8-1-2013

In Our Own Backyard: A Qualitative Investigation of Marginalized and Dominant Perspectives on White Privilege in Counseling Psychology Training Programs

Steven Matthew Andrews

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, smandrooz@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations

IN OUR OWN BACKYARD:
A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF MARGINALIZED AND DOMINANT
PERSPECTIVES ON WHITE PRIVILEGE IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING
PROGRAMS

by

Steven M. Andrews

B.S., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2007
M.A., Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2009

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
August 2013

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

IN OUR OWN BACKYARD:
A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF MARGINALIZED AND DOMINANT
PERSPECTIVES ON WHITE PRIVILEGE IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING
PROGRAMS

By

Steven M. Andrews

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the field of Counseling Psychology

Approved by:

Kathleen Chwalisz, Chair

Meera Komarraju

Cynthia Sims

Patrick Rottinghaus

Yu-Wei Wang

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
June 26, 2013

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

STEVEN ANDREWS, for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in PSYCHOLOGY, presented on JUNE 26, 2013, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: IN OUR OWN BACKYARD: A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF MARGINALIZED AND DOMINANT PERSPECTIVES ON WHITE PRIVILEGE IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAMS

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Kathleen Chwalisz

Systemic racism endures in the United States (Feagin, 2010). The race-related barriers experienced by trainees of color in counseling, clinical, and school psychology programs (Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011) reflect this reality. Focusing exclusively on the barriers confronting people of color, though, can distract from the benefits and power that Whites accrue to maintain a system of privilege and oppression.

Recently, counseling psychologists have recognized the critical importance of understanding social privilege (Israel, 2012) and its unique features based on context (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001). However, the study of White privilege within counseling psychology training is an underrepresented area of the literature. To address this gap and more deeply explore racial inequities in training, interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith, 1996) was used to guide a qualitative exploration of White privilege in counseling psychology training programs. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with advanced-level doctoral trainees in APA-accredited programs. In addition to recruiting White trainees, Black participants were also recruited to honor a marginalized perspective on White privilege.

Encounters with White privilege in training were particularly salient and painful for Black participants. White participants identified a number of unearned racial advantages, and other unacknowledged privileges in their accounts were revealed through analysis. Emerging superordinate themes and subthemes from each subsample are presented separately and then

i

examined concurrently. Recommendations for counseling psychology training programs are

made, and a developing list of White privileges in training environments is presented.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This list of acknowledgments could easily become a second dissertation. Quite simply, I have a ton of people to thank. A ton of people to whom I owe the completion of this research project. This is not mine. It's ours.

First and foremost, to the participants of this study, you devoted so much time and effort to this project. I know that many of you had to flex and challenge yourselves personally and professionally to participate in a study that dealt with very difficult topics. I hope that I have done your ideas and experiences justice. Also, I hope you understand that particularly critical interpretations of your responses and language were not an attempt to disparage your contributions, but rather to deconstruct and deeply explore the phenomenon of White privilege— the ultimate goal being empowerment of those in our field to self-reflect and change appropriately.

Kathie, you have truly been a caring and dependable presence throughout my graduate experience. Thank you for the years of talks, meetings, patience, support, guidance, and of course, coffee and tea. And considering how much I love sharing ideas, thank you for always pushing me to do so clearly and simply. I will miss you.

Soumya, you are such a special and easy friend. Even though you're too humble to ever admit it, your creativity and brilliance have left an indelible mark on this project. Oh, and Ian, I am so grateful for your professional input. I'm sorry there were too many periods in earlier drafts of my dissertation. I tried to replace some with commas and semi-colons.

Meera, thank you for teaching me to be a better teacher and always making time in your busy schedule for me, whether to address my pressing questions, or to participate in thesis and dissertation meetings. You have been an integral part of my graduate training. I will never

iii

forget your enthusiasm and patience.

Dr. Sims, although we didn't work closely together and I was not a student of yours, thank you for reaching across disciplines to be a member of my committee. I especially appreciate you urging me early on to more explicitly state the implications of my research. Keeping those implications in mind kept me motivated.

Yu-Wei, I'm sorry that I had to change the date of the defense meeting. I really wish you could have "joined" us via Skype. Your e-mail response to me when I felt overwhelmed by the demands of qualitative research had me on the verge of tears (in a good way). I felt completely validated. Thank you for saying just what I needed to hear to keep on moving.

Pat, thank you so much for your willingness to join my committee with little notice. I have enjoyed working with you in a variety of capacities. You've kept me connected to the very important world of vocational psychology. You didn't have to invite me to collaborate on various projects, but you did. And that has meant a great deal to me.

Ann, although you were unable to attend the defense meeting, I am thinking of you. To me, you are still a member of this committee. Without you, I'm not sure this study would exist. Thank you for teaching me to ask hard questions and question easy answers.

To every friend and family member who asked me how school was going, or how my dissertation was coming along, it really helped me to persist. And thank you especially to Jeff, J.F., Jason, Eric, Patrick, and Emily for letting me crash at your places when I needed a change of setting.

Stephanie and Rob, I know that your job was to run a business, not accommodate my schedule. Bearing this reality in mind, your flexibility and patience during this year provided me with the time I needed to make this a successful project. Thank you.

Christian, thank you for being such a close cohort buddy over the years. Laughing with you kept my heart light and my mind resilient throughout graduate school. Your personal and professional talents amaze and inspire me.

Val, I am a different and better person because of you. The amount of encouragement and problem-solving you provided as I dissertated was absolutely invaluable. I could never repay you for your support. Thank you for always making time. You are an incredible friend who I would trust with anything. No one could ever come close to replacing your presence in my life. I love collaborating with you on this multifaceted research project we call life!

And Mom and Dad. Oh, dear. This could be a third dissertation. How do I begin to share my gratitude for all you've done for me? Rather than thanking you for everything, I'll stick to the past year for the sake of brevity. I want you to know that I recognize the endless accommodations and sacrifices you had to make while I was in your space transcribing, analyzing, and writing. Thank you for the meals, the proofreading, and your endless encouragement. Mom, your office is yours again. Dad, no more jars of homemade kefir in the fridge (after next month). I love you both with all of my heart.

Finally, related to the research that follows, I want to affirm here in this public document that I will commit my life's work to a responsible use of privilege to undermine systems of oppression. Too many have been hurt and continue to be. Too many have been unaware and continue to be. This life is beautiful and we all deserve to experience it that way, free from the constraints of oppression and disconnection of privilege.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

viii

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Perry (2007) tersely clarified, "Racism is real. 'Race' is not" (p. 1). Race is a social construction, but because it has been constructed and reified throughout a history of domination of people of color by White people, race has real implications for real people (McIntyre, 1997). In recent decades, scholars from a variety of disciplines have acknowledged a glaring problem with dialogues about racism. Namely, when racism is viewed as a problem faced by "others" (i.e., people of color), there is a tendency to overlook how certain people (i.e., White people) benefit from the disadvantage of others in a "system of racial oppression" (Neville, Worthington, & Spanierman, 2001, p. 260). It is through this critique of the discourse on racism that the concept of White privilege is ushered in. According to Rothenberg (2008), "White privilege is the other side of racism" (p. 1). Spanning the levels from individual to society, White people reap, often inconspicuously and unconsciously, unearned advantages because of the power and superiority ascribed to White culture and assumed by White people (McIntosh, 1988). This is the essence of White privilege.

As a part of the larger social fabric, the history of psychology is laden with racism and Eurocentrism (Guthrie, 1998; Katz 1985). In professional disciplines in psychology, the symptoms of imbedded racism and White privilege are evident in the disparate experiences of White trainees and trainees of color in professional training programs (Clark, Mercer, Zeigler-Hill, & Dufrene, 2012; Maton, Wimms, Grant, Wittig, Rogers, & Vasquez, 2011). The proposed study is a phenomenological investigation of White privilege in counseling psychology training programs from the perspectives of White trainees and trainees of color.

White Privilege

Johnson (2001/2008) observed that privilege is ascribed to social categories (e.g., Whites, men, heterosexuals), yet is experienced at the level of the individuals who belong to these categories. He further described the characteristics of privilege as involving undue "acceptance, inclusion, and respect," having (or having a sense of) increased power over self and others, and being able to navigate life with greater comfort and sovereignty (p. 117). From Johnson's comments, it is clear that multiple forms of privilege exist stemming from group-level membership. Also, identities intersect such that one can be privileged in some ways and not in others depending on the multitude of group-level identities to which people belong (Dyer, 2002/2008). In general, there are undeniable benefits when one belongs to, or is perceived as belonging to, a privileged group (Johnson, 2001/2008).

In the past several decades Critical Whiteness Studies has emerged as an interdisciplinary effort to illuminate "Whiteness," a concept which has thus far been studied and presented as a socially constructed race, societal norm, and system of power and privilege (Andersen, 2003; Fine, Powell, Weis, & Wong, 1997). To Dyer (2002/2008), Whiteness is characterized by its invisibility and implied humanness. The norms and values of White culture predominate in society through a guise of neutrality. Thus, an imposed White cultural worldview becomes the de facto human worldview (Dyer, 2002/2008; Katz, 1985; Sue, 2004). Recently, scholars have encouraged an "unhinging" of Whiteness from the bodies and identities of White people so that Whites and people of color can more easily examine and navigate its realities (e.g., Rowe & Malhotra, 2007). This idea bears similarity to externalizing, a narrative therapy practice of extracting the problem from the person in order better understand its nature and limitations (White & Epston, 1991). It is important to note that long before there was any formal study and

critique of Whiteness, people of color, especially African Americans, were (and in order to survive, had to be) keen observers of Whiteness (hooks, 1992/2008).

Whiteness emerges, "in all its glistening privilege" (Fine et al., 1997, p. ix) as "an invisible package of unearned assets" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1). The benefits of White privilege can be material, psychological, or symbolic in form (Feagin, 2010); these are the currencies of Whiteness. Benefits are transacted through individual, interpersonal, and institutional media (Neville et al., 2001); these are the banks. Many Whites feels a sense of entitlement to the unearned assets stemming from White privilege, believing that they have been accrued through hard work in a society of equitable opportunity (McIntosh, 1988; Neville et al., 2001). By evading the realities of race and privilege, for example, through language which obscures what it means to be White (Martin, Krizek, Nakayama, & Bradford, 1996), White privilege and structural racism maintain their power through invisibility.

In psychology, a plethora of White identity development models have surfaced to explain White privilege and racism on individual and interpersonal levels. Early models posited a series of stages passed through to see oneself with increasing complexity as a racial being with privilege in a racist society (e.g., Helms, 1984). Later models were revised to depict a series of context-dependent and epigenic identity statuses called upon to negotiate racial information (e.g., Helms, 1995). More recently, psychologists have presented constellations of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral reactions to White privilege and costs of racism (e.g., Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). Todd and Abrams (2011) critiqued the sometimes static stages and statuses of existing models and also synthesized the information from extant models into a theory of dialectical struggles White people face from moment to moment related to race, racism, and privilege.

White Privilege in Counseling Psychology

Racism and White supremacy are part of psychology's history. This was at times astonishingly obvious, as with psychologists' promotion of eugenics in the early 20th century (Guthrie, 1998). Sometimes it has been more subtle, as with research that has overlooked the dominance of a White worldview in favor of research that has "fetishized 'people of color' as the 'problem to be understood'" (Fine et al., 1997, p. ix).

Professional psychology (i.e., clinical psychology, counseling psychology, and school psychology; American Psychological Association, 2009) and other counseling-related fields are also implicated in this legacy of White privilege and racism (e.g., Katz, 1985). For the purpose of this investigation, how White privilege operates in counseling psychology training programs is of particular interest. As in related disciplines, training activities in counseling psychology typically include research, counseling, supervision, and coursework (Murdock, Alcorn, Heesacker, & Stoltenberg, 1998).

Psychological research has been largely driven by Eurocentric paradigms and methods (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Katz, 1985). Needless to say, the products of such research have tended to be theories and practices most suitable for White people (Betancourt & López, 1993). In counseling and psychotherapy research specifically, the findings from studies conducted with predominantly White samples using Eurocentric methods have been inappropriately generalized to people of color (Quintana & Atkinson, 2002; Sue, 1999).

Dominant counseling theories and practices are laden with White cultural values. For example, counseling theories have tended to emphasize the individual and intrapsychic rather than contextual factors (Katz, 1985). In the 1990s, the multicultural counseling movement ushered in the need for culturally-sensitive therapy and counselors with knowledge, awareness,

and skills to conduct such therapy (Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). In accordance with the multicultural movement in psychology, White counselors have been encouraged to reflect on what it means to be White and how White privilege might impact the counseling process (Black & Stone, 2005; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996). White counselors have the privilege to avoid or overlook issues of race without obvious penalty (Wise, 2000/2008), but doing so can be detrimental to racially diverse and White clients alike (Blitz, 2006; Sue et al., 2007). Through their unawareness, White counselors may perpetrate racial microaggressions against clients of color (Sue et al., 2007). Similarly negative outcomes can occur, especially for supervisees of color, when White clinical supervisors (who due to privilege) overlook the importance of race in their work with supervisees (e.g., Burkard et al., 2006; Constantine & Sue, 2007).

In the classroom, educators have altered their course curricula to heed the call of the multicultural movement (Pieterse, Evans, Risner-Butner, Collins, & Mason, 2009; Ponterotto, 1997), and attention to White privilege in multicultural courses appears promising (Pieterse et al., 2009). However, White privilege lingers for instance, in the lack of attention to Whites as a racial group in the multicultural courses of APA- and CACREP-accredited counseling and counseling psychology programs (Pieterse et al., 2009). Also, when educators have directly addressed White privilege with students, findings suggest that unawareness and resistance may be common reactions (e.g., Ancis & Szymanski, 2001).

Professional psychology training programs are required to create culturally sensitive training environments to obtain and maintain accreditation (APA, 2009). Despite this requirement, trainees and faculty of color and White trainees and faculty in counseling, clinical, and school psychology programs report disparate experiences that can be attributed to race

(Clark et al., 2012; Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008; Maton et al., 2011). More specifically, detailed accounts of racial microaggressions among faculty and fewer perceived racial barriers among White trainees seem to suggest the presence of White privilege in general training environments.

