Schools, School Psychology,

Procedures

Study 1: Name Analysis

In Study 1, a multi-step approach was used to estimate the current diversity representation on school psychology editorial boards using internet search and name analysis of listed editorial board information on journal websites.

Identifying Editorial Board Member Information. During February of 2023, a total of 636 names and affiliations were collected across each journal’s official website listing of editorial board members. Names of persons not associated with the peer-review of manuscripts (graduate assistant, bookkeeper, etc.) were excluded from this total. The resulting names were also deduplicated by removing individuals’ names that appeared more than once to reduce the redundancy of internet searches. A total of 473 different editorial board members were considered. Representation of gender and scholars of color were assessed by examining proportions across the journal corpus, by journal, and by levels (i.e., editorial board position) across journals.

Position Levels of Board Members. Due to differences in position titles and the variety of power positions among journals, titles were categorized into three levels based on their responsibilities and influence (Fitzpatrick et al., 2023; Floyd et al., 2021; Topaz & Sen, 2016). Level 1 positions represented the highest leadership position and most power influence over a journal such as an editor or editor-in-chief. Level 2 positions represented the next highest position such as handling editors, associate editors, or journal managers. Level 3 represented the
lowest power position on editorial boards such as board members, reviewers, or consulting editors.

**Determining Gender.** Gender coding of names was completed in a two-step process that follows similar processes established by previous research (Feeney et al., 2018; Fitzpatrick et al., 2023; Fox et al., 2019; Gottlieb et al., 2021; Grinnell et al., 2020; Hafeez et al., 2019; Lowe & Fagan, 2019; Mauleón et al., 2012; Metz & Harzing, 2009; Mun & Akinyemi, 2020; Schmaling & Blume, 2017; Topaz & Sen, 2016). For transparency, coders’ gender identities are disclosed as personal experiences may shape understanding of gender. Gender coding was conducted by the primary investigator and a second coder (both doctoral-level graduate students and cisgender women) following a practice session. The practice session included two demonstrations of internet search and gender coding procedures from Fitzpatrick et al. (2023) using randomly selected names from a previously coded dataset. Both coders were blinded from previous coding results before the practice session. Coders then independently conducted the internet search and coding procedures using an additional 20 randomly selected names from a previously coded dataset, achieving an intercoder agreement of 95%. After the practice session, coders independently coded the deduplicated dataset of 473 names, with each coder receiving a randomized list of names.

Coding procedures were as follows. First, coders copied and pasted names and affiliations of editorial board members into a Google search and searched for websites to identify their pronouns for the coding of gender. If no pronouns could be found, gender was coded based on editorial board members’ appearance in images. Method of coding was noted (“Pronoun” or “Image”). After the first round of internet searches, the intercoder agreement was 99% (with agreement on gender for 468 names but information related to 5 names identified by only one
coder). Webpages for the discrepant names were re-reviewed by both coders, and discrepancies were resolved.

Seven names could not be located online by either coder. These names were coded using the https://genderize.io database (Fitzpatrick et al., 2023; Fox et al., 2019; Gottlieb et al., 2021; Schmaling & Blume, 2017; Topaz & Sen, 2016). The principal investigator entered the seven names into the interface that estimates the probability of a name’s association with either female or male. This step was used last due to its restriction in classifying gender as a binary. At the time of this study, the https://genderize.io database contained a corpus of names with over 473 million entries from 252 different countries (go to https://genderize.io/our-data). Names that met a probability value of 0.85 or higher (Fitzpatrick et al., 2023; Topaz & Sen, 2016) were coded. Of the 473 deduplicated editorial board member names, the majority (95%) were coded using pronouns, 4% were coded using images alone, and 1% were coded using genderize.io. Results were entered into an Excel sheet for analysis.

**Determining Race and Ethnicity.** Given the prior work of Bertolero et al. (2020), Bailey and Trudy (2018), Xie (2022), and APA’s recommendation of the “ethnicolr” name analysis tool for reviewing reference lists, a similar program was used to estimate the associated race and ethnicity of editorial board names in the seven aforementioned journals. Identification of names likely to be associated with a racial or ethnic category was done using the Fullname model from Xie (2022)’s “rethnicity” R package. “rethnicity” uses the categories of Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White, and was found to be significantly better at predicting name association for Asian, Black, and Hispanic categories than “ethnicolr” (Xie 2022). The databases and iteration of ethnicolr’s and rethnicity’s steps are described in detail in Sood and Laohaprapanon (2018) and Xie (2020). In summary, models were created using datasets from the
Florida Voter Registration and U.S. Census Bureau from 2000 and 2010. This information was used to train models with long- and short-term memory networks or recurrent neural networks. According to Table 1 of Xie (2022), the overall precision of the Fullname model on test data that was not included in training was 0.77 for the student model after distillation. The precision for each category was as follows; 0.86 for Asian, 0.70 for Black, 0.83 for Hispanic, and 0.67 for White. In describing this method’s limitations, we refer to the Diversity Statement and Code Notebook from https://github.com/dalejn/cleanBib#readme about “ethnicolr,” as it pertains similarly to the use of “rethnicity”:

This method is limited in that a) names, Census entries, [voter registration data] and Wikipedia profiles used to make the predictions may not be indicative of racial/ethnic identity, and b) it cannot account for Indigenous and mixed-race authors, or those who may face differential biases due to the ambiguous racialization or ethnicization of their names. We look forward to future work that could help us to better understand how to support equitable practices in science (Diversity Statement Template).

