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The Paradox of Emotionality & Competence in Multicultural Competency Training:

A Grounded Theory

Jude Bergkamp

The American Psychological Association mandates multicultural competency training as a requirement of accredited doctoral programs. The tripartite model of knowledge, skills, and awareness has been the most consistently cited framework in the last two decades. Although multiple pedagogical methods have been researched, there has yet to be a unified theory developed to link educational techniques to the tripartite domain competencies. Furthermore, there is a dearth of research exploring the various learning factors involved in multicultural competency training. Emotionality is an important factor in obtaining multicultural competency. No unified theory of multicultural education can be developed without incorporating the element of emotional triggering. This grounded theory study found that the emotional construct, termed Agent Shame, served as a barrier to multicultural competency. Further, a curriculum construct coined Oppression Mechanics, offers powerful implications for future multicultural competency training.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Increased interdependency among the world’s societies, economies and governments is the direct result of globalization. In the United States, there will soon be a historic level of ethnic diversity when white Americans will be in the numeric minority in just a few decades (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). In translation, there will be a more diverse clientele in need of psychological health services (Daw, 2002; Friedman, 2005; Zurita, 2003). The methods in which power and privilege are disseminated in society play a critical role in individual psychological health (Holmquist, Karp, & Kong, 2001; Thomason, 1999). The American Psychological Association emphasizes competence as one of the fundamental ethical codes for professionals and the new global society demands innovation to reach multicultural competency (American Psychological Association, 2002).

Traditionally, graduate training in psychology was based on the research-scientist model. In the 1960s, the Boulder model shifted the emphasis of graduate training towards the application of psychology, also known as the scientist-practitioner model (Ellis, 1992). With more emphasis on the practice of psychology, the issues of power and privilege also began to draw more attention within the field. In 1973, the Vail Conference further pushed the issue of application of scientific knowledge in graduate training, thus creating the practitioner-scholar model (Sue, Bingham, Porche-Burke, & Vasquez, 1999). This evolution induced the birth of the professional training model and the proliferation of professional schools of psychology (Gary, Childs-Jackson, Durham, & Lewis, 1990). Out of this change also came a major emphasis on making cultural
competency a priority within the field of clinical psychology (Allison, Crawford, Echemendia, Robinson, & Knepp, 1994).

In 1979, the American Psychological Association recognized the importance of diversity and multicultural training. This association began requiring psychology graduate training programs, accredited by the American Psychological Association Committee on Accreditation, to provide proof of multicultural education in their curriculum. Now, forty years later, all graduate psychology programs include some form of multicultural training in the curriculum (American Psychological Association, 2003; Bluestone, Stokes, & Kuba, 1996).

In order to deal with the issue of multiculturalism in the last forty years, the field of psychology has developed cultural paradigms that essentially pathologize and marginalize minority groups (Phinney, 1992; Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 1995; Sue, 1998; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). Croom (2000) posited that psychologists tend to perceive others through the lens of their own social position, operate within their own culture (dominated by White, heterosexist, and able-bodied privilege), and conceptualize others’ identities and behaviors based on dichotomous perception. And these tendencies may also apply to other assessing professionals as well, such as medical physicians or forensic investigators.

Consequently, psychologists utilize treatment approaches that minimize power and privilege discrepancies and result in unethical and ineffective practice (Hansen, Pepeitone-Arreola-Rockwell, & Greene, 2003). These paradigms affect both the psychology of those with and those without power and privilege in our society.
Historically, multicultural models have progressed and changed since the early 1900s (Potocky, 1997). In the assimilation model of the 1890s, minorities were viewed in terms of pathology and deviance with a drive towards acculturation. The anti-racism model of the 1960s emphasized the institutional racism that systematically discriminates and advocated political change. The 1980s brought the cultural sensitivity model with an emphasis on tolerance for individual and group differences, understanding of cultural norms, and cross-culture communication strategies (Abrams & Priscilla, 2007; Goldberg, 2000; Lee & Green, 2003).

The term multicultural competency comes from seminal work of Sue et al. (1982), Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992), and Sue et al. (1998). This term has been adapted for the current grounded theory study to includes all forms and settings where multiculturalism is presented. These settings include academic classes, organizational workshops, or continuing education seminars. The differing forms of multicultural competency training include names like diversity, sensitivity training, or cross-cultural communication in business settings and cultural competency and ethnic minority psychology in mental health settings (Hills & Strozier, 1992).

In 1982, Sue posited the tripartite model of multicultural competency with the domains of knowledge, skills and awareness. Ten years later, Sue (1992) made a call to the profession to define standards for the tripartite competences. For the last two decades this has been the framework for the development of theory and curriculum in the field. In 2003, the American Psychological Association offered six general guidelines for multicultural competency in clinical psychology (Table 1).
Some authors have stated that since the American Psychological Association mandate for multicultural competency training, there has not been a unified theory that provides a foundation for multicultural competency training pedagogy (Becvar, 2008; Constantine, 2002; Pope-Davis, Liu, Toporek, Brittan-Powell, 2001). A popular criticism of multicultural competency training is that the field of multicultural psychology has developed without sufficient empirical, theoretical, and institutional support (Atkinson & Low, 1995; Ponterotto & Casas, 1991).

Table 1

*American Psychological Association Guidelines for Multicultural Competency (2003)*

1. Psychologists are encouraged to recognize that, as cultural beings, they may hold attitudes and beliefs that can detrimentally influence their perceptions of and interactions with individuals who are ethnically and racially different from themselves.
2. Psychologists are encouraged to recognize the importance of multicultural sensitivity/responsiveness, knowledge, and understanding about ethnically and racially different individuals.
3. As educators, psychologists are encouraged to employ the constructs of multiculturalism and diversity in psychological education.
4. Culturally sensitive psychological researchers are encouraged to recognize the importance of conducting culture–centered and ethical psychological research among persons from ethnic, linguistic, and racial minority backgrounds.
5. Psychologists strive to apply culturally–appropriate skills in clinical and other applied psychological practices.
6. Psychologists are encouraged to use organizational change processes to support culturally informed organizational (policy) development and practices.

Instead, there are a variety of documented techniques and activities utilized with the general intent of increasing competency in knowledge, skills and awareness. These generic methods have included lectures, readings, guest speakers, participatory discussions, journaling, and supervised clinical experience (Dickson, Jepson, & Barbee, 2008; Kogan, 2000; Pressly, Parker, & Jennie, 2001; Priester et al., 2008; Rogers, 2006; Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006).
One purpose of graduate program mandate made by the American Psychological Association is to ensure that competent and ethical treatment is provided to potential clients (American Psychological Association, 2009). With no theoretical foundation to scaffold multicultural education methods, a lack of agreement on the core constructs, and a lack of consensus on how to measure progress, the field of multicultural competency training may not be meeting the wider ethical standard of competency (Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006).

The tripartite model of multicultural competency emphasizes the increase in the domains of knowledge, skills, and awareness in order to provide ethical treatment. Yet, current research reveals a mixed review of the confused state of multicultural competency training. In an evaluation of multicultural competency training programs, authors cited difficulty in finding a common definition of multicultural competency (Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, & Nielson, 1995).

There has been clear empirical evidence that current training efforts have a positive effect on the domain of knowledge, especially considering cultural differences between minority groups in the United States (D’Andrea & Heckman, 2008; Rogers, 2006; Vontress & Jackson, 2004). However, the effects of multicultural competency training on the domains of skills and awareness are far from satisfactory throughout the literature. Using client outcome as a measure of multicultural skill, there is no clear evidence of competency (Cartwright, Daniels, & Zang, 2008; Constantine, 2001; Constantine, Gloria, & Ladaney, 2002; Constantine & Ladany, 2000; Diaz-Lazaro, & Cohen, 2001; Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006). And the domain of awareness, also termed as “attitude” in some research, was found unaffected by
multicultural competency training (Kiselica, Maban, & Locke, 1999; Seto, Young, Becker, & Kiselica, 2006). One possibility for the lack of effectiveness in the domains of awareness and skill is that they involve emotionality.

Multicultural competency training addresses both individual difference regarding age, gender, race, disability, economic status, sexual orientation and religion as well as institutional power and privilege. These issues often elicit strong and diverse opinions and emotions in both students and faculty. Frustration, shame, guilt, betrayal, confusion and sadness are some emotions commonly associated with multicultural competency training (Hays, Chang, & Dean, 2004; Helms, 1995; Howard, 1993; Jackson, 1999; Lopez, et al., 1989; Ridley, 1994; Seldon, 1993; Steele, 2006; Tatum, 2006). Once individual differences of power and privilege become more conscious, the likelihood for conflict within and between individual students increase (Hays, Chang & Dean, 2004; McIntosh, 1988; Wildman, 1996). In addition to interpersonal interactions in the classroom, the process of bringing these issues into consciousness can possibly induce past memories of prejudice or discrimination, both as a perpetrator or a victim (Hays, Chang, & Dean, 2004).

Multiple survey and interview studies have shown a large minority of graduate students find multicultural competency training irrelevant or irritating (Bernal, Sirolli, Weisser, Ruiz, Chamerlain, & Knight, 1999; Jackson, 1999; Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, & Weeks, 1998). In one study, one-third of students surveyed thought that multicultural competency training was meaningless or unnecessary (Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, & Weeks, 1998). In other studies, both students and faculty expressed irritation in both the content and process of current multicultural competency training
(Bernal, Sirolli, Weisser, Ruiz, Chamerlain, & Knight, 1999; Jackson, 1999). Some authors have indicated that multicultural competency training may paradoxically increase student resistance toward multicultural competency training (Jackson, 1999; Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, & Weeks, 1998).

Garcia, Hoelscher, and Farmer (2005) labeled this emotional triggering as a “diversity flashpoint.” Derived from 34 university faculty interviews, the authors defined a diversity flashpoint as a potentially explosive interpersonal situation that arises out of identity differences. A diversity flashpoint can compromise relationships by bringing memberships and the presence of “isms,” such as racism or sexism, to the attention of those involved.

Multiple researchers have rallied for further study into the area of emotionality and multicultural competency training (Abrams & Gibson, 2007; Garcia, Hoelscher, & Farmer, 2005; Hansen, Pepitone-Arreola-Rockwell, & Greene, 2000; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Sue, 1998). There are few qualitative studies that explore students’ experience in multicultural competency training, and none found that studied emotionality specifically (Ancis & Sanchez-Hucles, 2000; McDowell, 2004).

My assumption is that student reactions of multicultural competency training point to emotionality as a barrier to the learning process and ultimately, effective education. If dealt with skillfully, strong emotionality can assist in the development and integration of multicultural competency curriculum. If not successfully facilitated, strong affective states can instill defensiveness, guilt, shame, anger, and avoidance of the topic in the individual student (Abrams & Gibson, 2007; Garcia, Hoelscher, & Farmer, 2005).
It can also permeate into the interpersonal dynamics of the class as a group and hinder effective and integrated learning (Gudykunst, 2005; Ridley, Mendoza, & Kanitz, 1994).

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between emotionality and the multicultural curriculum used in one clinical psychology doctoral program. This study contributes to the research regarding the effectiveness of the current curriculum models as well as provides implications for curriculum and theory development in the future. It is my hope that this study improves future multicultural competency training so that new psychologists cultivate ethical practice and provide effective services to improve mental health during the increasing globalization of our society.
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to make connections between my research philosophy and the specific research methods utilized in this study. I will explain the progression from my research worldview to the research philosophy, approach, type, strategy, and finally to the method of data-analysis. The initial section of this chapter addresses the important legacy that the Western empirical tradition has had on shaping our ideas about culturally different populations and emphasizes the need to re-master this legacy by utilizing different methodologies in current multicultural research.

Legacy of Empirical Research

In any research endeavor it is important to clarify the philosophy of science that underlies the method of obtaining knowledge. This is an increasingly important task when the topic is multicultural in nature because of the long legacy of post-positivist research that has produced oppressive and destructive Eurocentric bias (D’Andrea & Daniels, 2001; Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis, 1992). Specifically, research regarding counseling theories and models developed within a Eurocentric perspective, were left unacknowledged behind the mask of the post-positivist paradigm. The historic pattern of Western empiricism has been to position indigenous populations as the other, and the danger in current multicultural psychology research despite good intention, is that minority populations continually are seen as the other (Neville, Worthington, & Spanierman, 2001).

Psychology, like other social sciences, has historically fallen prey to the illusion of empirical objectivity in researching the culturally different, instead perpetuating a White middle-class value structure in research. Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis (1992)
suggested three harmful multicultural models that resulted from psychology research regarding multiculturalism over the years. The first is the inferiority model, which claims that people of color are primitive and less evolved than White populations and are thus, inferior and pathological. The second is the genetically deficient model, which rests on the basic idea that people of color are biologically inferior to Whites and their place in society is a natural result. The third model is in reaction to the previous two positing that people of color are not biologically inferior, but instead, culturally deprived because of the lack of power and resources (Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis, 1992).

In short, multiple authors agree that the legacy of psychological research has been harmful, going so far as calling psychology “an instrument of oppression” (Sue & Sue, 1999, p.32). The field of psychology has utilized theories, models, and instruments created in a Western cultural context, resulting in the depiction of culturally different Americans as deprived or deficient (Casas, 1984; Lee, 1997; Morrow, Rakhsha, & Castaneda, 2001; Ponterotto & Casas, 1991; Pedersen, 1999; Sue, 1999; Sue et al., 1998). Prominent researchers in the field of multicultural psychology have made the rallying call for future research to make efforts to counteract the post-positivist empirical legacy (Ponterotto, 2002; Sue, 1999).

**Imperialism & Qualitative Research**

Grounded theory is the chosen qualitative research method for this study for many reasons, one of which is to counteract the legacy of Western imperialism and its influence on empirical Western research in general and multiculturalism specifically. Acknowledging the legacy of cultural oppression that has been inherent in Western empirical science is important in any research endeavor, especially one that involves
multicultural competency and training. In this section, I will briefly introduce the influence of imperialism on empirical research in general and on the field of psychology specifically in order to emphasize the need for inductive qualitative methods such as grounded theory.

Imperialism has been defined as “the creation and maintenance of an unequal economic, cultural and territorial relationship, usually between states and often in the form of an empire, based on domination and subordination” (Johnston, 2000, p. 375). Imperialism, which is older than the fifteenth century, includes components of economic expansion, definition and subjugation of others, and shaping discursive fields of knowledge (Smith, 2006). Imperialism consists of the sub-components of colonialism that refers to the establishment of settlements or capitalism, which can be considered a form of economic imperialism (Said, 1994).

In her book, Decolonizing Methodologies, Smith (2006) examined the way that imperialism is embedded in the Western empirical tradition of creating knowledge and truth. The author highlights the destructive dynamics that occur when Western ideas of discovery, claiming and naming through empirical science, invalidate the existing indigenous and cultural paradigms. Smith emphasized the responsibility that current researchers hold to be mindful of the legacy of imperialistic research and make efforts to prevent further damage; this seems of particular importance regarding the topic of multicultural competency in this study.

Research Foundations

In the tradition of qualitative research, where the researcher is a vital factor, it is important to articulate the philosophical foundation upon which the study is based.
Philosophical beliefs regarding science involve ontology (the nature of reality), epistemology (the relationship between the researcher and the participant), axiology (personal values influencing the research), rhetorical structure (use of language), and methodology (the research procedures). These beliefs and perspectives guide the formulation of the research question, the data collection method, the analysis method, and the findings. These beliefs affect the way the research is approached and conducted. Because of this variation in cultural perspective, clarification, congruence of philosophy, and method is required at each stage of research.

Explicitly stating underlying beliefs regarding the research process is an effort to counteract, or somehow prevent damage that past Western empirical research has had on targeted populations throughout history from happening again. The topics involved in this multicultural research project include epistemology, teaching, politics, history, power and privilege. It is important to create a new legacy of research involving these social factors by making clear the underlying beliefs that determine research conception, purpose, method, and use.

The following sections will cover the methodology of this study, including the worldview, research philosophy, research approach, and research type. Table 2 provides a visual depiction of the progression from worldview to data analysis to be used as a guide for the reader throughout this study. Note in Table 2 that the progression from my worldview to research type make up the methodology of this study, while classic Glaserian grounded theory is the chosen method for the aforementioned reasons.
World View - Verstehen

A worldview is the set of beliefs and assumptions that are used to interpret and make meaning of our experience. My worldview, including ontological and epistemological assumptions, underpins all aspects of the research process. This worldview dictates how I see the nature of reality and what I consider fact or fiction. It inevitably influences my choice of research topic, the use of quantitative versus qualitative, and what results will be seen as relevant and meaningful. In the world of

Table 2
Method/Methodology Progression

- **World View:** Verstehen
- **Research Philosophy:** Social Constructivism
- **Research Approach:** Induction
- **Research Type:** Qualitative
- **Research Strategy:** Classic Glaserian Grounded Theory (GT)
- **Data Collection:** Interviews, Memos
- **Data Analysis:** GT
research, it determines which side of the positivist/post-positivist debate will determine what is real knowledge (Creswell, 2007).

In this study, I examined the experience of students in multicultural competency training. Their experiences were described as memories, thoughts, emotions, and behaviors. Attempting to gain insight into the student’s thoughts, emotions, and behavior by interpreting how they experience their experience could be termed Verstehen.

Verstehen is a German word closely resembling English words like understanding or comprehension. Verstehen is a concept in which the effort to understand is done through close contact with the social phenomena. In social science, the term refers to a scientist’s attempt to understand the intention and context of human action. Verstehen theorists state that Verstehen is necessary for social scientific understanding and is a method for discovery but not verification (Habermas, 1990; Weber, 2003).

The legacy of Western science contains numerous examples of declaring fact before context and causality is truly understood. Social science has been particularly rich in perpetuating false facts about foreign and exotic populations under the guise of objectivism. Verstehen is a worldview that promotes a full understanding of research participants according to the participant’s own experience. Regarding the subject of multicultural competency training, I believe that the Verstehen of the students, how they experience their experience, is necessary for effective theory-formation and training. Thus, in this study on multicultural competency training, my worldview of Verstehen has influenced the subsequent research methodology and method choices as to be true to the emphasis on the participant’s experience of their experience.
Research Philosophy - Social Constructivism

Individuals seek meaning of their subjective experience. Social constructivism posits that these meanings are socially constructed over numerous interpersonal and group interactions. These interactions create shared knowledge, or artifacts, and systems of making-meaning. The essentialist, positivistic view is that knowledge is fixed in time and true throughout cultural and historical variables. In contrast, social constructivism shows that knowledge artifacts are, in fact, shared subjective meanings negotiated on social and historical bases.

Research based on social constructivism is characterized by inductive procedures such as the focus on participants’ subjective views and an emphasis on researcher positioning. In traditional positivistic research, a hypothesis is used as the origin and anchor of scientific investigation with the assumption that there is a singular knowledge artifact that is immune to social and historical influence. In contrast, social constructivist research acknowledges the multiplicity of subjective knowledge and thus begins with general questions regarding the participant’s experience. Constructivists argue that the research participants, scientists, and knowledge are all socially constructed within the context of culture and power.

Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Lowe (2002) provide a more pragmatic definition that looks for the essence of the philosophy. They state that social constructivism, is the idea “that ‘reality’ is determined by people rather than by objective and external factors. Hence the task of the social scientist should not be to gather facts and measure how often certain patterns occur, but to … appreciate the different constructions and meanings that people place upon their experience. The focus should be on what people, individually and collectively, are thinking and feeling … One should therefore try to understand and
explain why people have different experiences. Human action arises from the sense that people make of different situations” (p.30).

Burr (2003) identifies three key assumptions shared by all shades of social constructivists: a critical stance towards positivistic taken-for-granted knowledge, the specificity and influence of culture and history, and that knowledge is sustained by social processes and is connected to social action.

The social constructivist researcher understands that by the sheer act of study and investigation, he or she is instantly involved in the mutual artifact construction process. For the purpose of philosophical congruence, the researcher positions him or herself within the context of the research and acknowledges that their background influences the interpretation (Creswell, 2007). Singh (2009) described the social constructivist research paradigm as “where knowledge is viewed as partial, situated and relative, and where language is seen as central, constitutive and performative” (p.362).

In this study, a social constructivist paradigm acknowledges my interpretation of events and situations involving students of multicultural competency training. These interpretations were acknowledged and bracketed, but not dismissed in the process of theory construction that ultimately produced a substantive and formal theory grounded in the data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Furthermore, this research philosophy dictated my use of open-ended interviews with no specific posited hypothesis.

As a point of clarification, Charmaz (2000) posited a new type of grounded theory method with strong constructivist influence that focuses on minimizing researcher bias. Glaser (2002b) responded to this constructivist tact to method by emphasizing that most grounded theory researchers do their best to limit bias knowing that by staying out of the way of emergence is the only way to produce quality grounded theory. Glaser also
reiterated the constant comparative process as a safeguard from forcing data because only a multivariate and generalizable theory will withstand constant comparison across time and different data sources. In this study, social constructivism is part of the methodology that I as a researcher bring to the process but does not negate the classic grounded theory method that will be addressed in chapter 3.

