

## Chapter 2

# The Application of Critical Consciousness and Intersectionality as Tools for Decolonizing Racial/Ethnic Identity Development Models in the Fields of Counseling and Psychology

Richard Q. Shin

It is clear that racial and ethnic identity development models have made significant contributions to the fields of counseling and psychology over the past 30 years. The sheer size and span of the literature on these constructs demonstrate how impactful they have been on the fields (e.g., Atkinson et al. 1998; Cross 1971; Ong et al. 2006; Phinney 1989). These models have provided useful foundations for understanding the identity development processes and experiences that some people of color face.

The initial intention underlying these models was to help mental health professionals understand that people of color experience unique identity development processes as a result of oppression and marginalization. They were meant to push the mental health fields away from operating solely from a Euro-centric perspective. However, as the editors of the current book note, ideologies that initially are intended to disrupt the status quo always are susceptible to being co-opted or appropriated by dominant, hegemonic forces.

My primary motivation for writing this chapter is to create an honest and robust dialogue about negative, unintended consequences of the proliferation of racial/ethnic identity development models. I also am concerned with the question of whether we can transform this paradigm so that it can stay relevant in counseling and psychology theory and practice. I have no interest in denigrating the authors of these theories or in minimizing the positive impact that racial/ethnic identity models have had on countless folks of color. And for the purposes of transparency, I am a person of color who feels very grateful for being exposed to the concept of racial/ethnic identity development. I am a second generation Korean American, who lived and went to school in predominantly white contexts until college. Before I came into contact with racial/ethnic identity theories, I was extremely confused about my own racial/ethnic identity development. It is not hyperbole to say that I felt like a light bulb went on in my head the moment I was introduced to Phinney's (1989) ethnic

---

R. Q. Shin (✉)

Counseling Psychology, School Psychology, and Counselor Education,  
University of Maryland, 3234 Benjamin Building, College Park, MD 20742, USA  
e-mail: rqshin@umd.edu

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2015

R. D. Goodman, P. C. Gorski (eds.), *Decolonizing "Multicultural" Counseling through Social Justice*, International and Cultural Psychology, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-1283-4\_2

identity formation model. I was astonished to see how my own ethnic identity development process fit neatly into the model, and I felt a significant sense of relief realizing that my experiences were not abnormal. It is astonishing to me now to realize that I traveled through the stages in a relatively linear fashion.

However, over the years, my affinity for racial/ethnic identity development models has been tempered by my growing levels of critical consciousness regarding issues of racism and white supremacy in the USA. White supremacy has been defined as the securing of white racial hegemony through “a process of domination, or those acts, decisions, and policies that white subjects perpetrate on people of color” (Leonardo 2004, p. 137). I prefer to use the term white supremacy, rather than white privilege, because the former creates the conditions in which the latter can exist. My increased consciousness regarding white racial domination represents an evolution in my thinking, so that I can no longer view theories and models within the mental health fields in isolation from the various forms of systemic, institutionalized discrimination that continue to plague our society. Even though one of these models spoke so profoundly to my own personal life experiences as an Asian American, I am now fully aware that there are many folks of color in the USA who simply do not fit into any of these identity development frameworks. Promoting narrow, oversimplified depictions of people of color is just one example of how the counseling and psychology fields have colluded with the existing social, political, and cultural status quo. A combination of these factors led me to agree to contribute a critical examination of the racial/ethnic identity development paradigm for this book.

## **Racial/Ethnic Identity Development Theories**

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to provide a comprehensive review of all the prominent racial/ethnic identity development models. It also is not my objective to describe all of the most current iterations of these theories because my assumption is that most counseling and psychology educators and practitioners who are not experts on racial/ethnic identity development operate from their knowledge of the early forms of these theories. Having said that, in broad terms, racial and ethnic identity has been defined as the significance and meaning of race and/or ethnicity in people’s lives (Sellers et al. 1998). Though there is much debate about the level of overlap and/or distinctiveness between the constructs of racial and ethnic identity (Cokley 2007; Phinney and Ong 2007), in this chapter, the terms will be used interchangeably (racial/ethnic identity) because my analysis is directed at the common threads that bind many, if not all, of these models together. For instance, most racial/ethnic identity stage models describe a transformational process of the attitudes of persons of color from racial or ethnic self-denigration to pride and self-acceptance (Yi and Shorter-Gooden 1999).

