I introduce this special issue, “Education, Research, and Practice for a Diverse World,” by sharing a perspective regarding evaluating research and/or institutions through the consideration of diversity, justice, and sustainability (DJS). As part of this process, I employ a series of metaphors that help conceptualize each construct individually, but also how they relate to each other. Finally, by situating this special issue among other similar attempts, I highlight the important work that these authors are attempting while celebrating the Psi Chi Journal’s foray into this challenging and critical research areas in a timely manner.
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through the usage of a metaphor can help the reader navigate this complexity. I hope the process of framing one DJS lens will help readers discover and develop their own DJS lenses.

Any individual, as a proponent of DJS, must have an idealistic perspective for the future. People writing and reading the articles in this special issue likely have their own perspective on what that ideal society would look like, how to best advance education or research or a diverse society. However, even individuals who share similar visions experience disagreements about the exact nature of that ideal future. To highlight the complexity of the problem and to help define diversity, justice, and sustainability for the purposes of a DJS lens, I invite the reader to take a moment and consider for a society, what is the ideal mix of personal, cultural, institutional, and national identities for individuals? Consider all the various cultural identities that shape an individual from family, ethnicity, religious institutions, educational experiences, work experiences, interpersonal experiences, and intergroup experiences. The development of these identities, and individuals who experience distinct demographics, results in the complex relationship between ethnic/racial identity and outcomes, where strong identity sometimes provides a buffer against discrimination, but also is associated with negative personal and interpersonal outcomes (Lewis & Vandyke, 2018; Yip, 2018). However, individuals living with devalued identities might suffer mental/psychological health consequences (Lewis & Vandyke, 2018; Yip, 2018), stereotype threat (Appel, Weber, & Kronberger, 2015; Nguyen & Ryan, 2008), microaggressions (Lillienfeld, 2017; Sue et al., 2007), and face racism throughout their life cycle (Salter, Adams, & Perez, 2018). This remarkably incomplete list of negative outcomes from stigmatization of personal identity demonstrates some examples of why it is important to discuss personal identities.

Ideally Integrating Cultures Under a National Identity: A Metaphorical Example

With a goal of achieving an equitable society, consider the metaphor of “the United States as a melting pot” (Hirschman, 1983). The melting pot invokes an image where people from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds become Americans with a single shared identity through an intensive enculturation process that strips the uniqueness away. This is a problematic vision that assumes a collective unified cultural standard with consensual agreement that this standard should replace various multicultural experiences. Decades ago, as a college student, I remember discussions regarding the flawed nature of approaching society from this metaphorical perspective. My instructor offered an alternative metaphor of “the United States as a salad bowl” (Mio & Morris, 1990). The salad bowl invokes a contrary image where cultural flavors are retained rather than blanched from the person through overheating. From a multiculturalism standpoint, this is preferred because individuals are not expected or required to sacrifice a part of their identity to succeed in the society. As a psychology student in college, I argued that the loss of the common identity in the salad bowl metaphor is problematic because it would yield a disconnected culture. I thought a third metaphor provided a better vision: “the United States as a stewpot.” In contrast to the melting pot, where all contents are melted into a single flavor, the various contents of a stewpot maintain their uniqueness while taking on a common flavor from the collective (e.g., a carrot still tastes like a carrot, but also inflects all the other flavors too). Moreover, items that are particularly flavorful or hold unique textures are more influential on the overall eating experience (e.g., hot peppers differ little from their primary taste even in a stew). What I liked so much about this metaphor was that it allowed for a common cultural identity and yet facilitated the maintenance of unique ethnic and historical experiences, much like the optimal distinctiveness theory recognizes drives for both collective and individual identities (Brewer, 1991).

As my career progressed, I never tried to share the Stewpot Metaphor professionally because I never achieved sufficient expertise to justify my position empirically, although others still discuss the merits and challenges of these perspectives. In a Google Scholar search, the exact phrase, “United States as a melting pot,” returned 522 entries, whereas the phrase, “United States as a salad bowl,” returned 24. In contrast “United States as Stewpot” yielded none, so apparently my conversation arguments in favor of this position are the only that ever existed. Today, I would no longer assert that the stewpot represents a superior metaphor to the salad bowl. Rather, I would argue that the stewpot, salad bowl, even the melting pot metaphors represent three distinct viewpoints on the ideal combination of the many and varied cultures that exist within and come to the United States. To continue with the metaphor a bit further, imagine...
an entire menu of meals that combine ingredients rather than three meals. There are many different ways that one might ideally integrate various idiographic and demographic identities for a larger society, particularly if considering a broader array of political systems. Therefore, the plethora of cooks approaches those meals from distinct individual and cultural backgrounds. Clearly, there is not any one superior metaphor to describe the ideal way to integrate people’s various identities together into a common society. Many different cooks will see different combinations of ingredients to prepare their preferred meal to their personal taste.

