**Adding racially diverse faces to the stimulus set**

As the point of our experiment is to show how the construction of research questions and paradigms can enforce existing hierarchies, it feels actually kind of irresponsible to use an all-white set of faces without comment or question. To put it plainly, if we use an all-white stimulus set, we are implicitly reinforcing a white supremacist power structure. I think it can be defensible to use a racially homogenous stimulus set, but the fact that these sets are almost always white speaks to that bias where whiteness comes to be seen as default for human. I would rather not participate it, even if it means doing a little bit of extra work. For the rest of this PM, I will outline some methodological objections that could be raised and how they might be overcome. The final section of this PM will explore a little what this would look like in practice.

**Why racially diverse faces**

First, it is true that adding more faces would make the experiment longer. However, pretesting suggested that participants completed the study in between 10-15 minutes. Furthermore, many of the participants commented that the number of faces did not feel overly strenuous. If we pay participants 100 kr (or a cinema ticket) I think it’s pretty reasonable for them to work for half an hour. This actually is how I came to this idea in the first place. It suggests that there is room to add more faces if we wanted to.

Another drawback is that we add a potential layer of complexity to the analyses. Adding diverse faces means adding a new variable. This must then be incorporated into the modeling that we do, and raises additional questions. We are already testing measuring response options across 5 types of responses and 7 levels of femininity. How does race fit into this? Do we conduct hypothesis testing? What tests? What priors? Are we going to use an ANOVA? T-test? Bayes Factor? Something much more complicated?

My suggestion for how to deal with this complexity is that we simply ignore it. I’m being a little facetious there, but not too much. Depending on how we construct our stimuli, and model our data, it would still be possible to minimize the impact of this variable at every turn. I’ll get into it more later, but if we don’t morph white and black faces together, but simply include black and white faces, morphed separately, that already cuts out one layer of complexity. In terms of data analyses, we could carry out the analyses on racialized and white faces separately, if the results are similar we simply consign it to an appendix, briefly mentioned and then forgotten. If the results are different, on the other hand, that would be a pretty important in and of itself.

One objection to this minimizing approach could be that we then introduce more noise into whatever analyses we proceed with. I mean, we would definitely be injecting more variability and uncertainty into our measures. But this actually could be conceived as a strength. We are not really injecting noise, so much as designs with all-white faces are using artificially homogenous samples. I’ll get into more detail exactly how to do this, but I do think we should have some kind of test to see whether the overall pattern of results differ (i.e. maybe an interaction). Importantly, if we don’t note that effect, we bury it in the method section and if we do, that seems like a pretty important finding in and of itself!

**How to add racially diverse faces**

Based on feedback from participants and the time they took to complete the pilots, I think it’s possible to double the number of faces. This would mean adding 10 morph continua (a total of 70 additional faces). Furthermore, as I mentioned earlier, we don’t morph across race, but instead ensure that all of the new morph faces are drawn from Black faces to begin with. So, in other words, the faces would be drawn from a total of 20 black faces. Then we could potentially treat race as a factor with two levels, as I mentioned earlier, reducing some of the complexity and difficulty.

I’m going to end up repeating myself a little, but I’m going to spend the next paragraph reflecting on how to incorporate the faces in the analyses. For our analyses, we’ve talked a little about not actually running any statistical tests. Why? This is probably going to have to be the subject of a whole different PM (that I’m going to write) but in short because I had imagined this part of the study to be mainly exploratory and because the various conditions are so different that direct statistical tests are difficult, if not impossible to interpret (how can we compare a condition with four response options to one with two?). If that is the approach we take, then for analysing the white and black faces, we could create figures them out, similar to what I showed you in the last meeting, separately black and white faces and note. I would expect that black faces are more likely to be categorized as men, or perceived as more masculine, but I think the overall of the curve is probably going to be similar. Or at least, I can’t think of a theoretical reason to suppose it wouldn’t be.

I just want to note that I have been thinking about doing a little more advanced modelling, mainly to be able to better capture the uncertainty (i.e. confidence intervals) of our measures. Like I said, this is the PM that I’m about to write next!