The idea of racial/ethnic identity development unfolding through linear stages has been applied by a variety of scholars to African Americans (Cross 1971), Asian Americans, and Latina/Latino Americans (Kim 1981; Ruiz 1990), and across all

ethnic groups (Phinney and Ong 2007). Many of these models either explicitly or implicitly invoke a stage-like process whereby an individual begins with an uncritically accepted negative self-image or, at minimum, an unexamined or neutral racial/ethnic sense of self (Yi and Shorter-Gooden 1999). This beginning stage is then disrupted by a phase of active exploration and gradual rejection of the previously accepted idealized image of white culture and hegemony. The individual eventually arrives at a final stage of healthy integration, which includes the acceptance of one's racial/ethnic background as well as a respect for the cultural norms of other groups.

A number of theorists have revised their models to expand the meaning of the term *stage*. Helms (1995) replaced the term *stage* for *status* suggesting that the identity stages are permeable and not mutually exclusive categories. Other theorists acknowledged "blends of racial identity statuses" (Carter 1995, p. 125), as well as the notion that individuals cycle through some of the stages more than once as a result of contextual events that challenge their ethnic identities (Parham 1989).

## Overgeneralization and Essentializing

A common criticism of racial/ethnic identity stage theories, offered previously by several scholars, is the fact that the models fail to capture the vast intra-group differences in identity development within all racial and ethnic groups (Constantine et al. 1998; Yi and Shorter-Gooden 1999). This, of course, has been a constant tension created by traditional mainstream psychology, which has been so focused on developing universal, linear models to describe the experiences of large demographic groups. For example, Sue and Sue (2003) have asserted that the ethical guidelines and standards of practice among fields like counseling and psychology are significantly skewed toward universality so that approaches to treatment can appear to be appropriate for all groups. The propagation of categorical stage models is not surprising considering that the field of psychology, like other social sciences, is built on the Cartesian–Newtonian paradigm (Capra 1982), which demands a mechanistic, reductionistic approach to studying complex human processes (Prilleltensky 1994).

When we consider the complexity of constructs meant to reflect how individuals view themselves in terms of race and/or ethnicity, it seems almost nonsensical to rigidly promote theoretical models that are based on the assumption that all members of a particular racial group perceive and experience racial issues similarly. For instance, Constantine et al. (1998) have critiqued Black identity theories for not addressing the impact of the African Diaspora (i.e., the dispersion of West and Central Africans to the Americas through the slave trade) on the racial identity development of various subgroups of Black Americans. These models also are inadequate in their lack of consideration for immigrants who have developed a positive sense of ethnic identity in their native countries (Uba 1994) or children who have a strong positive ethnic identity (Cross 1995). It is also unclear how well racial/ethnic identity models can capture the potential nuances of identity development that occur in tight-knit ethnic enclaves that exist all throughout the USA.

On the one hand, the problem of overgeneralization associated with racial/ethnic identity models can be viewed neutrally and as a necessary byproduct or challenge of applying any psychological theory to the real world. Therefore, one might argue, “This has always been an issue with identity development models, so it is not any more of a problem with racial/ethnic identity theories as with other identity theories.” However, this argument ignores the socio-historical–political context in which psychological theories are promoted and practiced. Oversimplified, incomplete stories about people of color represent one of the ways in which the social sciences have helped to reify white supremacy in the USA. The many narrow and typically deficit-oriented theories regarding people of color have been termed “master narratives” (Montecinos 1995) and “majoritarian stories” (Solórzano and Yosso 2002) because they often are bound by the constraints of racism and white privilege. Hence, these stories “provide a very narrow depiction of what it means to be Mexican American, African American, White, and so on.... A master narrative essentializes and wipes out the complexities and richness of a group’s cultural life” (Montecinos 1995, p. 293).