Research Approach – Inductive

The term induction is usually associated with logic, in which an inference of a general principle is made using particular instances. This is in contrast to the process of deduction in which particular instances are inferred using a general principle. In pursuing research based on social constructivism, an important aspect is that “rather than starting with a theory (as in positivism), inquirers generate or inductively develop a theory or pattern of meaning” (Creswell 2007, p.21). This generative or inductive characteristic of inquiry is what determines the inductive research approach of this study.

To further elucidate, deductive reasoning moves from the general to the more specific; a top-down approach that originates with a theory. A hypothesis is formulated which can be tested and either proven or disproven. Then the process narrows down with the collection of observations to address the hypothesis. The result is a confirmation or denial of the hypothesis and thus the more general theory. This deductive method is closely associated with the traditional scientific method based in positivist/post-positivist philosophy.

Inductive reasoning, or the bottom-up approach, moves from specific observations to broader generalizations and ultimately, theory. Induction begins with observation of phenomena devoid of hypothesis-testing. Rather specific observations
form regularities and reveal patterns that produce hypotheses that can be explored. This process results in general theory induced from observations and data. In congruence with social constructivism, the inductive process builds from data as opposed to the deductive process that stems from pre-specified theory.

Used in social research, inductive and deductive methods have very different qualities. Deductive research is focused with a narrow intent to confirm or deny the hypothesis, and to ensure that the method eliminates any confounding factors. In contrast, inductive research is open and exploratory, waiting for things to emerge and focused on chronicling the process. Yet, as different as these two methods appear, most social sciences utilize both deductive and inductive methods as both offer complimenting strengths.

Research Type – Qualitative

The flow from Verstehen to social constructivism to induction naturally results in qualitative research. The word qualitative reflects the emphasis on quality versus quantity of phenomena. Qualitative research is concerned with the why and how as well as the what, where, and when. Qualitative researchers study things (people, phenomena) in their natural setting, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p.3). Qualitative research dominated the social science fields, especially sociology and anthropology up until the 1970’s, when there was a resurgence of quantitative methods. In the 1980’s qualitative methods began to spread to other social sciences including education, management, and marketing. While qualitative methods have been widely used in the fields of anthropology, sociology and nursing, the use of these methods in psychology is a
relatively recent development (Morrow et al., 2002; Ponterotto, 2002). In the last decade there has been an increased inclusion of qualitative research in mainstream scientific and academic journals (Guba & Lincoln, 2005).

Qualitative methodology is designed to discover and build a model rather than a quantitative methodology that would measure preexisting concepts. When quantitative researchers set forth certain theoretical ideas to be measured, the only option for participants is to endorse or not endorse those ideas. Additionally, little new or additional information outside this theoretical paradigm would be achieved, and potentially important responses by participants would be considered as error rather than valid responses. Thus, qualitative methods are employed to fully understand the experiences and voices of the participants.

Qualitative methods potentially produce a different understanding from those already set forward in the research literature and allow researchers to incorporate context. Through the use of interviews that continually reflect the participant’s experiences, a model or framework to understand the participant can be developed, which can then drive future quantitative research, (Pope-Davis et. al., 2002). Richie (1997) stated, the usefulness of qualitative methods is the ability to study a phenomenon “for whom the information needed to build a foundation for sound quantitative research is often either unreliable or unavailable” (p.134).

The qualitative product includes “the voices of participants, the reflexivity of the researcher, and the complex description and interpretation of the problem, and it extends the literature or signals a call for action” (Creswell, 2007, p.37). Creswell (2007) offered these characteristics of qualitative research:
• Data collection occurs in the natural setting of the phenomena studied.
• Researcher as the instrument of analysis and must position themselves as such.
• Multiple sources of data are used; in this study they are interviews and memos.
• Inductive data analysis, moving back and forth from concepts to the data.
• The participants’ meanings are the focus of the study.
• Emergent design, the research process shifts and changes according to the emerging ideas.
• Theoretical lens are used to guide the research and it is important that they are clearly identified.
• Interpretive inquiry done by the researcher, which cannot be separated from the researcher.
• Holistic accounts are provided of the emerging dynamic.

Qualitative Research Criteria

In the last decade, qualitative researchers have focused on increasing the rigor of qualitative methods using four main criteria for qualitative research in order to further legitimize the qualitative tradition in scientific academia. The qualitative criteria include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). These criteria can be compared and contrasted with the classic criterion for quantitative research, which is validity and reliability.

Comparable to the quantitative criteria of validity, qualitative products strive for credibility and transferability. Credibility is achieved when the research participants judge the findings as relevant and verifiable (Creswell, 2007). One way this is achieved is by presenting the research findings to the participants of that research in order to assess their opinions regarding the accuracy and usefulness of the results. Since the main purpose in qualitative research is to understand phenomena from the participant’s experience, the participants are the source for establishing credibility.
In addition, transferability of results, or the exportation of results from one situation to another, is a priority for qualitative research. This generalizing of results can be facilitated by the researcher’s thorough description of the context, process, and underlying assumptions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003).

Regarding the quantitative criteria of reliability, qualitative products strive for dependability and confirmability. Quantitative reliability is achieved when research is repeated with the same research method and produces the same results. Yet, everything changes, especially in social phenomena. Qualitative research offers the criteria of dependability, meaning that the researcher clearly describes the changing context and how the study is affected. Confirmability is achieved when the participants, and others who have also experienced the phenomena in question, confirm the results. In addition, the researcher can actively work at disproving the resultant theory and look for its weaknesses (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

In an effort to produce qualitative research that achieves the four criteria above, Padgett (1998) enumerates and elaborates on six strategies for enhancing the rigor of the research:

- Prolonged engagement
- Triangulation
- Peer debriefing and support
- Member checking
- Negative case analysis
- Auditing

The rationale for qualitative research in multicultural competency training
As the progression from Verstehen to social constructivism to qualitative methodology move toward the specific methods, it is important to address the topic of research and multicultural competence training. A qualitative type of research methodology was chosen for this project because the worldview, philosophy, and approach of both the researcher and the research topic were all internally coherent with one another. Specifically, qualitative methods add to the multicultural competency research in the field of psychology and also attempt to counteract the legacy of oppression that past Eurocentric research has had on marginalized populations.

From the beginning of this decade, multicultural psychology researchers have been calling for the incorporation of qualitative methods (Fuertes, 2001; Morrow, Raksha & Casteneda, 2001; Pope-Davis, Liu, Toporek, & Brittan-Powell, 2001; Ponterotto, 2002; Sue, Ivey, & Pedersen, 1996). Many authors have stated that the existing body of quantitative research in the field of multicultural competency is, in fact, premature, as we do not understand the underlying theory (Jackson, 1999; Klausner, 1997). Ponterotto and Casas (2002) reviewed empirical methods in numerous psychology journals and found only ten percent that utilized qualitative methods to address multicultural research. The main reasons for this call to research is the sheer dearth of qualitative research in the field of multicultural psychology and the strengths of the qualitative methodology to address the damage done by Eurocentric research in the past.

Qualitative methods are particularly suited for multicultural psychology research. It enables the consideration of the multifaceted nature of identity and the sociocultural contexts. Further, it allows the researcher to fully understand the studied phenomena.
The method both puts participants at ease and gives them easy access to results (Choudhuri, 2005).

In an article entitled *Qualitative research methods: The fifth force in psychology*, Ponterotto (2002) strongly advocated for a constructivist paradigm of qualitative methodology in multiculturalism to guard against the Eurocentric bias of post-positivist psychological research. Ponterotto (2002) was trained in quantitative methods and expressed frustration in the limits of that method to study the complex and fluid constructs involved in multicultural counseling competence. He further stated, “I believe the strong affinity of qualitative approaches held by many counseling students and professionals will lead to a radical transformation and paradigm shift in the research-training components of counseling psychology programs” (p. 395). Further reasons for advocacy included the researcher being in close proximity to the participants, the use of participant’s own words and experiences, and the researcher as co-investigator with participants.

In addition to valuable paradigm shifts, qualitative research can also facilitate participant empowerment and researcher social activism (D’Andrea et al., 2001) in order to liberate themselves and others from oppression (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994) and increase awareness of power and privilege (Neville, Worthington, & Spanierman, 2001). Qualitative research can also provide the needed bridge between science and practice (Kazdin, 2008). Specific to this study on emotionality and training, grounded theory has received particular attention as an ideal method for multicultural psychology research because of the aforementioned reasons (Pope-Davis, Torporek, Ortega-Villalobos,
Researcher as Instrument of Analysis

Qualitative methodology and grounded theory specifically, call upon the researcher to be the main instrument of data analysis. All steps, from project conceptualization to interviewing, from coding to theory generation, go through the researcher. The nature and goals of qualitative research that are different from quantitative research, in fact, require a type of researcher subjectivity. Yet, it is important in the tradition of social constructivism to acknowledge the personal and professional factors that influence the data analysis. This idea is best described with the term reflectivity. Robson (2002) defined reflectivity as “…an awareness of the ways in which the researcher as an individual with a particular societal identity and background has an impact on the research process” (p. 22). The following is a list of potential factors that may influence data analysis: (a) researcher theoretical orientation to multicultural competency training, (b) researcher’s political views, (c) researcher’s awareness of the political ramifications of emergent findings, (d) level of development regarding researcher’s cultural identities, (e) researcher’s worldview. Lincoln and Guba (1985) encourage ongoing debriefing with other researchers familiar with the methodology to manage subjectivity. This is achieved in this study through routine communication regarding the procedures with the dissertation committee, fellow grounded theory researchers, and academic peers. These efforts are covered in further detail in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Introduction to Grounded Theory

The grounded theory method was developed in the 1960’s as sociologists Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss were investigating American’s perspectives on dying. Although both Glaser and Strauss were quantitatively trained, they began to discover the implicit and emergent power of inductive exploration of data into theory. Grounded theory can be both a quantitative or qualitative method designed to guide the structured collection and analysis of data as well as the construction of a systematic theoretical model. This inductive method centers on capturing participants’ experiences by systematically analyzing the data in sequential stages; this leads to concept coding, categorization, and synthesis of categories into meaningful interrelated constructs (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The process of grounded theory consists of overlapping and simultaneous activities that include process-coding, clustering codes into categories, concept development by reduction, core variable emergence, selectively sampling pertinent literature, and resultant core variable modification. This process continues to spiral until a concept reaches saturation with a large amount of codes, concepts and memos that capture the different aspects of the emergent theory. An articulate description is as follows:

Building empirically grounded theory requires a reciprocal relationship between data and theory. Data must be allowed to generate propositions in a dialectical manner that permits use of a priori theoretical frameworks, but which keeps a particular framework from becoming the container into which the data must be poured (Lather, 1986, p. 267).
In this section, I will introduce general characteristics of grounded theory that make it applicable to this study on multicultural competency as well as differentiate it from other quantitative and qualitative methods. These general characteristics include the emphasis on emergence versus forcing, theoretical sensitivity, the license to conceptualize, and the four criteria for a grounded theory.

*The Rationale for Grounded Theory in Multicultural Competency Training*

Grounded theory inductively generates data-rooted ideas from a simultaneous process of data collection and constant comparative analysis with the intention to find a theory that captures the essence of the research participant’s concerns and solutions. Grounded theory is important for this project because if multicultural competency training is to improve, the participants are at the heart of the solution. Past theory and research on multicultural competency was based on individual ideas, notions and assumptions. The aspiration of this project is to distill the participants experience into a theory that can assist in rooting multicultural competency training into a clear theoretical foundation. The classic, or Glaserian, method of grounded theory allowed the emergence of a core variable that supported a theory about multicultural competency training. This theory is generalizable to any context in which there is an encounter with cultural difference and given the increasing rate of globalization, the theory is applicable to almost any current context.

Given the importance of examining both the students’ experiences in multicultural competency training and the incorporation of the students’ context in the research of multicultural competency training, grounded theory presented an optimal method of study. Predicated upon constructing a theory of participant experiences, grounded theory
allows an emergent theory to evolve from within the participants lived experiences. Thus, data collection, analyses, summarization, and subsequent interviews are all closely grounded within the answers given by the participants (Pope-Davis et. al., 2002).

The product of grounded theory is a generalizable and conceptual theory, which differs from the descriptive product of other qualitative methods. Other qualitative methods offer a detail-rich description of a phenomenon with specific people, time, and context. This product can offer useful insights, but as the people, time and context inevitably change, so can the product’s utility. In contrast, a grounded theory offers a generalizable conceptual framework that can apply across people, time, and contexts. Glaser (2002) stated, “without the abstraction from time, place, and people, there can be no multivariate, integrated theory based on conceptual, hypothetical relationships” (p.8). This grounded theory, derived from multicultural psychology, can also inform problems related to business, government, media communications, and public health.

In a broad perspective, postmodernism seeks to delimit dominant power structures and rewrite the social narratives that have been deformed by imperial-driven research. Grounded theory is in line with these postmodern, multicultural values by limiting preconceived notions and strives to eliminate external bias. Grounded theory works to find the essence of the phenomenon studied, discovering latent patterns that emerge unencumbered by predisposition. The result is a focus on the relevant issues and of the participants experience versus the researcher’s agenda.

*Emergence versus Forcing*

Traditional positivist quantitative research begins with a preconceived hypothesis followed by an extensive literature review, data collection, and data analysis to confirm
the hypothesis. Classic grounded theorists posit that by the data analysis stage, researchers have developed a strong motivation and intention to confirm their hypothesis. Despite the notion of modernist scientific objectivity and use of supposedly unbiased statistical tools, researcher motivation and intention can force the conclusions drawn from the data to support a hypothesis. In many instances, intensive effort, time, and institutional resources are designated to confirm a hypothesis that has dependant political and financial implications. In other words, pressures that amplify the requirement for hypothesis-confirmation will amplify the possibility for forcing the data, either consciously or unconsciously, by the researcher.

In contrast, grounded theory emphasizes limiting pre-contrived hypotheses and trusting in the emergence of relevant information rooted in the experience of the research participants. The grounded theorist enters the field of study with a genuine interest in a general question, open to the emergence of concepts that are of relevance and fit to the research participants. The focus on emergence helps constrain the researcher from attempting controlling the research situation in order to limit confounding factors and prove the hypothesis. Further, watching for emergence allows conceptual patterns to appear in the space between the participants, the researcher, and the method.

The grounded theory principle of emergence versus forcing is uncommon, if not revolutionary, in the realm of research methods. Emergence is achievable by not limiting confounding factors that could be the most relevant information, but by limiting the factors that increase the need for hypothesis confirmation. In grounded theory a preliminary literature review is an example of a powerful force that can increase the necessity for pre-conceived hypothesis formation and confirmation.
In any research, and especially in qualitative research, the researcher can knowingly or unknowingly influence the results. Some methods take enormous efforts to bracket this influence for the sake of objectivity and the replication of results. Grounded theory acknowledges that the researcher can influence the result and does not view it as a vulnerability of the research findings, but as a strength. The vulnerability to influence the data and its’ meaning is not restricted, but instead fully owned and used.

The choice of classic grounded theory does not insinuate that another methodological choice would be wrong or that it will lead to the opposite result. Rather, classic grounded theory offers a unique opportunity to base theoretical development on participant data versus assumptions made by those who may not be in touch with the “everydayness” of the problem being studied, but instead utilize conjecture and preconception (Heidegger, p. 338). Common reasons that make grounded theory a method of choice include keeping the participant’s main concern and solution in focus and attempting to transcend preconceived notions that exist in professional fields of study in order to develop theory rooted in lived experience. Researchers using grounded theory seek to identify a core variable (described later in this chapter) early in the data and remain open to further emergence based on analytic interpretations and participant relevance in order to reach confirmation and saturation of the rooted, or grounded theory.

**Theoretical Sensitivity**

Grounded theory begins with a general area of interest, usually formed in a “grand-tour” question that opens the most common form of data collection, the interview (Christensen, 2007). As the interviews progress, the researcher is concerned with two main analytical questions: What is the participant’s main concern and how are they
dealing with this concern? In order to understand the underlying processes of the main concern, a systemic empirical and inductive approach is required. The inductive grounded theory method is not assumption free, as that would be in contradiction with qualitative values, but is more “assumption-based.” In other words, grounded theory is based on the assumptions of the emerging core variable and patterns of data conceptualization.

A common criticism of grounded theory is the impossibility to set aside, or bracket, the interplay between the researcher’s agenda, the data, and the resultant theory. This criticism also assumes that it is improbable that the researcher’s prior knowledge will not contaminate the findings. A quick read of classic grounded theory may give the impression that it is assumption-free. However, a closer look will reveal that, in fact, this reflexive interplay is at the heart of classic grounded theory (McGhee, Marland, & Atkinson, 2007).

Grounded theory attempts to acknowledge and utilize the researcher’s worldview, assumptions, and prior knowledge in order to get closer to the emerging theory rooted in the data. At first glance, this can appear a contradiction, yet in practice it assists the researcher in both the conceptualization of, and remaining grounded in, the data. It is not unlike the process of therapy, in which the practice of gaining awareness of a phenomenon actually frees the client up from the invisible constraints of that phenomenon.

Theoretical Sensitivity “refers to the researcher’s knowledge, understanding, and skill, which foster the researcher’s generation of categories and properties” (Glaser, 1978). Prior knowledge of the general field of study will enhance the researcher’s
theoretical sensitivity and assist in conceptualizing the underlying phenomena emerging in the data. Again, this may seem contradictory, but the grounded theorist is vigilant to follow versus force the data and practice reflexivity (Lowe, 2005).

In grounded theory, the researcher uncovers their own assumptions (through practices like memoing and constant comparison) and then can more fully concentrate on the underlying dynamics emerging in the data. This is part of the famous axiom in grounded theory, “all is data” and can include interviews, casual conversations, thoughts and emotions, observations, and media sources (Glaser, 1998, p.8).

“All is data” means that from the initial stage of data collection, a dynamic interplay of researcher assumptions, thoughts, and influences in addition to the accumulating data all culminate in a core variable and resultant theory. During this interplay, the researcher is thinking about the data almost all the time, constantly immersed in the process. Thoughts that occur while in casual conversation, watching the news, or washing dishes are all useful data points to attend to and could possibly enrich the emerging theory. This refers to the practice of memoing to be covered later in Chapter 4. Ultimately, the researcher does not contain themselves to just dynamics during interviews or data analysis, the psychic interplay of ideas is an example of the grounded theory motto, “all is data” (Glaser, 1992).

Specific to this study regarding multicultural competency training, theoretical sensitivity was considered sound because this author has worked and studied for more than ten years in the general field of psychology, and specifically in the sub-field of multicultural competence.
License to Conceptualize

In line with the social constructivist underpinnings, grounded theory allows for a number of equally justifiable interpretations to be made of complex social and cultural phenomena. Grounded theory gives the researcher the license to conceptualize. The purpose of conceptualization or concept generation is to identify and name latent patterns and relationships that reoccur in the data. These concepts may emerge repeatedly from participant to participant, or could re-emerge within one participant’s many experiences. The data is cut into slices of information that is constantly being compared to each other to find repeated patterns of process or relationship. The stable patterns are concisely named to encourage theory formation (Christiansen, 2007).

In order to assist with conceptualization, there is a tradition in grounded theory to name concepts with concise and “grabby” names that condense a complex idea into a single phrase. It is encouraged to beware of “jargonizing,” using the terminology dominant in the academic field of study because of the risk of losing touch with the emerging data-driven patterns. Concept names, by avoiding technical or academic rhetoric, result in a fresh, new, and candid thinking style that is conducive to discovery.

The Four Criteria of a Grounded Theory

A quality grounded theory is inductively derived from data, subjected to theoretical elaboration, and successfully judged by evaluative criteria. Glaser (1978; 1992; 1998; 2001; 2003; 2005) mentions pertinent criteria throughout his extensive explanation of classic grounded theory that include clarity, consistency, parsimony, density, scope, integration, explanatory power, predictiveness, and heuristic worth. Yet,
only four specific criteria are reiterated as the standard to which grounded theories are judged. These are relevance, fit, workability, and modifiability (Glaser, 1978). Fit refers to how close the concepts relate to the incidents they represent and how thoroughly the constant comparison was performed. Workability refers to how well the theory explains the research problem with as much variation as possible. Workability also relates to grounded theory generality and its exportability to different situations, contexts, and academic fields. Relevance refers to the degree of congruence between the grounded theory and the participants’ concern. Relevance is a quality of a phenomenon that is of particular interest or “grab” to the participants. In this study, certain aspects of the core variable ignited passionate discussion from students. Modifiability refers to the ability of the grounded theory to absorb outlier data. A grounded theory can be altered in the face of new data when compared to existing data.

In addition to the criteria offered by grounded theorists themselves, other authors that specialize in qualitative research have suggested guidelines when considering a grounded theory. For example, Creswell (2002) proposes the following questions to consider while evaluating a grounded theory.

- Is there an obvious connection between the categories and the raw data?
- Is the theory useful as a conceptual explanation for the process being studied?
- Does the theory provide a relevant explanation of actual problems and a basic process?
- Can the theory be modified as conditions change or further data are gathered?
- Is a theoretical model developed or generated that conceptualizes a process, action, or interaction?
- Is there a central phenomenon (or core variable) specified at the heart of the model?
• Does the model emerge through phases of coding (e.g. initial codes to more theoretically oriented codes or open coding through selective coding)?
• Do the categories naturally interrelate to the core variable?
• Does the researcher gather extensive data so as to develop a detailed conceptual theory that is well saturated in the data?
• Does the study show how the researcher validated the evolving theory by comparing it to the data, examining how the theory supports or refutes existing theories in the literature, or checking theory with participants?

