AWRY: JOURNAL OF CRITICAL PSYCHOLOGY
Article

Disrupting Androcentrism in Social Psychology Textbooks: A Call for Critical Reflexivity

Meghan George[1] | **Susannah Mulvale**[1] | **Tal Davidson**[1] | **Jacy Young**[2] | **Alexandra Rutherford**[1]

[1]Department of Psychology, York University, Canada

[2]Department of Social Sciences (Psychology), Quest University, Canada

Correspondence
Email: meghanlgeorge@gmail.com

Previous examinations of gender representation in psychology textbooks have revealed consistent gender bias. Although this situation has improved somewhat over the past several decades, it nonetheless appears to persist. In this study we sought to examine whether a sample of psychology textbooks continues to convey androcentrism at the most immediate textual level. Using a selection of social psychology textbooks as a case study, we show how androcentrism persists in the ways research and even illustrative examples are presented to readers. Given the powerful role of textbooks as vehicles through which students are socialized into a field and are exposed to its gender norms and assumptions, suggestions are made for a critically reflexive approach to writing and teaching social psychology in order to disrupt this subtle yet potentially powerful bias.

KEYWORDS
gender, textbooks, representation, social psychology, androcentrism, implicit bias

1 | INTRODUCTION

A substantial body of research examining gender representation in learning environments and teaching materials suggests gender stereotypes can profoundly impact women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields (e.g., Carli et al., 2016; Eagly & Miller, 2016). Much of this research is situated within the social psychology literature, wherein social psychologists investigate how stereotypes equating science with masculinity influence the participation and success of women in many scientific fields, and test interventions to ameliorate the effects of such stereotypes (e.g., Griffith & Dasgupta, 2018; Ramsey et al., 2013). While social psychologists have been at the forefront of this work, here we turn a reflexive gaze back on social psychology itself, in terms of how its own teaching materials, namely introductory social psychology textbooks, fare in terms of gender representation.

In terms of the participation of women in social psychology itself, 1984 marked the year in which the percentage of women earning PhDs in social psychology at United States (U.S.) universities first exceeded the percentage of men, at 52.2% (American Psychological Association [APA], 2006). Between 1984 and 2002, the percentage of women earning PhDs in social psychology fluctuated between 52.2% (in 1984) and a high of 65.3% (in 1996). In 2002, the last year for which these data were available, the percentage of women earning PhDs in social psychology was 58% (by comparison, the percentage of women earning PhDs across all areas of psychology was 66.7%; APA, 2006). In 2017, the membership of APA Division 8, the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP), had a male majority, with 62.4% male and 37.2% female members (APA, 2017a). When the entire membership of SPSP is considered (one does not have to be a member of Division 8 to be a member of SPSP), these numbers shift a bit. As of 2018, the entire membership of SPSP was 43% male, and 53% female (3% responded "I'd rather not say" and 1% did not report gender; SPSP, 2018). Membership demographics for APA Division 9 – the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues – are similar. In 2017, 56.4% of their members identified as male, and 43.5% as female (APA, 2017b).

In light of these numbers, showing that the percentage of women earning social psychology PhDs has been equal to or even slightly higher than that of men for some time, and women are proportionately represented organizationally, we were curious to see whether textbooks showcased women's contributions to the field commensurate with their numbers. If the pipeline leading women toward tenure and promotion, citation, and ultimately eminence is to be created and maintained, we need to ensure teaching materials reflect their contributions (see Eagly & Miller, 2016).

Accordingly, in the present study, we examine how social psychology textbook authors convey the gender of who was/is doing important scientific work in their own field. Unlike past textbook studies that have measured gender representation by way of textbook author and reviewer gender (Peterson & Kroner, 1992), citations (Denmark, 1994), etc., our goal in the current study was to focus on gender representation through the eyes of the typical reader. Although it is obvious that gender (among, and in intersection with, other categories, including race and class) has historically been a barrier to women's equal participation in social psychology, and that these historical forces will thus impact whose research is included in contemporary textbooks, we nonetheless argue that the unreflective repetition of a male-dominated canon can subtly reinforce the association between (masculine) gender and science that social psychologists themselves are actively trying to dismantle. This unreflective repetition also contributes to skewing the metrics that continue to be (problematically) used to declare who is "eminent" in the field (see Eagly & Miller, 2016). We use the results of our textbook analysis as a springboard for suggesting some critically reflexive practices that may help authors challenge problematic assumptions about eminence, create more gender-inclusive textbooks, and – importantly – teach students how to think about psychology – and textbooks – in more critical, contextually-grounded ways.

1.1 | Bias in Textbooks

Textbooks are powerful tools for communicating the central assumptions, methodologies, and achievements of a discipline (Smyth, 2001; Vicedo, 2012). Textbooks are typically presented as though they are objective, value-neutral, and stand apart from the culture in which they are created. However, there are important judgments that authors, editors, and publishers make when choosing content and language to represent their field to a relatively naïve audience (Marecek, 1993). For instance, including a particular theory or study instead of another may implicitly suggest that the work of some researchers is considered more significant or relevant. The presentation of "classic studies" as divorced from context and critique has been shown to contribute to an origin myth process that allows psychologists to celebrate the long lineage of important work that comprises their field (Samelson, 1974). In addition, how ideas are communicated reflect the norms and ideals of particular sociohistorical contexts (Griggs & Christopher, 2016). If textbook content presents skewed gender representation without acknowledging the reasons for such representation, social psychologists themselves might suggest that implicit attitudes are likely to form by way of associative learning (Olson & Fazio, 2001) and evaluative conditioning (Smith & DeCoster, 2000). These theories posit that concepts frequently encountered together are more readily recalled together, and attitudes toward these paired concepts develop from repeated exposure, respectively. Despite concerns about replicability across many topics in social psychology, implicit attitudes have proven quite robust across multiple measures, and reliably correspond to biased behaviors (Kurdi, et al., 2019). For example, implicit stereotypes held at the national level, such as the stereotype that boys are better at math than girls, have been found to impact girls' performance on standardized math tests (Payne et al., 2017). Because this bias has become normative and often goes unrecognized, it can be thought of in terms of what Benokraitis and Feagin (1986) refer to as subtle sexism, which is perpetuated by uncritical adherence to social conventions with obscured sexist origins.

Textbooks thus transmit to students the sometimes-subtle assumptions about who is doing important work in psychology. Research suggests that this messaging can have a profound influence on a student's academic performance, career choice, and the gender composition within Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields (e.g., Carli et al., 2016; Eagly & Miller, 2016). In STEM classrooms, male normativity is constructed through the relative lack of non-male educators, the visible fact that women more often occupy professional positions in which they are subordinate to men, and the fact that White cis-gender male privilege imbues the politics of class participation (Tindall & Hamil, 2004). Work by Griffith and Dasgupta (2018) also speaks to the importance of implicit messaging conveyed by one's environmental context. Women in lower level STEM courses who were paired with female mentors in upper level courses were more likely than female students with male mentors or without such mentors to remain in a STEM major. The presence of other women in the field appears to be a strong incentive for retention in an otherwise male-dominated area.