The Fullname model was used to input the first and last names of editorial board members, as it is the model with the highest precision. This package and instructional use were obtained from the researcher at https://fangzhou-xie.github.io/rethnicity/articles/introduction.html. First and last names that were collected from journal websites were entered by the principal investigator into R using the appropriate syntax for the Fullname model, and the output was exported into Excel. Each name produced a value between 0 and 1.00, representing a proportion of the likelihood that a name was associated with the categories of Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White. Results were then collapsed into two categories of “scholar of color” (SOC) and “non-scholar of color” (NSOC) to increase the accuracy of name associations and reduce the likelihood of producing
identifiable information for instances where only one name may be associated with a particular race and ethnicity. To our knowledge, there have not yet been established criteria in research for the classification of SOC names’ using name analysis. The criteria for a name to be categorized as SOC was for the retnicity association value for a single category (i.e., Asian, Black, or Hispanic) to be greater than or equal to 0.5. Names that did not meet these criteria were categorized as not SOC. Results were entered into an Excel sheet for analysis. Previous studies have used both the produced four-category options of race and ethnicity (Bertolero et al., 2020; Lyu et al., 2023; Millard-Ball et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022) and a collapsed two-category option for coding race and ethnicity (Bhattacharya et al., 2020). Presently, there is no standard for determining the minimal threshold in which to accept an association value. The use of a two-category approach serves two purposes in light of the limitations it presents in collapsing categories. The first is that it increases the accuracy of name associations by using a majority statistic (>0.5) as opposed to a split majority. The second is that it reduces the likelihood of producing identifiable information for instances where only one name may be identified as being associated with a particular race and ethnicity. Although this approach will prevent the ability to analyze representation beyond “of color” it increases the accuracy of classification.

**Study 2: Board Member Survey**

In Study 2, editorial board members were surveyed directly to obtain their demographic information. The 7-item survey included items about the boards to which they belonged, position level, as well as demographic information about race and ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability identity, and languages spoken (see Appendix A). The survey was sent via (1) direct email to publicly listed email addresses on journals’ websites, (2) circulation on a listserv focusing on graduate educators in school psychology (i.e., Trainers in School Psychology
[SPTRAIN listserv]), and (3) social media sites (Facebook and Twitter/X) from August 2023 to January 2024. Using the deduplicated list of 473 names from Study 1, direct email addresses were identified by the principal investigator and graduate student using journal websites and internet searches of board member names and affiliations. An initial email to board members was sent in September 2023 and a follow-up reminder was sent three months later.

Circulation of the survey occurred on the SPTRAIN listserv following administrative approval in December 2023, and a reminder was sent out one month later. An initial social media post in the Facebook group “Said No School Psychologist Ever” occurred in late August 2023, and it was reposted in early November 2023. This popular group has 24,000 members identifying as school psychologists. The same social media post was publicly posted on Twitter/X in November 2023 from the principal investigator’s professional account.

From the survey, four variables were created to reduce the identifiability of any one response for low frequency items and to investigate an intersectionality variable. To determine how many responses belonged to scholars of color (SOC), the variable SOC was defined by endorsement of one or more of the following racial and ethnic categories: American Indian, Alaskan Native, Indigenous, Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Middle Eastern or North African, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Endorsement of White or European American was coded as not a scholar of color.

To determine how many responses belonged to respondents from gender minority groups, a variable was created and defined as a response that included one or more of the following gender identity categories: transgender, agender, nonbinary, and questioning or unsure. Endorsement of cisgender was coded as not gender minority. To determine how many responses belonged to sexual minority groups, a variable was created and defined as a response that
included one or more of the following sexual orientation categories: asexual, bisexual, gay or lesbian, or pansexual. Endorsement of heterosexual/straight was coded as not sexual minority. To determine how many responses belonged to those who speak another language in addition to English, the variable multilingual was defined as a response that included any language in addition to English. Endorsement of English only was coded as not multilingual. To determine how many responses belonged to those who identified as belonging to two or more marginalized groups, an intersectionality variable was created. If a respondent was coded with two or more of these identities (i.e., SOC, gender minority or woman, sexual minority, or person with a disability), they were identified as being intersectional in these identities.

Representation of diverse scholars related to race and ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, disability, and languages spoken was analyzed in survey responses across the journal corpus, by journal, and then by levels (i.e., editorial board position). With regard to position levels of board members, due to the small numbers of individuals in level 1 positions, and to reduce the identifiability of any one member when completing this survey, level 1 and 2 positions were collapsed. Results of Study 2 were analyzed using just two categories (levels 1 and 2, and level 3). Respondents were able to select multiple positions they may hold at each of the targeted journals.

**Study 3: Editor Survey**

Study 3 collected demographic information about editorial boards via a survey of journal editors. A 10-item survey was distributed to the editors’ email addresses publicly listed on each journal’s website or editor’s academic faculty profile. Items addressed editors’ length of term as editor, what systems they employed for collecting demographic information about their editorial board, the size of their editorial board, and estimates of board members belonging to
demographic categories of race and ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, and languages spoken. Editors were also asked to share what source they used when responding to the survey (see Appendix B). The survey was distributed in August of 2023, and two reminders were sent approximately one month apart. To improve the response rate, a third reminder was sent to two editors who had not responded. Representation of diverse scholars in the areas of race and ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and languages spoken was analyzed by journal only. Descriptive information about editor positions and systems employed was also reported.

**Results**

**Study 1: Name Analysis**

*Diversity Representation Across Journals*

Study 1 estimated the diversity representation of SOC and gender using name analysis procedures. Results from Study 1 showed that 29% of names likely belonged to SOC, 56% of names likely belonged to women, and 0.2% likely belonged to gender minorities (see Figure 1). Analysis of intersectionality revealed that SOCs who were women or a gender minority composed 17% of the sample (or a little over half of the SOCs). SOCs who were men composed 12% of the sample.

![Figure 1. Representation of Scholars of Color and Gender according to Study 1](image_url)
**Diversity Representation by Journals**

Study 1 examined representation for seven journals. Representation of SOC by journal was as follows: SPTP (12%), JASP (17%), PITS (26%), SP (29%), CSP (30%), JSP (30%), and SPR (39%). Representation of women and gender minority groups was as follows: JASP (37%), SP (55%), SPR (56%), CSP (57%), JSP (58%), PITS (60%), and SPTP (67%).

**Diversity Representation by Levels**

Study 1 examined representation at three levels of power within editorial boards. Results indicated there were 25% of SOC in level 1 positions, 43% in level 2 positions, and 29% in level 3 positions. Results are shown in the top half of Figure 2. Regarding gender, 42% of level 1 positions were held by women, 49% of level 2 positions were held by women, and 57% and 0.2% of level 3 positions were held by women and gender minority groups, respectively. Results are shown in the bottom half of Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Representation of Scholars of Color and Gender, by Level in Study 1](image-url)
Study 2: Self-Report Survey

Journal Participation

A total of 298 responses were collected from a survey of editorial board members. Of those, 19 responses were blank and 35 were from those selecting “none of the above” regarding service in the seven journals identified in this study. Thus, 244 responses were retained for analysis using Qualtrics and Excel. Participants were able to select multiple editorial boards of which they were members, and a total of 377 board positions were represented across the seven journals. Approximately 34% of participants belonged to more than one editorial board (see bottom right of Figure 3).