The Grounded Theory Analytic Process

Grounded theory has sequential, simultaneous, and spiraling processes involved in data analysis. Components of data collection, coding, analysis, memoing, and literature review are ongoing and overlapping as a way to cultivate the constant comparative process, which is crucial to emergence (Glaser, 1978, pp. 82-92; Glaser 1998, pp. 177-186). In contrast, some procedures such as open coding, core variable identification, selective coding, theoretical sorting, and sampling occur in a more sequential pattern in grounded theory research. In this section, I give a brief description of both the sequential and simultaneous aspects of grounded theory as used in this research project. Included will be descriptions of open coding, the core variable, selective coding, memoing, and constant comparison.

Open Coding

Classic grounded theory asks the researcher to dive into the field of study with a general area of interest and the permission to code and conceptualize right away. As soon as data collection begins, coding begins. Coding activities include breaking down, analyzing, comparing, labeling, and categorizing data. Grounded theory coding is a kind of content analysis procedure used to conceptualize a core variable hidden within a mass
of data. A grounded theorist is always asking two main questions; what is the
participant’s main concern and how are they dealing with this concern? These questions
assist the analyst to code for description and underlying concepts (Glaser, 1978).
Christiansen (2007) offered additional questions to ask during open coding, each with an
analytic purpose:

- “What is this data a study of?” – leads to identification of the core variable.
- “What category does this incident indicate?” – encourages conceptualization.
- “What is actually happening in the data?” – leads to theoretical coding.

Most qualitative coding requires analysts to highlight in vivo statements or
descriptors during coding. Phenomenology, for example, codes for the most similar and
frequent experience among participants and turns these into themes (Creswell, 2007).
While grounded theory also codes for descriptors and in vivo statements, its goal is not to
find out the most common experience but to construct a theory that gets to the heart of
the experience of all the participants with as few outlying concepts as possible. A
concept, as defined by classic grounded theory, is the underlying meaning and pattern
within a set of descriptive data (Glaser, 1992). Open coding is where a grounded
theorist’s license to conceptualize is active, avoiding the jargon of the field and using
new phrases to point to emerging underlying dynamics. Ultimately, the purpose of open
coding is to identify the core variable.

The Core Variable

Grounded theory, like most qualitative methods, has many terms that relate to the
coding process. These terms include codes, concepts, categories, in vivo statements,
properties, and hermeneutic units (Creswell, 2007). These terms describe a certain
characteristic and focus used to analyze the data. All types of coding can be used in grounded theory, but as a meta-conceptual theory is the goal, concepts are the initial and preferred method.

As concepts are identified using a constant comparative open coding process, they are grouped together into categories that have common conceptual relationships. Through the relational analysis of categories, a core variable begins to appear. A core variable is defined as the substantive concept with the most abstraction that also closely relates to all other codes. In other words, a core variable is a meta-concept derived from concepts that emerged during the open coding process. The core variable is the “main theme of what is happening in the data” (Glaser, 1978, p. 94). In addition, the core variable will abstractly address the concerns of all, or almost all, the participants.

The goal of grounded theory is the generation of a theory around a core variable. The core variable serves as an anchor from which the rest of the theory scaffolds. Without a core variable the analysis will drift in relevancy and workability. Since a core variable accounts for most of the variation in a pattern of behavior, it has several important functions for generating grounded theory: integration, density, saturation, completeness, and delimiting focus.

Glaser (1978) provides the following criteria of a core variable:

1. Must be central to other categories.
2. Occur frequently throughout the data and reveal itself during coding.
3. Forms natural connections to other categories.
4. Has relevance for the participant and implication for formal theory.
5. Carries the theory through the main concerns.
6. Account for the widest variation in coding patterns.
7. Meets a level of saturation where no new evidence emerges from subsequent data.
8. Captures a dimension of the problem.

Memoing

“If data are the building blocks of the developing theory, memos are the mortar” (Stern, 2007, p. 119).

Grounded theory involves simultaneous data collection and analysis during the open coding stage. Memoing is a technique in which anything that informs the research, including thoughts and discussions, is quickly written down and treated as a data source. These memos are simultaneously analyzed for emerging concepts. Memoing begins simultaneously alongside initial data collection. Memos are considered a valid data point comparable to other data sources. The technique of memoing allows for the constant comparison process to produce conceptual relationships, which are the foundation of a grounded theory.

Memo writing is a requirement in classic grounded theory. Memos are the ideas and thoughts that arise regarding the relationship between substantive codes, since ideas can be fleeting and fragile, memoing is an essential technique in conceptualization. Coding provides familiarity with the data and memoing cultivates the emergence of theory. “The bedrock of theory generation is the writing of theoretical memos” (Glaser, 1978, p.83).

Grounded theory memoing can achieve many goals including, raising the data to a conceptual level, encouraging freedom in sorting and working with emerging ideas, and creating a source and system for writing. Glaser, Holton, & Rhine (2008) offered guidelines for the memoing process:

1. Each memo should be introduced by a title or caption which is the category or property that the memo is about.
2. Any other category or property that appears in the memo should be highlighted or underlined, so the memo can be sorted for this concept.

3. If two categories or properties appear in the memo, the relationship between the two should be discussed or perhaps categorized or highlighted so that this hypothesis could be sorted for.

4. Memos should be printed in at least two copies so that one is easily cut up, taped in new combinations, and sorted without losing the original.

5. Sometimes it's possible to memo on small pieces of paper or index cards which makes them easier to sort. Writing memos in the margins of field notes reduces sortibility.

6. The analyst should be psychologically prepared to sort memos wherever they may fall.

*Constant Comparison*

The constant comparison process is an essential part of grounded theory. It is in the spiraling quality of the research method that the researcher can compare ideas and concepts throughout the data collection and analysis process. Grounded theory seeks to find the most multivariate and generalizable meta-concept that addresses the widest participant concern. This results from constantly testing new concepts with old concepts, new data points to established data points, and new researcher insights to old insights.

Constant comparative analysis is the constant comparison of data (line by line) to emerging concepts, then relating concepts to other concepts. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967) the development of categories, properties, and tentative hypotheses through the constant comparative method, is a process whereby the data gradually evolves into a core variable of the emerging theory.

Glaser (2002b) asserted that constant comparison prevents forcing of data and limits researcher bias because by seeking a theory that applies to all data points, the data
itself will trump the drive to force or bias most of the time. Grounded theory is not a linear or procedural process, but rather a spiraling path in which the researcher alternates from data collection to data coding to memo writing to literature review and back again. This is a delimiting and inductive method funneling data down to its most abstract, generalizable, and multifaceted theory. The constant comparative method is not to prove a hypothesis or to produce a replicable research procedure, but to generate a theory grounded in data (Glaser, 1978, p.102).

Selective Coding

Selective coding is the final stage of data analysis in grounded theory. After a core variable has emerged as prominent and pertinent in the data, the other categories derived from the open coding process are analyzed in relationship to the core variable. The researcher goes back through all the data, including past memos, with the core variable in mind and codes with evermore theoretical abstraction. This process naturally reveals whether the core variable is applicable to the main concern across the data. Then a theory will emerge when most of the conceptual categories relate to the core variable. The selective coding phase is also an important time to keep the four grounded theory criteria in mind, these being fit, relevance, modifiability and workability.

The Role of the Literature Review

In classic grounded theory, the literature review begins during selective coding, acting as an equal data source along with the data, memos, and emerging conceptual codes. The grounded theory literature review “neither provides key concepts nor suggests hypotheses” (May, 1986, p.149). Instead, the literature review is utilized in the constant comparison process in order to position the emerging theory into the existing
body of knowledge. The literature review indicates whether the emerging grounded theory reinforces theories already existent in the field and how the grounded theory connects with other related ideas and findings. Hutchison & Wilson (2001) instructed that the researcher must review the literature that links existing research and theory with the concepts of the emerging grounded theory. Because of this usage, the literature review is usually woven into the findings section of any grounded theory study and will be the case with this study as well.

McGhee, Marland, & Atkinson (2007) explored the rationale and usage of a literature review in grounded theory. These authors stated the literature review should be conducted during the selective coding phase in order to keep the focus on the data versus the literature, to prevent the researcher being constrained by the literature, and to “promote telling it as it is rather than telling it as they see it” (p. 336).

Glaser (2001) stated that a more preliminary literature review could assist a researcher whom is not familiar with the field of study in order to promote theoretical sensitivity. In general, if the researcher is familiar with the literature in the field of study, it is important to conduct the review during selective coding and writing phases only for the aforementioned reasons.
CHAPTER 4: PROCEDURES

In this study, data collection and open coding were performed simultaneously, with additional open coding occurring at the conclusion of eighteen conducted interviews. Open coding for both descriptive and conceptual codes was done in order to break down and conceptualize a large amount of raw data. After the interviews were completed, further constant comparison and open coding resulted in the generation of categories using concepts that involve high interrelatedness. In order to ensure the grounded theory criteria of fit, the categories were examined to ensure all concepts fit into a category as well as to eliminate duplications. This process resulted in a core variable.

Data Collection

Eighteen graduate students in a psychology graduate program in an urban city in the Pacific Northwest were interviewed. All eighteen signed a consent form that described the nature, procedure, and implications of the research. All interviews were conducted face-to-face on-site, at the academic institution in which the participants attended multicultural classes. Each interview began with the same general question regarding their experience with multicultural education spanning their entire educational career. Most of the interviews lasted an average of one hour, with the shortest being half an hour and the longest being two hours. Each of the interviews were recorded and transcribed.

In accord with grounded theory methodology, initial analysis occurred within a day of each interview. Additional data included memos of thoughts and discussions that
occurred during the proposal and data collection/analysis stages. This source of data was concurrently analyzed along with the interviews. Concurrent with data collection, data analysis was conducted producing emergent codes and memos. The simultaneous data collection, comparison, and abstraction techniques lead towards the substantial core variable.

Participants

All participants were doctoral level graduate students in a clinical psychology program at a liberal-arts university in the Pacific Northwest. The university is tailored for both traditional, just out-of-college students as well as non-traditional adult learners. The participant pool consisted of both traditional and non-traditional students. Almost all of the participants had experienced multicultural classes in their Bachelors or Masters coursework. In addition, most of the returning adult students had worked in the social services prior to matriculation and had participated in multiple workshops and trainings around the issue of multiculturalism.

Of the eighteen participants, six were male and twelve were female. Three participants were students of color and fifteen were white. Interviewees ranged in age from early twenties to early sixties, with no clear age cohort in the numeric majority.

All participants had completed a graduate level course on multiculturalism within the past year. The first ten interviews were conducted in October 2008 with a cohort of students who had completed their multicultural course in 2007. The second cohort of eight completed their multicultural course in 2008 and were interviewed in February, 2009. The multicultural course contained variation from year to year, in curriculum content, interpersonal dynamics, faculty, and focus. The strength of the grounded theory
method is the ability to cultivate a theory that will generalize, using meta-conceptualization, beyond the limits and specifics of the data set.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the trustworthiness of the current study, is considered high because the categories and the model created emerged directly from the interview data. The current study also possesses ample credibility because the narratives obtained from the participants describe experiences of multicultural competency training as observed by both the students and consumers of this area of study (Patton, 1990).

Trustworthiness, or validity in quantitative research, is a primary concern of any empirical study (Creswell, 2007). In qualitative research the main factors of trustworthiness include the data collection, analysis, and overall interpretation methods employed. Triangulation of data, member checking, theoretical sampling, and peer debriefing were techniques utilized to ensure trustworthiness.

*Triangulation*

Denzin & Lincoln (2005) define triangulation as an empirical effort to collect data from different sources, compare results, and look for contradictions to the final product. These efforts enrich the qualitative findings, whether its purpose is descriptive or conceptual. In this study, multiple participants were interviewed from diverse backgrounds and the resultant data was analyzed using various methods. In addition, data from the existing research literature in the field was also used in the grounded theory constant comparison process.

*Member Checking*

Member checking, or soliciting feedback from participants, is an important method of ruling out the possibility of misinterpretation of what is ultimately occurring in
the data (Maxwell, 1996). Some participants were contacted after selective coding and provided a list of predominate concepts, categories, and emerging theory. These participants were chosen based on the influence their transcript had on concept generation. The participants were asked if these components had the quality of fit and relevance. This process also contributed to the trustworthiness of the final product.

**Theoretical Sampling**

Theoretical sampling is one of the hallmarks of classic grounded theory. It is the practice of continually analyzing various data points with the emerging core variable in mind. Theoretical sampling can use the original data set, academic literature in the field, member checking, or a second round of participant interviews focused on the core variable. This study capitalized on all of these sources to increase trustworthiness.

**Peer Debriefing**

Group coding and peer debriefing with multiple analysts is a verification and validation step that increases trustworthiness (Pope-Davis, 2002). In addition, open articulation of potential personal bias and background is achieved through peer debriefing (Patton, 1990).

After the initial interviews were complete and preliminary open coding conducted, peer debriefing was utilized to increase trustworthiness. The primary researcher and two other analysts, whom have specialized knowledge in the general field of multicultural competence training, gathered for two full days of concept review. All three analysts reviewed the audio version of the initial set of ten interviews together, looking for similarities and differences among existing codes and concepts. Addition codes emerged and the “argue to consensus” technique was employed to flesh out the
intricacies. Peer debriefing occurred when exploring the relationship between the similarities and differences within the data and between each member. A specific effort was made to identify the relationship between the emerging concepts and each member’s personal background.

*Interview Protocol*

A predominant source of data in grounded theory is the open-ended and intensive interview. These interviews use a “grand-tour” question, the purpose of which is to stimulate dialogue and allow for the emergence of relevant data (Simmons and Gregory, 2004).

Using a grounded-theory approach proposed by Glaser & Strauss (1967), and further developed by Richie et al. (1997), the goals of the first interview were to establish rapport, be nondirective, and allow the participants’ experiential data to emerge on its own. To ensure that all participants were provided with similar opportunities to address certain topic areas, pre-established questions were used to facilitate the participants’ description of their experiences (Pope-Davis, 2002).

Students were asked open-ended questions regarding their experiences with multicultural competency training. A priori probes were used to facilitate the interview process to encourage thorough responses. Interview questions are listed in Table 3. At times, the participants were encouraged to speak openly about whatever thoughts, feelings, and concerns they had regarding multicultural competency training. Questions were kept to a minimum in order to facilitate an open dialog and invite frank and honest narrative.
Table 3
Interview Questions

1. What was your understanding of multicultural competency before this class?
2. What is your understanding of multicultural competency now?
3. How did the class influence your understanding of multicultural competency?

Interview Sections

A total of 18 interviews were completed with graduate students in a clinical psychology doctorate program at a Northwestern liberal arts institution. These interviews were conducted over the course of about six months. The first interview was conducted in October of 2008 and the last finished in March of 2009. The author conducted the first ten interviews and another member of a related research team conducted the last eight interviews. The first section of ten participants took part in different multicultural courses during the 2007/2008 academic year. The second section of eight students all took part in the same multicultural class in the 2008/2009 academic year.

Based on ongoing research regarding multicultural competency training, there were changes made to the second class (2008/2009) in order to increase effectiveness of curriculum. The main curriculum change that occurred from year one to year two was a focus on the historical roots and current dynamics of wider societal systems that determine the distribution of power and privilege (referred to as Oppression Mechanics in the Findings section). Because of the meta-conceptual emphasis in grounded theory, these variations among participants, cohort, and curriculum increase the generalizability and workability of the resultant theory (Glaser, 1992).

The data set, when taken as a whole, encompassed approximately 13.5 hours of verbal report and over 180 transcribed pages.
Data Analysis Process

Initial coding was conducted during, and immediately after, each of the first 10 interviews. These codes followed the classic grounded theory procedure of in vivo coding. A full list of the codes and their corresponding descriptions is available in the appendix.

An example of the transcripts was introduced to researchers at the grounded theory seminar in Mill Valley, CA in 2008. This experience provided clarity of the function and process of coding and introduced some specific codes that emerged in the transcript example. This experience also influenced the coding style and procedure. As a result of the seminar, the coding procedure and focus shifted from more descriptive to more conceptual codes. And the emphasis of the coding was to find and elucidate the core variable quickly and completely. As a result of this new shift in my understanding of the grounded theory coding process, the core variable emerged faster with more apparent relevance. The is in contrast to my previous method of finishing the entire open coding process with all the interviews and then moving on to selective coding and going through all the interviews again.

A phase of open coding was conducted in 2009 in which a core variable emerged by the time the fifth interview was coded. A list of fifty-seven codes and their definitions are located in the Appendix. As the core variable emerged further, selective coding was utilized to further clarify a theory to ensure the grounded theory qualities of fit, modifiability, workability, and relevance (Glaser, 1992).

Six concept categories permeated the entire open coding process, from initial to later open coding. These categories were labeled Agent Shame, the PC Game, Boxing
In/Out, Cultural Difference Curriculum, Power & Privilege Awareness, and Oppression Dynamics. A list of these categories and their conceptual properties are found on Table 4 of the Findings section.

Terminology

Throughout the description of the analysis and findings, I will be using the term institutional power and privilege. Within the social sciences, power can be defined as the ability of an entity to control the environment and the behavior of other people (Lukes, 1974). Privilege is defined as access and advantage according to social group designation and is unseen, unacknowledged, and unearned (Kimmel & Ferber, 2003). The term institutional power and privilege is used to emphasize the fact that power and privilege is granted and exercised within a wider systemic context and not simply prejudicial beliefs or discriminatory actions of individuals.

I will be using the terms status, agent and target throughout this study to connote positional concepts to reach a clearer understanding of the phenomena of multicultural competency training. The ADDRESSING model differentiates ways in which power and privilege are allotted in Western society (Hays, 2001). An individual can be categorized as a part of the dominant or marginalized group according to age, race, sexual orientation and others. How each individual falls into the “haves” or “have-nots” of each category is called their status. If an individual is part of the dominant group that holds institutionalized and systemic power and privilege that connotes an agent status.

Conversely, if one is part of a group that does not hold institutionalized power and privilege, he or she is of target status. Note that one individual can hold multiple statuses, an agent in one area and a target in another. In addition, an individual’s status is
not determined by choice or intention. Rather, the larger societal institutions dictate status memberships as target or agent. Please note, that this simplistic and dualistic model draws significant criticism within the data and will be presented in the findings.

Another important distinction to make is the difference between prejudice and discrimination and oppression, racism, or sexism. Prejudice is the uninformed and entitled beliefs about other members of a cultural or ethnic group. Discrimination is specific action or lack of action based on prejudicial beliefs (Kovel, 1984).
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

Conceptual Categories – Definitions & Example Quotes

There were fifty-seven conceptual codes that resulted from the open and selective coding process. Most of the codes occurred multiple times, while a few only arose once. Later, the majority of codes were deemed as properties of more grounded and conceptual categories. During selective coding, these codes condensed into conceptual categories. The term grounded connotes the number of times a category occurred in the data. Other less grounded and less relevant codes collapsed into categories during the selective coding process. During and after selective coding all of the data points, the quotes, codes, categories, and memos, were further refined and related to one another. The level of connection with other data points is termed density.

Multicultural competency training is similar to other types of training, in that the curriculum and facilitation must address the various student levels of knowledge, skills, and awareness. However, because of the higher level of possible controversial content, divergent views, and resultant emotional reactions, student developmental levels are evermore important to address (Neville et al., 1996). Neville et al. (1996) asserted that multicultural competency training varies in efficacy based on the developmental stage of each individual student. The field of multicultural psychology has produced multiple developmental models that include racial identity stages and target/agent status stages (Helms, 1995; Bennett, 1993; Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 1995; Sue, Ivey, & Pedersen, 1996). This developmental variability is important to consider concerning the findings of this study.
The major conceptual categories are Agent Shame, the PC Game, Boxing In/Out, Cultural Difference Curriculum, Power & Privilege Awareness, and Oppression Mechanics. A brief description of each of these conceptual categories, the number of times they occurred within the interview data, and theory implications can be found on Table 4. The following sections will explore the intricacies of each category, their related concepts, and direct quotes from the data.

Below is a summary of the major conceptual categories accompanied by fitting descriptive quotes directly from the data. After each quote there is a two number reference that points to the interview number and the transcript line number. The interview numbers are in order and patterns can be deduced regarding quotes from the first ten interviews versus the last eight in light of the curriculum changes between the two cohorts.

Agent Shame

The core category labeled Agent Shame was one of the first codes that emerged early in interview 2. The code occurred in almost all of the interviews and in both sections to varying degrees. As a concept, Agent Shame continued to be refined throughout the interviews and had a high level of density. It was the most grounded code of the original fifty-seven codes, occurring more than sixty times during data analysis. Agent Shame was also one of the densest codes, connecting in either relationship or property to other quotes, codes, categories, or memos.