One of the pillars that upholds white supremacy, patriarchy, heteronormativity, class oppression, ableism, and other forms of systemic, institutionalized discrimination is the widely held belief that there are genuine realities or *essences* that underlie socially constructed categories like race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and (dis)ability. It is upon this foundational ideology that dominant, hegemonic forces can provide the rationale or justification for hierarchical social arrangements (e.g., Latina/Latino Americans experience higher levels of poverty because they generally do not like to work hard). Recent research has shown that essentialist beliefs about social groups defined by gender, race, and sexual orientation are prevalent (e.g., Jayaratne et al. 2006), associated with the justification of social inequalities (Verkuyten 2003), and the endorsement of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination directed toward racial minority groups (Jayaratne et al. 2006; Keller 2005).

At its heart, essentialism is “unavoidably a philosophical concept, one whose definition and critique quickly gets us into arguments which are as old as philosophy itself” (Sayer 2008, p. 454). An in-depth exploration of this debate is beyond the scope of this chapter, but it is important for me to make clear that my critique about racial/ethnic identity reinforcing essentialist notions of race is not an all-or-nothing proposition. By this I mean that the literature on racial/ethnic identity development has in fact documented an important process experienced by some individuals of color, but it has also simultaneously reinforced essentialist ideologies about race. The racial/ethnic identity development paradigm in the fields of counseling and psychology simply represents a tradition known by political theorists as “the politics of recognition” (Snyder 2012, p. 249). The defining feature of the politics of recognition is the demand that a devalued collective identity be included, affirmed, and valued, in other words “recognized.” As stated at the beginning of the chapter, it is clear that the motivation underlying the racial/ethnic identity development paradigm was to problematize the ethnocentric, universalistic theories of human development. However, the exercise of engaging in the politics of recognition comes

with inherent dangers. The endorsement of distinct racial/ethnic identity theories for African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latino/Latina Americans contribute to fixed visions of collective identities that serve to reify hierarchical relationships both within and between groups (Markell 2003; Oliver 2001; Phillips 2007). Let me emphasize again that there is no clear answer to the question of whether racial/ethnic identity development theories do or do not contribute to dominant essentialist discourses about race, however, I am very troubled by the fact that there has been no serious dialogue about this consequential tension within the counseling and psychology literatures.

## Pathologizing and Assimilationism

One consequence of conceptualizing racial/ethnic identity development as a linear, staged unfolding is the crystallization of a supposed “ideal” or “normal” sequence, which naturally leads to implicit pathologizing of those who fall outside this pattern. Although clearly not the intent of the authors of racial/ethnic identity models, these theories have provided yet another tool in the hands of mental health professionals to diagnose members of marginalized groups with some form of deficiency. This is consistent with the long-standing tradition in the fields of counseling and psychology to transform oppressive, colonizing contexts into mental health disorders. Further, if a person of color dares to speak out in the face of a racially discriminatory situation, they can easily be “diagnosed” as having a primitive racial/ethnic identity. Take for instance the following conversation that the author experienced with a white colleague:

**Colleague:** I need to speak with you about my advisee, Derek.

**Author:** What’s the problem?

**Colleague:** He’s claiming that the reason he received a poor grade on an exam was the result of our colleague being racially biased.

**Author:** So how would you like to proceed?

**Colleague:** Well I think you should talk to him to let him know he’s wrong.

**Author:** How do you know he’s wrong?

**Colleague:** Well obviously our colleague isn’t racist and haven’t you noticed that Derek is in the immersion–emersion stage of Black identity development?

**Author:** No, I haven’t come to this conclusion about Derek’s racial identity. What makes you say he’s at that stage?

**Colleague:** Well, in addition to the fact that he’s making this false claim about our colleague being racist, I’ve heard he’s been very resistant to opening up in his experiential group. And it doesn’t appear to be a group issue because all of the other members have been very open and vulnerable.

**Author:** Isn’t he the only person of color in that experiential group?

**Colleague:** Yes and that’s just my point. Derek is untrusting and suspicious of his white group members even though none of them have done anything racist. In fact, I’ve heard they’ve been bending over backwards to make him feel safe and comfortable, but he still won’t open up. Unfounded feelings of anger and mistrust are hallmarks of people of color who have stunted racial identities.

This interaction made it clear to me how white counseling professionals could easily interpret people of color as unable to accurately identify racist situations if it is perceived that they have not reached the “highest” stages of racial/ethnic identity reflecting a “healthy acceptance of both dominant and minority cultural group components” (Sneed et al. 2006, p. 73).