If associations can be formed through subtle messaging about math and the gender composition of science majors, as these findings suggest, it stands to reason that textbooks might be equally responsible for forming associations and could therefore have a similar impact on students. With this in mind, psychologists have previously examined textbooks in search of potential gender biases, ones that may impact student understanding of the subject matter as well as their social world. Textbooks were systematically explored in 1972, when an APA Task Force examined the content of 13 popular psychology textbooks (APA, 1975). They found that textbooks conveyed messages of male dominance even without any overtly sexist content. Textbooks overgeneralized male pronouns, neglected to report sex differences, applied results collected from samples of men to all genders, and referenced women's research less frequently than their prominence in psychology would suggest they should be referenced (Gray, 1977; Peterson & Kroner, 1992; Woolsey, 1977). To remedy this, the Task Force recommended amending the APA publication style

guide and advocated that authors (1) avoid generalizing data from one sex to another; (2) discuss sex differences when they occur in the data; (3) propose more than just genetic hypotheses to account for sex differences, including the possibility of methodological bias; and (4) cite women psychologists' work in proportion to their contributions to the field (Peterson & Kroner, 1992).

Despite the Task Force's recommendation, these guidelines were not integrated into the APA publication manual (Peterson Kroner, 1992). Predictably, psychology textbooks continued to perpetuate gender stereotypes in various remediable ways. Examining images in human sexuality textbooks, Low and Sherrard (1999) established that women were depicted in traditional sex roles much more frequently than in political or professional roles, and that this gap had barely narrowed between 1970 and 1990. Percival (1984) found that in eight popular introductory psychology textbooks authors made deliberate efforts to be grammatically gender-neutral and discussed gender differences where appropriate, but still failed to include women psychologists' work in proportional numbers. Peterson and Kroner (1992) conducted content analyses on introductory psychology textbooks in the early 90s. Taking into consideration the gender of textbook authors and reviewers, as well as any mentions of gendered individuals throughout the texts, these researchers concluded that men were represented significantly more than women across all categories. A few years later, Hogben and Waterman (1997) analyzed 28 introductory psychology textbooks published between 1990 and 1997, to determine how gender, race, and sexual orientation were represented in texts and images. Their results showed that while textbooks generally included discussions of gender roles and differences, they also included minimal coverage of issues in psychology that pertained to sexism and homophobia.

Much of the research on the biases present in psychology textbooks took place two or more decades ago, and it remains to be examined to what extent such biases persist in textbooks today. In addition, the extant literature has yet to consider gender representation in textbooks from the reader's perspective. As such, the aim of our current research is to provide an up-to-date assessment of how gender is communicated in social psychology textbooks at the most immediate level. As understanding of bias reduction techniques such as counter-stereotype training (Kawakami et al., 2008) advances, we are more equipped than ever before to intervene when issues relating to diversity and representation arise, however, it is crucial to critically – and continuously – assess textbook content and form in order to identify if and when such a need exists.

1.2 | Present Research

Here we explore the current state of gender representation in social psychology textbooks to see where this sub-field of psychology stands in relation to the issues described above. We contribute to the extant literature by providing data from recent editions of social psychology textbooks, focusing on the proportion of women versus men who are depicted as researchers versus used as examples (e.g., describing the experience of a fictional woman named Mary to illustrate the confirmation bias effect), and on the extent to which women versus men are depicted in pictures/photographs and quoted in sidebars.

Accordingly, this paper reports the results of a modest, exploratory, empirical examination of gender representation in several recent and widely used social psychology textbooks as a catalyst for discussing writing practices more generally. To assess gender representation in textbooks we developed a straightforward measure using variables explored in prior textbook research: a count of how many times women and men were explicitly mentioned as either researchers or examples in the texts, appeared in photographs and illustrations, and were quoted in sidebars.[1]

To account for the fact that textbooks may no longer convey gender stereotypes in readily apparent ways,

[1] Note that although the current analyses represent gender in a binary fashion, the authors do not adhere to this conceptualization. Due to the nature of the investigation, however, we were unable to determine if individuals mentioned within the textbooks identified with a gender other than male or female.

our main goal was to examine whether women and men are more frequently represented as researchers and scholars, or as examples in scenarios and descriptions of studies. If women are more often mentioned as examples rather than researchers, and the opposite is found for men, it can be argued that textbooks still perpetuate the stereotype that women make less substantial contributions to psychology relative to men. While prior textbook studies have assessed the gender distribution of researchers by comparing the genders of all the researchers referenced in a particular work, we argue that students being introduced to social psychology will not recognize many of the names, and by extension the genders, of researchers cited parenthetically. We thus compared only those researchers whose gender was evident through their name or the use of a gender-specific pronoun. We opted for this method because students' most elementary interactions with textbooks are critical sites for associative learning and evaluative conditioning, which shape their gendered impressions and associations about psychology.

2 | METHOD

We selected a sample of 11 social psychology textbooks.[2] Our goal was to choose textbooks that were widely used in North American social psychology classrooms and therefore represented material that students were likely to encounter. We achieved this by first selecting only recently published textbooks for our sample, with no books published prior to 2013. Our initial inclusion criteria were informal and relied heavily on recommendations from our research team members and colleagues in social psychology. As such, the chosen textbooks were well-known and widely used in the course syllabi of these individuals and members of their extended academic networks. In addition, the textbooks are published by large textbook publishers in North America, suggesting their wide availability and distributions (for the full list of textbooks, see Table 1).[3] Textbooks were also selected based on our ability access to them through purchasing or renting either physical hard copies or online editions. Despite a lack of systematic selection criteria, post hoc investigation provides some supporting evidence for the widespread use of the sample textbooks. For example, eight of the included textbooks had been sampled in previous studies of social psychology content (Griggs & Whitehead, 2015; Whitehead et al., 2017), although updated editions were used for our current research where available (see Table 1). Four new editions of our selected textbooks appeared on a recent blog post identifying the top textbooks in social psychology (Parker, 2019), and at least the first author of each book in our sample had authored a social psychology textbook that was listed on the Social Psychology Network website (Plous, 2020b).