Agent Shame refers to an emotional phenomenon triggered by the realization or focus on difference. This difference refers to ways people are categorized according to culture or to power and privilege distribution. When this difference is addressed in
Table 4  
*Conceptual Categories and Definitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Theory Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Shame (61)</td>
<td>An emotional reaction to multicultural competency training information regarding prejudice/discrimination or power/privilege.</td>
<td>Agent Shame connotes a predominant differencing focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Game (33)</td>
<td>Based on the assumption that the purpose of multicultural competency training is to respect cultural difference and use appropriate language. PC Policing is making others aware when they are using disrespectful language.</td>
<td>A product of Cultural Difference multicultural competency training curriculum versus Oppression Mechanics. A Differencing effort, possibly to counteract Agent Shame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing In/Out (38)</td>
<td>The process of grouping or categorizing. In multicultural competency training, grouping according to culture or power and privilege.</td>
<td>Differencing efforts that trigger Agent Shame, resemble prejudice/discrimination and lead to the commodification of subjective suffering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Difference MCT Curriculum (41)</td>
<td>The focus on cultural differences instead of Oppression Mechanics.</td>
<td>Differencing effort that emphasizes the variations between cultural groups without the recognition of the dominant culture or Oppression Mechanics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power &amp; Privilege Awareness (39)</td>
<td>An individual’s awareness that their position in the Oppression Mechanics entails more or less power and privilege compared to others.</td>
<td>This awareness appears to be secondary in Cultural Difference Curriculum and is more likely to trigger Agent Shame. Multicultural competency curriculum focusing on Oppression Mechanics appears to facilitate a more clear and non-reactive awareness. A constructive Differencing effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppression Mechanics (35)</td>
<td>The systems and institutional processes that establish and maintain power distribution.</td>
<td>On an individual level there is a Saming aspect to Oppression Mechanics in that we all as individuals live and function within the same systems and institutions. Exposure to the historical roots of oppressive belief systems and institutions is a vital component.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

multicultural competency training, the interview data reveals a common pattern in which students personalize the information and realize they hold more power and privilege than
others. In addition, they appear to be part of a general grouping that has historically perpetrated discriminatory acts supported by prejudicial beliefs.

The term Agent Shame closely relates to White guilt, as referred to in the existing educational and psychological literature (Steele, 2006; Hays, Chang, & Dean, 2004; Tatum, 1994; Helms, 1995; Howard, 1993; Seldon, 1993). Iyer, Leach, & Crosby (2003), social psychologists, posit that White guilt is associated with the belief in unearned White privilege and the perception that White Americans are perpetrators of racial discrimination. According to Helms (1995), whom has focused on racial identity development, White people exposed to culture and power/privilege difference begin to recognize the dilemma of being White. In her White identity developmental model, Helms (1990) included feelings of guilt associated with people becoming aware that racism exists and that conforming to White racial norms can harm marginalized and targeted populations. She further stated that guilt is a natural developmental emotion when Whites begin to disregard racist attitudes.

Similarly, Ponterotto’s (1988) second stage of White identity development included the emotion of guilt when a student has accepted that the underlying counseling philosophy in the field of Western psychology fosters subtle racism and oppression. In agreement, Corvin & Wiggins (1989) stated that guilt occurs with the recognition of collusion with racism, either with action or apathy.

In addition, Howard (1993), like Helms (1993), emphasized the paradox that White people must reconcile when faced with the fact that they enjoy a degree of power and privilege that others do not. This creates a type of cognitive dissonance and guilt is a common result. White Americans whom work hard towards a decrease in racial bias find
themselves falling prey to these unintentional prejudices that result in feelings of guilt (Devine et al. 1991). Middleton et al. (2005) echoed this observed experience of guilt in addition to the common underlying question, “How can I continue to benefit from White privilege while denying any moral responsibility for the suffering of others?” (p. 452). Baldwin (1998) seemed to write it best, “No curtain under heaven is heavier than that of guilt and lies behind which Americans hide” (p. 323).

The word *agent* used in this conceptual category connotes any status in which there is unearned power and privilege. Common examples include being white or male. The word *shame* emphasizes a painful and helpless feeling of distress regarding an individual’s identity.

The affective terms shame and guilt can be confusing and often used interchangeably. Shame is the perception that one’s self is essentially bad (Tangney, 1991). Shame is caused by attributions that are personal, internal, global, and uncontrollable (Janoff-Bulman, 1979). Shame is found to increase self-focus, limit empathic understanding, and culminate in counter-transference reactions (Tangney, 1991, Hoffman, 1984).

This is in contrast to the common usage of *guilt*, which is an unpleasant emotion of remorse over a specific act committed. Guilt is described as an externalized way of experiencing regret for a specific action or behavior that is different from the self (Tangney, 1992). Guilt allows a person to confess, apologize, and make amends (Tangney, 1990).

Emotion researchers clarify the differences that delineate shame and guilt. First, shame is caused by global events or perceptions while guilt is caused by specific
behavior. Second, shame is linked to the core self while guilt is linked to a separate behavior. And third, shame can lead to disabling anxiety and anger while guilt could lead to reparative action (Parker & Schwartz, 2002). Wicker (1983) elaborated that guilt produces a desire to be more active, correct the situation, and regain control while shame is accompanied by submission, inferiority, and inhibition.

Guilt maintains that an individual has done something bad; shame maintains that an individual is bad. Tangney & Dearing (2002) described the experience of guilt as self-disappointment regarding an interpersonal transgression. Shame is experienced as self-loathing regarding identity. In the case of being white or male and having more power and privilege than a woman or a person of color, there was no specific act committed in order to gain the agent status. Unearned and unintentional agent status is thus connected to shame. Therefore, the main intention of the term Agent Shame is to address the possibility for multiple statuses and acknowledge the emotional experience of having unearned and unintentional power and privilege compared to others.

In order to fully understand the construct of Agent Shame and its impact on multicultural competency training, it is important to reiterate the ideal outcomes for multicultural competency training. According to the American Psychological Association the desired outcome is to increase competency in the domains of knowledge, skills, and awareness (American Psychological Association, 2002). The interview data revealed that Agent Shame is a major barrier in achieving these competencies. In addition, the interview data revealed that multicultural curriculum itself may be a causative factor in inducing Agent Shame. Furthermore, the interview data indicated that
Agent Shame caused resistance to further multicultural competency training, elicited a sense of being falsely accused, and resulted in feeling of hopelessness and helplessness.

The interview data suggested that Agent Shame is triggered, with more frequency and intensity, when cultural and power differences are explicitly addressed in the curriculum without the support of a historical knowledge about oppression. When these differences are pointed out to individuals in the classroom or when there are personal comparisons of the amount of power one holds over another, Agent Shame appears to be a likely trigger.

Agent Shame occurred as a common emotional reaction to the history and experience of oppressed populations. The participants reported that they felt a sense of shame for being white, male, or middle class, after they read accounts of marginalized people and their struggles. Agent Shame also appeared to be more likely when action-oriented language was used such as oppressing/oppressor, being racist, and dominating. When words that connote power and privilege, like oppression and racism, are converted to verbs, Agent Shame could become a likely barrier to multicultural competency training.

Some examples of emotional resistance resulting from the experience of unresolved or unprocessed Agent Shame included:

“I was furious because there is the element that one must understand what white privilege brings but there also has to be the element of the shame that a white person can have after these multicultural things are learned. I think that shame is very misplaced and I don't think that it's helpful, and I've actually had several teachers almost vilify me or somebody who is white. You know, what good does that do? I think that's the approach that really makes learning multiculturalism difficult is that it's a difficult concept anyway but I think that having the atmosphere of having to defend my white skin, I don't see where that's helpful.” (5:14)

“...there was this huge piece of guilt that I felt and then all of a sudden there was this place where the guilt shut off and it's like that's not productive. That gets in the way of
me learning and experiencing and connecting and I need to be aware of all of the components of oppression to which I contribute, or continually learning about that. But the guilt really is a waste of energy and having the guilt without the visceral component was the source of my annoyance…” (9:11)

“I think when people start to see the disparity of privilege between themselves and other people they feel like they should be doing something and they are like ‘I’m not doing that,’ that’s where I think the guilt comes from.” (17:164)

A major component of Agent Shame is feeling falsely accused of being prejudicial or discriminative simply because of having more power and privilege. This elicits a type of “not me” reaction that is counterproductive to the intentions of multicultural competency training.

“Oh, I was…even actually after that class I was resistant for awhile because I thought I am not responsible for all the ills of the world. I’m simply not. I was really resistant to it.” (5:46)

“I think if I was gonna teach the class, I would teach it, from day one I would say you are much more than your skin color. We all are. You are also not responsible for all the ills of the past. You simply aren’t. What happened before has been awful to people, the purpose is not to say, you’re white, you did all this. You obviously didn’t. And even mistakes that may have been made or errors that you weren’t even aware of, or whatever, are done and over with.” (5:74)

“…like just that people need to get over it—there’s no point in hanging on to it. I wasn’t around for slavery…” (14:75)

“…since I’m white, and in a privileged and empowered group, and a lot of people were teaching me were also in that group, there was an overriding sense of ‘we have to do this, this is our responsibility, like we need to check this box because we feel guilty or it’s not our fault…” (16:27)

“…some White people start to identify when they hear about slavery and how that’s affected Blacks in history up to now, they start to feel as if they are the White slave owners themselves. I think that’s where guilt comes from for some people.” (17:164)

“Here it comes…the White guilt is going to start even though you don’t consciously contribute to it. I don’t think I do…I can safely say it’s not a conscious effort to contribute or perpetuate these things but you still can’t escape the feeling that you are responsible…you can’t escape or get beyond the guilt. You start to say ‘I didn’t ask for it’ and you start making excuses…it serves no purpose other than as a penance to tell other people you feel guilty.” (18:34)
“...it’s kind of like a retreating within yourself, checking out...almost a ‘poor me’...a kind of self pity.” (18:42)

There were many comments in the data that described a helplessness or hopelessness quality after getting over the initial shock of Agent Shame. Many reported no resolution or next step provided in their multicultural competency training regarding how to utilize power and privilege in a constructive manner.

“...instead of the stereotype being that everyone is the same...this person is normal like I am. The stereotype is I can’t help anyone. I’m just going to be oppressing them and I’m gonna feel even worse.” (3:41)

“A lot of anxiety! Uh...A lot of white guilt, a lot of, Ok, I get it, I see it, now what do I do with it? I have no idea what to do with this...” (11:33)

“being a old white guy, I walked away from the two other courses feeling...better informed, but also feeling attacked and uh unsure of what I could do, given my skin color and my cultural background and all, how I could contribute.” (13:6)

“So, I guess what I am trying to say is it (MCT) leaves you a little disillusioned because you realize how white guilt, if improperly channeled or used, can frustrate people even more than they were frustrated when they were just ignorant.” (3:33)

A feature of Cultural Difference Curriculum (addressed later) is the increase in both intensity and frequency of Agent Shame.

“So I think yeah—it might shut down your learning to some degree if it's too much too fast around power and privilege.” (14:109)

The following is an example of a multicultural term, oppression, being used as a term and the emotional reaction that it induced:

“It wasn’t presented as everyone is being oppressed. It was presented as she is still an oppressor, and I think that was even the words that were used. So, in that way it made me...indifferent towards the curriculum, not like angry against it, thinking that it was this affirmative action curriculum.” (3:58)

In recognition that Agent Shame is a difficult experience, one participant alluded to a kind of self-compassion important in multicultural competency training.
“I'm trying to have gentleness with myself and a kind of acceptance of my own racism and my own places where I've taken on or internalized the prejudices of our mainstream culture. There is a way in which this work has deepened my own internal work around cultural issues and racism and prejudice.” (8:15)

For a balanced perspective on Agent Shame, it is important to explore the constructiveness of this category. Research in the field of social psychology indicates that the emotional terrain of guilt can be a powerful motivator towards multicultural competency training outcomes. Amodio, Devine, & Harmon-Jones (2003) showed that guilt is a natural motivator in reducing prejudicial beliefs. The authors used electroencephalography technology measuring cortical activity to test a hypothesis regarding guilt. The authors posited that guilt would provide a negative reinforcement cue and a resultant motivation for prejudice-reducing behavior to White subjects exposed to multiracial faces. Findings indicated that guilt served as a positive predictor of prejudice-reducing behavior when subjects were presented the opportunity. Applied to this study, these findings imply that there are positive aspects to Agent Shame if cultivated. Agent Shame has a place in multicultural competency training; it simply must be addressed and guided in order not to result in stagnation, resistance, and helplessness. Suggestions regarding how to redirect and capitalize on Agent Shame are covered in chapter 6 and table 7.

The field of social psychology also provides an interesting distinction between guilt and shame. As the above study suggests, guilt over one’s transgressions, such as having prejudicial beliefs, is usually followed by an increased interest in reparatory behavior. In multicultural competency training, this may include pursuit of further training or social justice work. In contrast, shame, such as the awareness of having ancestors whom have engaged in harmful discriminatory behavior, actually decreases
interest in reparatory behavior. One theory for the decrease related to shame is that no reparation can fully affect one’s self-concept or static identity (Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

Because of the emotions generated, aversion, a lack of motivation or overcompensation can occur. The curriculum has not offered a hopeful vision of multicultural competency growth.

The implications of this study suggest that Agent Shame may result in a state in which students no longer have the motivation for multicultural competency training. One of the implications of this reaction is that current curriculum has not provide a hopeful vision of multicultural competency potential. Whereas, guilt may serve as a motivator for further training and predicate the Agent Shame experience.

Garcia, Hoelscher, & Farmer (2005) presented the closest description in current literature to Agent Shame. In their work as multicultural competency trainers, they observed how students experience a sense of shame and blame after becoming aware of unearned power and privilege. The authors point to the importance for students to reintegrate their worldview after carefully examining this new awareness. The authors cautioned resistance, avoidance, and defensiveness would result without compassionate reintegration.

“...if guilt leaves you with a desire to do something then its positive...there has to be an addressing or debriefing on that guilt. People need to have it realistically...to be explored and reality checked...don’t own more than you should. Don’t start feeling guilty that you had anything to do with prior drastic forms of oppression. Just
understand where you are now and what you can do to help and that’s all you should own.” (17:168)

“...if you take the guilt and use that to say ‘there’s a systemic problem and we need to do something about it.’ Then you can get beyond the guilt.” (18:43)

Agent Shame – Related Concepts

The category of Agent Shame achieved high density and related to many other codes and categories within the data. Agent Shame is related to the categories of the PC Game and Boxing In/Out, both will be explored later in this chapter. Other concepts that closely related to Agent Shame included Equality Hunger, Target Flag-Waving, and Agent Bashing. The similarity that these three concepts share, and what connects them to Agent Shame, is that they serve as a way to avoid emotional discomfort.

The concept of Equality Hunger appeared in the first interview and periodically reappeared throughout the data. Equality Hunger is the desire to see everyone as having equal human worth. It puts emphasis on the intrinsic value of each separate individual. Equality Hunger can be identified in everyday language in the phrases, “We’re all pink inside,” “It’s a small world after all,” or “We’re all children of God.” Equality Hunger can serve as a salve for the discomfort of Agent Shame. It serves to nullify the inevitable difference in power and privilege between groups and individuals.

Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Table 5) attempts to conceptualize stages in which people, usually in an agent status, understand cultural and power/privilege differences. The first two stages of this model are Denial and Defense. In Denial, people experience their own worldview as the only real one. Other cultures are seen simply as foreign. Those in Denial are not interested in cultural
differences and may actively avoid exposure to difference. In the Defense stage, cultural
difference becomes more real and defensive mechanisms, like “us/them” or
“superior/inferior” are formed. People in their agent status may perceive a cultural
difference as an attack on their cultural identity and values.

An interesting variation on Bennett’s Defense stage is that of Reversal. Reversal
occurs when a person in agent status adopts another culture’s dress, food, music, and
convenient aspects of the belief system. Bennett uses the terms “going native” or
“passing” to better describe this phenomenon. It is distinguished from Defense because
those in Reversal do not consider other cultures as much of a threat to their own (Bennett,
1993).

Table 5
*Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (1993).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>My worldview is the only true worldview. Everything else is “foreign.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Reversal</td>
<td>Other worldviews threaten mine. Us/Them, Superior/Inferior mindset. Reversal is “going native.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Adopting universals of biology or spirituality to ease the tension of difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>My worldview is one of many equally complex worldviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>My worldview can expand to include aspects of another worldview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>I can move in and out of different worldviews without losing my self, “global nomads.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is the third of Bennett’s stages, Minimization, which highly relates to Equality Hunger. Minimization results when one’s cultural worldview is seen as universal. Adopting familiar universals such as biological nature or religious tenets can ease the threat of difference experienced in the previous stages. Physical universalism, common needs and functions that all humans share, can be used to avoid culture and power differentials. Similarly, transcendent universalism can also be utilized to decrease the cognitive dissonance of difference. Bennett (1993) posited that for people in agent status, Minimization serves to mask the recognition of their cultural worldview and the afforded institutional power and privilege.

The following are examples of Equality Hunger from the data:
“I don’t want to say it’s natural or it’s just me, but I try to look past that and try to get into the core of the person. You know this person is a person and try to find out who this person is, and not just see them as a person of color or ethnicity…just being aware that even if this person is of this color, they’re not gonna necessarily represent the whole.” (10:31)

“The conversation was around cultural arrogance going to another country or trying to fix things in another culture and what that looks like outside kind of the white guilt. It’s not just guilt either, it’s also a really deep sense of justice…and a desire for equality. Those are kind of more noble ways of looking at that dynamic.” (8:31)

“I had no framework for that (power/privilege differentials) because I thought we just need to work together and make stuff fair for everybody.” (9:72)

“I would not have given the credibility to how far culture can play into differences and how they can contribute to totally unintentional misunderstandings. I would’ve thought that we’ll all just get along, that we’re all underneath the same. We’re all the same.” (9:104)

“…there’s some sort of ‘we’re all the same’ type conversations. So totally different than the ‘there are these different groups and they all have differences,’ but don’t even see the differences. We’re all in this peaceful harmony, but we’re also all in this super privileged white school, in this nice area, but let’s not talk about that.” (16:23)

Power and privilege are distributed to individuals according to multiple memberships that include gender, race, or class. Most individuals may have some areas
in which they have more power and privilege than others (agent status) and other areas in which they hold less power and privilege than others (target status). Target Flag-waving, also related to the PC Game, is the choice to put emphasis on our target status over our agent status. It appeared to be an avoidance tactic in order to counteract Agent Shame. In the data, some participants stated that their target status overrode their agent status; meaning the power and privilege gained from one status was nullified by that of a lower status.

“Understanding that being white is certainly privileged is one thing but I don’t think that being white trumps everything cause certainly women, people who are obese, people who have disabilities, those all play into how they’re viewed in the world.” (5:14)

Agent Bashing is the act of explicitly blaming individuals for specific discrimination, racism/sexism, or a general dynamic of oppression. As a code, Agent Bashing appeared ten times and is highly related to both Agent Shame and the PC Game. The implication of Agent Bashing in multicultural competency training is that it is okay for people in their target status to attack those in agent status. This appears to be congruent with a model of multicultural competency training, which focuses on cultural and individual differences without a focus on Oppression Mechanics. In the following example, the participant remembers how Agent Bashing occurred in a past class:

“it actually happened a couple of times. The prof seemed to be ok with it. We had student presentations...and it got to the point of pointing at people. It seemed like an opportunity for certain members to voice their anger and their frustration, and at times – perhaps too strong a word – but hatred. The first thing you go to is ‘God, I don’t think I’m that, you know, which isn’t helpful either because we all participate in oppression...but to make one so defensive, I think it counteracts what we are studying.’” (13:8)

The implication of Agent Bashing in multicultural competency training is that it is acceptable or even encouraged for people in their target status to attack those in agent
status. This appears to be congruent with a model of multicultural competency training, which focuses on cultural and individual differences without a focus on Oppression Mechanics. The following is an example of a participant who has experienced Agent Bashing before but has completed a class in which Oppression Mechanics was the main focus:

“I think it’s safe from male-bashing, safe from White-bashing, safe from hetero-bashing all of those particulars that one is a member of, it wasn’t allowed. But I think even more importantly, it wasn’t necessary. I think we accomplished a great deal without having to attack, I guess, is the best word.” (13:58)

**The Politically Correct (PC) Game**

To reiterate, the goal of multicultural competency training is to increase knowledge, skills, and awareness. According to the interview data and existing literature in the field, current multicultural competency curriculum emphasizes knowledge of specific cultural groups, awareness of personal beliefs and privilege, and the history of oppressed populations (American Psychological Association, 2002; Cartwright, Daniels, & Zang, 2008; Constantine, 2001; D’Andrea & Heckman, 2008; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis 1992). The dictums of current multicultural competency training are to be tolerant, accepting, and welcoming of all differences. Seemingly, from the data, an underlying notion of current curriculum is that competency implies not offending minority populations, not making any assumptions, and always using the correct terminology to identify their group. Thus, competency is measured by using the least-offensive labels and knowing the most about a specific cultural group, the PC Game.

The data reveals a paradoxical dynamic in multicultural competency training. The emphasis on using accepting and honoring language towards marginalized groups
becomes rule bound, resulting in a type of multicultural rhetoric. Students become hesitant to speak up for fear of breaking these multicultural rules of language and appearing like part of the oppressive majority. As mentioned to in the following quotes, as long as students utilize the politically correct language to express altruistic intention, no one is required to acknowledge the differences in power and privilege that exist in current society. Instead of moving toward an increase in knowledge, skills, and awareness, there is a silencing of the dialogue required for learning.