As an estimate of possible response rates, response counts were compared to the number of deduplicated positions collected from the journal’s official websites (473 across journals, with a range of 16 to 108 for individual journals) in study 1. The total response rate was approximately 52%. At the journal level, comparisons suggested that more than half of the members per journal may be represented in this survey. The exception is Journal of Applied School Psychology, for which an estimated 29% of editorial board members responded. The breakdown of responses per journal in Study 2 is shown in Figure 3.
Diversity Representation Across Journals

Study 2 examined diversity representation across several self-reported variables. These include SOC, gender and sexual identity, disability identity, languages spoken, and intersectionality. Study 2 revealed that 23% of responses were from SOC and also offered a detailed report of racial and ethnic representation. Responses showed that 76% of editorial board members identified as White or European American, 9% as Black or African American, 6% as Asian or Asian American, 5% as multiracial, and 3% as Hispanic or Latino/a/x/e. A total of 0.4% selected "other," and 0.4% preferred not to disclose. Of note, only 1.6% of respondents identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native/Indigenous, Métis, or Inuit and were included in the multiracial category. These findings are depicted in Figure 4.
Results indicated that 61% of respondents identified as being a woman and 0.4% identified as being a gender minority. An overall 11% of participants identified as a sexual minority. Additionally, 23% of participants identified as having a disability, and 16% of participants identified as multilingual. These results are shown in Figure 5.

Results indicated that 33% of participants had intersecting marginalized identities, most of which were from two identities. There were 15% of participants identified as women or gender minority with disabilities, 14% of respondents identified as women of color, 7% as SOC with disabilities, 7% identified as sexual minority women, 6% as sexual minority SOC, and 4% as sexual minorities with disabilities. Only 7% had three or more intersecting marginalized identities, the most common being women of color with a disability/ies (n = 6).
Diversity Representation by Journals

Scholars of Color. For Study 2, the representation of SOC was as follows for the seven journals: PITS (9%), JASP (27%), SP (27%), JSP (28%), SPR (29%), SPTP (30%), and CSP (56%). Results are shown in Figure 6. Regarding race and ethnicity representation at journals, results from the survey indicated that the largest group of SOC was Hispanic/Latino/a/x/e at 25% for CSP. For JASP, JSP, SP, and SPR, the largest group of SOC was Black or African American at 14%, 13%, 13%, and 15% respectively. Additionally, at JASP, 13% of respondents were biracial/multiracial. For PITS and SPTP, the largest group of SOC was Asian or Asian American at 5% and 13%, respectively.
Study 2
Scholars of Color by Journal

CSP
- Asian or Asian American: 12%
- Black or African American: 13%
- Hispanic, Latino/a/x/e: 25%
- White or European American: 44%
- Biracial/multiracial: 6%

JASP
- Asian or Asian American: 6%
- Black or African American: 13%
- Hispanic, Latino/a/x/e: 1%
- White or European American: 72%
- Biracial/multiracial: 7%
- Other: 1%

JSP
- Asian or Asian American: 5%
- Black or African American: 6%
- Hispanic, Latino/a/x/e: 1%
- White or European American: 91%
- Biracial/multiracial: 7%

PITS
- Asian or Asian American: 5%
- Black or African American: 4%
- White or European American: 91%
- Biracial/multiracial: 4%
- Other: 1%
Gender and Sexual Identity. According to the self-report, the representation of women and gender minority groups was as follows: CSP (44%), JASP (53%), SPR (54%), SP (59%), JSP (59%), PITS (76%), and SPTP (77%). Results from Study 2 for representation of marginalized sexual identities were as follows: CSP (6%), JSP (6%), SP (7%), SPR (14%), PITS (16%), SPTP (17%), and JASP (33%).

Disability Identity. Study 2 indicated the following for representation of scholars with disabilities: SPTP (17%), JSP (21%), PITS (24%), SPR (26%), SP (27%), CSP (38%), and JASP (60%).

Multilingual Speakers. For Study 2, the representation of scholars who speak another language in addition to English was as follows: JASP (13%), JSP (15%), SP (16%), PITS (20%), SPR (20%), SPTP (23%), and CSP (44%).

Figure 6. Representation of Scholars of Color and Race and Ethnicity by Journal in Study 2
Diversity Representation by Levels

Scholars of Color. In Study 2, participants selected whether they had a level 1 or 2 position or a level 3 position for each targeted journal. Study 2 indicated that 43% of level 1 and 2 positions were held by SOC and 23% of level 3 positions were held by SOC. Figure 7 depicts this representation by level.

![Study Two Levels 1 and 2 Positions](image1)

![Study Two Level 3 Positions](image2)

**Figure 7.** Representation of Scholars of Color in Levels 1 and 2, or Level 3 Positions in Study 2

Gender and Sexual Identity. Study 2 indicated that 48% of level 1 and 2 positions were held by women, and 0.3% and 72% of level 3 positions were held by gender minority groups or women, respectively. For positions held by scholars identifying as a sexual identity minority, they compose 8% of level 1 and 2 positions and 12% of level 3 positions. Results are shown in Figure 8.
Disability Identity. Study 2 indicated that 17% of level 1 and 2 positions and 25% of level 3 positions are held by scholars identifying as having one or more disabilities. Results are shown in Figure 9.
Figure 9. *Representation of Disability Identity in Level 1 and 2, and Level 3 Positions*

**Multilingual Speakers.** Study 2 results indicated that 12% of level 1 and 2 positions and 20% of level 3 positions are held by multilingual scholars. Results are shown in Figure 10.