Due to the number of textbooks included in our sample, as well as the limited number of coders involved in the study, it was not feasible for us to analyze each book in its entirety. Instead, we opted to analyze a single chapter from each. Because the total number of chapters in each book varied, we selected an early chapter to ensure that it would be included in all textbooks within the sample. We decided – in advance of consulting any of the books – that analyzing the first two chapters was likely to result in inflated gender bias, because male-dominated historical and methodological content is often introduced early in a course as foundational and contextual material (Parodi, 2010). The topics covered in the third chapter, we reasoned, would be less consistent across textbooks and would therefore avoid any systematic effects that topic might have on gender representation of researchers. That said, when we began our analyses, several of the books did converge on Social Cognition in chapter three (4 out of the 11 books).

[2] Our original sample size was 12, which included both the 5th edition of Aronson's Social Psychology textbook (2013), and – following its release in 2017 – the 6th edition. Thanks to a reviewer's comment, however, it was pointed out that this might inflate the gender differences we found in our results. We have since removed the data from the earlier edition, and present only the most recent edition in the current paper.

[3] Because this research was conducted in Canada, our sample included both American and Canadian editions. Although we did not initially consider this as a possible confound, one reviewer pointed out the potential for cross-cultural differences. This point is particularly timely, as the New York Times recently reported that textbook content differed from state to state in the U.S. (Goldstein, 2020). However, the pattern of gender representation within our sample was consistent regardless of the publication country.

TABLE 1 Social Psychology Textbooks Sampled

Textbook Citation	Chapter Analyzed
Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., Fehr, B., & Akert, R. M. (2017). *Social psychology* (6th Canadian ed.). Toronto: Pearson.	3 - Social Cognition
Branscombe, N. R., & Baron, R. A. (2017). *Social psychology* (14th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.	4 - The Self
Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2014). *Essential social psychology* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	3 - Social Cognition
Fiske, S. (2014). *Social beings: Core motives in social psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.	3 - Ordinary Personology
Franzoi, S. L. (2016). *Social psychology* (7th ed.). Redding, CA: BVT Publishing.	1 - Introducing Social Psychology
Gilovich, T., Keltner, D., Chen, S., & Nisbett, R. (2015). *Social psychology* (4th ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.	3 - The Social Self
Greenberg, J., Schmader, T., Arndt, J., & Landau, M. (2015). *Social psychology: The Science of everyday life.* New York: Worth Publishers.	3 - The Core Elements of Social Cognition
Kassin, S. M., Fein, S., & Markus, H. R. (2013). *Social psychology* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.	3 - The Social Self
Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L., & Cialdini, R. B. (2014). *Social psychology: Goals in interaction* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.	12 - Groups
Myers, D. G., Spencer, S., & Jordan, C. H. (2015). *Social psychology* (6th Canadian ed.). Whitby, ON: McGraw Hill Ryerson.	3 - Social Beliefs and Judgments
Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. ,Claypool, H. (2015). *Social psychology* (4th ed.). New York: Psychology Press.	3 - Perceiving Individuals

Accordingly, if any of the remaining 7 books also covered social cognition in Chapter 3 we selected a different chapter for analysis (note that we have no reason to believe that the field of social cognition is especially dominated by men).

A team of 10 coders was involved in the chapter analyses. Each coder analyzed the content of at least one textbook chapter, with a minimum of three people assigned to each chapter. Analysis proceeded as an iterative process, and as such, the coding scheme was developed over several readings of the chapters. The group assigned to each text did an initial reading of the chapter while coding for two items: the gender of any person mentioned and the purpose of the mention (i.e., as a researcher or theorist, or invoked as an example). Following this first pass, the entire research team met and discussed questions that arose and any ambiguous coding (e.g., should female "triplets" be counted as a single mention or three individual mentions). A final coding scheme was then agreed upon by all coders and included the categories listed below. Any disagreement on the totals for each chapter were discussed and resolved among coders.

Each time a person was initially mentioned in the text, their name and gender information were recorded.

Mentions could include real people, such as "William James," or imaginary people, such as "Jane." References to generic people were also recorded (e.g., "Catholic women," "male manager," etc.). If an individual was mentioned by name more than once, only the first unique mention was counted, unless the subsequent mentions were in reference to different research studies. Researchers who were identified only by their last name with no gender specification were not counted. Researchers were counted, however, if only their last name was provided but their gender was revealed by the use of a gender-specific pronoun later in the text. If a first name was provided but the gender was ambiguous (e.g., Sam), this was counted as an ambiguous mention.

It should be noted that a small proportion of the names that appeared within the chapters sampled were specific to cultural or ethnic groups outside the North American, Eurocentric norm (e.g., Takahiku, Fabienne, Heejung). When coders were unable to identify the gender in such a case, or when they believed a North American reader of the textbook not from this culture or ethnic group would not know the gender of a name, the mention was classified as gender ambiguous. We acknowledge that some students will be familiar with these names and therefore able to associate them with a gender, but because our study is concerned with how gender is communicated to social psychology students who are more familiar with North American names relative to names of diverse ethnic origins, we decided to code these names as ambiguous.

People named in the text were then divided into two categories: researchers and examples. If a person was mentioned because of their contributions to research or theory, they were classified as a researcher. If a person or group was mentioned as an example of some psychological phenomenon (e.g., women may underperform on math tests following stereotype threat; Crisp & Turner, 2014, p. 64), as a fictional stimulus person in a study (e.g., participants rated "Hannah's academic abilities…"; Greenberg et al., 2015, p. 103), or as part of a fictional scenario (e.g., if a single mother lives in a poor neighborhood, individuals are likely to make attributions about her economic situation that are in line with attributions of her environment; Fiske, 2014, p. 107), they were classified as an example. Across our sample of textbooks, chapter authors differed in their use of examples; some examples were real people, while some were fictional and created to elaborate a point. Gender was coded regardless of whether the example individual was "real" or not.

In addition to analyzing the text, we also coded the perceived gender of individuals in images. Images appeared in various forms (i.e., photographs and cartoons) and quality, and there were therefore instances where the gender of the person pictured was not clear. In this case, coders again employed a gender ambiguous category.

Finally, five of the textbook chapters prominently featured quotes within sidebars. We coded the gender of the person being quoted separately from the body of the text, as these sidebars often stand out and readers who move quickly through the chapter may be more likely to read these, given their position and generally larger font size.

3 | RESULTS

There were a total of 946 individual mentions coded across all 11 chapters. Of these mentions, 269 were classified as women (28%), 639 were classified as men (68%), and the remaining 38 mentions were coded as ambiguous (4%). Chi-square analyses indicate that the association between gender (male versus female) and the type of mention (researcher versus example) was significant, $\chi^2(1) = 30.13, p < .001$ (see Table 2 for contingency table).