“by incorporating PC language we think we’ve achieved (competency) which allows us to quit working.” (4:10)

“I’ve been to a lot of diversity workshops over the years and they all seem to be really geared toward...placating. They seem to be geared towards placating people instead of actually questioning things. And I understand that people don’t want to voice some of their inner dialogue that might be going on for them around issues of race, and ethnicity, and culture. We do live in a very PC culture right now where it’s considered a vulnerability to say these thinks out loud so they’re not being addressed. We get to the point where we’re too afraid to talk about realities so therefore dialogue is stifled a lot in these workshops...” (4:43)

“my problem is with people coming to school and saying, ”Make me multicultural, make me sensitive.” I think that's more the thesis I'm trying to get at is that that's when it's frustrating. Because at the end of the day, people go back home to their all-white neighborhoods, and you know they don't want any minorities there cause they're gonna bring the house value down.” (11:26)

“I think that in the zeal to go out and cure everybody of racism, we miss the point.” (5:15)

“most of the multicultural education that I'd had was just ridiculous little trainings with the state and stuff like, "don't say the n-word." Respect other people when they show up wearing stuff that you're not used to or you know...don’t make sexual jokes in the work place...it wasn’t particularly challenging for anyone. It was more like just a socialization thing in this place and in this culture – you’re not allowed to do these things.” (8:62)

“I found a lot of what I considered to be questionable political correctness and nothing that settled into my guts. I was annoyed by a lot of the training that I had. That's the best way to put it. And did not have any concept of where I even fit in the picture in terms of what privilege I experienced, what different types of oppression I experienced in my own life, and I had nothing viscerally in which to frame it.” (9:6)
“I didn’t feel a connection with the way it was presented...it just felt like a lot of rules, and a lot of rich white kids saying you should think this way.” (9:7)

“we’re getting all this very righteous multicultural lingo thrown at us. It was like, who’s more multicultural than who?” (9:24)

“I found that I am much more aware of guilt and worry about stepping wrong or offending someone unintentionally. I am much more hyperaware of my own internal process and do a little self beating up about it sometimes...” (8:4)

“...either you don’t talk about it, and it’s PC, like language type things that you should be employing and using, and a lot of silencing around ideas of race and culture and power and all these things, or you talk about it like here’s all these different groups – they have an experience that’s different from you, like you feel bad for them because look at what you’ve done – you’re a white person.” (16:21)

“...when I read Zinn, I didn’t want to read it, I didn’t want to talk about it. Or, it’s not that I didn’t want to talk about it, I was just thinking and thinking, and I just couldn’t say things. I think that part came from my multicultural training around PCness. Like don’t talk about that, don’t say that!” (16:81)

The PC Game – Related Concepts

A property of the PC Game is labeled PC Policing. It occurred over ten times in the coding process and was highly related to Agent Shame in that it is a way of coping. If the underlying assumption is that the ultimate outcome of multicultural competency training is to respect cultural difference and use appropriate language, than PC Policing is a way to ensure the outcome. PC Policing is making others aware when they are using what is perceived as disrespectful language.

The data reveals a tendency of students to quickly draw other’s attention when they are speaking outside of the dominant multicultural discourse. Despite their good intention, which is to express respect towards marginalized groups, this effort appears to result in silencing as referred to in the description of the PC Game.

“...these are really triggering topics and um, not something I would normally talk about in a class setting because somebody inevitably gets called out on their thoughts as they’re
processing it. And if somebody is not maybe as far along in going through this and if you do that openly, you tend to get targeted by other people sometimes for your perspective…” (11:68)

“Like tiptoeing around culture and race and...being afraid, not to insult somebody, being afraid to say something that might offend somebody. I feel like if we continually practice talking about it then I’m going to get better at it. Even if I feel that it’s really vulnerable and it makes me kind of sit hunched over because I’m afraid to say something wrong but I’m only going to get better by continually educating myself and practicing.” (6:144)

“...like when some sort of multicultural topic comes up, there’s usually a lot of automatic reactions in the room. Um, maybe a few people speak out, somebody says something and maybe they don’t say it quite right, you know, they don’t say it in quite the politically correct way, and everyone else corrects them and it shuts it down.” (11:71)

“...people would be like, ‘You must consider multiculturalism,’ but at the same time they would be judging your statements and ideas so narrowly and so counter intuitive to what we were taught. And it really irritated me. I mean, I could feel myself physically getting flushed and like, wait a minute. You know feeling like, let’s not throw the baby out with the bathwater.” (2:53)

“...I have been in classrooms where some people can stomp on you for not having the same exact perspective as they do which is hard because I know where they’re coming from and it is great that they have these values and they have these experiences that I have not encountered but they do it in a way that makes me feel like a less of a person whereas, yeah, I don’t think that’s fair.” (6:101)

“I think people are really scared to be up front about that because that really brings up issues that...well, one: are even more overwhelming and two: it calls people on being hypocrites...Cause you know, people throw epithets around and no one wants to be labeled as insensitive. And especially white people are scared to bring up these issues and studies have shown...like very well with statistics that white people are very scared about these issues and the more they're scared, the more non-white people that they're trying to bring these issues up with will feel oppressed basically.” (3:83)

Boxing In/Out

In a review of multicultural competency syllabi, there appears to be two distinct types of multicultural curriculum. An older version, which seemed to be prevalent in the early 1990’s, focused on different cultural groups (D’Andrea & Heckman, 2008; Dean, & Chang, 2007; Hays, Rogers, 2006; Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006). In the findings section this curriculum has been coded as Cultural Difference
Curriculum (covered later in this chapter). A syllabi review of doctoral level multicultural classes revealed a pattern of focusing on a different cultural group common to the United States. These groups usually included African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Latino/Latina Americans. These sections of the curriculum would focus on the cultural specifics of each group, such as traditions, music, food, as well as concepts of time, family, and work. These lessons were usually framed in terms of how these groups are different from the dominant population, but without an explicit acknowledgement of the cultural assumptions of the dominant population. In addition, these lessons usually did not include a significant focus on issues of historicity or power and privilege (Caspe-Detzer, Tien, & Bergkamp, unpublished manuscript). In the coding process, this type of curriculum was coined Festival-Boothing to connote the sense of sampling from the other without an acknowledgement of the self.

The syllabi study also revealed a change in multicultural competency training at the time of the study from a Cultural Difference Curriculum to syllabi that indicated more attention towards issues of power and privilege. This shift in curriculum was signified by three specific factors. These factors included the study of histories of oppressed populations, the emphasis on self-reflection and self-critique, and models that draw distinctions of individual power and privilege (Caspe-Detzer, Tien, & Bergkamp, unpublished manuscript).

A common model used to highlight issues of individual power and privilege is the ADDRESSING model (Hayes, 2001). This model offers ten domains of identity and membership that signify the possession of unearned and institutionalized power and privilege. Each domain is indicated with a letter in the ADDRESSING acronym (see
Table 6). This model enables individuals to identify domains in which they hold agent or target status. An individual usually holds multiple statuses in both the agent and target domains, allowing for a deeper understanding of the complexity of power and privilege distribution.

Table 6
*ADDRESSING Domains (Hays, 2001)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Age and generational influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Developmental and acquired Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Religion and spiritual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Indigenous heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>National origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The past and present multicultural competency curriculums invite individuals to group themselves into distinct categories according to either cultural distinctions or power and privilege distributions. The benefits of grouping can be to learn about general characteristic of a cultural group or how power and privilege possession can differ among individuals. Despite these benefits, these curriculums continue to group individuals into categories that can negate their distinctive identities. To force someone into a box, whether it is culture or power specific, can appear like stereotyping and making assumptions. Two important principles in past multicultural training are to avoid stereotypes and assumptions, and this style of boxing individuals into categories can seem like essential principle violations.
All participants in this study were in a doctoral program in clinical psychology whose curriculum heavily relied on the ADDRESSING model (Hays, 2001). This model was integrated into multiple classes and commonly used as the “sixth” axis in psychodiagnostic training. It was common for participants to experience a combination of curricula that included grouping models according to both culture and power differentials.

The category termed Boxing In/Out was used to code descriptions of grouping, categorizing, or “checking the box” regarding cultural distinction or power and privilege distribution. It occurred over twenty times during data analysis and was highly related to Agent Shame in that most focus on differences heightened the awareness of one’s power and privilege and consequently, increased Agent Shame.

The interview data revealed an ambiguity regarding grouping efforts. Most participants expressed an understanding of the benefits of learning in generalities about larger culture or power groups; yet there was discomfort in seemingly making assumptions or stereotypes. There was confusion regarding how far the grouping could extend, how many sub-cultures should be addressed, and how different group memberships within one individual interrelated. In addition, there was a repeated opinion that grouping and “checking the box” negated the fluidity and contextuality inherent in issues around multiculturalism and oppression.

In addition, the interview data also generated a general question regarding the ultimate intention of a curriculum that emphasized cultural or power differences. Regarding cultural differences, the underlying assumption seems to be that when knowledge of different cultures increased then competency increased. The question the
participants seemed to be asking was, how far does one need to go? Since general
c characteristics of a cultural group cannot be applied to individuals, coupled with many
cultures and sub-cultures to learn, it appears impossible to truly reach competency.

Regarding power and privilege differentials, it is beneficial to raise awareness of our own
power, but it may be ineffective to apply the model to others.

“...there could be some controversy with the Addressing Model. I guess some people
could use it as just more labeling. But others can...if you use it as just kind of a tool to
better understand somebody or just get a feel for their background I guess it could be
useful but there’s also the danger of labeling so...I guess it really just depends on how
you use it. How you interpret it.” (10:15)

“...usually separate cultures. So we would say African Americans – this is how they
might do on a WISC or WAIS – but they were always very separated out, we just never
really integrated it.” (11:4)

“...but you know we weren’t talking about, you know, the mundane eye contact thing you
know, check the list, check the box...” (13:76)

“Why I say check box with customs because if you know the customs then you’re
supposedly multicultural...” (13:81)

“...there’s so much diversity within culture-certainly in the U.S., that can impact level of
acculturation. So having someone say they’re Japanese, for instance, doesn’t necessarily
mean they don’t make eye contact, doesn’t necessarily mean they don’t shake hands,
doesn’t necessarily mean they’re...” (13:82)

“...the other thing that I notice...is the fear that this is becoming another categorization
tool that boxes people in, and talking about how then all they see is the person of color.”
(4:10)

“...I’ve seen some similarities in group thinking, but that kind of training just feels really
harmful to me, unless it’s somebody from a community that says ‘I can represent my
entire community,’ I don’t know how those are effective.” (14:23)

“Because it just stereotypes everybody and if I say ‘Filipino men are all this way’ or
‘Japanese women are all that way,’ or I speak for all white women? I can’t imagine
doing that. I’m very different; I’d like to think, than every other white woman that I know.
So I just think there’s lots of cultures within any community. Cause I don’t think culture
is just about race or ethnicity or religion, it’s about gosh-your class, your socioeconomic
status, your belief system, your holidays, whether your parents are heterosexual or
whether you’re-you know all those things, you know, that fit into every culture.” (14:25)
“I just hate it! ...I think it kind of repeats that same kind of static groups, like White people are here and you’re always going to be here, and these people are always going to be there, and like it’s the agent’s job to like give to the target or do something to the target. It’s like you get to bring the target up, you get to do something to the target. ...it’s not like we’re all agents and targets, we go in and out of those roles constantly...it wasn’t generalizable.” (16:92)

“...they’re always going to be low (target status) and there’s a certain demographic that can never get beyond that, and that certain people have power and only certain people can’t have power, which is true in certain systems, but the fluidity is gone. The shifting and the constant different situations are gone. Like the targets can’t own their power and they don’t have power. They do. But if you are always putting them in one category...” (16:96)

This quote explicitly points to the connection between Boxing In/Out, the PC Game, and Agent Shame.

“...definitely a trigger was that type of labeling, because we were talking in labels and groups, you can’t get around that. We do talk about power and oppression, but at a certain time we have to talk about the way that that operates on a group level, so you do end up talking about white men, for instance, and I think when those kind of conversations came up, it definitely brought up those feelings...of self-silencing. ‘I’m not allowed to talk about this because I’ll mess up and I’ll say something that is offensive...” (16:86)

Participants also acknowledged the strengths of the ADDRESSING model by stating:

“...the Addressing Model...I took away a central message...which is considered dimensionality. Nobody is any sort of monolithic representation...we just need to always be considerate, that not everyone of any given ethnicity is like everybody else of that ethnicity. I think that that's...whatever tools encourage that kind of thinking and even to take that thinking outside of culture but in terms of just looking at the world in general. Anything that really encourages dimensionality, I think is generally a good thing.” (4:10)

“...we were given this handout...and it named targets and agents of privilege and oppression. And I was like, holy cow – I’m like every single one – it really just sunk in.” (12:212)

For participants of color, their experience with grouping efforts, regarding either culture or power, reflected a sense of negating their individuality.
“...our professor putting up statistics about Asian American women in our society. You know, it’s harder for them to move up the ladder, and then when I tried to think about my own life I was thinking...the statistics didn’t fit...and was kind of an eye-opener for me. Like I never saw my family being a part of that statistic, and to me it sounded like a generalization the way it was being presented, and I just had an interesting discussion with my mom about that. She said, sometimes those kinds of statistics can hinder people from wanting to move up but you just don’t let that affect you...” (10:47)

“...the ADDRESSING model...is really well meaning and it is actually to broaden somebody’s perspective but what it actually does is, I’ve found in my own experience, is that it tends to create another mode of categorization which continues to sort of box you in so like for instance because I look a certain way because I look a certain way, I look like I’m from a certain part of the world, people will make assumptions both without being introduced to the Hayes model and then also with being introduced to the Hayes model so they’ll be like, “Well, she looks like this so I am going to assume that she’s from this part of the world because she’s of a different race,” and then you fall into these categories and then they further make assumptions about you which I may not even identify with...I think that the danger in using it...does have a tendency to create this tunnel of thinking and it’s annoying sometimes. I mean it’s just irritating cause that’s not the intention but that’s what happens, you know, so people...I sense that the curriculum used, that specific part, I understand why people might have problems with it in the sense that it does sort of categorize people you know, which seems counter productive for a multicultural curriculum.” (2:20)

Boxing In/Out – Related Concepts

The grouping of individuals according to culture or power and privilege also lead to confusion regarding the measurement of suffering, and the amount of power and privilege in each group. Since most individuals hold multiple agent and target statuses, the question was how these power differentials relate to one another. The participants wondered if there was a numeric formula that could add, subtract, and equate how much culture, power and privilege each person possessed. There was also a dynamic of comparing the subjective “amount” of power and privilege, possibly in an effort to equate who holds more or less in the current context.

Commodification of difference results in the individual attending more to the target statuses than to agent status. This effort to draw attention away from power and
privilege and towards marginalization was coded as Target Flag-Waving. It appeared related to Agent Shame in that it served as a coping skill to ease the feeling of shame with a refocus on the ideas that we all suffer under the systems of oppression.

“The teacher at the time said, ‘If you’re white you’ve got it all.’ I don’t agree. I think that anybody with a disability or a body size that does not fit into the dominant culture right now knows that that’s not true.” (5:42)

“People that are transgendered or anybody of difference, they may well be white but that doesn’t give them privilege over the dominant culture which I would say is not just being white, it’s being multitudes of other things - in this culture right now it would be Christian. It would be a thin, trim, athletic looking person. You know, those kinds of things. It’s definitely not the elderly and it’s not the young.” (5:42)

“I have often railed against the idea that because I'm white, automatically gives me power over virtually everybody else because I am obese, I am a woman in middle-age and all those things need to be taken into account but I think it's certainly…it's helped me tremendously, it took me a long time to get the idea that just by being white that I do have privilege because it's not something that I was brought up to believe or even educated in. But I think that those other cultural or those other parts of a person need to be addressed, and I think many times they're neglected.” (5:6)

“...like with one of the guys, you know he was just so, he felt so bad about everything. You know he was just really taking it on, and felt the need to constantly apologize and constantly explain. And I think you hear about that a lot in those exercises where you hear about your power and privilege and your like, white people try to put themselves in as much of a non-privileged group as they can because they felt like so bad. I think there was some of that happening.” (16:83)

“...it seemed to me that the White women in the class could disassociate from the White male thing because they are women and so they’re able to say, 'hey, I’m a woman so I have plenty of oppression despite being White so I’m not going to take on the burden of guilt.’” (17:120)

**Cultural Difference Curriculum**

As part of the interview, each participant described their understanding of multicultural competency before taking the current doctoral level courses. Almost all responses focused on cultural differences between groups and individuals. Lacking in most responses were references to oppressive systems, history and underlying
philosophies of oppressive systems, or awareness of their position in these systems that signify degrees of unearned power and privilege.

As described in the Boxing In/Out section, curriculum with a primary focus on cultural difference, without the acknowledgement of the cultural assumptions of the dominant population, was coded as Cultural Difference Curriculum. These classes usually emphasize increasing student knowledge of cultural characteristics of ethnic minority groups; this was coded as Festival Boothing. The common cultural characteristics that were of focus in this curriculum included holidays, traditions, music, food, religious beliefs and concepts of time, family, communication, and work. The underlying assumption appears to be that once there is an increase in cultural knowledge it will result in a decrease of prejudicial thinking. The above aforementioned syllabi study indicated that the primary cultural difference focus was characteristic of past multicultural competency curricula (Caspe-Detzer, Tien, & Bergkamp, unpublished manuscript).

A review of current literature indicated that most multicultural competency training models focus on cultural differences (Rogers, 2006, Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006). There has been a sporadic and unclear critique since the mid 1990s of, what is termed here, as the Cultural Difference Curriculum (Das, 1995; Kiselica, Maben, & Locke, 1999, Seto, Becker, & Kiselica, 2006). In general, this body of research points to the limitations of a cultural difference focus as resulting from a deeper understanding of issues of power and privilege in clinical psychology.

The interview data reveals the prominence of Cultural Difference Curriculum in this study’s data set. It appears that Cultural Difference Curriculum encouraged token
education, in which a student of color is elected to speak for an entire cultural group. Also, the data indicated an expansion of understanding regarding the term multiculturalism. The expansion seemed to move from a focus on cultural/ethnic difference to other power-distribution domains that include gender, class, and sexual orientation. The second and more recent expansion, moved from multiple domains to Oppression Mechanics (addressed later in this section).

Another assumption that seemed implicit in Cultural Difference Curriculum is that exposure to people from other cultures equates to a level of competency. Whether the student is a minority or the student has had prolonged exposure to minorities, this appeared to be a consistent reference throughout the data.

“...a deep acceptance, understanding and knowledge that you need ongoing education on peoples from many different cultures. That doesn’t mean that you have to know about every culture. It means that you have to embrace peoples from all cultures.” (1:43)

“...to me multicultural is just the understanding that there are various cultures in our nation and just being open-minded to that and being aware that not everyone has the same view. Not everybody is coming from the same background so just to be aware of whatever stereotypes that might be coming up or biases...maybe take a step back. I guess just the awareness that there are differences.” (7:19)

“an understanding of different cultures and how it plays into your therapy with people, how it influences everything really, from interactions to symptoms to what’s socially acceptable...” (11:2)

“...I only thought of multicultural really as ethnicity...” (11:8)

“...understanding customs, which is important, but that’s not multicultural training.” (13:79)

“...the world is much larger than your own perspective so you need to consider that people from other cultures or other parts of the world might have different views about how things should be...” (2:8)

“I think I operated under the assumption that I am a minority so I understand automatically what multiculturalism mean...” (2:16)
“if someone had said the word multiculturalism to me before this class, images of diversity would come to mind...international diversity rather than gender issues, sexuality issues...more like working with someone who wasn’t born in America...” (3:10)

“My ideas on multiculturalism is that it’s really important to take into account the fact that people’s belief systems, which come out of their environment, wherever those are and how they interplay with one another, really shape the way that person thinks, feels, acts, and responds to everybody else in the world.” (4:10)

“...multiculturalism was reaching out and exploring other cultures and understanding things from other cultural perspectives.” (7:20)

“I considered multiculturalism to be a general respect for other people’s backgrounds and cultures. (8:6)

“I felt like I had a good understanding of multiculturalism because I came from a very diverse undergraduate college.” (6:9)

“...it’s about knowing, understanding and being in tune to people and cultures different than your own.” (12:25)

“...cultures are all very distinct and very different but also that cultures share similarities that are different from U.S. White culture. Knowing those similarities that they do share that are different form U.S. White culture makes me feel that I know more about more people.” (12:61)

“...I’m very interested in not only how different people live and do things and how that intersects with the main stream culture, but also how that affects how we use knowledge systems and worldview and what we accept and what we don’t accept...” (15:12)

“Multicultural is differences in culture. Diversity is differences in everything.” (10:125)

“...about being curious, and open and humble around what we don’t know about each other, and I think that it’s a kind of having a willingness to be guided by the person in front of you, by the group in front of you rather than coming in and trying to guide them in the direction that I might think is the right direction...” (14:9)

“I think it includes diversity and thinking diversity and lifestyle diversity and all the traditional things: religion, gender, racial, ethnicity, it’s about the inclusion of multiple perspectives on living...” (14:15)

“...the emphasis has been on diversity. On realizing that there’s a plurality of ways of looking at things or that people have different experiences and that there are issues about inclusiveness and exclusiveness and prejudice and oppression.” (15:14)
A feature of Cultural Difference Curriculum is the increase in both intensity and frequency of Agent Shame.