Figure 10. *Representation of Multilingual Speakers in Level 1 and 2, and Level 3 Positions*

**Study 3: Editor Survey**

**Journal Participation**

Of the seven editors contacted in Study 3, five editors (71%) responded. All editors reported on the year they entered their position, term length, board size, and what methods they employed to collect demographic information about their board. Two responses were incomplete. Of the incomplete responses, one editor reported they were unable to provide demographics as their internal process was preliminary at the time of the study, and the other
editor did not complete the demographic questions. Overall, editors reported their term lengths to be 4 to 5 years. Most began their service in 2020, and one began in 2023. With regards to methods used at journals for collecting editorial board demographic information, CSP and SP reported using a formal system through APA journals or Editorial Manager, JSP and SPR reported using independent methods including surveys by Qualtrics and data analyzed within Excel, and SPTP reported not using any formal method.

**Representation by Journals**

Results focusing on editorial board members were available for only CSP, SPR, and SPTP. Study 3 results indicated the following percentages of SOC: SPTP (17%), CSP (50%), and SPR (61%). For women, results were as follows: CSP (40%), SPR, (63%), and SPTP (67%). For sexual minorities, the results were as follows: 0% for CSP, 0% for SPTP, and 6% for SPR. For multilingual members, the results were as follows: SPTP (4%), CSP (20%), and SPR (37%).

**Discussion**

This dissertation used three studies to determine the representation of diverse scholars on editorial boards in prominent school psychology journals at present. Incorporating diverse perspectives and experiences, particularly those that stem from marginalized communities, is essential for the making of equitable, just, and productive research in fields like that of psychology. Historically, psychology has excluded the contributions of diverse scholars, perpetuating systemic discrimination and inequalities (APA Council of Representatives, 2021). The peer-review economy governs not only whose voices and perspectives are considered to be valuable but also the quality of valid and reliable research that is disseminated into our society and applied to humanity. Simply determining how many diverse scholars are included on editorial boards does not dismantle these systemic inequalities. It does, however, capture a
snapshot of what voices may be included using available demographic information at the current point in time. This dissertation offers an overview of representation for editorial boards in one field, school psychology. While it cannot, on its own, determine how and where discrimination influences the peer-review economy, it can teach about enhancing the collaboration of diverse perspectives within school psychology academia and inspire future generations of scholars.

Each of these studies employed methods inspired by previous research to make informed estimates of representation in the areas of race and ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, and language as well as the intersection of two or more marginalized identities. Furthermore, diversity representation in these studies was considered by journal and by levels of power (i.e., editorial positions) to provide summaries and data points for monitoring representation over time. These studies are a direct response to antiracist calls to action made by García-Vázquez et al. (2020), Jimerson et al. (2021), Newman et al. (2021), and Noltemeyer and Grapin (2021) to ensure marginalized voices are represented in leadership. This dissertation provides a baseline to which answers to these calls may be compared.

By current understanding, these studies represent the largest and most comprehensive assessment of diversity representation among school psychology editorial boards to date. Each study used a different approach to create estimates of what proportions of demographics were present across several journals and editorial positions. Study 1 used name analysis inspired by previous methodologies assessing the inclusion of diverse scholars in other fields (Bertolero et al. 2020; Sood & Laohaprapanon, 2018; Lyu et al., 2023; Millard-Ball et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022). Study 1 is the most comprehensive approach as it includes almost every listed name from editorial board sites to estimate the representation of SOC and different gender identities.
However, Study 1 also likely represents the least accurate approach because it uses extrapolations for variables that are most accurate when self-reported.

Study 2 used a self-reported survey of editorial board members that included 244 individuals representing 370 total memberships. Study 2 represents the most accurate approach for determining the representation of marginalized identities but is vulnerable to most survey and self-report weaknesses (e.g., selection bias and low response rate). Furthermore, analyses at deeper levels, such as by journal or by position, may be distorted depending on how many individuals from that particular board or position responded.

Study 3 was a survey of journal editors about the representation of editorial board members with different demographics on their boards. For some journals, there are internal efforts and systems in place to track the involvement of editorial board members with specified demographic characteristics, but journals do not uniformly monitor these data. Study 3 attempts to tap into this internal process to contribute to and strengthen the weaknesses of those presented in Studies 1 and 2.

**Comparison of Results of Studies 1, 2, and 3**

In an effort to leverage the strengths and weaknesses of each study, Table 1 depicts a comparison of the results of Studies 1, 2, and 3 for each categorical variable of interest. In some areas, results are similar. For example, both Studies 1 and 2 totals reported similar percentages for the representation of SOC and gender across all journal boards. At the journal level, results are similar for some variables and journals and less so for others. For example, JSP was similar in results for SOC and gender in Studies 1 and 2, with only a 1-2% difference. Whereas PITS is very different for results of Studies 1 and 2 for SOC and mildly different for gender.
Table 1

*Representation Estimates Comparing Studies 1, 2, and 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Scholars of Color</th>
<th>Women*</th>
<th>Sexual Minority</th>
<th>Disability Identity</th>
<th>Multilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASP</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSP</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITS</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTP</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Representation and Inclusion of Marginalized Scholars in School Psychology**

**Scholars of Color**

Results of the first two studies found that 23-29% of editorial board members in the most prominent U.S.-based school psychology journals are SOC. These results are very similar to the Johnson et al. (2023) survey of school psychology faculty that suggests about 21% represent SOC. As editorial board members do not exclusively come from academic settings or APA-accredited institutions, these higher results may reflect a more diverse selection pool (e.g., practitioners and non-APA accredited institutions) or an increase in marginalized scholars entering the field in recent years since APA’s 2011 survey.

To compare to the 2020 NASP membership survey, respondents were 0.1% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 0.5% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2.5% were Asian American, 3.9% were Black or African American, and 2.8% were more than one race (Goforth et al., 2021). Together, this estimated 10% of school psychologists of color is significantly lower.
than the 21% of faculty of color in school psychology programs and the estimated 23-29% of SOC on editorial boards in this field (Johnson et al. 2023). Given that students of color represent about 20% of school psychology programs, an even more discernable issue amongst representation in school psychologist practitioners is evident.