Multiculturalism and social justice are defining features of counseling psychology (Leong, Savickas, & Leach, 2011). Yet, the available literature reveals that racial oppression, and therefore White privilege, are present in various areas of counseling psychology training, including research, counseling, supervision, coursework, and the general training environment (Black & Stone, 2005; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Constantine et al., 2008; Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2004; Katz, 1985; Maton et al., 2011; Pieterse et al., 2009; Sue et al., 2007). With some exception (e.g., Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Burkard et al., 2006; Constantine et al., 2008; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Hird et al., 2004; Maton et al., 2011), White privilege as it operates within the profession of counseling psychology appears to be an under-researched area. Furthermore, these studies have tended to examine racial dynamics within the field via topics of divergent academic experiences, racial microaggressions, cross-cultural or multicultural supervision dyads, or White racial identity development, etc.—rarely via White privilege, specifically. Indeed, a review of the literature reveals that relatively little is known about how counseling psychology trainees observe and experience White privilege.

This Study

In 2010-2011 former APA President, Dr. Tania Israel, made the exploration of privilege her presidential initiative ("Exploring Privilege," n.d.). Drawing on the momentum of this initiative and the lack of empirical attention devoted to White privilege in counseling psychology and its training programs, this was a qualitative investigation of White privilege in counseling

psychology training programs. Qualitative research can provide context and depth to phenomena in ways that quantitative research cannot (Wang, 2008), and therefore seems an appropriate way to elaborate on some of the racially disparate experiences of psychology graduate students identified in previous research (e.g., Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011).

This study was undertaken primarily from a constructivist paradigm, but was also influenced by critical theory. This paradigmatic blend was chosen to reflect an appreciation of multiple social constructions of reality, the inclusion of a Critical Whiteness Studies perspective (i.e., interest in deconstructing Whiteness), and the importance of including people of color in discussions of Whiteness (Andersen, 2003; Marx, 2003). The chosen methodology was interpretative phenomenological analysis, an approach which emphasizes participants' personal meanings and contexts, as well as the importance of researcher interpretation (Smith & Eatough, 2007).

White privilege in counseling psychology training programs would be a rather underdeveloped construct without the perspectives of those who experience and encounter it (i.e., those who benefit and those who are oppressed). Through interviews with White and Black trainees, I hope to (a) describe the experiences of White trainees with White privilege, (b) describe the encounters of Black trainees with White privilege, (c) examine the similarities and differences in the accounts of White and Black trainees, and (d) comment on the meanings of these similarities and differences. Ultimately, I hope to better understand the phenomenon of White privilege in counseling psychology training programs from the perspectives of trainees of color and White trainees.

Implications

The implications of this study for the growth of counseling psychology are potentially

significant. An integral aspect of multicultural competence for counselors is self-awareness (Richardson & Molinaro, 1996; Sue et al., 1992). Certainly an essential quality at the individual level, I also see the necessity of self-awareness at the group level. That is, a professional constituency can also be self-aware—of its strengths, shortcomings, and biases, for instance. I hope that this study can shine as one spotlight (of many needed) to illuminate counseling psychology's blind spots related to the consequences of racial privilege and oppression in its training environments. The results of this study may also serve a protective function as a loose guide for what new trainees in counseling psychology might expect to encounter in their programs, depending on their racial background. Furthermore, through continued empirical attention to White privilege, areas for growth can then be identified from within and addressed appropriately. Perhaps most importantly, as counseling psychology's trainers and trainees reap the benefits of more culturally aware and socially just environments, so too might the people we serve.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Feagin (2010) describes systemic racism as "a diverse assortment of racist practices: the unjustly gained economic and political power of Whites; the continuing resource inequalities; the rationalizing White racist frame; and the major institutions created to preserve White advantage and power" (p. 9). He later explains that people "defined as 'white'" in the United States are ensured inheritance of various privileges because of the imbedded dominance of Whiteness in the Western world (p. 189).

What follows is a review of conceptual, theoretical, and empirical works in the Critical Whiteness literature. The review begins with a more thorough description of privilege, Whiteness, and White privilege. Next, pertinent literature on the identity development and attitudes of Whites is presented. Although the emphasis will be on theoretical and empirical studies in psychology, an effort has been made to investigate and incorporate interdisciplinary works as well.

In the second major section of this literature review, the presence of White privilege is considered in the field of counseling psychology. The focus will be on how White privilege and racial inequality affect various aspects of counseling psychology training. Lastly, a description of the proposed study is provided.

White Privilege

Katz (1985) unabashedly asserted, "White culture is omnipresent. It is so interwoven in the fabric of everyday living that Whites cannot step outside and see their beliefs, values, and behaviors as creating a distinct cultural group . . ." (p. 617). Three years later in her influential essay, "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," Peggy McIntosh (1988) spoke to

the realities of this assertion in her everyday life, listing the ways in which she benefited from the inconspicuous dominance of White culture in the United States. McIntosh explained that hierarchical systems—in this case the social hierarchy of race—disadvantage some while privileging others. With regard to racism, people of color are disadvantaged, with the obvious (though often unseen or unacknowledged) corollary being that Whites are privileged. She described White privilege "as an invisible package of unearned assets that I can count on cashing in, but about which I was 'meant' to remain oblivious . . . an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions . . ." (p. 1).

Feagin (2010) noted that the unearned assets of White privilege may be material (e.g., wealth, property), symbolic (e.g., myths regarding the White race's superiority), or psychological (e.g., fewer resources expended coping with discrimination). Furthermore, it has been suggested that White privilege connotes both unearned advantages as well as a sense of entitlement to them (e.g., Feagin, 2010; Neville, et al., 2001). Neville and colleagues outlined White privilege according to its "core components and processes," noting that it "differentially benefits Whites, embodies both macrolevel (i.e., systems) and microlevel (i.e., individual) expressions, consists of unearned advantages, offers immunity to selected social ills, embodies an expression of power, is largely invisible and unacknowledged, and contains costs to Whites" (p. 262). In the review that follows, these defining features and operating principles of White privilege and Whiteness will be explored in greater detail. Throughout this discussion, the reader will be presented with significant works in the area of Critical Whiteness Studies—a rich and growing interdisciplinary literature base with contributions from sociology, communications, psychology, philosophy, history, media studies, literature, and education (see Critical Whiteness Studies Group, 2006 for a interdisciplinary bibliography of Critical Whiteness Studies literature).

Privilege

Privilege has been defined as "a right or immunity granted as a peculiar benefit, advantage, or favor" (Privilege, n.d.). There exist multiple systems of privilege, including but not limited to those rooted in class, gender, sexual orientation, and race. All systems of privilege are part of power dynamics in which some category of people is dominant and another subjugated. One need only be *perceived* as belonging to a particular reference group to be ascribed the privileges of that group's status (Johnson, 2001/2008). Neville et al. (2001) noted that White privilege is an "active expression of power (conscious or unconscious) that serves to maintain status and increase access to desired goals" (p. 264).

Wildman and Davis (1995/2008) clarified the commonalities that systems of privilege share. First, the characteristics of the privileged group are viewed as normal. Katz (1985) made explicit some of the beliefs and values of White culture assumed to be the neutral norm against which people of color are measured in U.S. society. Although not an exhaustive list, these include a future time orientation, rugged individualism, a Protestant work ethic, emphasis on nuclear family structure, and holidays tied to White history and historical figures. Second, those who benefit from a system of privilege can choose whether or not to combat forces of oppression perpetuated by that particular system (Wildman & Davis, 1995/2008). In other words, when Whites observe acts of racism (or for that matter, act in ways which perpetuate racism themselves), they have the option to ignore, deny, or avoid dealing with these events and their consequences. This is an enormous privilege in and of itself. Indeed, the majority of racism today is perpetuated by Whites who silently accept the status quo of systemic racism (D'Andrea and Daniels, 2001).

Privilege, oppression, and intersectionality. From an essentialist viewpoint, a person

may be privileged or not, independent of multiple relevant identities. However, this approach leads to a fragmented view of whole people (Grillo, 1995). In describing the construct of intersectionality, Brown (2009) explained that "each of us is more than the most obvious component of our identity and . . . mixtures of aspects of self occur in a myriad of ways" (p. 344-345). The incredible diversity of human experiences necessitates a more complex understanding of privilege than simply present or not based on a particular identity. People have and are impacted by multiple social identities, each of which potentially marginalized or privileged, a source of resilience or pain (Brown, 2009). We can simultaneously embody the "colonizer and colonized" (p. 346).

Sojourner Truth's "Ain't I a Woman" speech in 1851 at the Women's Rights Convention in Akron, Ohio, is often acknowledged as a landmark critique of an essentialist view of identity (e.g., Brah & Phoenix, 2004; Fischer & DeBord, 2013). At a time when all women were not equally represented by the women's rights movement (which centered on the experiences of White women with class privilege), Truth's words spoke to the importance of an inclusive and varied conceptualization of what it meant to be a woman. In this way, one's identity and experiences with privilege as a White person are contextual and dependent on intersections with other identities, including but not limited to gender, sexual orientation, ability/disability status, religious/spiritual identity, and class (Cole, 2009).

Certainly, some of our identities are at times more salient than others depending on the environment, but that does not mean that other identities we posses become absent or unrelated (Grillo, 1995). Often, this error of omission is committed in psychological models attempting to capture or speculate on the experiences of categories of people (Cole, 2009). This has been particularly true of social identity development models (Fischer & DeBord, 2013). While

Whiteness and White privilege are the foci of this study, I attempt to explore them as sociohistorical and interactive, rather than fixed and independent characteristics.

Whiteness

Frankenberg (1993) observed, "That which is most 'given' about Whiteness (and indeed about the relations of race in general) is the materiality of its history—the impossibility of undoing what has already taken place" (p. 238). It is undeniable that the dominance conferred to Whites in the U.S. (and even throughout the world) has been secured throughout a "history . . . fraught with the destruction of other peoples in the name of democracy, freedom, and equal rights" (e.g., colonization and slavery, McIntyre, 1997, p. 89). Indeed, the features of Whiteness have roots that stretch and curl deep beneath the ground of the present day into the depths of hundreds of years past.

Dyer (2002/2008) depicted Whiteness as a phenomenon through which Whites are not raced, assumed to be simply human. Accordingly, Whiteness is ubiquitously (yet invisibly to most Whites) displayed in Western society (e.g., in movies, television, magazines, etc.). Whiteness becomes the standard to which all are held but to which only those with a fortunate birthright can adhere. Whiteness, therefore, is an invisible system of hegemony. Sue (2004) similarly acknowledged that equating Whiteness and humanness characterizes a hidden power structure and an intrusive and restricted White worldview, both of which deny the realities of people of color under the presupposition that the lives of White people are "morally neutral, average, and ideal" (p. 764).

Rowe and Malhotra (2007) echoed the previous descriptions of Whiteness as a social construction that confers racial privilege to Whites through the neutralization and universalization of Whiteness. The authors also offered a critique of how Whiteness has been

understood and studied, emphasizing the importance of distinguishing (or "unhinging," to use the authors' terminology) Whiteness from White identity and bodies. Rowe and Malhotra affirmed that "all of us are constantly navigating Whiteness" (p. 289). A failure to differentiate between Whiteness and White identity and people results in barriers to Whites and people of color in confronting and challenging Whiteness. If Whiteness is viewed as being only relevant to White people, one overlooks how people of color are impacted by it (e.g., lighter skin privilege, internalized racism, assimilation, etc.). Quite germane to the proposed study, it is critical to note that people of color have long been describing their experiences navigating Whiteness (Roediger, 1998). Doing so has been necessary for their survival in America (hooks, 1992/2008).

Other scholars have expressed concern that an uncritical focus on White people in Whiteness studies may be reinforcing the system of privilege and oppression sought to be undermined (Andersen, 2003). Also, if Whiteness is not separated from White people, Whites may become unmotivated and paralyzed by guilt. They may assume that Whiteness and its privileges are inescapable and unchangeable, not realizing that their identities need not encompass all that Whiteness signifies in a racist society (Rowe & Malhotra, 2007).

Critical Whiteness Studies. Following the civil rights movement, scholars began to examine Whiteness, White privilege, White racial attitudes, and White identity (Spanierman & Soble, 2010). Critical Whiteness Studies are an attempt to destabilize a racist system by shifting the usual focus from racial *others* to the dominant group (Doane, 2003). In so doing, the aim is to illuminate and challenge the hegemony which has remained hidden from so many (Whites) for so long.

Also acting as a springboard of scholarly inquiry for critical Whiteness inquiry has been Critical Race Theory (CRT; Bergerson, 2003). The origin of CRT lies in the dissatisfaction of

people of color with the failings of a legal system *theoretically* committed to social justice. The defining principles of CRT are as follows. First, those who utilize CRT place a central focus on race and racism without defending or explaining why these are still glaringly relevant issues. Second, proponents of CRT realize the faults of liberal approaches to curb racism, including "neutrality, merit, and color-blindness" (p. 53), which actually privilege the norms of the dominant group by taking the focus off of race. Finally, in CRT, the voices and stories (often referred to as counterstories) of people of color are viewed as valid accounts of reality that can dispute the dominant group's discourse (Bergerson, 2003). This study is paradigmatically influenced by both CRT and Critical Whiteness Studies, inviting the voices of both African Americans and Whites to explore the phenomenon of White privileges.

Unearned Advantages of White Privilege

Wise (2000/2008) candidly observed that "each thing with which [people of color] have to contend as they navigate the waters of American life is one less thing Whites have to sweat: and that makes everything easier, from finding jobs, to getting loans, to attending college" (p. 133). The author was referring to the benefits of being White in the U.S., which are reaped institutionally, interpersonally, and individually in a variety of ways (Neville et al., 2001). In the discussion that follows, these material, psychological, and symbolic benefits are examined more closely at societal, interpersonal, and individual levels.

Although a historical review of racism in the U.S. is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is crucial to understand that the modern privileges of Whiteness have been inherited throughout many generations of racism (Feagin, 2010; Wise, 2005). For instance, from the 1600s through the 1930s, several governmental actions and programs provided Whites with land to settle on (e.g., the Homestead Act), while excluding Blacks due to slavery and anti-Black

legislation. In terms of education, U.S. universities were not desegregated until the 1960s (Feagin, 2010). These are just two examples of the overt racial discrimination in America's history that still lingers today in the systemic and personal racial privileges held by White people.

