CALL FOR PROPOSALS
Special Issue of Industrial & Organizational Psychology

Navigating Recent Changes in the DEI Terrain

Special Issue Editor:
Lars U. Johnson

Co-Editors:
Alison V. Hall and David F. Arena, Jr.

The last decade has been marked by an uptick in social discourse surrounding the utility, impact, and nature of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) at work. Due to increased societal attention to DEI, including global protests and political discourse focused on race, gender, sexual orientation, and immigration, scholarship has refined its attention toward contemporary DEI management and how DEI unfolds within work contexts. Following increases in DEI conversations, policies and practices, and the establishment of facilitative roles and offices, a salient opposition has emerged as stakeholders question the authenticity and validity of DEI practices and their utility for advancing the societal and organizational goals they are intended to support.

Anti-DEI actions and rhetoric can be broadly described as *backlash* (i.e., attempts to reject or undermine pro-DEI efforts to maintain or restore group-based social hierarchies). Backlash has taken several forms, from interpersonal mistreatment (e.g., suggesting an employee is an unqualified "DEI hire") to federal and state-level legislation banning expenditure of state dollars on DEI offices, facilitative roles, and some DEI-related training, policies, and practices (i.e., "mega-threats" to DEI).

In this Special Issue of *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, we seek empirical papers that provide novel insights into recent changes in the DEI landscape. As the discourse vacillates between advancing DEI and eradicating DEI, it is prudent to investigate this shifting tenor's effect on DEI scholarship, practice, and advocacy. Whereas more recent trends in the DEI landscape can be broadly categorized by backlash, we encourage papers investigating circumstances, context, and phenomena beyond various barriers to implementing DEI efforts. We are interested in empirical papers addressing contemporary issues in DEI scholarship, especially those that have affected DEI efforts across the past decade.

Although our call is broad, investigations of the following DEI-related phenomena are of particular interest:

- Re-validations, revisions, and or updates to existing DEI measures that address specific empirical concerns (e.g., reliability, construct validity, generalizability)
- DEI training – inclusive of training design, evaluation, and stakeholder reactions

- Political and/or workplace backlash in response to DEI initiatives and consequences for DEI implementation, changes in group structure or composition, or individuals
- New insight into recent experiences of historically marginalized groups or individuals from such groups
- Unpacking the impact of anti-DEI legislation for targeted communities (i.e., LGBTIQA+ employees, working parents [an intersectional lens including and beyond gender identity for working parents is encouraged])
- Adverse impact
- Perceptions of and reactions to the use of new technologies (e.g., artificial intelligence; AI) in the workplace as it relates to DEI concerns
- Novel uses of archival and alternative data sources in DEI research and practice
- Interpersonal treatment and perceptions (e.g., allyship, advocacy, discrimination, vicarious mistreatment, aggressive behavior, and deontic justice)
- Testing of (especially recent) theoretical models of DEI, including multisource and/or longitudinal investigations thereof
- The impact of extra-organizational contextual factors (e.g., the global COVID-19 Pandemic, international policy, state/local policy, global conflicts) on DEI efforts and their outcomes

Of note, these are exemplars of topic areas of interest, but this is not an exhaustive list of research topics that could be addressed in the special issue. Although this call is open to various DEI-related submissions, papers included in this special issue are limited to empirical investigations. Prospective authors are encouraged to submit proposals for high-powered studies based on (potentially multiple) representative samples, and that feature robust (multi-method) designs (e.g., longitudinal surveys, randomized controlled experiments, qualitative methods, computational modeling, secondary analysis of archival data, meta-analysis, etc.).

We also strongly encourage open science practices such as pre-registration and data-sharing. Whenever possible, we encourage authors to make anonymized datasets openly available for readers (e.g., by posting to https://osf.io). We regard computational reproducibility (i.e., the ability to reproduce reported results from the data when reanalyzed) as critical for quantitative analyses. Authors should plan for, be prepared to, share (anonymized) datasets and analysis code with the journal editor and reviewers upon request.

Prospective authors should submit a proposal of no more than 1,500 words that outlines the proposed study context, methods, analyses, and research questions to the editors at lars.johnson@uta.edu with the subject heading "IOP SI Proposal" by February 1, 2025.

The editorial team will review proposals for fit to the special issue call. If invited, full manuscripts should be prepared for blind review according to the guidelines of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA, 7th ed.).

Selected proposals will be notified by April 1, 2025, and invited to submit full papers, which should be submitted by October 1, 2025.

Invitation of full papers from submitted proposals and final acceptance decisions are contingent on the review team's judgments and evaluations of the paper's contributions in four key areas:

Theoretical grounding/contributions to theory: Is the paper well-grounded in theory/situated within the relevant literature? Does the article offer insights that meaningfully test or extend existing theory? Of note, "theoretical novelty" is <u>not</u> a criterion for evaluation (i.e., papers need not make the case for establishing "new" theory, however such papers are welcomed).

Empirical contributions: Are the study design, data analysis, and results rigorous and appropriate for testing the hypotheses or examining the research questions?

Practical contribution: Does the article contribute to improving our understanding of DEI and the management of people within organizations?

Contribution to the special issue topic: Does the article contribute to the literature on the current state and/or the changing landscape of DEI at work?