“So I think yeah-it might shut down your learning to some degree if it’s too much too fast around power and privilege.” (14:109)

**Power & Privilege Awareness**

The terms power and privilege refer to the unearned societal and institutional advantages that certain individuals or groups possess based on innate characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, or gender (Greene, 2003; McIntosh, 1998). Croom (2000) provides numerous examples to support the case that being a white man is the single best predictor of health and financial success. Regarding power and privilege, Croom (2000) asserts that multicultural competency training must move past the cultural difference model and address power and privilege as an essential feature of curriculum.

A common experience reported by participants was gaining awareness of how they possess power and privilege within this societal context. The code termed Power and Privilege Awareness encapsulated participant references to their own power and privilege. It was coded more than thirty-five times and is related to Agent Shame, Boxing In/Out, Cultural Difference Curriculum, and Oppression Mechanics. The awareness of power and privilege seemed to occur with past, present, and emerging curriculum factors including the focus on cultural differences (Cultural Difference Curriculum), the focus on individual power and privilege (ADDRESSING model, Boxing In/Out), and the focus on institutionalize systems of oppression (Oppression Mechanics).

The interview data revealed that a new awareness of power and privilege seemed to trigger Agent Shame dependant on which curriculum focus was used. By varying degrees of emotionality, it seemed that the focus on individual power and privilege (like
the ADDRESSING model) triggered the most frequent reporting of Agent Shame, while the use of Oppression Mechanics (covered later in this chapter) eased the student into this awareness. One possible reason for this may be the ADDRESSING model seemingly individualizes and concretizes power and privilege in such a way that induces comparison and commodification of target or agent status. While, in contrast, Oppression Mechanics emphasizes the wider systems in which we all exist and induces a sense of unity and similarity.

“...I became very much aware of my own privilege. And I always knew that I came from a privileged background but to see that in a different concept...some of the privileges that would go beyond, even if I didn’t come from a middle-class background, just being White, Caucasian, American born, the privileges that come with that.” (1:11)

“I really thought of myself as not having that much power and privilege, and I don’t know exactly where I came up with that conclusion, but it’s kind of there, and then in the context of this class, I’m like – I do have a lot of power, where did I get all this power?” (11:15)

“...as a white guy, and the amount of power that I don’t even think of that I throw around and the assumptions that I make. You know, for instance, anywhere I go I can be pretty confident than other than my own limited abilities, for the most part, people are going to understand what I’m saying from my cultural perspective. And my intent is likely to be understood as I intended it to be understood.” (13:52)

“A much better understanding of oppression and how subtle it is, and how, despite my feelings that ‘I’m a good guy,’ and ‘I ain’t that way,’ how I can participate and even initiate oppression.” (13:104)

“...it was a deep revelation like that’s okay if I was maybe born into a family with money but maybe don’t identify with that fully or that people might perceive that about me but I don’t necessarily identify with that. And that’s okay.” (2:28)

“...caused me to sit back and reflect very deeply on where had I possibly...growing up in the culture I’d grown up...in social groups that are primarily white American middle upper-class values...” (7:28)

“Okay, well if I do have this authority by virtue of being a white male whose being extremely highly-educated, you know. I think they used the term, own the privilege. You know, taking ownership of that and saying what can I choose to do with it.” (7:32)
“There was a point when all these lights went on, and it's like okay, so this is where I have privilege. This is where I've had oppression. This is why certain things have been easy. This is why certain things have been hard. Everybody within a different framework has that with which they’re dealing. I doubt that many people have the level of privilege, you know, in terms of assuming rights, that I had, that I was raised with.” (9:7)

“I still realized there’s a lot of white bias that’s not really at the forefront, that we tend to just kind of skip over the white privilege. And I felt like the prac and pro series did a good job of bringing that to a head and acknowledging and it rather than just keeping it under the rug a lot. So I think in that sense not that my view on multiculturalism changed but it really made me examine my own privileges and how I present that to other people.” (6:13)

“I think there’s a little shame attached to it, like feeling like we had to move past of all of that but then like realizing that we really haven’t come that far. I guess as a society we haven’t come that far. Shame in the sense of like not being totally aware of it before then. Kind of just going about my business in a haze kind of thing and then like “whoa” being really shocked by that.” (6:37)

“I think the ones that have been the most powerful and continue to be the most powerful is when the focus is on self-awareness and privilege. I just think that when the focus is on unearned privilege, you just can’t get enough of that because I just continue to learn from that all the time. And I think also that, when the focus is on about how unearned privilege gets us where we’re...gets us into the predicaments where we expect people should believe us or...so just the...I think that’s what it comes down to.” (14:21)

“...we were given this handout about targets and agents, and it went through and it named targets and agents of privilege and oppression. And I was like, holy cow-I’m like every single one in that-it really just kind of sunk in...that this really kind of hit home...this furthering talking about White privilege.” (12:212)

Current literature in the field includes this type of conceptual category, mostly utilizing the term White privilege. Many educators have discussed the importance of teaching the concept of White privilege in multicultural competency training (Hamilton, 2001; McIntosh, 1989; Rothenberg, 2002; Swigonski, 1996). Garcia & Van Soest (1997) found that 71% of white students involved in multicultural competency training reported that white privilege served as a barrier for learning. Yet, Abrams & Gibson (2007) proposed a model of multicultural competency heavily focused on white privilege as a way to increase competency.
**Oppression Mechanics**

History reveals a multitude of methods in which humans agree on how resources are to be distributed. The construction of identifiers, backed by some kind of supporting ideology, has served to break down the human population into have and have nots (Kovel, 1984). Religion and nationalism are examples of large-scale identifiers that rationalize the entitlement of natural, economic, and human resources (Hannaford, 1996). While Eastern societies created the caste system as an explicit method, the West created the construct of race as a social force used to determine who is in the middle and who are on the margins (Sowell, 1994).

When participants were asked what their understanding of multiculturalism was before taking their most recent class, almost all responded with themes of acceptance, respect, and knowledge about different racial and cultural groups. Absent was the recognition of their own power and privilege, the broader systems that establish and maintain that power and privilege, or an understanding of the historical roots of these systems. The four components that constitute the category of Oppression Mechanics are historical roots of oppressive systems, current functioning of oppressive systems, positioning oneself within these systems, and being able to apply the knowledge of these systems in specific contexts.

Oppression Mechanics refers to the pervasive, historical, and institutionalized systems of power and privilege distribution. These systems are emblematic of the cultural assumptions they scaffold. Major examples of Oppression Mechanics include capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism (Zinn, 2003). Each of these systems can be traced throughout history and are functioning at some level within current societal
institutions. These institutions, which can be compared to cogs in the machine, can include banks, universities, and government agencies (Batra, 2007).

A focus on Oppression Mechanics is a paradigm shift that appears to be just beginning in multicultural competency training curricula (Arrendondo & Perez, 2006; Caspe-Detzer, Tien, & Bergkamp, unpublished manuscript; D’Andrea & Heckman, 2008; Hays, Dean, & Chang, 2007; McDowell, 2004; Zalaquett, Foley, Tillotson, Dinsmore, & Hof, 2008). D’Andrea & Heckman (2008), in a 40-year review of multicultural competency outcome research, noted a shift from multiculturalism with a focus on cultural difference to what they term as social justice, a focus on the broader themes of power and privilege. The authors encouraged others in academia to begin a shift in language by using the term “multicultural/social justice counseling” (p. 259).

Clinical outcome research conducted in the last five years further signified a shift in focus from the individual to that of the wider, systemic mechanics of oppression. One such study found that an increased awareness of systemic oppression resulted in a reduction of individual-attribution responses regarding poverty (Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2005). Of particular relevance to the concept of Oppression Mechanics, a recent qualitative study of therapists who utilized a power and privilege perspective in case-conceptualization were more likely to identify power and privilege dynamics during therapy interactions (Hays, Chang, & Dean, 2007). Thus, reinforcing the idea that this learning does indeed lead to multicultural competency in future therapeutic practice.

Oppression Mechanics encourages not just a present power and privilege perspective, but also an emphasis how the system came to be. As aforementioned, most multicultural competency curricula emphasized cultural differences in the past, individual
power and privilege differentials in the present, and just beginning to address wider systems that dictate resource distribution for the future. Only a few, such as LaFromboise & Foster (1992) have explicitly called for the inclusion of social and political history in multicultural curriculum.

Also, as mentioned in Chapter 4, most participants in this study received some components of Oppression Mechanics in their doctoral courses. The data reveals that the study of Oppression Mechanics appears to increase power and privilege awareness without triggering Agent Shame. The study of the history and current functioning of Oppression Mechanics offers a sense of unity (Saming) to students, in that we all live within these systems and that no one individual is responsible for the repercussions these systems produce.

“...if you know the customs then you’re multicultural, supposedly. Where when you learn about oppression, now you have something that’s useful across all cultures and situations.” (9:81)

The following quote points to the relationship between Boxing In/Out, Agent Shame, and Oppression Mechanics.

“I think when you label a group, I think when you talk about people as separate, when you talk about ‘you experience something different than I experience,’ like we’re not going to acknowledge the system, there’s no acknowledgement of that. It necessarily leads to people being defensive and feeling bad. So, like talking about more general topics like in class we did the ‘isms’ presentations on classism, talking about how these things happen, seeing them within ourselves, it felt like this could happen to anyone, this is happening to us, this is happening to everyone. This is not a White man, you’ve done this thing, or like low-SES, black woman, you’re always going to be in your group.” (16:75)
CHAPTER 6: THE GROUNDED THEORY

The grounded theory that emerged concerning emotionality in multicultural competency training is Agent Shame. It passed the four grounded theory criteria of relevance, fit, workability and modifiability. Agent Shame, as previously described, encompassed most of the participants’ reports of emotionality in the multicultural competency-training context. This revealed that Agent Shame most likely is triggered by focusing on differences in culture or power, referred to as Cultural Difference Curriculum and Boxing In/Out. The data also indicated some common coping reactions to deal with Agent Shame; these include the PC Game, PC Policing, and Target Flag-Waving.

An additional artifact of the data is a new dynamic in which curriculum utilizing Oppression Mechanics appeared to reduce the likelihood of Agent Shame and resulted in an applicable awareness of personal power and privilege.

In a thorough review of the existing literature on emotionality and multicultural competency training, one article appeared to explicitly confirm the theory of Agent Shame. Parker & Schwartz (2002) found, through years of multicultural competency training experience, that shame was frequently elicited in the course of training. They delineated shame from guilt for the aforementioned reasons. The authors stated that shame appeared to have a positive correlation with the awareness of personal power and privilege. Additionally, shame seemed to lead to defensiveness that served as a barrier to effective competency training. The authors provided general and specific suggestions regarding shame for trainers (see Table 7).

Table 7
Suggestions for Shame in Multicultural Competency Training (Parker & Schwartz, 2002)

- Assume that shame is natural and normal.
• Introduce research in which shame is a normal developmental stage.
• Identify triggers, cognitions, and behaviors associated with shame.
• Invite speakers who can discuss their shame process.
• Allot time to meet privately with students or a peer-to-peer support structure.
• Explain the purpose and process of each activity.
• Describe common reactions and emotions.
• All activities are voluntary.
• Model open and supportive communication.
• Take a neutral stance and encourage self-discovery.
• Continually discuss norms and roles in the class.

The Grounded Typography – Differencing/Saming

A general typography also emerged that serves to further explain most of the concepts that were derived from the data. This typography serves to clarify factors that relate to multicultural competency curriculum, intellectual learning, and emotional learning. The main two categorizations in this typography have been termed Differencing and Saming. These aspects are viewed as a gradated spectrum within which factors can occur. This spectrum encompasses all efforts and ideas that occurred in the data regarding multicultural competency training. This spectrum applies to multicultural competency training curriculum, facilitation, and conceptual content.

Differencing is any effort that emphasizes differences between systems, cultures, groups, or individuals. Differencing can be done in thought, speech, writing, and can occur as a major theme in curriculum or discussion. Saming is any effort to emphasize the sameness among systems, cultures, groups, or individuals. Like differencing, it can be done across thought, speech and writing, as well as in curriculum and discussion.
The data reveals a pattern of both effective and ineffective multicultural competency training. Differencing and Saming efforts can have both conducive and restrictive effects on the main goals of multicultural competency training to increase competency in the domains of knowledge, skills, and awareness.

Participants reported ineffective multicultural competency training, mostly in prior classes. These reports are more common in the first interview cohort (first ten interviews). For these students, there was a predominant Cultural Difference Curriculum that can be conceptualized as high on the Differencing spectrum. These training experiences usually triggered Agent Shame, which can sabotage further multicultural competency training.

A feature of effective multicultural competency training revealed in the data is the ability to think and conceptualize on both sides of the spectrum, as well as the awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of Differencing and Saming efforts. Effective multicultural competency training appears to require a flexibility of Difference and Saming thinking and an avoidance of a dualistic paradigm, which predominates on one side or the other.

The effective multicultural competency training reports that originated in the last eight interviews (the second cohort with a more tailored curriculum) revealed more emphasis of Oppression Mechanics and Power & Privilege Awareness. The general pattern that emerged was that exposure to the historical roots of imperialism and capitalism, for example, lead to a more generalized understanding of how oppression operates on a systemic level in the present. Oppression Mechanics can be seen as a Saming effort in that all individuals exist under the oppressive systems, while no one
person or group of people are intentionally being prejudice or discriminatory. In other words, the oppressive systems disseminate power and privilege. Thus, we all live within Oppression Mechanics and we also share in the responsibility to be aware of these systems and the impact on others. This understanding of Oppression Mechanics lead to an awareness of how each individual holds power and privilege in the wider social systems. This process also appears to bypass common Agent Shame reactions.

Table 8
*Differenting/Saming Typography*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Intellectual Learning</th>
<th>Emotional Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differencing</strong></td>
<td>Cultural Difference MCT</td>
<td>Boxing In/Out</td>
<td>Agent Shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Power &amp; Privilege</td>
<td>Target Tokenizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Festival Bothing</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Agent-Bashing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of the Oppressed</td>
<td>Individual Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salad Bowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prejudice/Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saming</strong></td>
<td>Human Universals</td>
<td>Systemic Focus</td>
<td>Equality Hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of “isms”</td>
<td>Oppression Mechanics</td>
<td>Target Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimizing of Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meritocracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melting Pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7: LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, & CONCLUSION

Limitations of this study

Limitations, especially in qualitative research, can be better termed as the uniqueness of each study. One of the major limitations of this study was the time taken between the conception of the project, the first interview conducted, and the final write-up. There was almost a year between conduction of interviews and the final coding. Grounded theorists advise the time between interview and write-up to be short and done in isolation to stay fresh and as connected to the data as possible (Glaser, 1992). One possibility is that in the time between initial interviews and open coding and the final phase of selective coding/literature review/write-up, many external factors including discussions and readings could have influenced the rooted quality of the grounded theory process.

With this being acknowledged, a somewhat counter notion is that by allowing more time to consistently contemplate these concepts and abide by another grounded theory principle, “all is data,” then this time may have enriched the final product (Glaser, 1978). This is a further possibility because the final coding was a thorough selective coding process and included participant input before write-up.

Another limitation was that all research participants were from the same academic institution, limiting variability and introducing some material specific to that university’s culture. All participants were part of the same doctoral program, which emphasizes certain unique curriculum components, such as the ADDRESSING model.
Demographically, participants were mostly white women, which could result in the emphasis on certain concepts specific to these demographic factors. There were some men and students of color interviewed, and yet, there did not appear to be a major difference in the transcripts based on these factors.

A common dictum in grounded theory research circles is, “Grounded theory never stops.” This common phrase alludes to the fact that the constant comparison process can continue indefinitely. The experience of having a concept emerge at latter stages of coding and then going back to find the concept in already coded data is at the heart of the constant comparison process. A grounded theory researcher needs to know when to stop. As described in chapter 3, the stopping point results when a meta-conceptual theory that meets the four criteria and accommodates most of the data has clearly emerged. The limitation being, whatever the stopping point is, there is probably more to glean from the data.

Implications for future research

One of the goals of empirical research is to contribute to the fund of knowledge by both offering new conceptual material as well as expand existing research. Furthermore, the aspiration of empirical study is to conduct research with integrity. This study on emotionality and multicultural competency training attempted to achieve an addition and expansion to the existing body of research as well as utilizing research methodology that respected the subject of study.

Qualitative research can be a precursor to both quantitative and further qualitative exploration and this study is no exception. The findings of this study connect to multiple
domains concerning multicultural competency training and point to a variety of further research efforts, both qualitative and quantitative.

Qualitatively, more research could be conducted to confirm and expand the six conceptual categories identified in Table 4. Each of these conceptual categories occurred multiple times in the interview data, signifying relevance for the participants. Further research on any of the categories utilizing different qualitative methods, such as phenomenology, case study, or discourse analysis, would undoubtedly result in the expansion of viable knowledge. In addition, variability in demographics of the research sample, including solely students of color, gender, faculty, non-academic trainees and trainers, and regional factors, could allow for further generalizability of these conceptual categories across populations and settings.

Concerning the grounded theory of Agent Shame, quantitative methods could be employed to construct psychometric measures of Agent Shame for use in a variety of setting and purposes. This measure could be used to track Agent Shame throughout the educational process in order to prevent barriers to competency and indicate effective training models. Correlative methods could utilize the measure to assess for levels of competency effectiveness in the training process or in clinical settings.

The qualitative findings derived from the interview data, in combination with the pre-existing research on multicultural competency training, point to multiple hypotheses that could be tested utilizing a wide range of methodology. The most pressing of these hypotheses is testing the grounded theory of Agent Shame and the conceptual category of Oppression Mechanics. Some possible hypotheses include:
• Agent Shame is more likely to emerge when the study of oppressed populations and their history is devoid of Oppression Mechanic.
• Agent Shame occurs when the curriculum focuses on individual power and privilege differences.
• Cultural Difference Curriculum does not increase the competency domains of knowledge, skills, and awareness.
• A curriculum based on Oppression Mechanics will reduce the frequency and intensity of the Agent Shame reaction during multicultural competency training.
• Test the difference in emotional reaction and competency acquisition between a Cultural Difference Curriculum and a curriculum based on Oppression Mechanics.
• A curriculum that utilizes techniques that explicitly address and attempt to decrease Agent Shame (such as the suggestions from Parker & Schwartz, 2002) will increase competency acquisition.

The Differencing/Saming typography provides a general descriptive tool to categorize and analyze any multicultural material. It could be used as a measuring system to gauge if a curriculum weights more heavily on one end of the spectrum or the other. It could also apply to differing curriculum components, as a way to assess which lessons, activities, or readings have a more Differencing or Saming aspect. This can also help predict what type of emotional reaction may be more likely to occur during multicultural competency training.

The typography can also be used on a wider scale to analyze any social discourse that addresses the topic of multiculturalism or oppression, including educational, social, religious, or political ideas. As a general example, if used to analyze the rhetoric of the Republican Party regarding multiculturalism and oppression, we may find an emphasis on Saming ideas that promote equality as a philosophical base for meritocracy. While the
Democratic Party may rest on ideas of Differencing in which respect and tolerance for differences in ethnicity, religion, and economic class are emphasized as a basis for governmental policy.

Recommendations

Preliminary recommendations can be made based on the aforementioned hypotheses in the section above. The recommendations are based on the grounded theory that Agent Shame is more likely during multicultural competency training when cultural difference and power and privilege on an individual level make up the majority of training curriculum. In addition, Agent Shame can create a paradoxical effect in which students may actually avoid the topic of multiculturalism and oppression in order to circumvent the negative emotional experience of Agent Shame.

The primary recommendation based on the findings is to utilize a curriculum that uses Oppression Mechanics as its organizing principle. Introducing systems of institutional oppression while discouraging a focus on individual differences during the initial stages of training can provide for a constructive Saming effect, which decreases the likelihood for Agent Shame triggering. Consequently, the PC Game and Boxing In/Out dynamics may also be avoided by using this tactic.

As the training progresses, the study of how these oppressive systems came to be, the historicity of oppression, reinforces the Saming aspect and help relieve any emotional reactions around shame and blame. As students begin applying this historical and systemic knowledge about oppression to current situations, they will be able to
understand individual differences in power and privilege in a deeper way that does not rely on shame or blame as an explanation.

Other recommendations include utilizing the suggestions from Parker & Schwartz (2002) to avoid Agent Shame reactions, and attempt to monitor classroom discussion for PC Game/Policing type interactions. Also, be cautious when using any theoretical model, such as the ADDRESSING model, because emotional reactions can affect its understanding and utilization.

**Conclusion**

In response to increased globalization and an influx of cultural diversity in the United States, the American Psychological Association mandated multicultural competence for all clinical psychologists. The first step in fulfilling this mandate was multicultural competency training requirements for all accredited graduate programs. In 2002 the American Psychological Association offered principles to guide multicultural competency, but gave no clear direction for graduation curriculum, this has left the training field to develop training by a trial and error process.