**Representation of Scholars of Color by Journal.** Using data from Studies 1 and 2, and Study 3 when available (as some journals did not complete), an estimated range is available for the representation of SOC per journal. These ranges show more variability across methods. Study 1 shows a range of 12% for SPTP up to 39% for SPR using name analysis. According to self-reported data, Study 2 suggests a range from 9% at PITS up to 56% for CSP. Across studies, some percentages of Scholars of Color are similar like that of JSP at 30% for Study 1 and 28% for Study 2, and SP at 29% and 27% for studies 1 and 2, respectively. Similarly, CSP had similar percentages between the self-report and editor survey at 56% and 50% respectively, but was found to be much lower in the name analysis study at 30%. Other journals showed more variability between methods. For example, Study 1 suggested 29% of members at PITS were SOC but Study 2 indicated only 9%, which may reflect low participation. For SPTP, results between studies 1 and 3 were closer at 12% and 17%, respectively, whereas Study 2 suggested 30% which may be indicative of higher participation of SOC and lower participation of White scholars. For one journal, one method was significantly higher than the others. SPR’s results for Study 1 were 39%, and 29% for Study 2, whereas Study 3 reported 55%. With the editor-reported survey being the outlier, this discrepancy may reflect a misunderstanding of survey instructions, perhaps with multicultural identities accidentally being reported as single individuals in each category, inflating the proportion.
**Representation of Scholars of Color by Leadership Position.** As it is with all hierarchal systems like that of journal boards in which different positions possess different amounts of influence and power over journal-level decisions, it is important to discuss representation in different leadership positions. According to Study 1, there were 12 level 1 (e.g., editor, editor emeritus, senior editor, etc.) positions across the journal corpus. Of those, three were positions held by SOC. These findings indicate that at the highest level of power, SOC represents a quarter of positions, not too dissimilar from the overall 29% general representation across the journal corpus. In level 2 positions (e.g., associate editor) SOC represented 43% of the 42 positions, suggesting that of the overall third of included SOC on editorial boards, many of them hold level 2 positions. This finding represents the highest proportion of representation across the three levels according to study one. Furthermore, level 3 representation of SOC was estimated to be 29%. Results of Study 2 support these conclusions, suggesting that SOC comprise a quarter or more of positions at each level across the journal corpus.

**Women and Gender and Sexual Minority Scholars**

The most recent examination of the representation of gender in school psychology editorial boards indicated that women comprised 55% of editorial board positions as of 2020, a significant and consistent increase from 3.4% in 1965 (Fitzpatrick et al. 2023). Although slightly different journal corpus to Fitzpatrick et al. (2023), Studies 1 and 2 yielded similar results for the year 2023 at 56% and 61%, respectively, for women’s representation. Furthermore, no known record has been established for the representation rate for gender minority groups, with Study 1 indicating 0.2% and Study 2 reporting 0.4%. This number is similar to that reported by the NASP membership survey in 2020 of 0.1%. However, it is also less than that reported in a brief report of characteristics of school psychology faculty indicating approximately 1.8% of survey
respondents as transgender, gender non-conforming, or two-spirit, a rate similar to that of the general population’s 1.6% according to the Pew Research Center (Brown, 2022; Johnson et al., 2023). Overall, these results indicate a lack of representation in the field.

To avoid identifiability during the analysis of Study 2, gender minority representation alone could not be examined at the journal level. Representation at the journal level for women was primarily about half for most journals except 37% for JASP at the lowest and 67% for SPTP at the highest according to Study 1. Study 2 indicated similarly that most journals had around 50% representation of women except for PITS at 76% and SPTP at 77%. Editor survey results for CSP, SPR, and SPTP were also similar to the results of Studies 1 and 2. Overall, these results were consistent at the journal level for journals that were also included in the Fitzpatrick et al. (2023) study, and they even suggested a continued increase in representation just over the 3 years (see Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s Representation on School Psychology Editorial Boards Since 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of School Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology (Quarterly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology in the Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results were obtained from Fitzpatrick et al. (2023).*  

Results from studies 1 and 2 are also similar to the representation of women in school psychology faculty positions as of 2017, 63% (Reddy et al. 2017). However, they also remain underrepresented as compared to the 87% of women as school psychologist practitioners (Goforth et al., 2021) and 85% of women doctoral recipients in school psychology (Fowler et al. 2018). Study 1 indicated that as of 2023, 5 out of 12, or 42% of members in level 1 positions
were held by women. This demonstrates a shift in historical trends of women in these positions as over the past 55 years, women had only held 10% of level 1 positions in school psychology journals overall (Fitzpatrick et al., 2023). However, this is still consistent as increases in women’s representation in level 1 positions have been within recent years. Furthermore, differences in results may be related to a slightly different journal corpus to the Fitzpatrick et al. (2023) study. At level 2, Study 1 indicated 49% of women in these positions, not too far off from the historical reporting of 42% in Fitzpatrick et al. (2023). Consistent results were found in Study 2 as well, with a combined representation rate of 48% women in level 1 and 2 positions. As for level 3, Study 1 estimated 57% and Study 2 estimated significantly higher at 72% for women and 0.3% for gender minority groups. This difference may likely be related to the limitations of self-report surveys, in which women have been found to be more likely to participate (Smith, 2008). Overall, these results are consistent with present trends in women’s representation on editorial boards in school psychology, which have significantly increased to approximately half of boards as of 2020 (Fitzpatrick et al., 2023).

To our knowledge, these studies are the first to examine the representation of sexual minorities on editorial boards in school psychology. Using the self-report data of Study 2, this was determined to be approximately 11% overall, similar to the estimated results of 10% from a 2021 survey of school psychology faculty (Johnson et al., 2023). Representation ranged from 6% for CSP and JSP to 33% at JASP. These results were strikingly different from reports from the editor survey from 0-6%, however, this is expectantly so, as sexual orientation demographic information involved self-disclosure to be collected. The analysis for leadership positions revealed that sexual minority groups compose 8% of level 1 and 2 positions and 12% of level 3 positions.
Scholars with Disabilities