However, the complex workings and privileges of Whiteness have influenced people of color in the U.S. in other nuanced ways. During the 1960s, a narrative regarding Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders as the model minority was propagated by the U.S. media (after this racial group was maligned for decades by White Americans), elevating their societal position nearer to Whites, and devaluing people of color whose "success" in the U.S. was not as evident. Not accidentally, White America's generation of this narrative myth coincided with the rise of the Black Power movement (Chow, 2011). Furthermore, researchers have observed social stratification according to skin tone in communities of color. Such studies involving African Americans (Keith & Herring, 1991) and Mexican Americans (Murguia & Telles, 1996) reveal better outcomes on such indicators as education, occupation, and income for fairer-skinned individuals.

Macrolevel privileges. Macrolevel racial privileges are those enjoyed via societal institutions (Neville et al., 2001). Neville and colleagues (p. 263) compiled a list of educational, employment, financial, health, and quality of life advantages that Whites tend to have from data provided by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 1997) and the Council of Economic Advisors for the President's Initiative on Race (CEAPIR, 1998). These unearned institutional advantages endure.

Regarding the U.S. educational system, White children are more likely than children of color to be placed in academically advanced, (i.e., racial tracking; Wise, 2000/2008), smaller,

and better technologically-equipped classes (CEAPIR, 1998; NCES, 1997; as cited in Neville et al., 2001). Furthermore, higher quality resources and facilities are found in predominantly White public schools when compared to schools with higher proportions of children of color (Feagin, 2010). Standardized tests have been written from a mainly Eurocentric perspective (Jensen, 1998/2008), a reality not taken into account by more recent class-based (as an alternative to race-based) affirmative action policies. Slater (1995) observed that compared to Latino and Black students, White students from low-income backgrounds were still better prepared and obtain higher scores on standardized tests. Other researchers have examined and commented on the enduring achievement gap between Whites and marginalized racial/ethnic groups (Blacks and Hispanics, in particular; Fryer & Levitt, 2006; Lee, 2002) and the inequities evident therein (Lee, 2004). Considering biases in standardized testing and academic outcomes stemming from such inequities, it is not surprising that Whites have historically enjoyed easier access to colleges and universities (Perry, 2007) and have been more likely to have at least a bachelor's-level education (Crissey, 2009).

Having the educational edge, so to speak, has definite implications for material and psychological outcomes like financial and career success and quality of life (Feagin, 2010). Data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau illuminate such glaring racial disparities. Differential unemployment rates also reflect Whites' better job access and retention. From 1972 to 2011, the annual average unemployment rates ranged from 3.5% and 8.7 % for Whites, from 5.2% and 13.8% for Hispanics/Latinos, and from 7.6% and 19.5% for African Americans. For Asians, data are only available for 2000 and after, and the range for is 3.0% to 7.5% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012)[1]. From 1979 to 2011, Whites' median weekly

---

[1] The following are caveats for interpreting data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: (a) Before 2003, respondents were categorized according to a primary racial group identification, even if they identified as

earnings ranged from $248 to $775, African Americans' weekly earning ranged from $199 to

$615, and Latinos'/Hispanics' earnings ranged from $194 to $549. For Asians, data are not listed

prior to 2000, but the range for available data is $615 to $880 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics,

2012). During 2008 and 2009, Whites had better health insurance coverage than any other racial

group (Denavas-Walt, Proctor, Smith, & U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Data collected between

2007 and 2010 show that homeownership rates for Whites ranged between 74.4% and 75.4%,

compared to a range from 45.6% to 60.1% among all other racial groups (Callis, 2010).

Furthermore, there are persisting racial disparities in housing and neighborhood quality. Whites

have been more likely than people of color to live in safer homes and neighborhoods with greater

infrastructural supports, conditions which have been linked to better health outcomes (Acevedo-

Garcia & Osypuk, 2004).

　　　Many U.S. institutions, including its capitalist economy and legal and political systems,

were all influenced by White European values and practices (Feagin, 2010). Institutional White

privilege is particularly noticeable in the U.S. criminal justice system (D'Andrea & Daniels,

2001; Neville et al., 2001). Mustard (2001) examined federal sentencing disparities among

77,236 offenders on a number of sociodemographic variables, including race. Forty-one

offenses were included, and observations were taken over a three-year period. Mustard found

average sentence lengths of 32.1 months, 54.1 months, and 64.1 months for Whites, Hispanics,

and African Americans, respectively. After controlling for several critical variables (offense

level and type, criminal history, and court district), Whites still received statistically significantly

more lenient sentences compared to African Americans and Hispanics. Such racial disparities

---

multiracial; (b) Respondents included in the data after 2003 identified only with those racial groups presented above;
(c) The data do not account for within-group ethnic differences (e.g., Hmong, Taiwanese) by race (e.g., Asian); (d)
In 2003, "Asian" was regarded as a separate category, whereas "Asian and Pacific Islander" was one group from
2000-2002. Finally, respondents who identified ethnically as Hispanic or Latino may identify with any racial group.

were especially evident among drug trafficking offenses, on which Whites received sentences 13.7% shorter than Blacks. Furthermore, these racial disparities are attributable to higher numbers of departures from the guidelines of United States Sentencing Commission in cases involving Hispanics and African Americans. When it was possible that offenders could receive no prison sentence for a given crime, Mustard also found that Whites were significantly more likely to be the recipients of this auspicious outcome. Neville and colleagues referred to this phenomenon as Whites' "[immunity] to social ills" (p. 263).

Andersen (2003) noted how it is critical that any discussion of Whiteness or White privilege not be undertaken in a way that decontextualizes these issues from the problems at hand—racism and the societal oppression of people of color. Taken together, the previously presented macrolevel benefits for Whites are the result of structural racism. Deeply ingrained in U.S. society are discriminative practices maintained by economic and governmental systems (D'Andrea & Daniels, 2001).

Microlevel privileges. Other benefits of Whiteness which reflect and uphold structural racism exist at the level of the individual or group and emerge "intrapsychically and interpersonally" (Neville et al., 2001, p. 262). Immersed in the pervasive comforts of the dominant culture, Whites have the privilege of remaining isolated with relative ease from the bodies and realities of people of color in daily life, (e.g., Helms, 1984; Wise, 2005). White people tend to reside in neighborhoods with populations close to 80% White (Acevedo-Garcia & Osypuk, 2004). This phenomenon is partly the result of "White flight" from cities to suburbs following World War II, as African Americans migrated north in search of job opportunities (Perry, 2007).

Bonilla-Silva, Goar, and Embrick (2006) investigated Whites' "social isolation and

residential segregation from Blacks" (p. 231) to further explain the dominance and normalization of White culture. The researchers explained the socialization process of Whites, or "White habitus." White habitus occurs through a lifetime of accrued messages (direct and indirect) which affirm the superiority of Whites (and the inferiority of non-Whites) and legitimate their segregation from non-Whites. Preexisting data were used from the 1997 Survey of College Students' Social Attitudes (SCS; $N = 627$) and the 1998 Detroit Area Study on White Racial Ideology (DAS; $N = 400$). The SCS sample included 451 White students, 41 of whom were randomly selected interviewees. All students were from mid-sized and large U.S. universities in the South, Midwest, and West. The DAS sample included 67 Black and 323 White residents of the Detroit metropolitan area. Randomly selected interviewees consisted of 67 Whites and 17 Blacks. Both studies incorporated survey-based and qualitative methods.

Bonilla-Silva and colleagues' (2006) results revealed a large discrepancy between Whites' sentiments toward racial integration and their lived realities. For example, 92.4% of White SCS respondents and 87.2% of White DAS respondents endorsed a "Not at all" response to the survey question, "How strongly would you object if a member of your family had a friendship with a Black person?" Yet, the DAS findings showed that of their three closest friends, 87% of White respondents reported that none of them were Black. This discrepancy between Whites' color-blind aspirations and lived realities became more noticeable when White participants in interviews equated interracial friendships with superficial and limited interactions with Blacks in residential, educational, and occupational settings. From interview data concerning Whites' views on their isolation from Blacks, it was learned that Whites mostly do not see this phenomenon as a racial matter, believe it to be an ontological given, attribute such segregation to a lack of opportunity, and even blame Blacks for not pursuing relationships with

them. The researchers interpreted their findings to mean that many Whites exist in spatial and interpersonal isolation from Blacks, do not explain this isolation in terms of race, and espouse color-blind sentiments that are not supported by their lifestyles. Such "boundary maintenance" strategies (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006, p. 248) serve to protect the status quo of racial dominance and distance beneath the guise of progressive color-blind attitudes.

Neville et al. (2001) presented color-blind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) as a form of modern (i.e., less overt) racism. Adopting CoBRAS can be viewed as a microlevel privilege through which White people can choose to deny or disregard race and racism and the roles that they play in the lives of people of color. To not know, or to not care to know, the perspectives or realities of those who are racially oppressed never comes with an obvious penalty because it is culturally sanctioned (McIntosh, 1988). Not only can Whites overlook racism when they see it, they also do not have to confront their own race on a daily basis. When participants were asked to consider their Whiteness in a participatory action research study of White female student teachers, McIntyre (1997) observed the phenomenon of *White talk*. White talk consisted of a series of "speech-tactics" participants used to "distance themselves from the difficult and almost paralyzing task of engaging in a critique of their own Whiteness" (p. 46). Such tactics included avoiding questions, using silence, interrupting, and caring for one another with excessive niceness. Not having to expend the psychological energy needed to continuously confront one's race, as many people of color have had to, is an undeniable privilege (Wise, 2000/2008).

A Black student at a predominantly White university may be confused by a low grade received on a paper in a class with a White professor. She may wonder whether or not her race was a factor in the grading process. On the other hand, a White student need not concern herself with this possibility, instead attributing the low grade to poor studying habits, lack of sleep, harsh

grading criteria, and so on. Bear in mind, this is merely one example of how Whites prosper by not being confronted with their race (likely multiple times) on a daily basis.

Often described in conjunction with microlevel White privilege is the concept of entitlement, believing that one deserves or has rightly earned what one possesses. Subscribing to the myth of meritocracy, that Americans live in a just society in which all have an equal opportunity to succeed and achieve by virtue of hard work and talent, is often implicated in this sense of entitlement (McIntosh, 1988; Neville et al. 2001). McIntyre (1997) found that White female student teachers reinforced the myth of meritocracy when they shared examples of a person of color they knew who had "made it," and suggested that people of color conform to White American values in order to succeed via assimilation.

Similar to White entitlement is the habit of ontological expansiveness associated with White privilege. According to this idea, many Whites demonstrate an automatic assumption that no "cultural and social spaces" are off limits (Sullivan, 2006, p. 25). Wise (2005) wryly depicted the qualities of White entitlement and ontological expansiveness: "That's what it means to be privileged: wherever you are, it's taken for granted that you must belong and that you deserve to be there. You never seem to spoil the décor or trigger suspicions of any kind" (p. 45).

Symbolic privileges. Thus far, many of the White racial privileges discussed have been either material (e.g., educational resources, financial success) or psychological (e.g., myth of meritocracy, entitlement, ontological expansiveness) in nature. Other advantages of Whiteness are symbolic (Feagin, 2010; Neville et al. 2001). Many White Christians today and throughout history have depicted Jesus of Nazareth as White despite disputing scientific evidence (Wise, 2005). In our collective discourse, examples of holiness, goodness, and purity being associated with Whiteness are often encountered. Again, privilege does not occur in absence of oppression;

they are two sides of the same coin. If Whiteness is symbolically linked to purity and goodness, then the symbols typically associated with impurity and depravity are characterized by darkness and Blackness (Three Rivers, 1991; as cited in Neville et al., 2001, p. 264). Such cultural symbols serve to perpetuate a system of dominance and subjugation, through which what is steeped in White culture (e.g., values, norms, beliefs) becomes ideal (e.g., Katz, 1985). That which is not is condemned and categorized as unworthy or undesirable.

In one well-known study, Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) disseminated 4,870 fabricated résumés to employers with newspaper advertisements in Chicago and Boston. High-quality and low-quality résumés were generated. Using birth certificate data from 1974 to 1979, the researchers randomly assigned names unique to African American or White communities to each of the résumés. It was found that those résumés assigned names associated with Whites received employer callbacks at a rate 50% higher than those associated with African Americans. Furthermore, high-quality résumés assigned White sounding names received callbacks at a statistically significant higher rate than low-quality resumes with White sounding names, whereas no such difference was found between high- and low-quality résumés assigned Black sounding names. The results of this investigation illustrated the idea that cultural symbols regarding race serve to privilege those people perceived as White (i.e., hardworking, qualified), and are detrimental to people perceived to be people of color (i.e., lazy, unqualified; Neville et al., 2001).

Invisibility. Neville et al. (2001) explained that culturally symbolic privileges serve as a perpetuating mechanism of institutionalized White privilege. Ingrained in society's collective mind, these "White ethnocentric definitions of self and other, good and evil, right and wrong, and normal and abnormal" (p. 264) ensure that White privilege remains invisible. Its invisibility

ensures that it remains unacknowledged, unchecked, and unending (McIntosh, 1988).

At the levels of group and individual, Whites are largely blind to their own Whiteness and its meaning in an inequitable society. It is not uncommon for Whites to identify according to ethnic ancestry (e.g., Irish, German) and to attribute the comforts and advantages of Whiteness—like residing in safe neighborhoods and having better educational opportunities—to socioeconomic rather than racial disparities (Feagin & O'Brien, 2003).