Beginning with the American Psychological Association’s recognition of multiculturalism as an essential component in professional graduate training, the field has continued to make strides to obtain the goal of competency in the domains of knowledge, skills, and awareness. And throughout the last forty plus years, the field has produced numerous definitions, theoretical and developmental models, and academic curricula. Despite these accomplishments, it seems that multicultural competency training remains one of the most difficult educational endeavors, wrought with emotional triggers and curriculum related confusion.
This qualitative study, guided by the grounded theory method, explored the general area of emotionality and multicultural competency training. The research methodology and method were chosen to address the empirical mistakes of the past and find new ways to examine a topic studied by only a few researchers. Students of a doctoral program in clinical psychology were chosen as the participants in order to reveal what is working and not working in multicultural competency training. The participants shared their thoughts, feelings, memories, and suggestions through an open interviewing procedure. Using the classic Glaserian grounded theory method, the interview data was analyzed, and a set of conceptual categories emerged. With further refinement, a grounded theory and general typography was generated using the constant comparison process.

The interview data of this study reflected both emotional reactivity and theoretical confusion as sources of contradiction to the multicultural competency domains of knowledge, skills, and awareness. The grounded theory of Agent Shame encapsulated the most common emotional reaction that occurred for this study’s participants. In addition, it was the central and core concept for which all other concepts related. Agent Shame supported, as well as expanded, the current research base in the field of multicultural psychology.

Agent Shame also revealed a dramatic paradox in multicultural competency training; the goal of multicultural curriculum is to increase competency, yet the emotional effects of this curriculum may result in an aversion to the very competency areas it seeks to achieve. This paradox, and the grounded theory of Agent Shame, provides important
information for the effective training of competency by preventing debilitating emotional
reactions that can cause a long-term aversion to multicultural training.

The concept of Cultural Difference Curriculum indicated the majority of
theoretical confusion of students in this data set. The interview data and literature review
revealed the predominance of syllabi and curricula focusing primarily on cultural
differences between generalized ethnic groups. There were also some instances of
curricula that addressed power and privilege, but only in the context of individuals. This
curriculum seemed to create a dynamic explained by the Boxing In/Out category.

Both the Cultural Difference Curriculum and Boxing In/Out concept imply
theoretical confusion in multicultural competency training that should encourage a
thorough examination of training from foundation to education to application.
Agent Shame should be redirected to promote rather than prohibit competency.

The concept of Oppression Mechanics suggested benefits in an increase in the
study of the historical progression of governmental, financial, and educational systems
that institutionalize oppression. Oppression Mechanics also suggested a decrease in the
focus of cultural differences or individual prejudices in order to avoid the common
triggers of Agent Shame. Oppression Mechanics offers a promising new direction for
future training models and holds implications for new paradigm shifts in multiculturalism
at large.

The Differencing/Saming typography is a highly generalized descriptive model
that encapsulated all aspects of the interview data findings. It categorizes any curriculum
component, theory, idea, or opinion on a spectrum of Differencing to Saming.
Differencing simply means anything that emphasizes the differences between individuals
or groups of individuals, while Saming points to the common and shared aspects.

Applied to the conceptual categories and grounded theory of this study, the Differencing/Saming typography assisted in highlights which curriculum components were effective and not effective, as well as delineated emotional from more intellectual training approaches.

The concept of Oppression Mechanics and the Difference/Saming typography offer a new path for multicultural curriculum, one that requires the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Meanwhile, the concept of Agent Shame may prove to be an indication of expired curriculum components that may require modification or elimination. The findings offer new conceptual directions regarding both the method and content of multicultural competency training.

The ebb and flow of multicultural ideas in psychology reflect the dynamic shifts in our increasingly globalized society. The intention of these efforts is to fulfill the American Psychological Association’s aspiration for multicultural competency. Yet, multicultural competency training is in continuous flux of change, both responding to and influencing societal attitudes and norms. Unfortunately, as indicated by the findings of this study, multicultural competency training may hinder the goal that it seeks to achieve.

The efforts of the multicultural psychology field seek to instill competency in graduate students. The findings of this study indicate just another evolving change in the pursuit towards competency. As with any development in education, the ripple effects can be pervasive and dramatic. New paradigms in graduate training will be distilled throughout the professional community once students have matriculated. These findings will contribute to the ambition of multicultural competency training that can address the
psychological needs of our increasingly globalized society. On a wider level, this knowledge will influence society at large similarly to other psychological ideas.

Hopefully, this study will contribute to further multicultural competency training by decreasing negative emotional triggering and increasing curriculum content clarity, thus encouraging life-long competency acquisition.
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What provisions will you take for keeping research data private?

Confidential memos that may be done during or after the interviews will be kept under lock and key. After the conclusion of the research project they will be destroyed.
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Location: Antioch University Seattle
Day & Time: Fridays 9-12

Class Description:
Students practice basic attentiveness and listening tools in the Social Justice Practicum placement setting. Some class time will be utilized for peer group consultation. Familiarization into the culture and profession of psychology will be introduced. Class will also focus on program and campus support systems such as orientation to library searches, databases, other electronic resources at Antioch University Seattle, and specific information regarding Antioch’s Psy.D. program.

Course Objectives:
Psy.D. program competency: Career Development and Management Level 1: Student recognizes that clinical psychology is a professional role.
Describe the main features of the professional role of clinical psychologists in general and of the Antioch program in particular.

Competency: Relationship
Level 1: Student makes contact with clients.
Key performance ideas: Student passes Communications and Counseling Skills class; can supply video demonstrations of successful client contacts.
Understand and apply reflective listening skills for emotional communication, metaphoric communication and rule-governed behavior.
Understand and apply skills for the development and maintenance of empathy.
Recognize, understand and apply knowledge about inter and intra-personal conflict, congruence and its communication.
Understand and employ the self as an instrument in communication and counseling, with particular emphasis on intuition, intimacy, boundaries, and self-care.
Discuss and integrate knowledge of communication and counseling with Social Justice Practicum. Increase awareness of issues related to diversity in the Social Justice Practicum.

**Competency: Consultation**

**Level 1:** Student knows under what circumstances one seeks professional consultation (continuum endpoint: accepting consultation).

*Key performance ideas:* Student brings videotaped segments to supervisors or relevant consultants for case-specific review.

**Level 2:** Student can self-assess on those professional domains in which s/he is competent and those domains for which consultation is necessary, and can assess the client’s needs in light of those domains.

*Key performance ideas:* Student systematically delineates areas of strengths and challenges on a case-specific basis.

**Class Participation**

Students are expected to develop and maintain constructive working alliances with faculty and peers. They are to exemplify professional behaviors that support the development of basic relationship competency. Such behaviors include, but are not limited to, respecting confidentiality of material, requesting, receiving and integrating feedback, maintaining appropriate boundaries, cooperating in the creation of an atmosphere conducive to learning and an active, positive contribution to the learning experience.

**Evaluation:**

Student learning will be evaluated in terms of course outcomes and key performances by which those outcomes are demonstrated. Course outcomes are as follows:

- Student will supply audio, video, transcript analysis and photographic demonstrations of successful practicum participant contacts (*Competency: Relationship – Level 1)*

- Student demonstrates class reflective listening skills, development and maintenance of empathy, and consistent congruence with practicum participants and during class exercises. (*Competency: Relationship – Level 2)*

- Student presents relevant information from Social Justice Practicum to the instructor and to the class (*Competency: Supervision – Level 1)*

- Student will present split/screen video or audiotape review of a practicum participant interaction, considers, and implement options suggested by class and supervisor and write a reflective paper about the experience (*Competency: Supervision – Level 2)*
• Student can accurately identify and report on some influence of self and practicum client’s race/class/gender/culture on the counseling communication, particularly regarding communication of empathy, understanding of boundaries, congruence, intuition, intimacy and self-care. The student will include these considerations in the final reflection paper. (*Competency: Multicultural – Level 1*)

• Student recognizes that clinical psychology is a professional role. (*Competency: Career Development and Management*)

• Student can identify, locate, and summarize key concepts of research on any area of psychology, including evidence-based practice. (*Competency: Scientific foundations of research and practice – Level 1*)

**Key performance tasks:**

• Participation in class discussions and exercises.
• Present a literature review based on key-word search of library databases on a topic relevant to the class.
• Presentation to class of photography, transcripts, audio or videotape examples of interactions with a practicum participant, as required by class material. (This requirement includes at least one instance of class presentation and transcript in the first two terms of the Prac & Pro series). Discussion and integration of feedback.
• Personal weekly journal on class and practicum experience.
• Final reflection paper: A ten page paper (plus references) on Practicum experience.

**Cultural & Ethnic Issues:**
It is well established that cultural and ethnic issues play an important role in all psychological processes. This is true regarding cognition, emotion, and behavior and all forms of communication and counseling. Awareness and implications of cultural and ethnical will be encouraged.

**Readings:**

**Text (Required)**


**(Optional)**
Pipher, M. *Letters to a young therapist.*

**Additional Equipment:**
Digital camera
Audio recorder
The topics are subject to modification in accordance to class interest, level of knowledge and other requirements.

Appendix D: 2008 Multicultural Course Syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>PSYC 701-1: Counseling and Communication Culturally Diverse ( Practicum I), 3 credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter:</td>
<td>Fall 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor:</td>
<td>L. Tien, Psy.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Hours:</td>
<td>By appointment through email; I am at AUS on Friday PM and Saturday AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Liaison:</td>
<td>Alex Suarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Day/Time:</td>
<td>Fridays 9:00 – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Description**

The purpose of this course is three fold: introduce students to the basic counseling skills, familiarize students to the culture and profession of psychology, and facilitate knowledge of the graduate program as well as campus support systems, such as library database.

**Course Objectives**

Students will learn the following in the area of counseling skills:

1. Understand and apply reflective listening skills.
2. Understand and apply skills for the development and maintenance of empathy.
3. Recognize, understand and apply knowledge about psychology’s role in systems of oppression.
4. Understand and employ the self as an instrument in counseling and in social systems.
5. Discuss and integrate knowledge of communication, and social justice with Social Justice Practicum.

Students will learn the following in the area of the profession of psychology.
1. Develop a beginning concept of themselves as a psychologist
2. Describe the main features of the professional role of clinical psychologists in general.
3. Describe the difference between psychology and counseling
4. Understand the social responsibilities of psychology within US culture

Students will learn the following in the area of graduate program and university support systems:

1. Develop a degree plan toward graduation that incorporates both course based and skill based learning
2. Working knowledge of the Psy.D. program’s competency based evaluation system
3. Working knowledge of the AUS library system
4. Working knowledge of APA style for writing

### Competencies and Evaluation of Student Performance

Students have the potential to achieve the following competencies through class assignments from this course:

- Competency: Career Development and Management Level 1 and Level 2
- Competency: Relationship, Level 1 and Level 2
- Competency: Consultation, Level 1 and Level 2
- Competency: Supervision, Level 1
- Competency: Multicultural, Levels 1, 2 and 3

Students are encouraged to review their performance on each assignment to determine:

1. Which competency is addressed by the assignment
2. Which level of competency is met by the assignment
3. Whether to request a faculty review for posting into electronic portfolio
4. Once faculty concurrence is obtained, whether to post.

### Learning Experiences

The goals of this course will be accomplished through student’s participation in lecture, reading and presentations. Specific demonstrations of learning are:

1. Regular attendance in class.
2. Active participation in class discussions and exercises.
3. Successfully completing reading, written and oral assignments in a timely manner of the following:
   a. Reflection papers
   b. Self-evaluation
   c. Submit a literature review based on key-word search of library databases on a topic relevant to the class.
   d. Paper on topic of aspect of system of oppression
e. In-class presentation on topic of student’s paper
f. Role play, transcription and presentation to class of role play that demonstrates a listening skill, as defined through the readings.

Required Books


Recommended Book
APA Publication manual

Class Structure and requirements

Clinical Program Policy on Student Disclosure of Personal Information: Students will be asked to share personal information during the class exercises or in writing papers. The ethical guidelines of the profession stipulate that students are responsible for monitoring the boundaries of their own personal privacy and may refuse discussing certain forms of personal information. If assignments are experienced as potentially intrusive, students are encouraged to discuss alternative assignments with the faculty.

Class Participation: Students are expected to develop and maintain constructive working alliances with faculty and peers. They are to exemplify professional behaviors that support the development of basic relationship competency. Such behaviors include, but are not limited to, respecting confidentiality of material, requesting, receiving and integrating feedback, maintaining appropriate boundaries, cooperating in the creation of an atmosphere conducive to learning and an active, positive contribution to the learning experience.

Class Attendance: Students are expected to attend all classes and to actively participate in the creation of a learning community. Failure to attend 90% of the classes for a course will adversely affect a student’s assessment unless there are medical or emergency reasons for the absence. Failure to attend at least 80% of the classes will result in no credit for the course.

Paper: Write a paper and develop a presentation on the topic of your choice. Topic should be relevant to a system of privilege and oppression in the United States, e.g. ageism, sexism, homophobia, etc. Each paper and presentation is to contain (1) a
summary of the historical social and cultural development of the topic; (2) an understanding of the mechanism of oppression, e.g. one example of a micro-aggression; (3) an understanding of the privilege protected by the system of oppression/discrimination; (4) synopses of the salient points of dialectic in the current literature; (5) the rational that supports each side of the dialog, and (4) your own suggestions for how you as a clinical psychologist might intervene to effect the system of oppression. Please make sure you go beyond a description of the topic you have chosen. Please make sure that you give equal support and rational to all sides of the dialog in the literature.

You are to submit your paper topic the second week of classes. The paper should be no longer than 15 double-spaced pages, excluding title page and references. Each paper is to reference no less than 2 refereed journal article or book. Given the nature of the topic, you might find more references in material that is not peer reviewed. In such a case, please assure yourself that the reference is either unbiased, or that the bias is clearly stated. The paper is to follow the style delineated in the APA Publication Manual.

In-class presentation: Based on the material of your paper, you are to present and lead a class discussion on the topic of your choice. Please provide your classmates with minimum of two articles to read on the topic of your choice the week before your presentation. For your presentation, prepare in-class power point presentation that covers the content outlined for your paper. In addition, you are encouraged to include some type of in-class exercise/discussion that would deepen the understanding of how the system of oppression might manifest in future clients, and steps that might advance the professional dialog and practice of recognizing opportunities of support of human dignity. In-class exercise/discussion could include presenting a clinical case. If clinical and/or personal material is going to be presented, consent to reveal personal material to classmates and the instructor must be read and signed in advance of the presentation. (see, APA Code of Conduct 7.04). Remember to provide all relevant references in your presentation.

Reflection papers: Write no more than two page reflection paper. You are required to submit minimum of 6 reflection papers. Each reflection paper is to address the work of the previous week. You may select the weeks for which you do not turn in a reflection paper. Each paper should include your reflections on the class content of the week immediately preceding the submission of the paper and the reading assignment for the next class. For the reflections on class content, please give a brief summary of the content covered in class, your critique of the class material, and your reaction. For the reflections on reading material, please include (1) a brief summary of the reading material for next class session; (2) your reaction to the material covered in the reading material; (3) your critique of the material covered in the readings; and (4) any questions you may have re: either material presented in class or covered in the readings.

Literature Review: Conduct a literature review based on key-word search of library databases on a topic relevant to the profession of psychology. Submit (1) notes on the progression of your library database search and (2) annotated bibliography of the articles read. The length of the bibliography is guided by the topic chosen.
**Role Play:** Each student is to conduct an interview with an individual either at his or her Social Justice Practicum Site or with a fellow student. The content of the interview is a non-therapeutic, non-treatment discussion of a problem situation experienced by the speaker. The interview is to be videotaped; audiotape may be substituted if the interviewee does not consent to be videotaped. You are to transcribe the interview.

**Narrative of role-play interviewee:** write an analysis of your interviewee, based on your understanding of his/her social, cultural, family, and personal context at the time of the interview. Please distribute this write up to the class at least one day before your presentation. On the day of the presentation, please come prepared with the videotape, your analysis of the interviewee’s social/cultural/family/personal context.

**Presentation of role-play:** You are to select a 5 minute segment of the video tape in which you demonstrated a skill in listening, as defined through the readings.

**Reflection paper:** The week after your presentation of the role play, please include in your reflection paper the following: your affective state going into, during and post in-class presentation; your thoughts during the presentation; what meaning you derived from the classroom discussion of your presentation.

**Self-Evaluation:** You are to evaluate what you’ve done from the perspective of two goals: your own and those of the course. From your own perspective, consider what you wanted to accomplish in this course. Did you accomplish your own goals? From the perspective of the goals of the course, please reflect and evaluate your own work against the goals of the course. Please consider including specific class activities that aided and hindered you in the achievement of either your own or the class goals. Parts of your written self-evaluation will be incorporated into your student assessment.
Appendix E: List of Codes with Related Memos
Code: Boxing In/Out
Created: 11/25/2009 09:08:56 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/29/2009 01:31:18 PM
Quotations: 35

"The ADDRESSING model encourages categorization which is an extension of focusing on individual difference versus looking at Oppression Mechanics.

Can be a useful model to highlight the multiplicity of individual memberships but can turn into another form of difference focusing.

It also seems to trigger off agent-shame by explicitly acknowledging the P&P within individuals.

The prejudice/discrimination that is the focus of MCT asks that we don't categorize people. The ADDRESSING model then asks us to categorize in order to see P&P more clearly on an individual level. This creates an apparent catch22.

The boxes and categories can be applied to prejudice/discrimination and individual P&P...both frustrate students and lead to possible minimization.

In interview 4, the idea of sub-culture appears. We need to acknowledge sub-cultures but not dilute the bigger ADDRESSING model boxes.

This brings up the issue of individual identity versus our position in P&P/OM. These can be two different things. What we "choose" to be and what we are in terms of OM and history. Which some can be changed by political action and some are more solid.

How would Oppression Mechanics and History change it? More focus on how the boxes were created and morphed through history.

Related to OM, P&P, Individual Identity Politics, Difference Focusing

King/Queen of Pain - the tendency to compare target impact. My target status is worse then yours.
In 5, my disability status trumps my white status...go I'm good. I can't be an agent.
5, body image, religion, able-bodiedness all negate white power. Can they both co-exist? Both agent and target? Would this be different with a more guided history lesson to show that some statuses are more deeply ingrained in the OM throughout history?

How does Differencing/Saming apply? In 5, the differencing is that the ADDRESSING model points to white agent status, which could be perceived as wrong or bad. Then a Saming attempt by pointing out that target statuses negate and so we're all pretty much targets except for those white, rich, Christian men.

In 9, an example of feeling boxed in. Social identification versus personal identification. What society will perceive upon first glance and what you proclaim. Sexual orientation can be framed as personal identification, because of the privilege of passing. People of color and women cannot pass as agents.

In 10, an example of an Asian woman taking a MCT class. Statistics on Asian women were presented which claimed that it hard for them to progress in a career. The participant’s mom had been successful and told her not to let those statistics bring her down. Statistics/categorizations can be a for of self-fulfilling prophecy and negative influence because they look like the scientific "truth." A form of Saming, if you are a _ then expect _. Is this Differencing or Saming? Not clear.

In 14, clear statements that grouping doesn't work and promotes stereotypes.

What are the redeeming qualities of categorization? Is it needed to understand OM? Is it useful to reveal P&P?

Closely related to Cultural Difference vs. Oppression.

It's an act of Saming, in that the reaction is that very few individuals purely fit into the category definition.

Closely related or is a Festival Boothing Idea."

"Cultivate acceptance with an aspect of multiculturalism that has been a struggle."
"The old MCT dynamic in which targets were allowed to blame obvious agents in class for being active "oppressors, racists, or bigots."
No foundation of OM in which to contextualize the dynamic resulted in active blaming on a personal level.
The far spectrum of Differencing.

Property of Ineffective MCT
Property of PC Game
Prevented by OM
Will restrict P&P Awareness
Will cause Agent Shame, Emotional Shutdown"

Code: Agent Shame
Created: 11/25/2009 09:15:54 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/29/2009 10:18:50 AM
Families (2): Agent Shame, Power & Privilege Awareness
Quotations: 49

"An unpleasant emotion related to becoming aware of P&P. Shame versus guilt because I have this P&P that has been a part of oppression/isms, but I didn't mean to do anything. I'm not racist, sexist, etc. I didn't do those things.

Related to individual prejudice/discrimination versus oppression

Further define oppression - the mechanics that require haves and have nots. Capitalism, Imperialism, Consumerism, ...
Oppression mechanics define who holds P&P in it's many forms and creates systems of race, intelligence, gender, sexuality, religion, ownership, etc. in order to identify P&P holders.
This awareness can threaten our very livelihood and can illicit shame, anger, dissonance, etc.

5, being an obese woman appears to negate the innate power of being white. Is this equalizing power towards target flag-waving, or is this further differencing using multiple ADDRESSING model boxes? Confusion over which ADDRESSING box is worse. Does one negate the other?
Associate with "Box me in"
Possible new code "King/Queen of Target Pain" Target-flag-waving.
5 is a prime example of how Agent Shame creates resistance to further learning. What triggered it? The seeming invalidation of target parts for agent power. The commodifying of power and personal suffering. Individualizing Differencing without effective historical and OM Saming.