With regard to disability, Study 2 indicated that 23% of respondents identified as being a scholar with a disability or disabilities. Furthermore, 17% were at the level 1 and 2 positions and a quarter at level 3 positions. These findings are significantly higher than the 5% reported for school psychology faculty in a 2021 survey and the 9% reported in 2015 for psychology research doctorate faculty overall (APA, 2019; Johnson et al., 2023). Comparisons to other studies evaluating inclusion and representation of scholars with disabilities are limited; past studies have multiple categories that respondents can endorse, making the exact number of individuals with one or more disabilities unclear (Lund et al., 2014). As an estimate, a survey by Lund et al. (2014) suggested ranges from 1.8% to 34% throughout different categories for a survey of 56 participants. U.S. estimates indicate 26% overall for noninstitutionalized adults (Okoro, 2018). Understanding how journals support or include scholars with disabilities may be useful for the future inclusion of this population. Lund et al. (2014) also indicated that half of participants with a disability selected their graduate school influenced by their disability including if there was a reputation for being welcoming toward students with disabilities. Half of the respondents indicated that their disability did indeed influence their research and clinical specialization focus. This pattern may continue to be true as scholars make more and more professional choices in their careers, including where they wish to publish or serve on an editorial board, emphasizing the importance of how accommodating or welcoming journals are perceived to be.

Multilingual Scholars

The inclusion of an item about multilingual scholars is a response to the call to recruit diverse students into school psychology programs, including multilingual speakers, by Proctor et al. (2014). Although NASP and other school psychologist practitioner-focused surveys have
made estimates of the representation of multilingual speakers (Charvat, 2008), these estimates were described as difficult to confirm, as sampled populations may not be entirely representative of the whole field of school psychology and differences in personal and professional use. As the studies included in this dissertation focused on only U.S.-based school psychology journals, it is expected that the majority of respondents, if not all, used English fluently. Study 2’s results of 16% of scholars being multilingual would indicate just a small increase to an estimate from a 2004-2005 survey of school psychologists being 11% multilingual (Charvat, 2008) and a 2020 survey of NASP members indicating 12% deliver services in a second language (Goforth et al., 2021). This study’s results are also consistent with a 2021 study of school psychology faculty that indicated 16% of respondents were fluent in another language other than English (Johnson et al., 2023).

*Intersecting Marginalized Scholars*

Crenshaw’s 1989 paper on intersectionality argued that focusing on a single-axis category overlooks the compound effects of intersecting identities and how an individual’s experiences are uniquely shaped. Intersectionality is crucial in the discussion of including diverse perspectives, as each intersection across each marginalized identity produces a unique outlook and experience. Most demographic surveys and collection systems analyze the representation of groups on single categories of identity alone, likely partly due to the limitations that determining intersecting identities of a person can present for surveys meant to be anonymous. Studies 1 and 2 aimed to tackle this limitation, using aggregate formats for reporting results to hopefully at least provide a preliminary peek at the representation of intersecting marginalized identities of scholars on editorial boards in school psychology.
Study 1 is limited in its analysis as it can look at only the intersection of being a scholar of color and a woman or from a gender minority group. From this, estimates are that there are 17% of scholars who are women of color, a little over half of the overall 29% of SOC. When looking at the leadership breakdown at this intersecting level, women of color comprise 17% of level 1 positions, 26% of level 2 positions, and 16% of level 3 positions, representing more than half of the SOC in each position. Study 2 provided the opportunity to evaluate the representation of intersecting marginalized identities of gender, race and ethnicity, sexuality, as well as disability. Overall, about one-third of scholars on editorial boards in school psychology had intersecting marginalized identities. This, to our knowledge, is the only study to provide these sorts of results on a variable like intersectionality, and hopefully provide an interesting and unique insight into the types of distinct experiences and perspectives that are included in editorial positions.

Limitations

Research examining demographic representation and inclusion has been scrutinized due to inherent limitations in most contemporary approaches, necessitating the exploration of alternative methodologies. Broadly, across all studies and analyses, variability within each area of diversity and intersecting identities will inherently present limitations as generalizability cannot be made within each group.

Study 1 possesses limitations in using name analysis to estimate the likelihood of a name belonging to a particular race and ethnicity category as it is susceptible to some inaccuracies. Although implemented for decades in public health and more recently in academic studies of inclusion and representation of scholars, has a significant disadvantage for certain subpopulations or multiracial groups. Newer models using machine learning from census and
voter registration data attempt to improve this accuracy (e.g., ethnicity and ethnic origin), but even these datasets are not exempt from the influences of systemic racism on how U.S. Census and voter registration data are collected, or cultural and societal trends and changes over time in names. Our use of a combined category of SOC was done to alleviate the limitations of this method for the accuracy of identifying multiracial groups but does so at the expense of combining the unique and distinct experiences of each racial and ethnic group. For gender, methods were able to include non-binary genders through the identification of pronouns used in biographies, but this method too is limited as publicly used pronouns or images are not a self-disclosure of gender.

Study 2 aimed to fill the gaps of Study 1 in allowing respondents to use self-report to provide accurate and specific demographic information that was not accessible by name analysis methods. Although over 200 responses were collected to represent 377 different board positions, the self-report survey from Study 2 is limited in that it had a response rate of 52%. This study, as with most surveys (especially those related to diversity, equity, and inclusion) is vulnerable to selection bias in which relevant respondents are more likely to respond (White et al., 2021) and women may be more likely to respond (Smith 2008), which is a significant challenge to determining the true representation of diversity on editorial boards. However, similar results yielded in Study 1 supplemented this limitation.

Study 3 presents many limitations, primarily in that response rates were so low. Additionally, not enough information was available to make general analyses of representation and were limited to only some reports of participating journals. The aspiration was that the reports of editors about their journals that come from internal surveys or “insider” knowledge might provide another measure by which to compare the results of studies 1 and 2. If similar
results were yielded, this could support the weaknesses of the other studies. Without solid results from Study 3, Studies 1 and 2 unfortunately have only each other to lean on.

**Implications**

Proctor et al. (2014) succinctly described the historical trends in the representation of SOC in school psychology using previous survey data. They indicated that the Thomas (1998) survey of school psychology graduate students showed that 17% were of minority racial groups. This representation rate did not increase over time as Highley and Carlson’s (2012) survey also indicated 17% for school psychology graduate students of color. In all APA-accredited doctoral programs, the representation of students of color has remained the same from 2006 to 2011, with students of color representing about 20% and White students representing over 80% (APA 2011).