It should not be surprising at all to social justice counselors and psychologists that racial/ethnic identity models could be so easily manipulated to support and reify white supremacy. All of these models are susceptible to the fundamental limitations of developmental stage theories in general. With identity stage models, development is seen as a process of “maturational unfolding...in which immature stages of lesser organization and differentiation are succeeded by more mature, complex, adaptive equilibria” (Steenbarger 1991, p. 288). These models inherently promote the notion that there is an “ideal” or “normal” developmental process, which leads to implicit pathologizing of the diverse range of life trajectories experienced by individuals. It is both insidious and convenient how racial/ethnic models can be used to “assess” people of color. Let us put this dynamic into context by considering some very important socio-cultural–historical factors.

Assimilationism or cultural hegemony is “the systemic tendency of one culture to negate another” (Berbrier 2004, p. 484). From the earliest days of the USA, “humanity” was defined as male, white, and propertied. In the case of African slaves in the USA, they were literally reduced to a fraction of a human being when the government classified slave representation to three fifths of a person. The colonization and attempted genocide of Native peoples in the USA were grounded in the belief that Native people were inherently inferior to European whites. And certainly, the long history of exclusion, violence, and discrimination aimed at Asians and Latinos/Latinas in the USA was justified through the dehumanization of these racial/ethnic groups. Articulated succinctly by Leonardo (2004), “It is easy to see that the white supremacist...subject represents the standard for human, or the figure of a whole person, and everyone else is a fragment” (p. 139).

The source of the problems associated with racial/ethnic identity models do not necessarily lie in the frameworks themselves. As opposed to acculturation models, which have been criticized for being apolitical and decontextualized (Bhatia and Ram 2009), almost all racial/ethnic identity models reference the damaging effects of racism on the psyche of people of color. The challenges stem from the fact that these models are embedded in the fields of counseling and psychology, which have been dominated by white privilege and mainstream values like extreme individualism, and the concomitant strong bias toward framing human problems in “apolitical, intrapsychic, and deficit-oriented diagnoses” (Prilleltensky 1997, p. 526). It is this context that has allowed racial/ethnic models to be used as tools for colonization. Like in the example described above, practitioners or educators with lower levels of critical awareness around issues of race and racism may be more inclined to conceptualize difficult cross-racial situations as a deficit within the person of color instead of as the result of a potentially oppressive context.

Another problem apparent in the case example above is the way that racial/ethnic identity development models can be used to support the assimilationist narrative

directed at people of color. Examples of the subtle assimilationist messages embedded in some racial/ethnic identity models include phrases like, “have developed an inner sense of security and now can own and appreciate unique aspects of their culture as well as those in US culture” (Sue and Sue 2003, p. 225), “Identification for or against white culture is no longer an important issue” (Sue and Sue, p. 213; describing Kim’s (1981) model of Asian American identity development), “Individuals at this stage have abandoned anger toward the majority group” (Phinney 1996). All of these descriptors are associated with the highest or most advanced stages in each of the models. Clearly, this is extremely problematic because it reinforces the dominant societal narrative that people of color “just need to get over” their exaggerated feelings of anger and resentment about racism because we are now supposedly living in a post-racial society. Pathologizing the legitimate anger experienced by people of color is also a byproduct of the individualistic bias in the fields of counseling and psychology, which sets the stage for victim blaming or holding “individuals responsible for the causes of and solutions to their problems” (Nelson and Prilleltensky 2005, p. 5). Now again, examining the descriptions of the stages described above without considering the systems of white hegemony and domination that exist in the contemporary US society does not necessarily illuminate the problem. However, if we do consider the pervasive forces of white supremacy in our society, then we can see how mental health professionals who are just as susceptible to internalizing prejudiced and stereotypical depictions of people of color as anyone else can use racial/ethnic identity models to: (1) conclude that a person of color is not a fully developed human being, and (2) challenge the accuracy of a person of color’s perceptions of whites and racially discriminatory situations.