All standardized residuals are significant, indicating that significantly more men and significantly fewer women than would be expected were mentioned in both the researcher and example categories. These results appear to be driven by women, with residuals associated with women being larger in magnitude relative to men. Our findings demonstrate relatively large effects specifically within the researcher category, such that the odds of being men-

tioned as a researcher were 3.61 times higher for men relative to women. Men were also 1.61 times more likely than women to be mentioned as examples. Taken together, the odds that any individual would be named as a researcher were greater for men than for women, $OR = 2.24(95\%\ CI: 1.66, 3.04)$. The proportion of gendered mentions varied across textbooks. For example, one text did not include gendered mentions of researchers, resulting in 0% of the women in that text being categorized as researchers. A different text, however, included 65% of all women mentioned as researchers. For a complete numerical summary of the mentions within each textbook, see Tables 3, 4, and 5.

TABLE 2 Breakdown of Total Mentions by Gender and Type

	Type of Mention					
	Researcher		Example		All Mentions	
	n = 639	%	*n* = 269	%	*n* = 908	%
Gender						
Male	372(2.06)[a]	78.32	103(-3.18)	70.37	475	52.31
Female	267(-2.16)	61.66	166(3.33)	29.63	433	47.69

[a] Standardized residuals are listed in parentheses. The N values do not include any mentions that were categorized as gender ambiguous.

TABLE 3 Number of Mentions in Each Textbook

		Gender					
		Women		Men		Ambiguous	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Authors							
	Aronson et al. 6th Ed.	17	26.6	45	70.3	2	3.1
	Branscombe & Baron	12	54.4	10	45.5	0	0
	Crisp & Turner	9	47.4	10	52.6	0	0
	Fiske	13	31.0	29	69.0	0	0
	Franzoi	20	26.7	53	70.7	2	2.6
	Gilovich et al.	28	35.0	43	54.0	9	11.0
	Greenberg	32	34.0	61	64.9	1	1.1
	Kassin	44	27.9	104	65.8	10	6.3
	Kenrick	17	17.5	78	80.4	2	2.1
	Myers et al.	48	23.0	148	72.0	9	4.0
	Smith et al.	29	32.2	58	64.5	3	3.3

TABLE 4 Types of Mentions Within Gender Category

		Women				Men			
		Researcher		Example		Researcher		Example	
		n	%[a]	n	%	n	%	n	%
Authors									
	Aronson et al. 6th Ed.	4	23.5	13	76.5	18	40	27	60
	Branscombe & Baron	0	0	12	100	0	0	10	100
	Crisp & Turner	0	0	9	100	3	30	7	70
	Fiske	2	15.4	11	84.6	18	62.1	11	37.9
	Franzoi	13	65	7	35	41	77.4	12	22.6
	Gilovich et al.	13	46.4	15	53.6	18	41.9	25	58.1
	Greenberg	1	3.1	31	96.9	17	27.9	44	72.1
	Kassin	27	61.4	17	38.6	88	84.6	16	15.4
	Kenrick	2	11.8	15	88.2	32	41	46	59.0
	Myers et al.	31	64.5	17	35.4	116	78.4	32	21.6
	Smith et al.	10	34.5	19	65.5	21	36.2	37	63.8

[a] Represents the proportion of mentions within the gender category.

TABLE 5 Types of Mentions Within Researcher vs. Examples Category

		Researcher				Example			
		Women		Men		Women		Men	
		n	%[a]	n	%	n	%	n	%
Authors									
	Aronson et al. 6th Ed.	4	16.7	18	75	13	32.5	27	67.5
	Branscombe & Baron	0	0	0	0	12	54.6	10	45.5
	Crisp & Turner	0	0	3	100	9	56.3	7	43.8
	Fiske	2	10	18	90	11	50	11	50
	Franzoi	13	23.2	41	73.2	7	36.8	12	63.2
	Gilovich et al.	13	41.9	18	58.1	15	32.6	25	54.4
	Greenberg	1	5.3	17	89.5	31	41.3	44	58.7
	Kassin	27	21.6	88	70.4	17	51.5	16	48.5
	Kenrick	2	5.9	32	94.1	15	24.2	46	74.2
	Myers et al.	31	20.3	116	75.8	17	32.1	32	60.4
	Smith et al.	10	29.4	21	61.8	19	33.9	37	66.1

[a] Represents the proportion of mentions within the researcher vs. example categories. Percentages were calculated using the total number of men, women, and gender ambiguous mentions. Because gender ambiguous mentions are not included in the above table, combining the percentage of women and men mentions will not always add to 100%

As for images, one text did not contain images, so the combined totals include 10 of the 11 analyzed chapters. Chi-square analyses once again indicate an association between gender (male versus female) and appearing in images, $\chi^2(1) = 33.00, p < .001$. Men were 1.78 times more likely than women to be featured in photographs, art, and drawings. Out of a total of 445 individuals counted in images across all textbooks, 152 (34.2%) of those people were clearly identifiable as women, 270 (60.1%) were identifiable as men, and 23 (5.2%) were classified as gender ambiguous. Representation of women in images ranged from 22.0 – 58.3% within a chapter. In all chapters but one, there were more pictures of men than women. For a breakdown of these results by chapter, see Table 6.

TABLE 6 Number and Percent of Gendered Images

		Gender					
		Women		Men		Ambiguous	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Authors							
	Aronson et al. 6th Ed.	7	24.1	22	75.9	0	0
	Branscombe & Baron	9	22.0	27	65.9	5	12.2
	Crisp & Turner	7	58.3	5	41.7	0	0
	Fiske	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Franzoi	14	34.2	26	63.4	1	2.4
	Gilovich et al.	20	29	46	66.7	3	4.3
	Greenberg	18	41.9	23	53.5	2	4.7
	Kassin	31	41.3	41	54.7	3	4.0
	Kenrick	23	31.1	50	67.6	1	1.4
	Myers et al.	12	35.3	18	52.9	4	11.8
	Smith et al.	11	40.7	12	44.4	4	14.8

Finally, sidebar quotes only appeared in four of the 11 chapters. Women quoted in sidebars across the chapters accounted for 7.7% of all quotes, while men accounted for 84.6%. The remaining 7.7% of quotes were not easily attributed to a gendered individual and were therefore coded as gender ambiguous. Each of the individual texts analyzed quoted only a single woman or none at all. For a complete summary of these results, see Table 7.

TABLE 7 Sidebars

		Gender					
		Women		Men		Ambiguous	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Authors							
	Franzoi	1	10	8	80	1	10
	Gilovich et al.	1	8	11	82	0	0
	Kassin	0	0	3	75	1	25
	Myers et al.	1	7	13	87	1	7

4 | DISCUSSION

When we considered all 11 social psychology texts together, a clear pattern emerged. Men were mentioned far more often than women in all capacities. Men were named as researchers more frequently than women, as well as used as examples more than women. This is despite the fact that women have been entering the field of social psychology (as PhD earners) at rates equal to or greater than men since the early 1980s. The discrepancy between the number of researcher and example mentions within each gender was particularly notable, with mentions of men as researchers outnumbering their mentions as examples, yet women were mentioned as examples more than as researchers. A similar trend was seen in images and sidebars; women comprised the minority of individuals depicted in images and quoted in sidebars. Although these percentages represent gender as it appears across the whole sample of 11 textbooks, these trends hold within the individual chapters as well (see Tables 1 – 5 for exceptions). That is, students reading any one of these social psychology textbooks will likely encounter significantly fewer women than men in photos, sidebar quotes, as researchers and as examples.