6, gives example of how increased in P&P Awareness over time produces a decrease in Agent Shame. Initial exposure triggered shame, increased exposure lead to forgiveness.
In 9, guilt/shame appeared to be a required stage for understanding OM/P&P. Reported that the shame was not left hanging in the class but was resolved somehow. A common report in other interviews is that the shame was left hanging and things felt unfinished. Students felt worse about MCT after the class was over and then either avoided it or shut down. (What gives MCT a bad name.)

In 11, agent shame is connected to anxiety and the question "what do I do now!" Can possibly lead to a kind of helplessness and checkout.

In 14, idea that if P&P awareness is pushed at an early developmental level, shut down will result.

In 15, direct reference to how OM helps reduce agent shame."

Code: All Accepting MCT
Created: 10/30/2009 01:45:48 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/03/2009 10:14:29 PM
Families (2): Agent Shame, Equality Hunger
Quotations: 1

"Multicultural competency means letting all orientations have all their say and all the time. Is there a PC idea under here? The illusion of equality that is a vital component of oppression mechanics. Systemic equality versus the basic equal value of human life. "

Code: Anger
Created: 10/30/2009 01:32:18 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/29/2009 09:51:48 AM
Families (1): Emotionality
Quotations: 13

"Anger at poor MCT teaching. Anger at the institution that is claiming MCT, but pushing difference out. Anger at injustice. Anger as a reaction to externalize Agent Shame. Anger as part of the PC Game? In 8, it was anger of being misunderstood as this student was trying to acknowledge and deal with her racism."
In 9, annoyed that the curriculum was not personally applied. That the classes did not position him within the larger OM. It had no personal insight potential."

Code: Bulldozing conformity
Created: 10/30/2009 10:07:18 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Quotations: 5

"Taken from the GT seminar. The institution insists on student fitting a certain criteria, despite economic challenges. This can perceived as classist.

Relates to Forced Assimilation and PC Game.

I 9, almost the same as Bulldozing Conformity."

Code: Class Development
Created: 12/03/2009 09:53:26 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:06:18 AM
Families (1): Agent Shame
Quotations: 1

"Stages of Class Development.

PC Policing as a young stage of class development. Result, student irritation.

Property of agent shame.

What about MCT promotes this stage or PC Policing?"

Code: Clinical implications of MCT
Created: 12/18/2009 01:14:20 PM by Super
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:09:38 AM
Quotations: 1

"See clients with an ever-widening perspective, not just as an individual or family but as a cultural and their place in the system.

Emerged around interview 11.

Created 12.18.09. There are more of them."

Code: Colonization
Created: 10/26/2009 02:13:42 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:15:34 AM
Families (1): Oppression Mechanics
"Colonization as a form of oppression."

A common definition of multiculturalism is that of exposure and knowledge of cultural differences. These include concepts of space, time, food, music, family, traditions, holidays, and religious beliefs. Not much on P&P/OM.

A focus on how cultural groups are different than each other without a recognition of oppression mechanics.

Also an assumption to since we have target status, we know all about MCT. Contributes to the token-effect in class where the most obviously different student is the representative for that entire group.

In interview 3, the participant was focusing on the vast differences between every individual. Sub-cultures and sub-cultures, until we logically reach...everyone is different. It also assumes that everyone is a target.

This does not equate to oppression knowledge.

Should there be a complete elimination of cultural difference in multicultural classes, or a balance of cultural difference as connected to P&P/OM.

Related to Target Flag-Waving.
Related to Festival Boothing.

The main point is that this idea of cultural difference is the prevalent understanding of MCT, almost no one talked about OM as part of MCT.

In 12, "looking at cultures being white and then looking at white from other cultures." This is a differencing move that bridges culture and OM."
"The experience of being with people from a different culture. Does this equate to cultural competence?"

Code: Difference beyond race
Created: 11/01/2009 11:36:46 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/09/2009 11:00:22 PM
Families (1): Difference vs. Oppression
Quotations: 3

"Acknowledgement that multiculturalism goes beyond race. Complete the ADDRESSING boxes."

Code: Difference vs. Discrimination
Created: 10/26/2009 01:41:14 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/06/2009 09:39:03 PM
Families (1): Difference vs. Oppression
Quotations: 1

"The knowledge of differences between individuals and groups versus how discrimination happens to individuals.

Is this different than Cultural Difference vs. Oppression? This focuses more on individual discrimination. Discrimination is a secondary symptom of Oppression Mechanics. The common mistake to individualize oppression, minimize it to prejudice/discrimination."

Code: Differencing/Saming
Created: 12/07/2009 02:34:30 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:16:03 AM
Quotations: 3

"Born 12.7.09
Differencing/Equalizing emerged in 4.

First usage in 5. 5, being obese and a woman negate the power differential of being white. Connection to agent shame, which comes up later in 5?"
I5, line 74.  Differencing using boxes to get to Saming.  I've got some many other target
statuses that we're all targets...there are only a few real agents.  So where does that leave
us?  We're all the same in being different.  Does this tactic ease Agent Shame?

Code: Effective MCT Instruction
Created: 10/30/2009 01:51:57 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/29/2009 09:52:32 AM
Families (1): Power & Privilege Awareness
Quotations: 13

"Effective MCT requires the instructor to have an awakening of their own."

Code: Emotional Awakening for Effective Teaching
Created: 10/30/2009 01:20:24 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 09:39:45 AM
Families (1): Emotionality
Quotations: 1

"Emotional learning assisted or hindered integration.

In Interview 3 we see an emotional reaction of "indifference" because of MCT confusion
over discrimination versus oppression mechanics cause a hindrance in MCT training.
The MCT Paradox - The intention is to increase knowledge/skill/awareness =
competency.  The method of MCT actually works against intention.

In 9, confusion was the first reaction to P&P awareness, and then effective teaching took
it to a level of clarity and insight.

In 12, respect and classroom rules were conducive to emotional learning.  Foster safety in
MCT may be more important than any other class."

Code: Equality Hunger
Created: 10/26/2009 01:54:11 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/29/2009 08:48:19 AM
Families (2): Agent Shame, Equality Hunger
Quotations: 7

"The desire to see everyone as having equal human worth.
We're all children of God.
We're all pink inside."
It's a small world after all.
Russians love their children too.

Ideal versus Everydayness.

In 9, OM/P&P appeared to decrease the equality hunger as a reaction to multicultural tension. The new response was working to understand the bigger OM systems, instead of trying to squelch the conflict with equality/saming ideas.

In 9, a great quote on how Saming was seen as a requirement to functioning. And with a new insight, there are nuanced levels of Differening/Saming all the time. The human condition.

In 10, an example of people making racial jokes and the participant tries to step back and remember that "this person is a person." And then try to not react.

In 14, an example of a white man saying that he didn't have anything to do with slavery and that people should just get over it.
A possible reaction to Agent Shame is anger and resentment at not being acknowledged for how the agent is trying to be good and not hurt people. There's no acknowledgment of their individual efforts.
This could also be the roots of Reverse Racism/Sexism.

A property of Agent Shame."
In 8, the practice of exposing ADDRESSING boxes by walking across the room. Visual display of held P&P was scary.

Category of Emotion:

In 13, a white man talking about walking into another MCT class and expecting targets to get angry and attack him. Part of the PC Game, in which targets experience is valued to the point at which they can express anger but agents cannot. One is empowerment and the other is racism."

Code: Forced Assimilation
Created: 10/30/2009 02:04:59 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:17:09 AM
Quotations: 12

"Claiming a value of cultural difference but valuing sameness. Possibly for the cause of smooth function and performance.

Psychology as a form of dominating or assimilation...is that all wrong? Or could there be some usefulness in there? Forced versus chosen assimilation.

How does this relate to Equality Hunger?

Forced Assimilation and Bulldozing Conformity appear to be very similar concepts, if not the same. Does this constitute a category?

In 14, example of two students of color being very quiet. When one did speak, it was methodical, possible to tease out if it would be okay with others. Example of how they were silenced in a way."

Code: Frustrated
Created: 10/30/2009 01:41:13 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/14/2009 02:38:18 PM
Families (1): Emotionality
Quotations: 6

"Frustrated at the level of MCT learning. Student felt further along than others and was impatient."

Code: Graded MCT
Created: 12/10/2009 10:03:34 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:03:27 AM
Quotations: 2
"In 8, participant brings up interesting point about doing some emotionally vulnerable work in a class in which students are evaluated and graded. This adds a pressure to say or do what is assumed to be "right" versus what is real.

Connected to PC Game, PC Policing. This could be a contributing factor to the PC Game. But not the direct cause because PC Policing doesn't always occur in the classroom and has no secondary gain in, say, a family setting."

Code: Grateful for exposure to oppression mechanics
Created: 10/30/2009 01:14:38 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:08:06 AM
Families (2): Power & Privilege Awareness, Oppression Mechanics
Quotations: 1

Code: Helplessness/Hopelessness in anti-oppression work
Created: 12/14/2009 10:30:48 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/20/2009 08:52:04 PM
Quotations: 1

"Code created 12.14.09, but the idea is embedded in other codes.

The idea that after understanding of OM and awareness of own P&P, there's a sense of hopelessness in the face of something so big. What effect can I as a single individual have on something that is so permeated into our system and our thinking?

Possibly part of agent-shame.

PC Game/Policing, agent-bashing could be a secondary reaction to this."

Code: History Exposure
Created: 10/26/2009 02:09:37 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/29/2009 09:28:13 AM
Families (1): Oppression Mechanics
Quotations: 12

"Reading historical accounts heightened awareness of oppression, not just specific discriminatory incidents.

Oppression over Culture.

Historical exposure could be of specific perspectives of the oppressed population, or it could show how Oppression Mechanics came to be and how they have been taken as solid-state truth.

MCT Curriculum seems to focus on the perspective of the target. "Let's really try to understand where they are coming from." So the historical component covers the civil
rights movement or slavery. This kind of history also seems to trigger off agent shame. Reactions can include: "I didn't do that." "I've got black friends." "I'm struggling and different too." (Individual versus systemic).

How would it be different if it covered the inception of imperialism, colonialism, capitalism, patriarchal philosophy, or the concept of race?

Part of Oppression Mechanics? Related to OM. The exposure to history, not just the history of the oppressed, but the history of pervasive mechanical systems, allows for a deep understanding of Oppression Mechanics. How it works, how it repeats over time and place, how it changes and evolves, how it stays the same, and how we fit into the larger machine. (Rage against the Machine)

History Exposure leads to/causes understanding of Oppression Mechanics. Is it required?

A property of OM.

Beginning in interview 6, History and OM seem to got together. Almost like the same code. Exposure to a certain type of history of the 'isms (imperialism, capitalism, colonialism, empirical) leads to OM and P&P."

Code: Illusion of Equality
Created: 10/26/2009 02:06:14 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:06:43 AM
Families (1): Equality Hunger
Quotations: 1

"Equality as the smokescreen or salve of the masses. Democracy/Equality is incompatible with Capitalism. The essential political paradox.

Relate to Equality Hunger?"

Code: Individual vs. System
Created: 12/03/2009 09:17:28 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/07/2009 08:58:09 AM
Quotations: 1

"Individualizing MC. Externalizing or Otherizing. The perspective that everyone is different and the goal of MCT is to recognize the difference.

versus

A systemic view in which we see the oppression mechanics at play, the power structures involved and position ourselves and the other into the bigger schema. This requires the
acknowledgment of P&P plus and courage to speak it. We then share a common struggle of living within the system.

Relates to Difference vs. Oppression Dynamics. It's a property of the core variable."

Code: Integrated MCT Curriculum
Created: 12/07/2009 09:24:26 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:12:51 AM
Quotations: 1

"Integrating MCT into all classes, not just one required Multicultural class and be done. Supported in the literature."

Code: Irritated
Created: 12/03/2009 09:52:04 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/06/2009 09:18:37 PM
Families (1): Emotionality
Quotations: 3

"Irritated at being judged as not MC or PC enough. Student of color.
Irritated at being a Token Educator. Student of color."

Code: MCT Causality
Created: 10/30/2009 01:29:06 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:17:03 AM
Quotations: 1

"Someone who drops out of MCT.
A dropout of a MCT class. Are there different kinds of causalities? This one was a target not being honored, or a culture clash causality.
Are there agent causalities that slip out without announcing it?"

Code: MCT Silencing
Created: 10/30/2009 01:42:01 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:17:09 AM
Quotations: 1

"The instructor silences cultural difference with an agenda of smooth class discussion, value-laden belief of good communication."

Code: Melting Pot
Created: 10/26/2009 01:56:14 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:16:38 AM
Families (2): Agent Shame, Equality Hunger
Quotations: 1
"Melt your cultural differences into the acceptable majority.

Related to Equality Hunger. How?"

**Code: Multicultural Definition**  
Created: 10/30/2009 10:21:37 PM by Jude Bergkamp  
Modified: 12/22/2009 09:40:09 AM  
Quotations: 12

"How the participant defines multiculturalism. Sometimes twice in the same interview. Taken literally from the word most of the time. Cultural difference.

Almost all of them are around cultural difference versus oppression. That's how they were coded."

**Code: No Difference**  
Created: 10/26/2009 01:53:15 PM by Jude Bergkamp  
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:16:03 AM  
Families (2): Agent Shame, Difference vs. Oppression  
Quotations: 1

"Refers to a polarity from Difference to No Difference. Like Bennett's minimizing."

**Code: Oppression Mechanics**  
Created: 10/26/2009 02:02:33 PM by Jude Bergkamp  
Modified: 12/29/2009 03:18:35 PM  
Families (2): Power & Privilege Awareness, Oppression Mechanics  
Quotations: 32

"Oppression - the systemic dynamics of the haves and have nots implicit in society. Mechanics - the philosophical framework that promotes or relies on oppression; capitalism, imperialism, consumerism. Powerful insight different than cultural differences. Oppression mechanics knowledge versus Cultural knowledge. Which is more applicable in psychology?"

Oppression Mechanics as a teaching tool involves four components:  
1. Historical roots of systems.  
2. Current system functioning.  
3. Positioning oneself within the systems.  
4. Contextualize and apply knowledge in specific situations.

OM, History, and P&P awareness appear to be causally linked. History leads to OM leads to P&P.
In 13, a white man reported that learning about OM allowed him to stop defending himself and more openly learn. In 13, learning about OM helped to drop the blame game. Or the PC Game of blaming the agents. "Less of who did what to whom and more on how it happened and justified. 13 makes it clear that focused curriculum and discussion on OM prevents agent bashing, agent shame, PC policing/game and increases P&P Awareness.

In 12, looking at all the different groups from a White perspective...which bridges cultural difference to OM."

Code: Oppressor - action tense
Created: 12/06/2009 09:12:43 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Quotations: 1

"Oppressor/Oppressed. This action/verb oriented language the rests on the assumption that an individual or even group of individuals has the ability to actively oppressed another. This seems to trigger off agent shame.

This could be the result of confusion between discrimination and oppression. Or a symptom of too much individual focus in MCT versus a wider and historic look at Oppression Mechanics.

Associated to PC Policing and Agent Shame.
Possible property of OM."
Associated with P&P awareness and OM."

"This assisted in learning integration. Widened the horizon."

"MCT as being tolerant, accepting, and welcoming of all differences. Being competent is knowing the right labels and a large general knowledge of different cultures (Native Americans don't like direct eye contact).

No matter if they contradict an academic agenda?

In interview 1 and 2, is it competent to allow a Native person to monopolize airtime?

In interview 3, confusion of being MC competent and being "sensitive" to individual difference. They may be related, but not the same.

In interview 4, the misconception that by incorporating PC language a solution is reached. This is not real change...no true awareness of P&P/OM has been achieved.

Interview 4, Diversity is about placating. If we find the right language then we can get over it.

In 8, diversity trainings focused on not saying things that sound racist or sexist.

In 9, not using a lot of terminology was helpful. Just naturally discussing what was happening in the material and the process. In 9, PC Game in corporate diversity efforts was Saming with language. Do not talk about difference and we'll all be the same and fine. "Don't ask, don't tell." Saming.

Connected to Effective/Ineffective MCT.

How did MCT communicate this type of Game? Did the PC Game come from the focus on cultural difference?
In 13, expectation of Agent-Bashing. The old MCT idea of blaming those with obvious agent status.
Agent-Bashing
Property of ineffective MCT
Part of PC Game
Avoided by OM curriculum and facilitation.

Code: PC Policing
Created: 12/03/2009 09:23:13 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/14/2009 02:39:39 PM
Families (2): Agent Shame, Power & Privilege Awareness
Quotations: 12

"A possible message in MCT is that once we understand what's "right and wrong" or adopt the PC language of the time, we are supposed to "speak out" and police those around us.

In interview 3, a minimization of an interpersonal interaction to an "oppressor/racist" misinterpretation. The confusion that in order to be MC competent means that we treat all minorities with respect all the time...even to the point of overlooking everyday interpersonal issues.
If MC competency meant being able to understand OM and contextualize the interaction in those terms as well, then there may be a different result.

I6, this person seemed very scared to be exposed for more mainstream beliefs that differed from the liberal culture of the school. The PC Game/Police was a big force here.

It may be a common stage in learning in which once we become aware of a phenomena, we see it everywhere. And then we need to speak up because that is what we are supposed to do. It could help reduce Agent Shame.

Is a property of Agent Shame and awareness of Oppression Mechanics?
Also a property of Old School MCT that focuses on individual cultural differences.

What about MCT promotes PC Policing or Agent Shame? Lack of focus on context, history, oppression dynamics.

In 14, an example of someone not PC Policing when it could be easy to do it. Did not do it because of the power differential and because the participant wanted to think things through."

Code: Personal discrimination = effective MCT instructor
Created: 10/30/2009 01:23:09 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 09:39:19 AM
Quotations: 3
"Being a target makes a better MCT instructor. Is this the myth that perpetuates only instructors of color teaching MCT classes? A token system of sort that encourages agent-shame?"

Code: Poor MCT Instruction
Created: 10/30/2009 01:49:33 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:12:32 AM
Quotations: 4

"The polarity of the effective MCT instructor. What makes a bad one? What makes a good one? How are these values determined, how well they are liked, how PC the language is, or how much P&P/OM is incorporated into the curriculum?"

Code: Power & Privilege Awareness
Created: 10/26/2009 01:46:56 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Families (3): Power & Privilege Awareness, Oppression Mechanics, Emotionality
Quotations: 35

"New awareness of the power and privilege that is unconsciously held. Does it increase or decrease agent shame? How does it differ from Oppression Mechanics?

P&P awareness positions the person within the Oppression Mechanics and dissolves the us/them, good/bad dichotomy that is a common remnant of MCT. In 14, the MCT instructor sets a clear and consistent message that everyone in the class holds some P&P by being a psychologist. Also, example of effective MCT.

In 14, the acknowledgment of P&P in the rules of communication and the amount of airtime taken by those in obvious agent status.

History of Systems/isms leads to OM which naturally leads to P&P Awareness. This process avoids the pitfalls of agent shame or Category reactions."

Code: Sadness
Created: 10/30/2009 10:14:43 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/29/2009 09:42:19 AM
Families (1): Emotionality
Quotations: 4

"Sadness due to MCT."

Code: Sense of differentness
"Is this a positive or negative thing? Is attempting to not see difference a way of avoiding our own P&P?"

Code: Shame - Activist Pressure

"Learning MCT means becoming an activities and trying to change things. Is this the desired effect? Or does it encourage avoidance of the topic?"

Code: Social justice in action versus PC policing

"In interview 3, faculty is confronted for being "insensitive" to a minority student, possibly a microaggression. Faculty responds with clear choices made to make social justice a lifestyle."

Code: Subtle Discrimination

"Exposure to individual experience of discrimination. Probably through reading or disclosure by target. How does this relate to competency? Raises knowledge? Still set in us/them framework?"

Code: Target Flag Waving

"In interview 4, the participant was focusing on the vast differences between every individual. Sub-cultures and sub-cultures, until we logically reach...everyone is different. It also assumes that everyone is a target.

This may be related to PC Game, in which MCT has encouraged a focus on blaming/shaming individuals with P&P. One way of avoiding this is to highlight our
target statuses in order to avoid the PC Police who will blame the agent individual for Oppression Mechanics.

Interview 4 - Origin
Associated with PC Game, PC Police, P&P Awareness, Difference Focus"

Code: Thought discrimination
Created: 10/26/2009 01:49:17 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 10/26/2009 02:18:29 PM
Quotations: 1

"No thought at all equates to prejudice/discrimination. Apathy. How we avoid thinking about it."

Code: Token Education
Created: 12/03/2009 10:06:27 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:11:49 AM
Families (1): Agent Shame
Quotations: 4

"A common dynamic in MCT classes that focus on cultural difference. Choose the student of color and "welcome" them to talk about their experience.

The "us & them" assumption.

Responsible of the majority of MCT faculty of color.

Property of Agent Shame. The welcoming shows we are not like the other Whites. We accept and welcome difference."

Code: Too much difference
Created: 10/30/2009 10:01:17 PM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:15:52 AM
Families (1): Difference vs. Oppression
Quotations: 1

"Difference on a spectrum. Be understatedly different and it's appreciated. Too much and it's detrimental."

Code: Worldview Clash
Created: 10/30/2009 01:59:49 AM by Jude Bergkamp
Modified: 12/22/2009 10:16:33 AM
Quotations: 1

"Cultural worldview too extreme to bridge.
Focus on cultural difference as a component MCT conflict.
Relates to Difference vs. Oppression