This consideration of various perspectives deriving the perfect blend of personal and cultural identities reflects diversity of a DJS lens. Before considering justice or sustainability, note that the ingredients reflect characteristics of people (personal, demographic, and cognitive diversity), whereas the cooks reflect people creating an ideal combination that values those characteristics (researchers, parents, teachers, students, anyone). This distinction is important because questions are only as good as those who ask and psychology has been criticized for not being as diverse as it should be, both demographically (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010; Syed, Santos, Yoo, & Juang, 2018) and ideologically (Jussim, Crawford, Anglin, & Stevens, 2015). Jones and Dovidio (2018) offered a diversity approach for psychology as a method to consider prior research and novel research questions. This approach invites people to recognize that “Diversity plays a central role in both the challenges posed and the opportunities provided by key elements of the contemporary social environment” (Jones & Dovidio, 2018, p. 10).

This diversity approach provides an ideal model to consider the breadth of diversity when researching the topic because it recognizes various sources of diversity and methods for improved interpersonal interactions as well as conditions that continue to hamper improved race relations. However, to develop the DJS lens, I will refocus the metaphor on how the meal is prepared and consumed.

To the degree that ingredients and cooks reflect the people and perceivers of diversity, who decides how the meal is prepared and distributed and who eats which meals reflect social justice. Historically in the United States there are many instances of people being forcibly separated from their identity whether that be through keeping slaves illiterate or sending indigenous children to schools designed to erase their culture. Deciding on which types of identity are valued and which should be kept hidden or ignored requires power. As with the examples of what types of meals are included and which ingredients are selected, there are many ways to decide who gets to be a cook and who is invited to a table to share the meal. Some of these decisions would value more diversity than others. As Psi Chi Diversity Director, Gallor (2017) proffered a social-justice approach for psychology, which provides a useful framework for this editorial. By reminding readers that social justice concerns everyone not just the privileged or the disadvantaged, she effectively integrated diversity and social justice. There are similarities between the diversity approach and this social justice approach because they both offer valuations that highlight the importance of demographic diversity as being critical in a social justice context. However, in both cases, there is an absence of considering sustainability.

Considering sustainability in the meal metaphors, the questions reflect the long-term availability of the resources necessary to make the meals and the contributions of the meals to the long-term health and well-being of those making and consuming the meals. Although sustainability often is considered within the context of environmental concerns (i.e., reduce, reuse, recycle), questions about sustainability should also address how an individual views and responds to those environmental concerns. From broader sustainability perspectives, one must also address questions about whether the outcome will be beneficial to the long-term health and well-being of the individual(s) making the decision as well the as long-term viability of an organization. Yet, without healthy locations to live and work, individual and organization sustainability are also at risk. Seghezzo (2009) detailed a broad approach such as this to consider economic and developmental sustainability through three categories of concerns: persons, places, and permanence. Connections between sustainability and justice or diversity include concerns about who creates the most waste and pollution and who suffers the greatest consequences (Swim & Bloodhart, 2018).

Understanding Interactions Between Diversity, Justice, and Sustainability

When I asked my students to consider basic or applied questions while also considering DJS, they often offer responses that assume adoption or valuation of all three. A hypothetical and simplified description of some program to address an applied
program, “We will make sure that everyone is welcome, everyone is treated fairly, and use recycled paper or computers to eliminate waste.” However, these situations are complex, and I expand the “identity as meals metaphors” to demonstrate this. At one extreme, in a world with vast resources where individuals have complete power over their own decisions and their decisions have no consequences on others, any and all meals would be welcome. For example, that would mean that everyone compiles their unique self and collective identity from any combination of individual or group sources. However, that world does not exist, and it is not likely that it ever will. Instead, people all make sacrifices, some more extreme than others. In a world with limited resources where control over decisions is made by some rather than all, there will be variations on those meals, what constitutes the right recipe, how the meals are prepared, how the ingredients are sourced and treated. In Table 1, I present a 2 (Diversity: Yes, No) x 2 (Justice: Yes, No) x 2 (Sustainability: Yes, No) factorial design to consider this metaphor with variations of the presence of D, J, or S. When considering this table, it is useful to consider this metaphor from the perspective of constituting the perfect society by combining the various identities for the ideal citizen. Questions related to how this happens are important for psychology. The debate between the melting pot and salad bowl approaches reflects differing valuing of personal and collective selves as they relate to an identity (Phinney, Chavira, & Williams, 1992). This debate extends beyond the United States because there is much migration and relocation around the world. Whether nomadic or sedentary, people navigate their personal and cultural backgrounds as part of their shared national identity, and the various governments and cultures encourage different combinations.