Taken together, it appears as though men are still given more "page time" relative to women, and they tend to be mentioned as researchers more frequently than women. This consistent pattern across all contexts suggests that the textbook authors may still be influenced by an androcentric culture in which men continue to be taken as the standard against which all others are compared (Hamilton, 1991; Hegarty & Buechel, 2006; Merritt & Harrison, 2006). Such representations reinforce this androcentrism by continuing to make men's contributions more visible and minimizing or omitting the contributions of marginalized psychologists whose work is then locked into an iterative loop of exclusion (i.e., without receiving recognition for their contributions, marginalized psychologists remain invisible to authors who write about their field; because they are invisible, their otherwise relevant contributions might be passed over for more "eminent" or "classic" work; Cynkar, 2007). This practice limits women and gender-nonconforming psychologists' access to professional credibility via citation, and slows their productivity given the added task of challenging stereotypes and microagressions that mediate their interactions with White men in STEM professions (Aksnes et al., 2011; Litzler et al., 2014; McGee, 2016; Van Arensbergen et al., 2012).

The skewed gender representation found in the present study mirrors the findings of early textbook research, suggesting that little has changed in the way of androcentric writing practices. Although some effort has been made to reduce bias, such as the 6th APA Publication Manual's (2010) guidelines for using neutral pronouns and appropriate gender identification, there remains a need to make the work of women and other underrepresented groups more visible if we are to disrupt androcentrism.[4] Naming women researchers within the text would promote the implicit association between women and social psychological research. However, the inclusion of women in any form (e.g., parenthetical, pictorially, within discussions of the reasons for their absence) may also help to increase the visibility of women in general and could potentially shift the automatic assumption that men are the default human form.

Although the APA manual prohibits the generic use of male pronouns, neutral pronouns themselves do not necessarily disrupt androcentrism; generic reference to a non-gendered 'person' or a gender-neutral name such as 'Chris' continues to evoke the image of a male, rather than a female (Hamilton, 1991; Merritt & Harrison, 2006). Social psychologists have shown that texts that adopt gender-neutral grammatical structures still tend to pose men (specifically, White, cis-gendered, heterosexual men) as the norm population from which other populations differ (Hegarty & Buechel, 2006). Methodological and linguistic conventions as subtle as the tendency to list cis-gender men before other genders, or White people before people of other ethnic and racial categories, appear to reinforce the normativity of White male bodies and the deviance of non-male and racialized bodies (Hegarty & Buechel, 2006;

[4] The section also includes brief guidelines for appropriate terminology in discussions of race and sexual orientation, but similarly lacks any mention of a need to represent all marginalized persons' contributions to psychology in ways that reflect the field's diversity.

Hegarty & Pratto, 2004).

Neither an adjustment of grammar nor a major reduction in the overt use of gender stereotypes has apparently changed the learning landscape enough to challenge the assumption that the White cis-gender male is the standard against which all other groups are implicitly or explicitly compared. This standard is constructed across a number of pedagogical modalities that textbooks employ (e.g., text, images, activities), and may even stem from cultural norms that have been passed down through generations unquestioningly (Griggs & Christopher, 2016; Smith & DeCoster, 2000). Writers and readers who are unaccustomed to seeing or hearing about women in relation to classic social psychology research, for example, may not identify androcentrism in their textbooks, let alone consider it problematic. Only when steps are taken to counteract existing associations (Kawakami et al., 2008) or when individuals are motivated and able to process information in a controlled and intentional way (Smith & DeCoster, 2000), will the implicit association between psychological research and men begin to decay.

4.1 | Dealing with History

Up to this point, we have discussed the ways in which textbooks present material using language and exemplars that communicate androcentrism. Although recommendations have been made for how to reduce androcentrism, these recommendations may overlook an important reason why textbooks still demonstrate a gender bias, at least in researcher mentions (we can think of no reason why women could not be featured in photos and as examples at a rate equal to that of men!). A critic might argue, quite justifiably, that since men have historically dominated social psychology (and indeed, all psychology), and given that textbooks often include not only a selection of the most current scholarship in an area but also the classic studies from a time when more men were working in the field, we may always (or at least into the foreseeable future) have more male researchers featured in textbooks. To try and tip the gender balance would result in an inaccurate portrayal of the history of social psychology.

We feel there are at least two related problems with such an argument, one historiographic (concerning the writing of psychology's history), and one historical (pertaining to the historical fact that men have been statistically overrepresented in psychology, and in social psychology, until the early 1980s). Historiographically, this argument communicates the uncritical acceptance that male-dominated history is somehow not distorted, and therefore precludes a critical, contextual analysis of social psychology's (and indeed psychology's) representation of its own history. Second, given that psychology was male-dominated until the early 1980s, it suggests that contemporary textbook authors have no obligation to lay bare the social, political, and structural factors that have historically kept women underrepresented in psychology until recently (and continue to keep women underrepresented in STEM, a topic in which social psychologists have invested quite a bit of effort, see Rutherford, 2020).

Androcentrism in the writing of psychology's history has been challenged for decades by the work of feminist historians who have highlighted women's considerable achievements even when they have been devalued, occluded, and omitted from history (Bohan, 1990, 1995; Scarborough & Furumoto, 1987). These historians have also unpacked in detail the host of structural factors and gender ideologies that have inhibited women's participation and visibility (see also Rutherford, 2015). One such structural factor is the role of gatekeepers of psychology's history. As Sue (2004) suggests, "the group who 'owns' history also controls the gateway to knowledge construction, truth and falsity, problem definition, what constitutes normality and abnormality, and ultimately, the nature of reality" (p. 766). For many years, those who "owned" psychology's history, at least in North America, were White men. Early history of psychology textbooks were authored, for example, by G. Stanley Hall (1912), E. G. Boring (1929), and Robert I. Watson (1953). It was not until 1976 that a text featuring the contributions of Black psychologists to establishing a psychology based on the Black experience was published (Guthrie, 1976). And although it is beyond the scope of this paper to

conduct a systematic analysis of who gets represented in widely used history of psychology textbooks, suffice it to say that our accumulated experience indicates that the telling of the history of psychology remains male-dominated in content and in practice.[5]