For graduate faculty, the same is apparent with reports of about 15% of school psychology faculty of color according to studies in 1986 and 2011 (Zins & Halsell 1986; APA, 2011). That is 25 years of no change in the representation of faculty of color in this field. Johnson et al. (2023) showed that this only increased by about 5% in 2021, a decade later. These patterns make the results of Studies 1 and 2 interesting, as they estimate 23-29% of editorial board members to be SOC. With a recent estimate of 21% of school psychology faculty representing SOC, these findings suggest many of these faculty members are also involved on editorial boards (Johnson et al., 2023). These results, as of 2023, and when compared to the demographic information of 1986 through 2021, may reflect a true movement by leadership to increase the representation of SOC to editorial boards in this field. This does contrast with reports of diversity representation in psychology as a whole. An examination of racial/ethnic minority representation among all faculty positions in psychology shows an increase from 8% in
1995 to 17% in 2019 (Bichsel, 2019). School psychology’s consistent representation of around 20% would indicate a notably higher representation in the subfield as compared to psychology as a whole in the 1980s, 90s, and 00s.

For women’s representation, at all levels—graduate student, faculty, practitioner, and editorial board member—women’s involvement has been historically increasing, and the results of these studies are consistent with that (Fitzpatrick et al., 2023). It is the representation of individuals who are from gender and sexual minority groups that are underrepresented or possibly not systematically included due to both methodological limitations as well as perceptions of hostility that remain in higher academia in general (Sowden et al., 2016).

Unfortunately, the ability to analyze trends and changes in representation rate throughout history is not as reliably possible for school psychology in the areas of gender minority, sexual minority, disability, multilingual groups, and intersectional identities. These studies aim to establish a reference point for future research, enabling ongoing monitoring and advancing the examination of diversity representation.

There have been recent calls to diversify journal leadership, actively recruit diverse voices, and include marginalized voices on editorial boards in school psychology (García-Vázquez et al., 2020; Jimerson et al., 2021; Noltemeyer & Grapin, 2021). Knowing that the representation at this time point is approximately 23% to 29%, researchers and leaders may be able to determine if that call is being answered with supporting demographic data. Although name analysis and self-report surveys by third-party researchers are two ways to go about monitoring this change, it is important that editors and leaders also be the ones to systematically collect demographic information about their boards. This ensures they are aware of what voices are included in the peer-review economy and allows them to be accountable for their progress in
responding to these calls for diversity. Their data collection methods should also be as inclusive as possible, exploring ways to include intersectionality-related questions so as not to ignore the compounding of diverse perspectives and voices.

The work of Clark et al. (2012), Franklin (2016), Lund et al. (2014), Proctor et al. (2014, 2018a, 2018b, 2021), Proctor and Truscott (2012), Silver (2019), Sowden et al. (2016), and countless others teach us to recognize inequities and microaggressions scholars face throughout their training and career that are barriers to inclusion. Simply an increase in representation will not change the challenges themselves. Perhaps, representation may relate to the furthering of inclusivity and reduction of attrition from the field. In psychology as a whole, the representation of students who are Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino/a/x, have disabilities, or are of gender minorities, were found to be underrepresented relative to the U.S. population (Callahan et al., 2014). These groups, in addition to Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, were found also to have the highest rates of attrition in psychology. Lund et al. (2014) found that many psychology students with disabilities made career decisions based on how accommodating or welcoming they perceived a university or specialty area to be. Representation can influence this perception, along with transparency about the specific policies in which programs are accommodating.

Recruitment efforts to improve diversity representation within school psychology editorship must begin well before the recruitment of diverse scholars as board members. Projects like that of the NASP Exposure Project by the African Diaspora subcommittee of the Multicultural Affairs Committee aim to expose high school students and undergraduates of diverse backgrounds to school psychology. Additionally, scholarship programs and materials for scholars and practitioners support recruitment efforts, representing promising actions toward this goal.
While recruitment and representation increase the involvement of marginalized scholars in school psychology, Settles et al. (2019) remind us that simply increasing diversity and representation does not dismantle the systems that create experiences of oppression. Their qualitative research amplifies the voices of faculty of color who emphasize the challenges posed by tokenism (Kanter, 1977). They report feeling that their inclusion or hiring is a “checkbox” and are missing the support for their academic work, or being asked/assumed to participate in additional diversity work. Social exclusion within the workplace furthers invisibility and leads to professional exclusion. Being isolated and ignored devalues and excludes them from both formal and informal professional conversations. Moreover, epistemic exclusion (Dotson, 2014), which relates to the editorial economy, devalues certain research topics, methods, or types of knowledge within academia by gatekeepers, perpetuating inequity and microaggressions. These experiences were found to influence faculty of color’s behavior to mitigate challenges and cope with the stress. Settles et al. (2019) identified strategic invisibility (e.g., managing the risk of being mistreated by choosing when to make themselves “invisible” (Lollar, 2015), working harder (e.g., increasing engagement to be perceived as equal to White colleagues), and disengagement through the loss of interest, as resulting responses from faculty of color. These responses to survive tokenism increase the risk of burnout and threaten retention efforts.

Social justice approaches such as decolonization have outlined the influence of historical oppression on academic institutions. Insights from feminist and indigenous literature offer guidance on addressing the challenges that come with diversification and representation. Dr. Virgilio Enriquez, a Filipino social psychologist, argues that tokenism is an inherent aspect of colonization (Laenui, 2000). This mirrors the findings from previous research identifying a lack of substantive support leading to exclusion and attrition (Proctor et al., 2014; Settles et al., 2019).
Diversification efforts must integrate decolonization and social justice perspectives. The act of questioning is proposed as a crucial step in this (Pe-Pua & Protacio-Marcelino, 2000). Michelle Grue’s (2021) work, rooted in Black feminist and anti-racist education theories, offers self-assessment tools that can be applied to academia as well as editorial boards. Just as faculty and departments assess teaching practices with students of color, editorial boards can reflect on interactions with members and authors of color by considering who is favored, who speaks, who is silent, and provide support for retention. They can also acknowledge extra burdens and ensure recognition through pay or benefits (Grue, 2021). Inviting marginalized groups to partake in a system built on their exclusion perpetuates injustice. Pōkā Laenui (2000), a Hawaiian rights activist and attorney, proposes a decolonization process that must include mourning for historical injustices and a phase of dreaming that must precede commitment and action. This dissertation emphasizes the importance of this dreaming and questioning alongside these efforts to enhance the diversity and inclusion of marginalized scholars in school psychology and editorial practices.
Appendix A

Editorial Board Survey
Adapted and modified from Akers et al. (2021)

Please do not share your name, institutional affiliation, location, or other identifiable information.