Power comes with the ability to self-identify and self-label. In a historical position of dominance, Whites have not had to make themselves known or understood through the use of self-labeling. There is no need to describe that which is *normal* and *standard* (Roman, 1993; Terry, 1981; as cited in Martin et al., 1996, p. 324). When asked to identify themselves racially, some Whites even resist doing so (Nakayama & Krizek, 1995). In one such illustration of this idea, Martin et al. (1996) distributed surveys to university students throughout the U.S. ($N = 371$) in an effort to determine which labels (White, Caucasian, White American, European American, Euro-American, Anglo, WASP) Whites prefer and how they understand them. Results revealed that *White* and *Caucasian* (see Teo, 2009, for a discussion on the racist origins and scientific incorrectness of the term *Caucasian*) were the most preferred labels. In reviewing participants' definitions, the researchers noted the preponderance of circular definitions (e.g., "White is White") and nonresponses (i.e., blank, indication of not knowing, opinion rather than definition). The researchers indicated that *White* and *Caucasian* were, in general, the most ambiguous terms on the list. They were also "most preferred and least defined" labels by participants (Martin et al., 1996, p. 139). These findings point to Whites' knowing or unknowing evasion of their own Whiteness. Whether or not the avoidance is intentional, it still serves to maintain power and privilege. Whites stand to benefit greatly when they "pay no attention to that man [sic] behind

the curtain" (LeRoy & Fleming, 1939).

Today, White individuals enjoy a wealth of privileges inherited from a long history of racism and oppression of people of color. These luxuries may be material, psychological, or symbolic, and span from the level of individual to institution. The racial hierarchy that benefits Whites has been maintained by centuries of cultural symbolism (reflecting the goodness of Whiteness and the lack and evil ascribed to people of color) and its invisibility to many Whites. However, not all White individuals possess the same level of awareness and attitudes regarding personal and interpersonal issues of race. It is the topic of racial identity development to which the discussion now turns.

White Racial Identity Development and Privilege

Researchers in psychology have been mostly concerned with the individual- and group-level processes (e.g., awareness, beliefs, feelings, behaviors, attitudes) associated with White privilege and racism. Some of psychology's most important contributions to the understanding of White privilege have come from theories and models of White racial identity development and attitudes. Several of these models share common objectives of "address[ing] (a) perceptions of one's own racial group membership (i.e., White) and perceptions of people of color, (b) awareness of institutional racism and White privilege, and (c) White supremacist ideology" (Spanierman & Soble, 2010, p. 284). Some of the models most relevant to this investigation of individual differences in White racial identity development will now be presented (note that for some models, theories, and measures, the term *identity* is not overtly used).

Hardiman's White identity development model. For her dissertation, Hardiman (1982) developed the White Identity Development model (WID) by reviewing the available identity development literature and the autobiographies of White antiracists. Although several

researchers had conceptualized the racial identity development of people of color, there existed

no parallel process depicted for Whites. Therefore, Hardiman sought to "examine the processes

by which White Americans develop a sense of racial identity as members of a racially privileged

group . . ." (p. vi).

The WID model is comprised of five stages. During the *Lack of Social Consciousness*

stage (often occurring during early childhood), Whites are unaware of racial differences and that

there exists a code of acceptable White behavior. They may experience some discomfort around

people of color, yet they are interested in knowing about them. By the time Whites reach the

Acceptance stage, they have been socialized into the norms of White culture and have

internalized: racist attitudes, taken for granted messages about acceptable codes of behavior, and

a sense of racial superiority. The radically different stage of *Resistance* is characterized by a

questioning and rejection of Whiteness and internalized messages about Whites and people of

color. Whites in the Resistance stage come to understand how they, as part of the dominant and

privileged group, are implicated in systemic racism. Guilt, anger, personal responsibility,

confusion, and isolation from other Whites are commonly experienced during this stage. White

individuals in the *Redefinition* stage attempt to reconstruct a White identity that is not built upon

the oppression of people of color and a sense of racial superiority. In other words, Whites come

to see that disparaging Whiteness is not necessary, and esteem for one's cultural group is

possible. In the Redefinition stage, other racial groups are appreciated for their uniqueness.

Pride may be felt with regard to the products of White culture, but the sense of superiority is

abandoned. In the final stage of *Internalization*, the newly constructed White identity is

incorporated deeply, enacted authentically, oriented toward activism, and affects other aspects of

one's social identity (Hardiman, 1982). Spanierman & Soble (2010) were unable to identify an

operationalization or direct empirical test of Hardiman's model.

Helms' model of White racial identity development. Helms (1984) presented a groundbreaking model of White racial identity development. Her intent was to capture Whites' consciousness and attitudes surrounding their own race and that of Blacks. Helms identified five stages through informal interviews and reviews from White friends, professionals, and students (a sixth stage was added in Helms, 1990). In later writings, Helms (1995) described identity development in terms of epigenic ego *statuses* instead of *stages*. She clarified that the theory was not intended to depict a linear development with static stages, but rather "mutually interactive dynamic processes by which a person's behavior could be explained" (p. 183). To Helms, healthy White development means becoming aware of and abandoning societally sanctioned entitlement, privilege, and typical strategies (i.e., denial and distortion) for navigating race in society. As Whites mature, they demonstrate greater personal and interpersonal racial adjustment. Helms detailed cognitive and affective information-processing strategies (IPS) and schemata (behavioral expression of IPS) which are characteristically displayed by Whites in various statuses. With developmental maturation, efforts to deny racial realities and protect privileges are increasingly abandoned.

In *Contact*, Whites are largely oblivious to racism and how they contribute to it. They are aware of racial "others" but do not see themselves as racial beings. Obliviousness, denial, and color-blindness are the primary IPS. In *Disintegration*, Whites are confronted and struggle with seemingly irreconcilable racial stimuli. As they come to recognize racism and their own Whiteness, Whites are torn between a commitment to the dominant in-group and broader societal issues of racism. In this sometimes emotionally tumultuous status marked by guilt, helplessness, and anxiety, IPS are mainly suppression and uncertainty. *Reintegration* connotes a sort of

regression in which Whites prize their own group and exhibit intolerance (e.g., stereotyping) toward of people of color. Whites may experience hostility and fear and avoid interactions with people of color. The predominant IPS are biases in racial perceptions which boost the image of Whites. Hostility and fear may fade with greater awareness of attitudes toward one's Whiteness.

In *Pseudoindependence*, Whites express tenuous acceptance of people of color while maintaining in-group loyalty. IPS applied with this status are intellectual distortions of racial perceptions to fit a liberal service agenda to help people of color. The *Immersion/Emersion* status is described as one in which Whites begin to reconstruct personal understandings of racism and privilege while moving toward greater activism. IPS associated with this status include hypervigilance of racial stimuli and redefinition of Whiteness. In the sixth and final status, *Autonomy*, Whites demonstrate continued dedication to activism and knowledge as they self-define their racial identity with an awareness of and desire to combat privilege. Flexibility and a more nuanced understanding and appreciation of privilege and racism are characteristic of IPS associated with Autonomy (Helms, 1984; Helms, 1995).

Helms (1995) asserted that a person may have developed several statuses and have at her/his disposal several cognitive-affective IPS and schemata when confronted with racial stimuli. Maturation of statuses and associated IPS and schemata are driven by the need in a given environment. Statuses, IPS, and schemata are context-dependent (hence, Helms' explicit use of *statuses* rather than *stages*). When faced with a racially challenging situation, dominant identity statuses may be strengthened, secondary statuses called upon, or new statuses developed to cope effectively.

For example, a discussion about affirmative action in the classroom may initially elicit a White student's dominant Reintegration status. The student responds with hostility and fear

toward people of color. IPS are activated and schemata expressed which secure Whites' superiority and his loyalty to the in-group. This status was called upon, as it has been most effective for coping in situations involving racially challenging stimuli. The student heatedly exclaims, "That's not fair! Why should smart White students be denied access to college just because a Black student who didn't do as well on the SAT has darker skin?" In response, the teacher calmly explains some of the unearned advantages of White privilege associated with biased standardized testing and the lack of resources available to many students of color whose schools are in neighborhoods which have suffered economically due to White flight and de facto segregation (e.g., Perry, 2007).

The student may retreat to a Contact status and respond with avoidance, such as "Well, schools shouldn't pay attention to race. We're all human anyway. Students should just apply, and the better student should get in." Conversely, the teacher's information may challenge the student to an extent that none of his ego statuses are adequate to process this information. A Pseudoindependent status may emerge, and the student may instead appear curious while intellectualizing the matter in a way that demonstrates loyalty to Whites. He might say, "Well, there are probably *some* Black students who work hard enough to get in to college and deserve it more than White students who don't work as hard. I guess Black kids in bad neighborhoods need better teachers and more tutors then."

Helms' model has inspired as much empirical research as it has endured criticism throughout "rigorous intellectual debates" (Spanierman & Soble, 2010, p. 288). The White Racial Consciousness Development Scale (WRCDS; Claney & Parker, 1989) and the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990) were created as measures of Helms' model. In reviewing the available literature on Helms' model, Spanierman and Soble

determined that much of the skepticism surrounding the model and its measures has been in regard to its similarities to minority racial identity development models, lack of focus on self-directed racial attitudes, questionable developmental trajectory, emphasis only on Whites and Blacks, and problematic psychometric properties of the WRCDS and WRIAS (see also Fischer & Moradi, 2001).

Despite these limitations, Spanierman and Soble (2010) acknowledged that Helms' model is generally supported by the available research. Helms (1984) originally presented her White identity development model, along with a model for Black identity development, with applications to counseling in mind. In this vein, multicultural training in psychology and counseling has been found to lead to changes in WRIAS and WRCDS scores indicative of more sophisticated White racial identity attitudes (e.g., Neville et al., 1996; Parker, Moore, & Neimeyer, 1998). Also, more mature identity developmental statuses have been found to correspond with self-reported multicultural competencies among professional counselors and psychologists (e.g., Middleton et al., 2005). Spanierman and Soble commented more generally that identity statuses correspond meaningfully with related constructs. For example, Carter (1990) found that lower-level identity statuses (e.g., Contact and Reintegration) as measured by the WRIAS predicted racist attitudes in women and men, respectively. Gushue and Constantine (2007) found that WRIAS scores (e.g., Pseudoindependence, Immersion/Emersion, and Autonomy) were significantly negatively correlated with an unawareness of (a) racial privilege, (b) institutional racism, and (c) unawareness of blatant racism. These three variables make up the subscales of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000).

Scott and Robinson's key model. Scott and Robinson (2001) posited that a White racial

identity model that focuses on the intersection of race and gender (specifically White males) could be especially helpful in a counseling context. White men are the recipients of socializing messages linked to both their race (e.g., importance of rugged individualism) and gender (e.g., importance of power, control). Socialized into superiority, they are privileged in U.S. society by both their Whiteness and maleness. Influenced by identity models such as Helms' (1995), the Key Model incorporates attitudes toward gender and race in a developmental context. Hence, White males can develop an awareness of their privilege and entitlement and challenge these societal forces in their own and others' lives. Phases or types are used in the model to depict malleable attitudes displayed by a White male at a given time. Development in this model is not linear, but circular, in that "movement occurs in multiple directions" (Scott & Robinson, p. 418). In other words, although one type may be dominant, White males can exemplify the characteristics from several types.

The first type in the Key Model is *Noncontact*, in which a White male is unaware of race, subscribes to inflexible gender roles, and is oblivious to discrimination that takes place as a result of others' oppressed gender and racial statuses. The *Claustrophobic* type emerges as the individual begins to realize that he lives in an inequitable society. This type is characterized by self-protective attitudes due to perceived threats to power and privilege by women and people of color. Scott and Robinson (2001) noted that many White males will stagnate as Noncontact or Claustrophobic Types.

One or several dissonance-inducing events which challenge the individual's racist and sexist belief systems can bring about movement into *Conscious Identity*. It is here that White males begin to confront their socialized racism and sexism. From this type, White males may regress to Claustrophobic attitudes or may progress to the *Empirical* type. White males who

exhibit Empirical attitudes are aware of racism, sexism, and their personal power and privilege as realities that affect their own and others' lives. Condemning attitudes toward women and people of color rooted in fear and self-protection are acknowledged as unfounded. In the final type, *Optimal*, White men display a growing appreciation for the significance of race and gender in U.S. society. They develop a social justice orientation as cooperation with women and people of color comes to replace competition for power as one's predominant orientation. Like Spanierman and Soble (2010), I too was unable to locate any empirical research on the Key Model apart from a suggested application of the model to career counseling (Scott, 2009).

Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites (and cost types). Whites are also privileged by not having to see the negative consequences they endure living in a racist society (Spanierman et al., 2008). Aware of this reality, Spanierman & Heppner (2004) constructed the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites Scale (PCRW), a 16-item, self-report, Likert-type measure of affective consequences of racism to Whites. The PCRW was developed in three studies involving exploratory ($n = 361$) and confirmatory ($n = 366$) analyses and initial validation. Scale items were generated by Spanierman following reviews of theoretical and qualitative literature. Items were reviewed by faculty, doctoral students, and undergraduate students. Participants recruited from undergraduate classes at one mid-sized and one large university in the Midwest were predominantly Christian, middle class, single, and had had moderate exposure to people of color and very little or some multicultural education. Spanierman and Heppner identified three reliable and valid factors which make up the PCRW subscales. Scores are interpreted by examining the relationships among subscale scores. Presented with each factor description that follows are internal consistency α-coefficient ranges from the three studies and test-retest reliability r-coefficients. Convergent validity was established with measures of racial

discrimination (Ponterotto et al., 1995), racial attitudes (LaFleur, Leach, & Rowe, 2002), color-blind racial attitudes (Neville et al., 2000), and ethnocultural empathy (Wang et al., 2003).

First, the *White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism* factor (α = .78-.85; r = .84) includes items related to emotional reactions to racism, such as sadness and anger. Spanierman and Heppner (2004) suggested that empathic reactions toward racism may increase with multicultural education. Second, the *White Guilt* factor (α = .70-.81; r = .69) consists of items pertaining to shame and guilt regarding one's Whiteness. High levels of White Guilt are linked to a sense of accountability and positive attitudes toward people of color, yet potentially low commitment to these attitudes. Third, the *White Fear of People of Other Races* factor (α = .63-.78; r = .95) is comprised of items that capture the extent to which one fears people of color. White Fear is linked to less racial awareness, sensitivity, enthnocultural empathy, and exposure to people of color (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). Further quantitative (e.g., Poteat & Spanierman, 2008) and qualitative (e.g., Spanierman et al., 2008) investigation has provided support for the PCRW and the concepts it operationalizes.