Despite this, women's contributions are slowly being added to this androcentric history, and there are now a number of resources – including for social psychology – that can help introduce more women into the canon of this field, if one is willing to look.[6] Ruth Tolman, for example, served as the first female council representative for the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) in 1944 (George, 2011). Marie Jahoda was SPSSI's first woman president and had a long career studying an array of social issues, including unemployment, community influences on mental health, and intergroup relations (see Rutherford et al., 2011). Her career is a good example of both the historiographic and historical forces that have kept some women's contributions occluded. Jahoda's methodological pluralism and sociological approach to research may have contributed to her exclusion from social psychology histories. She immersed herself in communities to gather knowledge about particular people and was less concerned with the theory-driven research being conducted by her contemporaries (whose research often did make it into the history books). Her field research spanned multiple countries and it was not until late in her career that she was offered a secure professorial position at a university. These factors demonstrate how she was not a typical social psychologist, and as such, Jahoda became "a difficult figure to situate historically, at least in traditional accounts of American developments" (Rutherford et al., 2011, p. 44). Without a clear place within the history of the field, her story is often excluded from our pedagogical materials (for a similar argument about the community self-survey work of Claire Selltiz, see Torre & Fine, 2011).

Finally, Georgene Seward is another good example of these historiographic and historical processes. Seward was also an active member of SPSSI, and published pioneering work on the social origin of sex roles (Seward, 1946). As historians have shown, however (see Johnston & Johnson, 2008; Rutherford, 2017), due to anti-nepotism rules and gender stereotypes (which Seward apparently transgressed), she had to re-orient her career to clinical work. Seward's work on sex roles and involvement in social psychology is rarely included in histories, or in social psychology textbooks. Her exclusion in part reflects the very real historical forces and gender restrictions that compromised her ability to remain directly involved in the field.

Acknowledging social psychology's androcentric history provides an opportunity for a critical examination of the ways gendering has affected who has had access to the field, whose contributions have been seen as important, and whose work has subsequently been passed down through generations of textbook writers. In fact, it is an opportunity for social psychologists to engage this history for its contemporary relevance. The same processes that seem so obvious with historical hindsight actually continue to unfold today (see Rutherford, 2015; Rutherford 2020).

We are not suggesting that textbooks should refrain from including research that has been selected – within a thoroughly androcentric context – as historic/classic/seminal. Nor do we necessarily insist that textbook authors slavishly commit themselves to ensuring that the proportion of researchers explicitly mentioned in their texts is 50/50 male/female. Instead, we argue that critical reflection on and acknowledgement of the contexts in which some work was selected, and other work excluded, from history, should be communicated to readers. In addition, acknowledgment of the barriers that women continue to face at all stages of their career should be highlighted. By examining the reasons for unbalanced gender representation in historical accounts, contemporary decision-making about research that should be considered worthy of mention moving forward can also be better informed. Additionally, by making

[5] As a quick example, this current web resource features 23 major figures in the history of social psychology (Plous, 2020a). Of these, only 3 are women (Mamie Phipps Clark, Evelyn Hooker, and Carolyn Sherif).

[6] Starting in the 1970s, a growing body of women's history of psychology has been developing. For a bibliography, see http://www.feministvoices.com/history-of-women-in-psychology/. The Psychology's Feminist Voices oral history and digital archive project is itself a contribution to this field of history.

intentional efforts to include more diverse researchers and exemplars, implicit androcentric messaging can be disrupted. In fact, simply stating positive or negative information about targets has been found to immediately change implicit attitudes toward those targets (Kurdi & Banaji, 2019), possibly resulting from an understanding of any new information being presented as a cognitive rule moving forward (Smith & DeCoster, 2000). Although learning information by way of such rule-based processing requires motivation and cognitive capacity, it is learned quickly rather than over repeated exposure. This suggests that providing context for the biased representation of gender in psychology textbooks has the potential override or weaken associative learning such as when concepts are repeatedly paired together.

How we communicate psychological research and theory does not simply "reflect reality," but instead has the ability to shape it. Textbook authors actively construct and influence the way we perceive reality, and these perceptions are transmitted to prospective psychologists (students) through pedagogical tools such as textbooks. By highlighting more men-led research simply because men have historically outnumbered women in the field we are creating a climate in which the majority rules and the contributions of more diverse members are continually overshadowed by the work of their majority group colleagues, keeping them locked in a cycle of exclusion. Higher citation counts for male-authored publications suggest that this overshadowing effect extends beyond the pages of our textbooks (Litzler et al., 2014; Van Arensbergen et al., 2012).

With women increasingly entering the field of social psychology as graduate students (Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 2018), ensuring they are able to move up in their careers is becoming essential. Underrepresenting women in psychology textbooks may make the field less attractive and inviting to members of this group. If students and future scholars do not see themselves in the materials with which they are presented, they may be less likely to picture themselves as being successful in their chosen field. This is because their learning materials do not challenge gender stereotypes, forcing students themselves to take on the double task of studying their field and resisting discrimination (McGee, 2016). Failure to retain women has been dubbed the "leaky pipeline" problem, referring to the fact that fewer marginalized students enter and complete STEM education, end up constituting a smaller pool of candidates at the professional level, and remain less likely to advance professionally at the rate of men even when they do acquire work in STEM (Wolfinger et al., 2008). The leaky pipeline problem has repercussions beyond individual career choice. Attracting underrepresented individuals to the field is one means of expanding disciplinary perspectives, encouraging innovative ideas, and promoting novel research. In order to educate and engage the multitude of students in our classrooms it is necessary not only to provide them with a thorough understanding of social psychological concepts, but also to take a hard look at what information we impart to them as being valued and important through the language and examples of our textbooks.

Given research that has shown the impact of gender-inclusive teaching materials, classrooms, and workplaces on the recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups (Griffith & Dasgupta, 2018; Kawakami et al., 2008; Steele et al., 2002), raising critical historical consciousness seems more important than ever. Ultimately, textbook writers must adopt a critically reflexive stance on their own representational practices if we are to disrupt the androcentrism that has permeated psychology's past and continues to leak steadily into the present.

4.2 | Limitations

Because the present study was primarily concerned with how textbooks are communicating gender, we examined instances where an individual's gender was readily apparent. We were not concerned with the number of men and women who were cited parenthetically (i.e., in in-text citations) because it is unlikely that a student at the undergraduate level would be able to discern author gender from a last name alone. We were also unable to determine

if individuals mentioned in the text identified with a gender other than that which is typically associated with their first name. Future research would benefit from considering the gender of researchers who are cited in a parenthetical context only, as well as investigating the number of gender non-conforming researchers mentioned. For example, if we include instances where a researcher's work is discussed but neither their first name nor gendered pronouns are used, will we still find that men and women are cited unequally? Are such researchers assumed to be less important or less representative than those mentioned within the text? It is entirely possible that textbook authors are now citing the work of male and female researchers at more equal rates. This does not, however, negate our findings that the gender of the researchers who are being made visible to students is still predominantly male. Perhaps greater care simply needs to be taken to ensure that women researchers who are being cited are simply made more visible (in photos, use of first name, etc.) at rates equal to their male counterparts.