When considering national identity from a worldwide perspective, understanding how governments or cultures within a society value DJS is not possible without understanding the interactions between these values. Further, as presented earlier, D, J, and S are multiplicative, not singular constructs. Besides the multiple constructs included within each of these three, it is naïve to argue that someone values these constructs in a Yes/No dichotomy. Thus, rather than a simple three-way interaction, one might argue that it is better represented in a simple Regression Equation as:

$$Y = \beta_{\text{diversity}} + \beta_{\text{justice}} + \beta_{\text{sustainability}} + \beta_{\text{dj}} + \beta_{\text{ds}} + \beta_{\text{djs}} + \text{error}$$

| Sustainability | Diversity | Justice | Sustainability | Diversity | Justice |
|----------------|-----------|---------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| YES            | Yes       | Yes     | YES            | Yes       | Yes     |
|                |            |         |                | NO        |         |
|                |            |         |                | NO        |         |
|                |            |         |                | NO        |         |
|                |            |         |                | NO        |         |
| NO             | Yes       | No      | NO             | No        | No      |
|                |            |         |                | NO        |         |
|                |            |         |                | NO        |         |
|                |            |         |                | NO        |         |

**Note:** Readers can use this table as a format to consider DJS in other circumstances. Another simple example could be to consider how people would approach school playgrounds and describe the characteristics in each of these conditions.
When considering the multiplicative nature of these constructs, a better representation would include various aspects of diversity (identity, demographic, cognitive, justice (procedural, distributive), or sustainability (person, organization, environmental). The factorial structure or regression equation to represent all these conditions together becomes overly complex very quickly. Further, when considering continuous variables, interaction terms tend to be very small except in cases of very extreme variability (Cohen, Cohen, Aiken, & West, 2003). To resolve this DJS complexity, individuals and organizations should clarify what aspects of D, J, or S are most important to the present query.

Applying a DJS Lens to This Special Issue

Although evaluating the contributions of various open science initiatives toward advancing DJS for students, we recently constructed a brief set of questions to guide our evaluations (Grahe et al., 2019). These questions are presented online (https://osf.io/qv8nt/) and provide a framework by which to examine research efforts of individuals or groups. In the present case, I will apply the DJS lens questions collectively to the research presented in this special issue. These manuscripts collectively represent research aimed at identifying conditions that people recognize as diverse contributions to the field (Cramblet Alvarez et al., 2019), measuring the impact of diversity training on microaggressions (Smith & Percy, 2019), examining the general perception of microaggressions (Patterson & Domenech-Rodríguez, 2019), explaining responses to antigay bullying (Katz & Klainberg, 2019), and advancing the diverse development of a researchers’ identity (Cabrera, Hatch, & Lovell, 2019). This process should reveal the degree to which the corpus of papers in this issue adequately addresses the breadth and depth of DJS.

Beginning with the diversity questions, the articles in this special issue addressed distinct questions related to identity/demographic diversity (d1) and across distinct categories (race/ethnicity, gender, sexual preference). Each manuscript also addressed cognitive diversity (d2) with questions about how taking courses changed knowledge (Cramblet Alvarez et al., 2019; Patterson & Domenech-Rodríguez, 2019; Smith & Percy, 2019) or processes underpinning biased perceptions (Katz & Klainberg, 2019), and even the unique experiences which encourage professional identities for students of color (Cabrera et al., 2019). The research on cognitive diversity in this issue overwhelmingly measure White students in these studies due to local population which is limiting. These studies encourage the uplifting of voice (d3) by recommending the improvement of the introductory texts used in classes (Cramblet Alvarez et al., 2019), ways to better communicate the problems caused by microaggressions (Patterson & Domenech-Rodríguez, 2019; Smith & Percy, 2019), or strategies to improve professional identities of students of color (Cabrera et al., 2019).

Continuing with the justice questions, the nature of the research included here was less likely to focus on questions of procedural justice (j1). With the exception of considering how actors involved in writing a book progressed, these studies were not trying to address procedures such as why women and/or persons of color were absent from textbooks or how macroaggressions or anti-gay attitudes developed. In contrast, these studies were concerned with distributive justice (j2) and why certain groups are underrepresented or victims of prejudice and discrimination. Authorship in this special issue was available to any Psi Chi member with a related question that survived the review process, which means the research system was limited in accessibility (j3) to certain qualified individuals. However, the Psi Chi Journal is open access by freely offering access to the findings to any interested reader. Recognizing the limits or reach of justice highlights that not all systems are intended to be equal, and that is not necessarily bad.