Spanierman, Beer, Poteat, and Armstrong (2006) illustrated how the PCRW subscale scores could be interpreted in combination as profiles, or types, to capture the complexity of Whites' personal struggles with racism. They conducted two studies in which they used cluster analysis to identify (n = 230) and validate (n = 366) five PCRW types in samples of White undergraduate students at one large and one mid-sized university. The *Antiracist* type was characterized by high levels of White Empathy and White Guilt, and low levels of White Fear. Antiracist individuals were aware of race and White privilege, were culturally sensitive, and had more diversity education and diverse friendships. Those who were *Empathic but Unaccountable* reported high levels of White Empathy, but low levels of White Guilt, and were similar to those

in the Antiracist type, except they tended to be less aware of White privilege.

Individuals categorized as the *Fearful Guilt* type showed high levels of White Guilt and White Fear, but low levels of White Empathy. The awareness these participants had of White privilege was accompanied by guilt and fear (e.g., of loss of privilege). An *Unempathic and Unaware (Oblivious)* type was discerned by low levels of White Empathy and White Guilt, and moderate levels of White Fear. Those comprising the Oblivious type were unaware of White privilege, mainly color-blind, and had less multicultural education and fewer racially diverse friends. Finally, those who fit the *Insensitive and Afraid* type endorsed low levels of White Empathy and White Guilt, and high levels of White Fear. This type was distinguished by its association with the least multicultural education, awareness, sensitivity, and exposure to people of color (Spanierman & Soble, 2010).

White privilege attitudes. Pinterits et al. (2009) recognized that existing measures of White privilege attitudes mainly emphasized cognition. In response, they constructed the self-report, Likert-type, 28-item White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS) as a multidimensional measure of White privilege attitudes. The WPAS was developed in three studies involving exploratory ($n = 250$) and confirmatory ($n = 251$) factor analyses, and initial validation ($n = 40$). Much like the original conceptualization of the PCRW (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), the WPAS was designed to capture affect, cognition, and behavior. Items for the WPAS were generated in accordance with the extant literature base and were reviewed and rated by multiculturally competent researchers from diverse racial backgrounds. White participants were recruited from 11 public and private universities and colleges in various regions of the U.S. Percentages of White students at these schools ranged from 50% to 80%. In all three studies, participants were on average 22 years old, between 65% and 70% female, and predominantly

undergraduate.

Pinterits et al. (2009) found psychometric support for the multidimensional (affective, cognitive, behavioral) four-factor structure of the WPAS. With each factor description that follows, internal consistency α-coefficient ranges from the three studies and test-retest reliability r-coefficients are presented. Convergent validity for the WPAS was established with measures of subtle racism (McConahay, 1986), color-blind racial attitudes (Neville et al., 2000), costs of racism to Whites (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), and views on group inequality (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).

The items of the *Willingness to Confront White Privilege* factor ($\alpha = .91$-$.95$; $r = .83$) reflected behavioral intentions to address and explore privilege. The second factor, *Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege* ($\alpha = .73$-$.83$; $r = .70$), consisted of items which captured affective apprehensions pertaining to confronting and losing privilege. The *White Privilege Remorse* factor ($\alpha = .81$-$.91$; $r = .78$) contained items that reflected negative emotional reactions to one's White privilege. Lastly, *White Privilege Awareness* ($\alpha = .81$-$.84$; $r = .87$) is comprised of items that capture the cognitive awareness of privilege and racial oppression in society. As Spanierman et al. (2006) demonstrated in their study of psychosocial costs of racism types, the WPAS points to the psychological complexity involved in realizing, examining, and addressing racial privilege.

Todd and Abrams' White dialectics framework. Todd and Abrams (2011) presented a model of Whites' racial self-understanding in terms of dialectics, or the "processe[s] of transforming apparent contradictions by engaging in two opposing ends of a continuum" (p. 355). More specifically, "White dialectics are the tensions that White people inherently experience as dominant group members in the United States" (p. 354). Informed by a critical-

ideological paradigm, Todd and Abrams utilized a grounded theory approach to study the racial experiences of White students ($N = 22$) enrolled in an introductory psychology course. From the data, six dialectical themes organized on continua were apparent: (a) *Whiteness and Sense of Self* (awareness and acceptance of self as White vs. not White), (b) *Closeness and Connection in Multiracial Relationships* (relational depth vs. shallowness), (c) *Color-Blindness* (color-blindness vs. consciousness of racial differences), (d) *Minimization of Racism* (experience of racism as personal vs. distant), (e) *Structural Inequality* (understanding of structural/institutional power as creating equal vs. unequal opportunities for Whites and people of color), and (f) *White Privilege* (understanding self as benefiting vs. not benefiting from unearned advantages of Whiteness).

The researchers offered a critique of other models of White racial identity and development which fix individuals in particular statuses, stages, or states, rather than allowing for the rapid shifting that can occur along dialectical continua in a given moment. Furthermore, they explained that their dialectical model captures well the ideas of other theories of White racial development, that while similar, were not necessarily framed as dialectics (e.g., Parham's, 1989 concept of recycling; Helms', 1995 notion of movement between identity statuses; conflict between counseling trainees' acknowledgment of, but unwillingness to relinquish White privilege, found in Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; psychosocial cost types according to Spanierman et al., 2006). The researchers encouraged the application of their model to working with the moment-to-moment ambiguity that many White counseling trainees and students experience.

Summary and Critique: White Privilege

Dominant racial status in the U.S. belongs to Americans with (or perceived as having) White skin color who are mainly of Western European heritage. Throughout history, myths of

the White race's superiority and the inferiority of people of color have been reified and embedded in America's collective psyche and institutional practices (D'Andrea & Daniels, 2001). These myths have been perpetuated to such an extent that the values and norms of White culture are often assumed to be fundamentally human and morally correct (Sue, 2004). As a result of their acquired dominant racial status, Whites enjoy an "invisible package of unearned assets" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1), or privileges, which people of color do not. Privileges afforded to Whites occur at individual and interpersonal (microlevel), as well as institutional (macrolevel) levels (Neville et al., 2001). Privileges may be in symbolic, psychological, or material form (Feagin, 2010).

Recognizing that Whites have often been overlooked as racial beings due to their dominant and privileged racial status, interdisciplinary scholars have co-created the field of Critical Whiteness Studies through works aimed at deconstructing White identity and culture. Much of what is known about Whiteness and White privilege in the United States comes from statistical data (e.g., U.S. Census data) and quantitative studies which remind us of macrolevel and symbolic racial disparities, or the lingering legacy of European colonization and a history of American racism (Frankenberg, 1993). Although qualitative studies are becoming more common (e.g., Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Spanierman et al., 2008; Todd & Abrams, 2011), quantitative studies have been the main tool for examining White identity and attitudes (Todd & Abrams, 2011). Yet, the rich interdisciplinary literature base of conceptual, theoretical, and qualitative works from such fields as sociology, education, psychology, communications, psychology (and even pop culture; e.g., Wise, 2005) has brought necessarily personal approaches to the task of deconstructing Whiteness and exposing White privilege. As the feminist adage goes: the "personal is political." These more "personal" approaches (e.g., Ancis & Szymanski,

2001; Helms, 1984; McIntosh, 1988; McIntyre, 1997) have begun to illuminate the often invisible White worldview and individual processes which perpetuate racism at a systemic level.

More specifically, psychologists have produced a variety of theories, models, and measures to further explain the processes underlying how Whites make sense of and are affected by their racial status, privilege, and racism—processes of awareness, acceptance, cognition, affect, and behavior. Viewed together, the multiple theories and models of White racial identity and self-understanding capture varying levels of consciousness and reactions (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral) to race, racism and privilege, and points of struggle with internalized versus observed racial messages and information. Although not always explicitly framed as such, a healthy, mature, or sophisticated White identity seems to entail knowledge and acceptance of oneself and others as racial beings, an awareness and responsible use of White privilege, a potential for genuine and empathic connection to people of color and their experiences, an understanding of how one is negatively impacted by participating (knowingly or not) in a racist system, and a social justice orientation.

As the Critical Whiteness literature base has grown, some scholars have brought concerns to the attention of its contributors. While sympathizing with the need to look beyond the experiences of the victims of racial inequality to those of the privileged as well, Andersen (2003) cautioned that examining Whiteness in a dualistic fashion "risks eclipsing the study of racial power" (p. 21). Rowe and Malhotra (2007) similarly recommended that Whiteness be explored not only in association with the bodies and identities of White people, but as a societal process that impacts both Whites and people of color. In terms of future directions, Doane (2003) echoed these concerns and noted the dearth of empirical research in Whiteness studies. Spanierman and Soble (2010) encouraged diverse methodological approaches to the study of

White identity and attitudes, emphasizing the importance of qualitative research.

Up to this point, the discussion has centered on the conceptual and empirical literature related to White privilege and White racial identity development. This study addresses the experiences of counseling psychology trainees from racial majority and minority backgrounds. Therefore, the relevance of White privilege to field of counseling psychology is now explored.

White Privilege in Counseling Psychology

Training in the profession of counseling psychology is multifaceted, with foci on research, counseling practica, clinical supervision, and coursework (Murdock et al., 1998). In the discussion that follows, how these areas of training are impacted by Whiteness and White privilege will be explored. A caveat is in order before proceeding. Professional psychology is comprised not only of counseling psychology, but also clinical and school psychology (APA, 2009). Research, counseling, supervision, and coursework are utilized in the training of all three of these doctoral-level professions (in addition to related master's-level counseling programs). Because these areas of professional training share a common history within the broader context of psychology, conceptual and empirical literature from these related professions are presented when relevant.

Research

Fischer and DeBord (2013) acknowledged that there are "often-unnamed structures of power which privilege knowledge production from select kinds of people, in select settings, on select topics, with select methodologies, in select formats" (p. 5). Research in mainstream psychology has traditionally privileged Eurocentric values on quantitative research methods, cause and effect analyses, and linear thinking (Katz, 1985), thereby overlooking and at times harming, people of color (Quintana, Troyano, & Taylor, 2001). For instance, White cultural bias

in the construction of cognitive abilities tests has led to people of color being viewed as intellectually deficient (Helms, 1992). Similarly, researchers in social identity development have tended to overlook intersecting identities, such that the experiences of women of color were wrongly equated with the experiences of women in general (Fischer & DeBord, 2013).

Criticisms of the monocultural emphasis of traditional psychology research and theory are abundant. Betancourt and López (1993) explained that "Usually, theories do not include cultural variables and findings or principles are thought to apply to individuals everywhere, suggesting that psychological knowledge developed in the United States by Anglo-American scholars using Anglo-American subjects is universal" (p. 632). Sue (1999) echoed the concern that mainstream psychological theory and research lack generalizability to the racially diverse.

In research on psychotherapy, for example, the habit has been to assume that establishing efficacy in a study of mainly or all White participants implies efficacy for members of all cultural groups. During the first decade of the empirically supported treatment (EST) movement, Quintana and Atkinson (2002) expressed their concern with the lack of cultural sensitivity in the research process guiding the determination of which treatments were to be deemed ESTs. Quintana et al. (2001) concluded, "The message is clear: researchers define normalcy with White populations and deviance with ethnic minority groups" (p. 605; see also Sue, 1999, for a personal account of this assertion).

Multicultural psychologists have offered many criticisms of quantitative research along with suggestions for its improvement. They have also presented qualitative research as a suitable methodology for privileging the voices and contexts of those who are oppressed and overlooked by more traditional research methods (Morrow, Rakhsha, & Castañeda, 2001; Wang, 2008). However, these alternative ways of knowing encounter great skepticism among mainstream

scientific thinking. Delgado Bernal and Villalpando (2002) declared the existence of an "apartheid of knowledge" in academia that favors a "Eurocentric epistemological perspective" (p. 171) which marginalizes ways of knowing in communities of color more akin to qualitative methods (e.g., storytelling).

Counseling

"Counseling is a sociopolitical act" (Katz, 1985, p. 615). Its theories and practices are value-laden and the values culture-laden. As one of many systems of healing, modern psychotherapy (used interchangeably with *therapy* and *counseling* in this paper) was developed by, and consequently is best suited to serve, those of White European-American descent (Katz, 1985; Sue & Sue, 2008). Emphases in counseling on the individual, autonomy, independence, internal loci of control and responsibility, taking action, the superior knowledge of the therapist, reflective listening, face-to-face communication with direct eye contact, the rigid therapy hour, and the separation of mind and body are all profoundly influenced by European-American beliefs and values (Katz, 1985). Traditional systems of counseling theory privilege either individual uniqueness or universal human experiences while overlooking group-level cultural variables (e.g., racial/ethnic background, gender, or level of ability/disability). To ignore culture is to ignore common ways of viewing and being viewed by the world (Katz, 1985; Sue & Sue, 2008).

Recognizing mainstream psychotherapy's failure to meet the needs of a racially diverse society, Sue et al. (1992) outlined 31 multicultural counseling competencies. These competencies were divided between trainees' awareness, knowledge, and skills in three areas: (a) awareness of one's personal "assumptions, values, and biases," (b) "understanding the worldview of the culturally different client," and (c) "developing appropriate intervention

strategies and techniques (p. 482). Arredondo et al. (1996) operationalized these competencies according to awareness, knowledge, and skills with explanatory statements that serve as outcome objectives. The contributions of Sue et al. (1992) and Arredondo et al. were influential in the development of the "Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists" (APA, 2003). Sue and colleagues' "tripartite model" of awareness, knowledge, and skills is the predominant framework for training students toward multicultural competence (Pieterse et al., 2009, p. 95).

White counselors who do not heed the call for a multiculturally competent approach to counseling may not realize the potential for harm to clients of color and to the therapeutic alliance (e.g., Constantine, 2007). One way this harm may be perpetrated is through racial microaggressions (RMA), defined by Sue et al. (2007) as "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of color" (p. 271). RMA may be manifested as microassaults, microinsults, or microinvalidations. Microassaults are intentional verbal and nonverbal acts of racism more akin to those associated with older forms of racism. Microinsults "represent subtle snubs" (p. 274), and unlike people of color who are blatantly affected by these verbal and nonverbal acts, perpetrators are often unaware of their negative impact. Microinvalidations are acts that dismiss or minimize the reality or experiences of people of color.