The results presented in the current study reflect a small sample of textbooks within a particular domain. Despite our limited sample size and narrow subject focus, we identified a consistent pattern across all textbooks, such that women were consistently underrepresented in the body of the texts. These findings are perhaps surprising given that issues of prejudice, bias, and discrimination tend to fall under the umbrella of social psychology. This calls attention to another limitation of the current study. Although we counted the number of times and ways in which women were included in the textbook, we did not code for the specific content of the chapters. Future research should examine the relationship between discussion of diversity issues in a textbook's content and the textbook authors' representation of gender in their choice of researchers, examples, and graphics. We did not code for the context surrounding each mention. A quick glance at the mentions of women in each textbook suggest that women are sometimes presented in stereotypical ways (e.g., as sorority members; Kenrick et al., 2014; shy around boys; Gilovich et al., 2015), however a systematic investigation of these factors would add important context to the current work. Due to the scope and methods used in the current study, we did not assess whether other biases (i.e., race, religion, sexual orientation) exist within our textbooks, and the field would benefit from further work examining inclusivity and bias-awareness in social psychology texts relative to other psychology sub-disciplines.

4.3 | Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to explore how commonly used social psychology textbooks represent gender to their audience. Since social psychologists are actively involved in research to combat gender discrimination and increase women's representation in STEM fields, it seems important to examine how gender is communicated in this particular field. Similar studies have been conducted in the past (e.g., Hogben & Waterman, 1997; Percival, 1984), however it was our intention to provide an up-to-date picture of how social psychology students are being exposed to the work of women researchers, as well as to mentions of women in general. We found that women are underrepresented in the social psychology textbooks that were sampled. These texts do not convey women as equal participants in the field of social psychology. Women in general, as well as their intellectual contributions, are still overshadowed by men, even though women have comprised at least 50% or more of the PhD holders in the field, in the U.S., since the early 1980s.

We suggest that social psychology textbook authors should engage with their material in a more critical and reflexive way in order to address this ongoing androcentrism. Textbooks can shape and inspire students both explicitly and implicitly. Social psychologists have shown that, although implicit associations may be automatic and difficult to control, they can be changed through repeated exposure to positive counter-stereotypes. Importantly, authors have the ability to exercise thoughtful control when writing content for textbooks in choosing whose work to highlight and make visible. They can also engage students in a critical, contextual analysis of why some groups (namely White,

European-origin men), may be overrepresented in the canon of the discipline.

acknowledgements

We would like to thank our many research assistants for their help with this project from conceptualization to publication. This research was supported in part by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

references

Aksnes, D. W., Rorstad, K., Piro, F. and Sivertsen, G. (2011) Are female researchers less cited? A large scale study of Norwegian scientists. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, **62**, 628–636.

American Psychological Association (1975) Guidelines for nonsexist use of language. *American Psychologist*, **30**, 682–684.

— (2006) *Women in the American Psychological Association*. Washington, DC: Author. URL: https://www.apa.org/pi/women/committee/wapa-2006.pdf.

— (2010) *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 6th edn.

— (2017a) *Division Profiles By Division*. URL: https://www.apa.org/about/division/officers/services/div-8-2017.pdf.

— (2017b) *Division Profiles By Division*. URL: https://www.apa.org/about/division/officers/services/div-9-2017.pdf.

Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., Fehr, B. and Akert, R. M. (2017) *Social psychology*. Toronto: Pearson, 6th Canadian edn.

Benokraitis, N. V. and Feagin, J. R. (1986) *Modern sexism: Blatant, Subtle, and covert discrimination*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Bohan, J. S. (1990) Contextual history: A framework for re-placing women in the history of psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **14**, 213–227.

— (1995) *Re-placing women in psychology: Readings toward a more inclusive history*. Dubuque, IOWA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 2nd edn.

Boring, E. G. (1929) *A history of experimental psychology*. New York: Century., 14th edn.

Branscombe, N. R. and Baron, R. A. (2017) *Social psychology*. New York: Pearson, 14th edn.

Carli, L. L., Alawa, L., Lee, Y., Zhao, B. and Kim, E. (2016) Stereotypes about gender and science: Women scientists. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **40**, 244–260.

Crisp, R. J. and Turner, R. N. (2014) *Essential social psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 3rd edn.

Cynkar, A. (2007) The changing gender composition of psychology. *Monitor on Psychology*, **38**, 46.

Denmark, F. L. (1994) Engendering psychology. *American Psychologist*, **49**, 329.

Eagly, A. H. and Miller, D. I. (2016) Scientific eminence: Where are the women? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, **11**, 899–904.

Fiske, S. (2014) *Social beings: Core motives in social psychology*. New York: Wiley, 3rd edn.

Franzoi, S. L. (2016) *Social psychology*. Redding, CA: BVT Publishing, 7th edn.

George, M. (2011) Profile of ruth tolman. In *Psychology's Feminist Voices Multimedia* (ed. A. Rutherford). Internet Archive. URL: http://www.feministvoices.com/ruth-tolman/.

Gilovich, T., Keltner, D., Chen, S. and Nisbett, R. (2015) *Social psychology*. New York: W.W. Norton, 4th edn.

Gray, V. A. (1977) The image of women in psychology textbooks. *Canadian Psychological Review/Psychologie canadienne*, **18**, 46.

Greenberg, J., Schmader, T., Arndt, J. and Landau, M. (2015) *Social psychology: The science of everyday life*. New York: Worth Publishers.

Griffith, E. and Dasgupta, N. (2018) How the demographic composition of academic science and engineering departments influences workplace culture, faculty experience, and retention risk. *Social Sciences*, **7**, 71.

Griggs, R. A. and Christopher, A. N. (2016) Who's who in introductory psychology textbooks: A citation analysis redux. *Teaching of Psychology*, **43**, 108–119.

Griggs, R. A. and Whitehead I. I. I., G. I. (2015) Coverage of recent criticisms of milgram's obedience experiments in introductory social psychology textbooks. *Theory & Psychology*, **25**, 564–580.

Guthrie, R. (1976) *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology*. New York: Harper Row.

Hall, G. S. (1912) *Founders of Modern Psychology*. New York: Appleton.

Hamilton, M. C. (1991) Masculine bias in the attribution of personhood: People= male, male=people. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **15**, 393–402.

Hegarty, P. and Buechel, C. (2006) Androcentric reporting of gender differences in APA journals: 1965–2004. *Review of General Psychology*, **10**, 377–389.