## Intersectionality

One of the most common critiques of the racial/ethnic identity development paradigm is that the models fail to consider all of the other critical social identity categories that affect individuals’ lives (Constantine et al. 1998; Yi and Shorter-Gooden 1999). Some of these identities provide access to unearned privileges while others result in exploitation and marginalization. In the contemporary US society, dominant social identities include being white, male, middle class, heterosexual, and physically/mentally abled. Devalued and marginalized groups include people of color; women; poor and working class people; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered individuals; and those with (dis)abilities (Johnson 2006). Most persons occupy both privileged and oppressed social locations. Take for instance a heterosexual identifying, Asian American woman. Due to her status as a woman of color, she is subjected to patriarchy and white supremacy, whereas her heterosexual identity affords her privileges associated with being a member of the dominant sexual orientation group.

Simply put, people of color in the USA are incredibly diverse in terms of age, class, gender, sexual orientation, immigration status, historical and contemporary



experiences with oppression, generational level, and many other important socio-demographic variables. Ignoring some of these critical social identity categories and/or continuing to privilege race in discussions focused on oppression silences the pervasive damages caused by patriarchy, heteronormativity, class oppression, ableism, and other forms of systemic, institutionalized discrimination. This process is contradictory to Audre Lorde's insistence that we must not support a "hierarchy of oppressions" (1983). Privileging the suffering of one marginalized group over others significantly interferes with the development of coalitions aimed at liberating all those who are negatively impacted by systems of power and privilege.

It is sadly apparent that the racial/ethnic identity paradigm in the fields of counseling and psychology is painfully outdated when juxtaposed with the growing demands by feminist, critical, social justice counselors and psychologists to critically and simultaneously analyze the many intersecting social identities that affect everyone's lives. Unfortunately, this limitation is inherent in the broader "multicultural" and "diversity" education movements (Andersen and Collins 2007; Manning 2009), which foster a comparative instead of relational understanding of oppressive systems in society. This is why contemporary multicultural-social justice counselors and psychologists are adopting frameworks like the *matrix of domination*, which focus on the oppressive structural patterns that bind systems of discrimination like racism and heteronormativity together (Andersen and Collins). This analytic frame is consistent with the growing emphasis on social justice in the counseling and psychology fields (Toporek et al. 2009; Vera and Speight 2003) because it positions professionals to think critically about transforming structures instead of continuing to simply document the effects of various forms of discrimination on marginalized peoples. At minimum, moving toward a framework like the matrix of domination in the fields of counseling and psychology will require educators, researchers, and practitioners to supplement the use of racial/ethnic identity development models with theories that focus on other systemic, institutionalized forms of discrimination like patriarchy, heteronormativity, class oppression, ableism, and religious discrimination. Ideally, I would like to see the development of more comprehensive theoretical models and assessment measures that shift the current emphasis on marginalized individuals' identities toward their awareness of the interrelationships of the forms of oppression listed above.

## Critical Consciousness

We may not have to search far for a useful tool for decolonizing the racial/ethnic identity development paradigm. Let us call back the spirit of an early psychologist and priest, Ignacio Martin-Baro, who served as the architect for the psychology of liberation (Comas-Diaz 2007). The psychology of liberation places at the forefront the goal of increasing people's awareness of oppression and of the ideologies and inequitable structures that keep them marginalized and oppressed. Because Paulo Freire's (1973) concept of *conscientization* or *critical consciousness* lies at the heart



of the psychology of liberation, increased awareness must be coupled with enhancing a sense of agency and empowerment among members of marginalized groups. Feminist, critical, and liberation psychologists have long been in the process of transforming traditional psychological theories to place a greater emphasis on oppressive sociopolitical conditions (Evans et al. 2005; Prilleltensky 1997). There is a clear need for this process to take place with the racial/ethnic identity development paradigm.

The first step in decolonizing racial/ethnic identity models is to move the focus of these theories away from individual, intra-psychic interpretations. Unfortunately, the counseling and psychology fields continue to privilege individual level conceptualizations and interventions, which is inconsistent with the increasing awareness of how systemic, institutionalized barriers are the root cause for many of the psychological and social difficulties experienced by members of marginalized groups (Fouad et al. 2006; Prilleltensky 1997; Vera and Speight 2003). Conversations about the racial/ethnic identity of a client or student of color should always include a consideration of critical consciousness. Critical consciousness is an ideal tool for understanding the deleterious effects of white supremacy on the hearts and minds of individuals of color because the construct itself places a spotlight on oppression in all its forms and demands action against social and economic inequities. (For examples on how to incorporate critical consciousness into psychotherapy and research, see Comas-Díaz 2007; Watts et al. 2003.) This stands in stark contrast to racial/ethnic identity theories that afford acritical, unaware educators and practitioners another tool for assessing people of color as deficient.