Unawareness of actions and outcomes related to RMA exemplifies what Johnson (2001) referred to as "the luxury of obliviousness" (p. 24). Viewed in this way, White privilege and power are implicated in the enactment of RMA. White counselors who endorse color-blind racial attitudes, for example, may impose a White worldview on clients of color via RMA and

never know the oppressive effects of their actions (Sue et al., 2007). As an essential component of multicultural competence, Sue et al. (1992) encouraged counselors to understand their personal cultural worldviews and biases. Similarly, others have called for White counselors to explore what it means to be part of the dominant racial group in society and how this privilege impacts the counseling process (Black & Stone 2005; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996; Sue et al., 2007). Black and Stone (2005) urged counseling trainees to reflect honestly on how social privilege impacts:

> self-disclosure, determines use of the expert role, reinforces or diminishes the inherent power differential in counseling, accounts for the degree of responsibility (blame) placed on the client, and determines who defines the role and the description of the client's family (p. 253).

White clients may also be harmed by their participation in a system of dominance and oppression (Blitz, 2006; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). Silence surrounding Whiteness and racism is an all too common occurrence, especially when White counselors work with White clients. Because of this socialization of silence, counselors and clients may not be able to identify or address how suffering is influenced by Whiteness. It is when counselors understand the history of systemic racism and apply a model of White identity development (e.g., Helms, 1995) to themselves and their clients that dialogues about Whiteness and racism are possible. To illustrate these points, Blitz (2006) presented the case of Tzapora, a White, 37-year-old Jewish woman whose well-being and interpersonal struggles were complicated by White privilege and the interaction between her race and other identities (e.g., color-blind attitudes, presence of White privilege even as a member of an oppressed religio-ethnic group).

Supervision

Clinical supervision, like counseling, is a political and cultural activity (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). As in the relationship between counselor and client, there exists an obvious power differential between supervisor and supervisee. That power may or may or may not be used responsibly to acknowledge and to explore issues of race, privilege, and oppression in the supervisory dyad or the supervisee's counseling work (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Duan & Roehlke, 2001). When supervisors do address culture, supervisees stand to gain self-efficacy in multicultural counseling (Burkard et al., 2006; Constantine, 2001) and awareness of how culture impacts them, their counseling work, and the supervision process (Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004). The costs of culturally insensitive supervision can be significant, resulting in negative emotion and damage to the supervisory alliance (Burkard et al., 2006; Chwalisz, Patel, & Chu, 2005).

Unfortunately, inadequate multicultural supervision may not be all that uncommon. Constantine (1997) surveyed 30 supervisor-intern dyads at 22 APA-accredited predoctoral internship sites. Results of the survey revealed that 70% of supervisors and 30% of interns had not previously taken a course in cross-cultural or multicultural counseling. Duan and Roehlke (2001) surveyed members of cross-racial supervisory dyads (60 predoctoral interns and 58 supervisors) at university counseling center predoctoral internships sites. They found discrepancies in supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions of supervision. Although 93% of supervisors reported that they informed supervisees about a lack of cross-racial supervision, only 50% of supervisees reported having this brought to their attention. In other categories as well, more supervisors than supervisees reported that power and culture were addressed by supervisors.

White privilege continues to impact supervision. Using survey-based methods, Hird, Tao, and Gloria (2004) assessed multicultural competence of supervisors in cross-racial ($n = 126$ dyads) and same-race ($n = 316$ dyads) supervision relationships. Dyads were recruited through the Association of Psychology Post-doctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC). The majority of same-race dyads included two White individuals ($n = 295$ dyads), and in the majority of cross-racial supervision dyads the supervisor was White ($n = 95$). Compared to supervisors of color, White supervisors were found to have attended less to cultural issues in the past four supervision sessions and to have reported lower levels of multicultural competence. Cultural issues were less often a focus in White dyads. In accordance with Bernard (1994), the researchers considered the role of White privilege in their findings. They suggested that because race is less salient for Whites than people of color, discussions of racial issues between White supervisors and supervisees are not a priority (Hird et al., 2004).

Burkard et al. (2006) used a consensual qualitative research approach to explore the experiences of counseling and clinical psychology students in cross-racial supervision dyads. A female sample of 13 supervisees of color and 13 White supervisees was recruited. Through semi-structured interviews, the researchers inquired about participants' experiences with culturally responsive and unresponsive events with supervisors of a different race. All participants of color reported a culturally insensitive event, compared to eight of 13 White participants. White participants were more likely to report that supervisors had avoided discussions of cultural issues. But participants of color reported that White supervisors had both unintentionally (e.g., avoided) and intentionally (e.g., criticized) disregarded cultural concerns in therapy. For supervisees of color, these negative events often resulted in anger, fear, limited future disclosures, and damage to the supervisory relationship.

These findings are consistent with supervisees' reactions to and reported effects of culturally unresponsive supervision as identified by Chwalisz et al. (2005) and Constantine and Sue (2007). Even when discussing culturally responsive interactions with White supervisors, Burkard and colleagues (2006) found that supervisees of color expressed discomfort and surprise at how rarely past White supervisors had addressed cultural issues. In general, these results revealed a preponderance of culturally-insensitive supervision for both White and racially diverse supervisees. However, when examined more carefully, White privilege remains apparent in the lack of intentional harm done to White participants, and in the more frequent reports from supervisees of color that White supervisors had sidestepped issues of culture.

Constantine and Sue (2007) examined Black supervisees' experiences of racial microaggressions (RMA) perpetrated by White supervisors. Ten Black participants in clinical and counseling psychology programs were interviewed. Several RMA themes were identified, including supervisors: (a) dismissing issues of racial-cultural issues, (b) stereotyping clients and supervisees, (c) feeling reluctant to give sufficient feedback for fear of being labeled "racist," (d) overly focusing on supervisees' clinical limitations, (e) attributing client problems to the client instead of oppression, and (f) giving culturally insensitive recommendations for treatment. The researchers noted that many participants believed that their supervisors lacked awareness of White privilege.

The unique, "intensive, interpersonally focused nature of the supervisory relationship" is well-suited for dealing with cultural issues (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010, p. 151). Hays and Chang (2003) emphasized the importance of supervisors, whether of color or White, educating supervisees about and sharing their experiences encountering White privilege and racial oppression. They also suggested that supervisees be encouraged to consider how White privilege

affects their own lives, their clients' lives, and the counseling process.

Coursework

Educators hold and exercise a great deal of power. They are "in a position to define reality . . . and enforce it through grading" (Sue & Sue, 2008, p. 34). In training competent counseling psychologists, educators have a responsibility to promote multicultural competence and address the Eurocentric bias in counseling (Hays & Chang, 2003; Sue & Sue, 2008). Gloria and Pope-Davis (1997) advised educators to teach not only *about* (i.e., course content), but *from* (e.g., cultural sensitivity of grading methods) a multicultural perspective. As the multicultural competency movement gained momentum, program instructors showed definite attempts to enhance the focus on multiculturalism in course curriculum (Ponterotto, 1997), and in some cases, have paid particular attention to issues of White identity and privilege (e.g., Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Pieterse et al., 2009).

Neville et al. (1996) explored the White racial identity development of 38 graduate students enrolled in multicultural counseling courses at three universities. Questionnaire packets including the WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990) were completed by students at the beginning and end of the semester. Significant increases in Pseudoindependence and Autonomy scores were found, which were framed as indicating greater intellectual understanding of racial issues, non-racist self-definition, and multicultural appreciation. At one-year follow up ($N = 25$), increases Pseudoindependence and Autonomy attitudes remained.

In a similar investigation, Parker et al. (1998) incorporated Helms' White racial identity model into a multicultural counseling course curriculum and experimentally evaluated the course's impact on White trainees. Counseling trainees ($N = 96$) enrolled in either a required multicultural counseling course (treatment condition) or a general counseling skills course

(control condition and prerequisite for multicultural counseling course) completed pre- and posttest measures of White racial identity (measured by WRCDS; Claney & Parker, 1989) and interracial comfort were assessed pre- and posttest. As a result of attrition, the posttest measures were completed by only 32 students in the multicultural course and 22 in the general counseling course. Students in the multicultural course showed comparatively significant gains in interracial comfort and WRCDS subscale scores pertaining to Contact, Pseudoindependence, and Autonomy statuses of Helms' model. In accordance with Helms' model, the researchers interpreted these score increases to mean that students became more willing to acknowledge racial differences, more unconditionally (rather than intellectually) accepting of Blacks, and more empowered as antiracist activists.

Ancis and Szymanski (2001) recruited participants from a multicultural counseling course and used constant comparative methodology to analyze written accounts of counseling students' ($N = 34$) reactions to McIntosh's (1995) list of White privileges. The researchers were interested in examining individual differences among trainees' awareness of White privilege and its associated advantages. The sample of master's-level trainees was predominantly female ($n = 31$), and the average age of participants was 33.4 years. Only the responses of White students were analyzed. Participants were asked to "'read the McIntosh article, identify 1 or more of the conditions that she describes as related to her daily experiences of White privilege, and provide affective, cognitive, and/or behavioral reactions to the condition(s) chosen'" (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001, p. 552).

Ancis & Szymanski (2001) detailed their attempts throughout the process of data analysis to "achieve trustworthiness, specifically, credibility, transferability, and confirmability" (p. 553). Three themes and a total of 11 subthemes (divided among the three general theme categories)

were identified. The first theme the researchers identified was *Lack of Awareness and Denial of White Privilege*. Subthemes in this category captured reactions involving (a) anger and resistance (directed at McIntosh and her ideas), (b) use of nonracial factors to explain experiential differences of privilege, (c) discussion of how there are "exceptions to the rule" (p. 556), (d) focus on one's own experiences of victimization or the perceived privileges of people of color, and (e) use of contradictory statements.

The second theme that emerged was *Demonstrated Awareness of White Privilege and Discrimination*. Subthemes in this category included (a) negative emotional reactions of guilt, sadness, or disgust regarding privilege, and (b) awareness of privilege with reluctance to surrender it. The third theme, *Higher Order Awareness and Commitment to Action*, consisted of reactions with a nuanced understanding of and motivation to change systems of White privilege and oppression. The four subthemes in this category capture reactions in which participants exhibited: (a) knowledge of the insidious nature of White privilege (even when one is oppressed due to other identities), (b) an understanding that many Whites deny privilege and resist change, (c) an awareness of how people of color are impacted by White privilege, and (d) a desire to act or inspire change (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001).

Case (2007) further examined the idea of White privilege awareness in a sample of undergraduate students ($N = 146$) enrolled in a gender and race diversity course in psychology. The results of her quantitative study indicated that a diversity course that included lessons on White racial identity and White privilege enhanced students' awareness of White privilege and racism. Reflecting on her findings, Case suggested from a pedagogical standpoint the need for such diversity courses to include a greater focus on racial issues.

Along this line, Pieterse et al. (2009) conducted a descriptive content analysis of the

required multicultural course syllabi of 54 APA- and CACREP-accredited training programs in counseling psychology and counseling. The sample included training programs across the U.S. Categories of focus which emerged from the data included "course goals and objectives, required texts and reading lists, class schedule and content, and methods of grade assessment" (p. 100). Ninety-six percent of courses were driven by goals and objectives connected in some way to the tripartite model of multicultural competencies (Sue et al., 1992). In 56% percent of course syllabi, social justice (i.e., addressing oppression, inequality, power, -isms, activism) was indicated in the goals or objectives. With regard to course content, 87% of programs surveyed covered racial identity, 45% covered specific racial/ethnic groups, 48% covered racism, and 30% covered White privilege (a relevant, not exhaustive list of course content categories). Although the topic of White privilege appeared in 30% of course syllabi, the researchers noted with intrigue that Whites were included as a racial/ethnic group in just 11% of the syllabi. These latter findings reflect the relative invisibility of Whiteness, which perpetuates privilege (Pieterse et al., 2009).

The following conclusions can be drawn from the results of these studies. Neville et al. (1996) and Parker et al. (1998) provided evidence for the effectiveness of multicultural training in furthering the White racial identity development of counseling trainees. To what extent White privilege was a focus in the course curriculum in these two studies was not apparent. The study by Pieterse et al. (2009) revealed that more recent efforts to create thorough multicultural course curricula, although evident, may be insufficient in terms of addressing White privilege and/or Whites as a racial-cultural group. Ancis and Szymanski (2001) demonstrated how students can be encouraged to reflect on White privilege, but also that students differ in their awareness of and willingness to confront White privilege. The results of these studies suggest that White

privilege remains present in the classroom, and it could be incorporated even more into professional psychology training.

General Training Environment

APA (2009) presented the following description of a cultural diversity standard in the accreditation of professional psychology programs:

> The program has made systematic, coherent, and long-term efforts to attract and retain students and faculty from differing ethnic, racial, and personal backgrounds into the program. Consistent with such efforts, it acts to ensure a supportive and encouraging learning environment appropriate for the training of diverse individuals and the provision of training opportunities for a broad spectrum of individuals. Further, the program avoids any actions that would restrict program access on grounds that are irrelevant to success in graduate training (p. 10).

This APA accreditation standard necessitates the intentional promotion of a culturally sensitive and affirming environment in professionally psychology training programs. Having discussed the ways Whiteness and White privilege emerge in the specific realms of counseling psychology training, a brief discussion of these issues as they may play out generally in a program's training environment is warranted. The implications (i.e., perceived losses) associated with creating a culturally-sensitive training environment may elicit resistance by the dominant White culture in academia (Gloria & Pope-Davis, 1997). The reader is encouraged to consider the studies below in light of this reality.

Using web-based survey methods ($N = 1,219$), Maton et al. (2011) investigated the experiences of a national sample of psychology graduate students. The sample consists of 80.4% Ph.D. students and 19.6% Psy.D. students, and was 85.8% European American, 5.1% African

American, 3.9% Asian American, 5.2% Latino/a, 82.9% female, and 17.1% male. Of interest were students' reports of academic satisfaction, supports, barriers encountered (generally and specifically linked to race), mentoring, research encouragement, faculty-student interactions, career confidence and aspirations (generally and also related to race), and cultural diversity in one's training program and the field of psychology.