1. From the list below, please select each journal and position which you have served for that journal during 2023. Check all that apply*. Do not report a journal for which you reviewed on only an ad hoc, fellowship or graduate student basis.

*Please note, journals for which there are less than 5 positions for editor/associate editor have not been included to maintain anonymity.

- Contemporary School Psychology
  a. Editor-in-chief or Associate Editor
  b. Editorial Board Member
- Journal of Applied School Psychology
  a. Editorial Board Member
- Journal of School Psychology
  a. Editor-in-chief or consulting editor or associate editor or advisory board member
  b. Editorial Board Member
- Psychology in the Schools
  a. Editor or Associate Editor
  b. Editorial Advisory Board
- School Psychology
  a. Editor or Senior Editor or Associate Editor
  b. Editorial Board or Statistical Advisory Board
- School Psychology Review
  a. Editor, Associate Editor, or Senior Editor
  b. Editorial Advisory Board
- School Psychology Training and Pedagogy (previously known as Trainer’s Forum)
  a. Editorial Review Board
- None of the above

1. Which of these best describes your racial or ethnic identity? Select all that apply.
- American Indian, Alaskan Native, Indigenous, Métis, Inuit
- Asian or Asian American
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino, Latina, Latinx, Latine
- Middle Eastern, North African
- Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander
- White or European American
• A racial or ethnic identity not listed  
  o Please specify, if desired  
• Prefer not to say

4a. Which of these best describes your gender? (1 of 2)  
• Cisgender  
• Transgender  
• Prefer not to say  
• Other, please specify if desired

4b. Which of these best describes your gender identity? Select all that apply (2 of 2)  
• Agender  
• Man  
• Nonbinary  
• Woman  
• Questioning or unsure of gender identity  
• A gender identity not listed. Please specify if desired  
• Prefer not to say

5. How do you describe your sexual orientation? Select all that apply.  
• Asexual  
• Bisexual  
• Gay or lesbian  
• Heterosexual/straight  
• Pansexual  
• A sexual orientation not listed  
  o Please specify, if desired  
• Prefer not to say

6. How do you describe your present disability/ability status?  

We are interested in this identification regardless of whether you typically request accommodation for this disability. Disabilities may include but are not limited to  
(a) a developmental disability (e.g., ADHD, ASD, etc.)  
(b) a learning disability (e.g., dyslexia, dyscalculia, etc.)  
(c) a long-term medical illness (e.g., epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, etc.)  
(d) a mental health disorder  
(e) a mobility impairment  
(f) a sensory impairment (e.g., vision or hearing impairment)  
(g) a temporary impairment due to illness or injury (e.g., broken ankle, surgery, etc.)  

• I do identify as having a disability or disabilities  
• I do NOT identify as having a disability or disabilities  
• Prefer not to say
7. What language(s) do you speak fluently (select all that apply)?
   - English
   - American Sign Language
   - Arabic
   - Chinese
   - French
   - German
   - Gujarati
   - Haitian Creole
   - Hindi
   - Italian
   - Japanese
   - Korean
   - Persian
   - Polish
   - Portuguese
   - Russian
   - Spanish
   - Tagalog
   - Telugu
   - Urdu
   - Vietnamese
   - Other(s) not listed
     - Please specify if desired
   - Prefer not to say
Appendix B

Editor Survey
Adapted and modified from Akers et al. (2021)

1. Please select the journal for which you are the editor during 2023.
   - Contemporary School Psychology
   - Journal of Applied School Psychology
   - Journal of School Psychology
   - Psychology in the Schools
   - School Psychology
   - School Psychology Review
   - School Psychology Training and Pedagogy (previously known as Trainer’s Forum)

2. Please enter the year you officially became the editor of the journal:

3. Please report how long your editor term lasts:
   _______ years

4. Do you or your journal’s publisher employ a formal system of reporting and summarizing demographic information about your editorial board members (i.e., Editorial Manager, etc.)?
   a. Yes
      i. Name of system _______
   b. No
   c. We use another method (e.g., Qualtrics, Google Form, survey, etc.), please specify what you use
      i. _______
      ii. _______

5. How many people form your journal’s editorial board as of February 2023 (or your first published issue of 2023)?

   Please only include those involved directly in the peer-review process, such as associate editors, board members, editorial advisors, methodological advisors, etc.

   Please exclude (a) those not involved directly in the peer-review process, such as journal coordinators, graduate assistants, administrative assistants, publishers, etc., and (b) ad hoc reviewers.

Please estimate the number of editorial board members who have the following demographic characteristics using available data from internal surveys, a publication manager system, or your personal knowledge.
If you do not have editorial board members in a demographic category, then you may leave the box as "0".

6. Racial and ethnic identity:
   - African American or Black ______
   - American Indian, Alaskan Native, Indigenous, Métis, Inuit ______
   - Asian, Asian American ______
   - Bi-racial or multi-racial ______
   - Hispanic, Latino, Latina, Latinx, Latine ______
   - Middle Eastern, North African ______
   - Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander ______
   - Other, please specify_____

8. Gender identity: Learn more at GLAAD.org
   - Gender minority (e.g., agender, genderqueer, nonbinary, transgender, gender-nonconforming) ______
   - Woman ______
   - Other, please specify_____

9. Sexual Orientation: Learn more at GLAAD.org
   - Sexual minority (e.g., asexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, pansexual) _____
   - Other, please specify_____

10. Is fluent in use of another language in addition to English
    - Fluent in another language (please include sign-languages)_____

10. In reporting these percentages, what sources did you employ (select all that apply):
    - Internal survey (self-reports of editorial team)
    - Publication manager system
    - Personal knowledge/interactions
    - Other, please specify
      - ______
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