Racial/ethnic identity models may also be decolonized by drawing from the concept of intersectionality. In practice, this would mean that whenever an educator or practitioner is considering a person of color's racial/ethnic identity, they would also attend to their other intersecting social identities. When working with persons of color, to increase their critical consciousness of the ways in which white supremacy has impacted their lives, there may also be a need to increase their awareness of how other forms of cultural hegemony (i.e., patriarchy, heteronormativity) have affected them. An excellent example of how to target issues associated with oppression *and* privilege in a clinical context is a framework called the cultural context model (CCM; Almeida et al. 2007), which has emerged out of the family therapy field. What makes this approach exceptional is the fact that therapists are given the charge never to privilege one discourse of oppression over others. For instance, when working with a Mexican American family, patriarchy, white supremacy, and homophobia may all need to be addressed simultaneously to achieve the highest level of safety and well-being for each family member. Following the principles of intersectionality, CCM therapists provide opportunities for their clients to gain awareness of how they can use their privileged social identities to participate in the liberation of other devalued and marginalized groups. Allies, or those who use their dominant status in a particular social identity category to advocate for the marginalized group, are crucial to the work of social justice (Munin and Speight 2010). As Audre Lorde (1984) states so eloquently while describing Paulo Freire's message in *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), "the true focus of revolutionary change

is never merely the oppressive situations which we seek to escape, but that piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us..." (p. 123).

## Conclusion

This chapter provided a critical analysis of the unintended negative consequences that the racial/ethnic identity paradigm has had in the counseling and psychology fields. The constructs of critical consciousness and intersectionality were offered as essential tools for the process of decolonizing racial/ethnic identity development models. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, my primary goal is to stimulate an honest and critical dialogue in the counseling and psychology fields because there simply has been no robust counter-narrative regarding the proliferation of this paradigm. Initiating such a professional exchange will be a necessary first step in assuring that these important theories in the multicultural counseling movement are not unintentionally reifying white racial hegemony and other forms of systemic, institutionalized discrimination.

## References

- Almeida, R., Vecchio, K. D., & Parker, L. (2007). Foundation concepts for social justice-based therapy: Critical consciousness, accountability, and empowerment. In E. Aldarondo (Ed.), *Advancing social justice through clinical practice* (pp. 175–206). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Andersen, M. L., & Collins, P. H. (2007). Why race, class, and gender still matter. In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class and gender: An anthology* (pp. 1–16). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1998). *Counseling American minorities*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Berbrier, M. (2004). Assimilationsim and pluralism as cultural tools. *Sociological Forum*, 19, 29–61.
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2009). Theorizing identity in transnational and diaspora cultures: A critical approach to acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33, 140–149.
- Capra, F. (1982). *The turning point: Science, society, and the rising culture*. New York: Bantam.
- Carter, R. T. (1995). *The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy-toward a racially inclusive model*. New York: Wiley.
- Cokley, K. (2007). Critical issues in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity: A referendum on the state of the field. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 224–234.
- Comas-Diaz, L. (2007). Ethnopolitical psychology: Healing and transformation. In E. Aldarondo (Ed.), *Advancing social justice through clinical practice* (pp. 91–118). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Constantine, M. G., Richardson, T. Q., Benjamin, E. M., & Wilson, J. W. (1998). An overview of Black racial identity theories: Limitations and considerations for future theoretical conceptualizations. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 7, 95–99.
- Cross, W. E. Jr. (1971). Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of black liberation. *Black World*, 20, 13–27.