Some noteworthy differences were found between the experiences of students of color and European-American students (Maton et al., 2011). First, European-American students perceived fewer barriers than African-American students and were less likely to link their racial/ethnic status to the perceived barriers. Second, European-American participants were also more likely to report a sense of fairness in psychology's representation of their racial/ethnic group. Conversely, students of color were more likely to report a stereotypical or nonexistent representation in the field. Lastly, European-American students reported greater perceived racial diversity in their training environments than did their colleagues of color.

In a similar study, Clark and colleagues (2012) examined the experiences of school psychology trainees ($N = 400$), 87 of whom were of color. Compared to White-identified trainees, trainees of color reported higher levels of racial microaggressions and lower levels of belongingness in their training environments. The researchers called for future research to explore in greater detail the microaggressive experiences indicated by trainees.

Some insights in to the racial/ethnic differences in experience and climate emerging from these recent investigations can be extrapolated from a study by Constantine et al. (2008). The researchers conducted a qualitative investigation of racial microaggressions (RMA) perpetrated against Black faculty in counseling psychology and counseling programs. Seven female and five male faculty between the ages of 32 and 56 participated in semi-structured interviews.

Constantine and colleagues identified seven RMA themes: (a) feeling invisible or hypervisible in the workplace, (b) having one's qualifications and credentials questioned, (c) lacking mentoring/support, (d) perceiving expectations of others to take on diversity-related service responsibilities not valued by other colleagues, (e) struggling to determine perceived discrimination as related to race or gender, and (f) experiencing self-consciousness about dress, speech, hairstyle (and the seventh theme surrounded methods of coping with RMA). The racially unique experiences described by the Black faculty participants, to a large extent, are experiences White faculty members do not have to face. Again, this is the nature of White privilege. It is not exactly a leap of faith to assume that Black students and other students of color in these programs share similar experiences which White faculty and students do not (Gloria & Pope-Davis, 1997; McNeill, Horn, & Perez, 1995).

Counseling Psychology's Commitment to Multiculturalism and Social Justice

An appreciation for issues of multiculturalism is central to the history and mission of counseling psychology (Ivey & Collins, 2003; Leong et al., 2011). Essandoh (1996) pushed hopefully and critically for a genuine promotion of multiculturalism as psychology's fourth force. He noted that counseling psychology has "at the very least paid more lip service to multiculturalism than have other APA divisions" (p. 136). Interestingly, Middleton and colleagues (2005) found no differences in self-reported multicultural competencies between professional counselors ($n = 163$), clinical psychologists ($n = 179$), and counseling psychologists ($n = 70$).

Still, counseling psychology has made its commitment to multiculturalism quite evident. The American Psychological Association's (APA, 1999) "Archival Description of Counseling Psychology" gives mention of the field's emphasis on culture: "Counseling psychologists focus

on healthy aspects of the client" and "environmental/situational influences (including the context of cultural, gender, and lifestyle issues . . . " (p. 589). Furthermore, "the competent and skillful practice of counseling psychology requires knowledge of . . . individual differences (including racial, cultural, gender, lifestyle, and economic diversity)" (p. 591). The APA Society of Counseling Psychology website includes a statement that counseling psychologists engage in a variety of practices to assist people in improving their functioning "with a sensitivity to multicultural issues . . ." ("About Counseling Psychologists," para. 1). Furthermore, Division 17 was part of the joint task force (along with Division 45, The Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues) which developed APA's (2003) "Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists." And lastly, Murdock et al. (1998) indicated that a model counseling psychology training program incorporates cultural diversity in its policies, philosophy, objectives, and curriculum.

More recently, several counseling psychology scholars have called for a commitment to multiculturalism grounded in a social justice orientation (Speight & Vera, 2004; Speight & Vera, 2008; Vera & Speight, 2003; Watts, 2004), a potential fifth force in counseling psychology (Ratts, D'Andrea, & Arredondo, 2004). Speight and Vera (2008) similarly acknowledged that the profession's values (e.g., on diversity and the intersection of person and environment) closely align with a social justice orientation. Fouad et al. (2004) also explained that a central purpose of the 2001 National Counseling Psychology Conference was to clarify a social justice agenda for the field and to continue to confront oppression (e.g., through the formation of social action groups to address such social justice topics as racism).

A social justice orientation necessitates an understanding of power, privilege and oppression (Vera & Speight, 2003; Watts, 2004). The importance of privilege has been

recognized by Tania Israel, 2010-2011 APA Division 17 President. She declared the exploration of privilege in its many forms her presidential initiative. This Presidential Project entailed a special task group, relevant events, and the provision of resources for educators, researchers, and practitioners ("Exploring Privilege," n.d.).

Summary and Critique: White Privilege in Counseling Psychology

White privilege is evident in the multifaceted training of counseling psychology, in research, counseling, supervision, coursework, and the general training environment. Research epistemologies embedded in the beliefs and values of White culture have been privileged (Katz, 1985). In turn, the products of research have historically served the interests and purposes of White individuals (Sue, 1999).

Prevailing counseling and psychotherapy theories and practices are also of Eurocentric origin (Katz; 1985; Sue & Sue, 2008). Multicultural scholars have recognized the inappropriateness of these counseling approaches for people of color, and attempts have been made to define and operationalize multicultural competence (e.g., Sue et al., 1992; Arredondo et al., 1996). White counselors who do not engage in serious self-reflection may inadvertently impose a White worldview on people of color (Sue et al., 2007; Sue & Sue, 2008) and may avoid or miss opportunities to explore White privilege and racism with White clients (Blitz, 2006).

Similarly, White clinical supervisors who have not examined how Whiteness dominates systems of therapy and affects them personally may avoid or mishandle discussions of culture with supervisees of color and perpetrate harmful racial microaggressions (Burkard et al., 2006; Constantine & Sue, 2007). In their work with White supervisees, they may remain unaware of or silent about culture (Burkard et al., 2006; Hird et al., 2004). Also, compared with supervisees of color, White supervisees may be less prone to perceiving intentional culturally-insensitive

behaviors by supervisors (Burkard et al., 2006).

Since the inception of the multicultural movement in psychology, curricular trends have revealed increasing attention to cultural diversity (e.g., Ponterotto, 1997). Furthermore, there seems to be a growing recognition for how multicultural competence is tied to a social justice orientation (e.g., Pieterse et al., 2009). However, the presence of White privilege is still noticeable in course topics (Pieterse et al.) and students' varying awareness and appreciation of White privilege (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001). Correspondingly, the unique (and often more negative) experiences reported by faculty and students of color suggest that White privilege lingers in the general environments of counseling psychology training programs (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Constantine et al., 2008; Maton et al., 2011). An assortment of conceptual works and quantitative and qualitative studies have exposed the reality and impact of cultural insensitivity and racial inequality in counseling psychology (and other related doctoral and Master's-level) training programs. Although the presence of White privilege is alluded to by researchers or can be inferred from empirical findings, there is ample room for empirical investigation of this topic. Qualitative studies may be especially valuable in deepening our understanding of how White privilege operates in training programs or in creating a foundation on which to build such understanding.

Some of the conceptual and empirical literature presented in this discussion extended beyond counseling psychology to other professions that utilize similar training content and methods. It is recognized that counseling psychology cannot be separated from the history and systems of professional psychology and psychotherapy at large. Despite this shared history, counseling psychology's outspoken commitment to issues of multiculturalism is distinctive in professional psychology (Essandoh, 1996).

The move toward a multicultural psychology has not been without constructive criticism. For instance, the typical method of training in multicultural psychology tends to be difference- and other-focused, rather than self-focused. This training emphasis "promote[s] unintentional ethnocentrism" and conveys an underlying assumption that the therapist, who is not an "other," is a part of the dominant culture (Brown, 2009; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996, p. 239). This criticism has particular relevance when viewed in the context of the current discussion of White privilege in counseling psychology. Blitz (2006) noted that with a few exceptions (e.g., Lisa Spanierman, Michael D'Andrea, Julie Ancis), the work of understanding Whiteness (i.e., White identity) and its implications for counseling has typically been undertaken by people of color and still remains relatively unexplored in counseling psychology. Clearly, not only is there work to be done by members of the counseling psychology profession (especially White members) to better understand Whiteness and White privilege. Upon considering that the perspectives and practices of Whites have been privileged in counseling psychology training, there is also a need to further explore White privilege in the confines of our own profession.

This Study

Although it is believed by many to be a reality of the past, racism persists in the United States (Feagin, 2010). Accordingly, so too does White privilege. Despite a fervent and growing commitment to multiculturalism and social justice (e.g., Speight & Vera, 2008), the profession of counseling psychology is not immune to the history of racism and Eurocentrism in psychology and mental health (Guthrie, 1998; Sue & Sue, 2008). In professional psychology and counseling training programs, the experiences of White trainees and trainees of color are markedly different (e.g., Burkard et al., 2006; Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011). At the societal level, while all racial/ethnic minority groups are oppressed by institutionalized racism similarly and uniquely,

African Americans seem to be disproportionately impacted according to significant life outcomes (e.g., Mustard, 2001; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Considering the role of White privilege in producing these differential outcomes is essential and consistent with recent efforts of the Society of Counseling Psychology to heighten "personal and professional awareness of privilege(s)" ("Exploring Privilege," n.d., para. 4).

This study was a qualitative exploration of the experiences of Black/African American and White trainees in counseling psychology training programs as they navigate the norms and privileges of Whiteness (Rowe & Malhotra, 2007). Quantitative research can be used to highlight discrepancies in the racially unique experiences of trainees and can show generalizability at a broad level. But it is qualitative inquiry that can deepen our understanding of these experiences through personal dialogue and contextual understanding (Wang, 2008). White counseling trainees have been asked to reflect on White privilege (e.g., Ancis & Szymanski, 2001), and trainees of color have shared experiences of modern racism (e.g., microaggressions; Constantine & Sue, 2007). However, the extant literature reveals that much less often, if at all, have counseling psychology trainees (especially White trainees) been asked to reflect on the experiences and impact of White privilege and racial inequality in their immediate training environments. In other words, it is important to discuss White privilege as not just something "out there," but "in here" as well. Creating a dialogue around these issues of privilege in counseling psychology programs may indeed be an important step for the discipline, the training of counseling psychologists, and ultimately, the people counseling psychologists serve.

How do White trainees experience, benefit from, and observe racial privilege in their counseling psychology training programs? What do these experiences mean to White trainees, and how are they affected by them? Alternatively, as those affected by racial inequality and

often overlooked as experts on Whiteness (Roediger, 1998), how do Black trainees observe White privilege in their training programs? How are Black trainees affected and disadvantaged as they navigate Whiteness and what do these experiences mean to them? What are the similarities and differences in the ways White and Black trainees describe encounters with White privilege? What are the implications of these similarities and differences? As a member of profession dedicated to cultural diversity and social justice, it was my hope to answer these questions through empirical analysis. This study was an interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith, 1996) involving in-depth interviews with advanced-level trainees about their experiences and encounters with White privilege.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Broadly speaking, this study was a qualitative, phenomenological exploration of White

privilege in counseling psychology training programs. More specifically, the purpose of the

study was to: (a) describe White privilege as it is observed, experienced, and thought about by

White-identified trainees in various areas of their training, (b) describe White privilege as it is

observed, encountered, and thought about by Black/African American-identified trainees in

various areas of their training, (c) examine how the accounts of Black and White trainees

overlap, (d) examine how the accounts of White and Black trainees diverge, and (e) describe the

potential meanings and implications of these similarities and differences. In the discussion that

follows, the study's design will be presented in greater detail, beginning more broadly with the

choice of a qualitative research approach and paradigmatic influences, and narrowing to a focus

on the chosen strategy of inquiry, and the study's procedure.

Qualitative Research Methodology

Quantitative research is often characterized by: (a) research questions that inquire *why*,

(b) the use of a positivist or postpositivist paradigm, (c) an emphasis on objectivity, (d) the use of

experimental manipulations to examine cause and effect relationships between variables, and (e)

measurements of "quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency" (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln,

2000, p. 9). In contrast, qualitative research often entails: (a) research questions that ask *how* or

what; (b) the use of paradigms which emphasize multiple socially constructed realities (as

opposed to positivism and postpositivism); (c) greater subjectivity in terms of the "value-laden

nature of inquiry" and the intimacy of the researcher-researched connection; and (d) a detailed

exploration of social processes and their meanings (sometimes as they occur in natural settings;

Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 9). As will be discussed in the sections that follow, the characteristics of qualitative research are consistent with the purpose, questions, and paradigmatic influences of this study.

Qualitative Paradigms

Creswell (1998) equated a paradigm with a worldview, or "a basic set of beliefs or assumptions that guide [researchers'] inquiries" (p. 74). A researcher's paradigm influences her/his beliefs and assumptions about "the nature of reality (the ontology issue), the relationship of the researcher to that being researched (the epistemological issue), the role of values in a study (the axiological issue), and the process of the research (the methodological issue)" (p. 74). Quantitative research paradigms are either positivistic or postpositivistic. Although subsets of paradigms in qualitative research do exist, as phenomenology is a faction of interpretivism-constructivism (Morrow, 2007), the more common guiding paradigms of qualitative research are constructivism (also referred to as interpretivism, interpretivism-constructivism, and constructivism-interpretivism) and critical theory (Ponterotto, 2005; Wang, 2008).

Constructivism

According to constructivists, there are socially constructed realities rather than fixed, universal truths (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). People construct reality in their minds as they interact with the physical, social, and cultural world. Therefore, events can be interpreted or constructed uniquely according to individual experiences and the associated meanings attributed to those experiences. Constructed realities that otherwise would be internal are discovered through the process of dialectics, in which researcher and participant interact to expose the inner reality of the participant. Also integral to constructivist research is hermeneutics, or the process of the researcher interpreting (through the lens of his/her

constructions of reality) the participant's reality. Constructivists make use of inductive research methods (Heppner et al., 2008). They research territories without maps, and there are multiple trails of knowledge that may be discovered as they explore the uncharted territories of unfixed realities. In constructivist research, the investigator's values are acknowledged "and are even embraced" (Morrow, 2007, p. 213).