Accompanying this limitation in justice, there are a number of areas where sustainability issues are not sufficiently addressed in this special issue. None of the manuscripts present research or strategies to improve conservation for human or material resources (s1). The research questions did not have this focus and therefore the authors never attempted to make that connection. This is not easily resolved because no single study can address all areas simultaneously. Further, the field generally is only beginning to recognize that issues relative to environmental issues are related to diversity and justice (Swim & Bloodhart, 2017) and so this dearth is not surprising. Other areas of sustainability fair better when evaluated. Studies with large sample sizes, employing reliable and valid measures provide research conclusions that have a longer lasting impact (s2). Although qualitative conclusions are limited in their generalizability and longevity, the researchers designed studies to test hypotheses with strong inference, suggesting...
findings more likely to replicate. For researchers seeking to conduct replications, these studies provide materials that make them reproducible (s3). Although data sharing is less common in these articles (only two shared data), other researchers are able to adequately develop close replications of the work here using exact materials. Special issues are static by nature after they are published, so these articles do not have adaptive capacity (s4), but the research paradigms described within them could be adapted to respond to better knowledge or new insight.

**Expanding the DJS Lens to Other Psychological Research and Beyond**

Although there were areas of DJS that were not fully examined in this special issue, the journal is on par with many other journals trying to integrate these complex topics. This Psi Chi Special Issue could use more diversity as the topics were relatively broad, but the samples somewhat restricted. This issue did not address questions about procedural justice as it could have. And finally, there was no research included that addressed questions related to how human and environmental sustainability questions intersect with diversity and justice concerns. Rather than focus on what is absent from the special issue, this evaluation invites readers to integrate these findings into broader questions and approaches. The ideal mix of DJS is elusive, and I invite the reader to examine three other recent special issues in psychology which presented research that included more than one DJS construct. The Current Directions in Psychological Science, “Special Issue on Racism” (volume 27, num 3, 2018) presents a collection across the domain of racism and prejudice to create a more just society (Richeson, 2018), but fails to connect to issues of environmental sustainability. The Group Processes and Intergroup Relationships special issue, “Climate Change and Interpersonal Relations” (volume 31, num 3, 2018) directly addresses the intersection of social justice and sustainability (Pearson & Schuldt, 2018) by considering the social facets of environmental issues. With varying degrees, each of these manuscripts explicitly connect DJS together by discussing how diverse voices or experiences contribute to the policies, problems, and solutions related to climate change. Finally, a very recent special issue, from Perspectives on Psychological Science titled, “How Can Psychological Science Cultivate a Healthier, Happier, and More Sustainable World?” (volume 14, num 1, 2019) highlights various intersections between DJS by considering the challenges and consequences researchers experienced while conducting work to improve the world (Gruber, Saxbe, Bushman, McNamara, & Rhodes, 2019). The theme is about social justice broadly (improving the world) with the assumption that a more sustainable world is better highlighted in the title. The connections to diversity come from some manuscripts specifically focused on the topic of identity or demographic diversity, but also the cognitive diversity of the questions and the research approaches. Collectively, these three special issues admirably complement each other and suggest a research approach for someone concerned with DJS questions. The Psi Chi Journal is engaging our field similarly to these other prestigious outlets and together, these four special issues could be useful for any researcher trying to further explore the intersections of DJS topics.

**Looking Forward**

The extended discussion metaphorically connecting DJS to the “identity as a meal” metaphor presented the distinction between diversity, justice, and sustainability as constructs and highlighted how different perspectives could yield wildly different perceptions of what makes an ideal national identity. That metaphor has real-world implications, but it is limited to only one aspect of being human. Readers will approach their own research from a diverse set of interests resolving unique problems and concerns. Considering their own research using a similar metaphor or the DJS lens, questions should assist in clarifying a personal lens or approach.

From my own personal perspective looking at the field, I would like to see more concern for environmental sustainability. This is an inherently social justice question about diverse populations because the wealthy and privileged who create the most pollution and waste are the least likely to suffer the negative consequences (Swim & Bloodhart, 2018), and climate change affects everyone on all parts of the globe. We need to ask questions about how to engage and uplift more people from various identity and demographic diversity groups to actively discuss and resolve the human and resource challenges of living on an ever-shrinking planet. From the same idealist who offered the Stewpot as an alternative to a melting pot or salad bowl approach to national identity, I offer DJS as an interactionist approach to improving interpersonal interactions and worldwide health. Hopefully, readers will find that using a DJS lens to examine their
own research or institutional commitments to social progress provides insight and benefits.
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