- Cross, W. (1995). The psychology of nigrescence: Revisiting the cross model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & D. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 93–122). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Evans, K. M., Kincade, E. A., Marbley, A. F., & Seem, S. R. (2005). Feminism and feminist therapy: Lessons from the past and hopes for the future. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 83, 269–277.
- Fouad, N. A., Gerstein, L. H., & Toporek, R. L. (2006). Social justice and counseling psychology in context. In R. L. Toporek, L. Gerstein, N. Fouad, G. Roysircar, & T. Israel (Eds.), *Handbook for social justice in counseling psychology: Leadership, vision, and action* (pp. 1–16). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Freire, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.
- Helms, I. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In I. G. Ponterotto, I. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & D. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181–198). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Jayarathne, T. E., Ybarra, O., Sheldon, J. P., Brown, T. N., Feldbaum, M., Pfeffer, C. A., & Petty, E. M. (2006). White Americans' genetic lay theories of race differences and sexual orientation: Their relationship with prejudice toward Blacks, and gay men and lesbians. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 9, 77–94.
- Johnson, A. G. (2006). *Privilege, power, and difference* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw
- Keller, J. (2005). In genes we trust: The biological component of psychological essentialism and its relationship to mechanisms of motivated social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 686–702.
- Kim, J. (1981). The process of Asian American identity development: A study of Japanese American women's perceptions of their struggles to achieve personal identities as Americans of Asian ancestry. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 155 1A (University Microfilms no. 81-18080).
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36, 137–152.
- Lorde, A. (1983). There is no hierarchy of oppressions. *Bulletin: Homophobia and Education*, 14(3/4), 9.
- Manning, K. (2009). Philosophical underpinnings of student affairs work on difference. *About Campus*, 14(2), 11–17.
- Markell, P. (2003). *Bound by recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Montecinos, C. (1995). Culture as an ongoing dialogue: Implications for multicultural teacher education. In C. Sleeter & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference* (pp. 269–308). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Munin, A., & Speight, S. L. (2010). Factors influencing the ally development of college students. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 43, 249–264.
- Nelson, G., & Prilleltensky, I. (2005). *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and well-being*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oliver, K. (2001). *Witnessing: Beyond recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ong, A. D., Phinney, J. S., & Dennis, J. (2006). Competence under challenge: Exploring the protective influence of parental support and ethnic identity in Latino college students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29, 961–979.
- Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological nigrescence. *Counseling Psychologist*, 17, 187–226.
- Phillips, A. (2007). *Multiculturalism without culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9, 34–49. doi:10.1177/0272431689091004.
- Phinney, J. S. (1996). Understanding ethnic diversity: The role of ethnic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 143–152.
- Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 271–281. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271.

- Prilleltensky, I. (1994). *The morals and politics of psychology: Psychological discourse and the status quo*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Prilleltensky, I. (1997). Values, assumptions, and practices: Assessing the moral implications of psychological discourse and action. *American Psychologist*, 52, 517–535.
- Ruiz, A. S. (1990). Ethnic identity: Crisis and resolution. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 18, 29–40.
- Sayer, A. (2008). Essentialism, social constructionism, and beyond. *The Sociological Review*, 45, 453–487.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 18–39.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8, 23–44.
- Sneed, J. R., Schwartz, S. J., & Cross, W. E. Jr. (2006). A multicultural critique of identity status theory and research: A call for integration. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 6, 61–84.
- Snyder, G. F. (2012). Multivalent recognition: Between fixity and fluidity in identity politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 74, 249–261. doi:10.1017/S0022381611001563.
- Steenbarger, B. N. (1991). All the world is not a stage: Emerging contextualist themes in counseling and development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 288–296.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Toporek, R. L., Lewis, J. A., & Crethar, H. C. (2009). Promoting systemic change through the ACA advocacy competencies. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87, 260–268.
- Uba, L. (1994). *Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health*. New York: Guilford.
- Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 31, 253–272.
- Verkuyten, M. (2003). Discourses about ethnic group (de-)essentialism: Oppressive and progressive aspects. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 371–391.
- Watts, R. J., Williams, N. C., & Jagers, R. J. (2003). Sociopolitical development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31, 185–194.
- Yi, K., & Shorter-Gooden, K. (1999). Ethnic identity formation: From stage theory to a constructivist narrative model. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 36, 16–26.

Decolonizing "Multicultural" Counseling through Social  
Justice

Goodman, R.D.; Gorski, P.C. (Eds.)

2015, XIV, 174 p. 2 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-4939-1282-7