Hegarty, P. and Pratto, F. (2004) The differences that norms make: Empiricism, social constructionism, and the interpretation of group differences. *Sex Roles*, **50**, 445–453.

Hogben, M. and Waterman, C. K. (1997) Are all of your students represented in their textbooks? A content analysis of coverage of diversity issues in introductory psychology textbooks. *Teaching of Psychology*, **24**, 95–100.

Johnston, E. and Johnson, A. (2008) Searching for the second generation of American women psychologists. *History of Psychology*, **11**, 40–69.

Kassin, S. M., Fein, S. and Markus, H. R. (2013) *Social psychology*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 9th edn.

Kawakami, K., Steele, J. R., Cifa, C., Phills, C. E. and Dovidio, J. F. (2008) Approaching math increases math = me, math = pleasant, and perseverance at math in women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **44**, 818–825.

Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L. and Cialdini, R. B. (2014) *Social psychology: Goals in interaction*. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, 6th edn.

Kurdi, B. and Banaji, M. R. (2019) Attitude change via repeated evaluative pairings versus evaluative statements: Shared and unique features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **116**, 681.

Kurdi, B., Seitchik, A. E., Axt, J. R., Carroll, T. J., Karapetyan, A., Kaushik, N. and Banaji, M. (2019) Relationship between the implicit association test and intergroup behavior: A meta-analysis. *American Psychologist*, **74**, 569.

Litzler, E., Samuelson, C. C. and Lorah, J. A. (2014) Breaking it down: Engineering student stem confidence at the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender. *Research in Higher Education*, **55**, 810–832.

Low, J. and Sherrard, P. (1999) Portrayal of women in sexuality and marriage and family textbooks: A content analysis of photographs from the 1970s to the 1990s. *Sex Roles*, **40**, 309–318.

Marecek, J. (1993) Disappearances, silences, and anxious rhetoric: Gender in abnormal psychology textbooks. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, **13**, 114–123.

McGee, E. O. (2016) Devalued Black and Latino racial identities: A by-product of STEM college culture? *American Educational Research Journal*, **53**, 1626–1662.

Merritt, R. D. and Harrison, T. W. (2006) Gender and ethnicity attributions to a gender-and ethnicity-unspecified individual: Is there a people= white male bias? *Sex Roles*, **54**, 787–797.

Myers, D. G., Spencer, S. and Jordan, C. H. (2015) *Social psychology*. Whitby, ON: McGraw Hill Ryerson, 6th canadian edn.

Olson, M. A. and Fazio, R. H. (2001) Implicit attitude formation through classical conditioning. *Psychological Science*, **12**, 413–417.

Parker, Q. (2019) Social psychology textbooks: Which is the best? *Top Hat Blog*. URL: https://tophat.com/blog/social-psychology-textbooks/.

Parodi, G. (2010) The rhetorical organization of the textbook genre across disciplines: A 'colony-in-loops'? *Discourse Studies*, **12**, 195–222.

Payne, B. K., Vuletich, H. A. and Lundberg, K. B. (2017) The bias of crowds: How implicit bias bridges personal and systemic prejudice. *Psychological Inquiry*, **28**, 233–248.

Percival, E. (1984) Sex bias in introductory psychology textbooks: Five years later. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, **25**, 35.

Peterson, S. B. and Kroner, T. (1992) Gender biases in textbooks for introductory psychology and human development. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **16**, 17–36.

Plous, S. (2020a) Historic figures in social psychology. *Social Psychology Network*. URL: https://www.socialpsychology.org/texts.htm.

— (2020b) Social psychology textbooks. *Social Psychology Network*. URL: https://www.socialpsychology.org/texts.htm.

Ramsey, L. R., Betz, D. E. and Sekaquaptewa, D. (2013) The effects of an academic environment intervention on science identification among women in STEM. *Social Psychology of Education*, **16**, 377–397.

Rutherford, A. (2015) Maintaining masculinity in mid-twentieth-century American psychology: Edwin Boring, scientific eminence, and the "woman problem". *Osiris*, **30**, 250–271.

— (2017) Making better use of U.S. women: Psychology, sex roles, and womanpower in post-WWII America. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, **53**, 228–245.

— (2020) Doing science, doing gender: Using history in the present. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, **40**, 21–31.

Rutherford, A., Unger, R. and Cherry, F. (2011) Reclaiming SPSSI's sociological past: Marie Jahoda and the immersion tradition in social psychology. *Journal of Social Issues*, **67**, 42–58.

Samelson, F. (1974) History, origin myth, and ideology: 'Discovery' of social psychology. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, **4**, 217–232.

Scarborough, E. and Furumoto, L. (1987) *Untold lives: The first generation of American women psychologists*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Seward, G. (1946) *Sex and the social order*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1st edn.

Smith, E. R. and DeCoster, J. (2000) Dual-process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, **4**, 108–131.

Smith, E. R. and Mackie, D. M., C. H. (2015) *Social psychology*. New York: Psychology Press, 4th edn.

Smyth, M. M. (2001) Fact making in psychology: The voice of the introductory textbook. *Theory and Psychology*, **11**, 609–636.

Society for Personality and Social Psychology (2018) *Member Diversity Statistics*. URL: http://spsp.org/sites/default/files/Member-Diversity-Statistics-December-2018.pdf.

Steele, J., James, J. and Barnett, R. (2002) Learning in a man's world: Examining the perceptions of undergraduate women in male-dominated academic areas. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **26**, 46–50.

Sue, D. W. (2004) Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the" invisible" visible. *American Psychologist*, **59**, 761.

Tindall, T. and Hamil, B. (2004) Gender disparity in science education: The causes, consequences, and solutions. *Education*, **125**, 282–296.

Torre, M. E. and Fine, M. (2011) A wrinkle in time: Tracing a legacy of public science through community self-surveys and participatory action research. *Journal of Social Issues*, **67**, 106–121.

Van Arensbergen, P., Van der Weijden, I. and Van den Besselaar, P. (2012) Gender differences in scientific productivity: A persisting phenomenon? *Scientometrics*, **93**, 857–868.

Vicedo, M. (2012) Introduction: The secret lives of textbooks. *Isis*, **103**, 83–87.

Watson, R. I. (1953) A brief history of clinical psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, **50**, 321–346.

Whitehead III, I., G., Smith, S. H. and Losonczy-Marshall, M. (2017) Core references in introductory social psychology and developmental psychology textbooks. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, **16**, 6–18.

Wolfinger, N. H., Mason, M. A. and Goulden, M. (2008) Problems in the pipeline: Gender, marriage and fertility in the ivory tower. *The Journal of Higher Education*, **79**, 388–405.

Woolsey, L. (1977) Psychology and the reconciliation of women's double bind: To be feminine or to be fully human. *Canadian Psychological Review/Psychologie canadienne*, **18**, 66.