Critical Theory

Like constructivists, proponents of critical theory (also referred to as critical-ideological theory) endorse an ontology of multiple socially constructed realities (Morrow, 2007). Unlike constructivists, they believe that these "social constructions are shaped by the social, political, cultural, historical, and economic forces . . ., particularly forces created by powerful individuals" (Heppner et al., 2008, p. 13). Power and oppression are "real" to critical theorists (Morrow, 2007). They conduct value-driven research with a goal of "emancipation and transformation" (Ponterotto, 2005, p. 129). Through a deep dialectical process between researcher and participants, social constructions are identified as oppressive and therefore are altered in the process. Furthermore, the need for social action, central to the critical-ideological paradigm, becomes apparent throughout the process. There are multiple critical theories, such as feminist theory and Critical Race Theory (Heppner et al., 2008).

The Chosen Paradigm

Morrow and colleagues (2001) recommended that researchers choose a paradigm according to how it fits: (a) naturally/personally, (b) with the researcher's discipline, and (c) with the research topic and questions. With these suggestions in mind, I chose a paradigm that was, to some extent, situated where constructivism and critical theory meet. This study was conducted primarily from a constructivist paradigm, but I also incorporated a Critical Whiteness Studies

perspective (e.g., Andersen, 2003).

There may be some concern that constructivist and critical paradigms are discrete philosophical entities and are in some way incompatible. However, Morrow (2007) noted that "it would be simplistic to assume that each research project falls neatly under a single paradigm" (p. 214). Also, Lincoln and Guba (2000) observed the interbreeding and confluences of paradigms and elucidated the ontological, epistemological, and axiological similarities among constructivism and critical theory. Having already described the constructivist paradigm, I now describe the influence of a Critical Whiteness Studies perspective before further discussing the constructivist-critical paradigm selected for this study.

Influence of a Critical Whiteness Studies perspective. This study is guided, in part, by a Critical Whiteness Studies perspective, which entails the questioning of what it means to be White (Andersen, 2003). Marx (2003) observed the efforts of critical Whiteness scholars to examine, or "[center] . . . Whiteness in order to better understand it and disrupt its predominance" (p. 4). This is certainly the spirit of this investigation. However, Marx suspected that centering for the purpose of disruption would only take the Critical Whiteness field so far. She acknowledged the need for voices of color to be included in analyses of Whiteness, lest Critical Whiteness research becomes a self-absorbed reflection on Whiteness (Andersen, 2003; Rowe & Malhotra, 2007). Similarly, Rowe and Malhotra explained that when "Whiteness as a universalizing, privileging *process*" (p. 271) is distinguished from the bodies and identities of Whites, both Whites and people of color have more room to resist racism (as it is both perpetuated and internalized, respectively). A central tenet of Critical Race Theory (from which Critical Whiteness Studies emerged) is the importance of perspectives of color, or counterstories, "narratives that challenge the dominant version of reality" (Bergerson, 2003, p. 54). Taking into

account these recommendations, the present study also included African Americans' encounters and observations of White privilege, rather than restricting the focus to White trainees. The descriptive terms, Black and African American, are used interchangeably here in general discussion. However, participants' self-identified racial identity labels were honored when reporting results.

Ontology, epistemology, axiology, and methodology. My ontological stance (assumptions about the nature of reality) is one in which I assumed the existence of multiple constructed realities. This is common ground for constructivists and critical theorists (Morrow, 2007; Wang, 2008). Like most critical theorists, I view "race" and "Whiteness" as social constructions perpetuated by those in power (Heppner et al., 2008), but the research topic and questions did not make this view of ontology a driving force in the study. The personally meaningful experiences of participants were the more central focus.

The epistemology (assumptions about the relationship between investigator and investigated) of constructivists and critical theorists is transactional/subjectivist (Lincoln & Guba, 2000), emphasizing the importance of the intimate communication between researcher and participant for meaningful and complex knowledge to be created (Ponterotto, 2005). Where constructivists and critical theorists diverge epistemologically is in "created" versus "value-mediated findings," respectively (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 168). Regarding my epistemological orientation, the nature of interaction and interpretation (i.e., dialectics and hermeneutics, respectively) between investigator and participant is more akin to constructivism than critical theory. By immersing myself in the contexts of participants, our interactions, and my interpretations of their stories, my hope was to co-construct meanings through question, reflection, and interpretation. I was open to the multiple meanings and realities that Black and

White trainees constructed around observations and experiences of White privilege, a

phenomenon which is indivisible from their experiences (Heppner et al., 2008). From a critical

theorist's perspective, my belief was that my interactions with participants and the process of co-

construction could lead to transformative (dialectic) and deep insights (dialogic) for both the

researchers and participants (Ponterotto, 2005).

Lincoln and Guba (2000) summarized the overlapping axiological views of

constructivists and critical theorists: "Propositional, transactional knowledge is instrumentally

valuable as a means to social emancipation, which as an end in itself, is intrinsically valuable"

(p. 172). My axiological stance (views on the function of values in research) is one of

acknowledging and embracing (Morrow, 2007), rather than attempting to eliminate, a value on

the importance of social justice. I see the very act of discussing with participants experiences of

privilege, oppression, and race as consistent with a social justice orientation. I plan to let the

study's findings "speak for themselves," and I will make recommendations for counseling

psychology based on these findings that may inspire social action in the field. My goal,

however, is *not* to actively attempt to inspire action, change, or emancipation in the participants,

but to co-construct meanings through discussion and interpretation of their experiences.

Finally, the methodology (views on the strategy of inquiry in research) of this study

should "[flow] from one's position on ontology, epistemology, and axiology" (Ponterotto, 2005,

p. 132). Constructivist methodologies tend to be dialectical and hermeneutic, and criticalist

methodologies are often dialectical and dialogic (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). In other words,

constructivists apply a methodology that features co-constructive dialogue (dialectical) and

interpretation (hermeneutic) of constructions. Critical theorists use a methodology that

emphasizes transformative dialogue (dialectical) and deep insights (dialogic) about constructions

that inspire liberating action. Participatory action research is a strategy of inquiry typically associated with critical theory (Ponterotto, 2005). Because this study was more heavily influenced by constructivism than critical theory, interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith, 1996; see next section) was identified and utilized as an appropriate strategy of inquiry. Taking a Critical Whiteness Studies perspective as a secondary paradigmatic influence, the methodological decision was made to not only include White participants in a discussion about White privilege, but Black trainees as well.

Strategy of Inquiry

The strategy of inquiry selected for this study was interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith, 1996). Phenomenology and hermeneutics, two rich and complex traditions, influenced the development interpretative phenomenological analysis. Generally speaking, interpretivist theory, phenomenology, and hermeneutics emerged during the late nineteenth century as intellectual figures reacted to the inappropriateness of natural science's positivist paradigm for the human sciences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Schwandt, 2000; Leahey, 2001). Before reviewing interpretative phenomenological analysis in greater detail, I briefly explore phenomenology and hermeneutics for their relevance to qualitative research in psychology and interpretative phenomenological analysis.

Phenomenology

Reacting to the positivist paradigm of mainstream natural science, early phenomenologists sought to "to describe consciousness as it appears naively, without presuppositions about its nature" (Leahey, 2001, p. 90). Giorgi and Giorgi (2003) commented on the unsurprising intermingling of psychology and phenomenology, as both traditions arose in the same historical periods and both with a focus on consciousness. In this tradition, Wilhelm

Wundt sought to *analyze* consciousness, and William James, more of a pure phenomenological psychologist, sought to *describe* pure consciousness (Leahey, 2001). Throughout Europe and then the U.S. in the twentieth century, phenomenology influenced psychologists' understanding of "perception, imagination, emotions, behavior, language and social processes," as well as mental health and existentialism (Wertz, 2005, p. 167). In phenomenological research, the main objective is to access and attempt to understand a given phenomenon through (not in isolation of) the subjective everyday life-world of the participant (Smith, 1996). By doing so, the details of experiences and their meanings often unexamined or passed by in everyday life are illuminated (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2003).

  Husserl, Heidegger, and hermeneutics. Interpretative phenomenological analysis sprung, in part, from the phenomenological thinking of Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger. Edmund Husserl is credited with the establishing a phenomenological research method (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2003; Wertz, 2005). He is often assumed to have perpetuated in his philosophy the dualism of outer and inner realities. However, he was not suggesting that a reality apart from us exists, but rather that reality is intimately tied to how we think about it (Larkin, Watts, & Clifton, 2006, p. 105). (For a review of Husserl's phenomenological methods and their utility for clinical and counseling psychologists conducting phenomenological research, see Wertz, 2005.)

  Martin Heidegger, another prominent figure in phenomenological philosophy (and Husserl's mentee), questioned the prioritizing of intentional thought in Western philosophy and rejected Cartesian dualism. He contended that because of our constant interrelatedness with situation and context, people do not relate to the world by stopping to intentionally think about it and ascribe meaning to things which have none. Instead, we are always intentionally engaged with the world, and meaning comes from this interrelatedness. Thought is only needed to

problem solve when the flow of person with context is interrupted by some barrier (Larkin et al., 2006). According to Heidegger, "What is *real* is not dependent on us, but the exact meaning of the nature of *reality* is" (Larkin et al., 2006, p. 107). Heidegger's critical questioning of the nature of meaning and understanding made him a significant figure in hermeneutic philosophy, and it was he who connected phenomenology to hermeneutics (Palmer, 1969).

Palmer (1969) noted regarding the etymology of *hermeneutics* that Hermes, a "messenger-god" in Greek mythology, made understandable to humans what was otherwise incomprehensible (p. 13). Understanding and interpretation are the essence of hermeneutic theory, a scientific tradition shaped by philosophies of phenomenology and existentialism (Palmer, 1969). In philosophical hermeneutics, what is interpreted is not discrete from who is interpreting and the process of interpretation (Schwandt, 2000).

Hermeneutics involves a clarification of the process of interpreting or describing a human-made work or phenomenon. In a sense, hermeneutics is a meta-understanding—a "study of the understanding of the works of man [sic]"—an analysis of the analytic process (Palmer, 1969, p. 10). In the hermeneutic tradition, interpretation is viewed as a phenomenon worth understanding. In asserting the importance of hermeneutics, Palmer further observed how central the act of interpretation is to everyday human life, whether describing the results of a scientific study or simply listening to a friend share a story.

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis

For the purpose of this study, interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA; Smith, 1996) was the strategy of inquiry used. Smith and Eatough (2007) described the IPA approach:

> The aim of IPA is to explore in detail individual personal and lived experience and
> to examine how participants are making sense of their personal and social world. The

main currency for an IPA study is the meanings that particular experiences, events,

and states hold for participants . . . IPA is particularly well-suited for topics

. . . where there is a need to discern how people perceive and understand significant

events in their lives . . . . It should be possible to learn something about both the

important generic themes in the analysis but also still about the narrative life world

of the particular participants . . . (pp. 36-37).

Evident in this description of IPA are the influences of phenomenology (according to

Husserl and Heidegger) and hermeneutics. Husserl's attention to the life-world, subjective

experience, and a phenomenological research method were integral to the development of

phenomenological research in psychology, and therefore to IPA as a phenomenological strategy

of inquiry (Smith, 1996). The focus on interpretation and meaning in hermeneutics and

Heidegger's phenomenological view drive the IPA approach. Furthermore, the meta-

interpretation characteristic of hermeneutic theory is what Smith and Eatough (2007) referred to

as the "double hermeneutic" involved in IPA (p. 36). The investigator is attempting to interpret

the participant's interpretation of experiences.

Beyond phenomenology and hermeneutics, idiography (i.e., individual meaning and

complexity), humanistic psychology (i.e., viewing a person holistically), cognitive psychology

(i.e., meaning-making), and symbolic interactionism (i.e., emphasis on personal meaning

obtained through interaction and interpretation) were also contributing factors to IPA (Smith,

1996; Smith and Eatough, 2007). Smith (1996) located IPA at the interface between social

cognition and discourse analysis, with the focus of IPA on both personal experience and

meaning-making *and* the contextual determinants of these meanings.

Smith (2004) labeled IPA as an "idiographic, inductive, and interrogative" approach (p.

41). IPA researchers take an idiographic approach through their holistic appreciation of each participant's data. Themes that emerge across participants are of little interest until a rather exhaustive understanding of each individual's experiences is reached. In this sense, Smith is actually advising IPA researchers not to lose the trees for the forest, so to speak. IPA is an inductive approach due to the lack of hypothesis testing and an openness to the implications of emergent data. IPA is interrogative because investigators who use this approach reflect upon how their research relates and may contribute to the broader context of psychological knowledge.

As may already be evident, IPA is a flexible methodology. During data collection, IPA investigators are interested in participants' immediate and charged content (hot cognition), as well as more distant and reflective accounts of experiences (cool cognition). During data analysis, the flexibility of an IPA approach is evident in researchers' intensive attention to and description of participants' spoken (or written) realities, while also critically questioning and interpreting these accounts (Smith & Eatough, 2007). The researchers' initial description of the data, although still an interpretation of co-constructed meanings, is kept intentionally close to what participants said. Also, IPA researchers can further interpret the findings and "[position] the initial 'description' in relation to a wider social, cultural, and perhaps even theoretical, context" (Larkin et al., 2006, p. 104). Greater detail about IPA will be provided in accordance with considerations of the study's procedure.

Study Methodology

The more practical aspects of the study's methodology will now be discussed. Consideration is given to the study's participants (also including this researcher, the study's auditor, and the study's social context), materials, procedure, and trustworthiness. Methodological decisions were made in accordance with the study's constructivist-critical

paradigm and IPA research design in mind.

 Participants

Between three and six participants is typical both for novice IPA researchers, in terms of manageability, and experienced IPA researchers, in allowing for a more expert level of analysis (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). The authors further acknowledged the potential for larger sample sizes to undermine the importance of idiographic meaning in IPA research. Smith and Eatough (2007) recommended that investigators determine an appropriate target sample size by considering a priori what level of generality versus specificity of interpretation is desired. Ultimately, I hoped to be able to comment on the unique within-group experiences of White/European-American participants and Black/African-American participants, and to compare and contrast the responses of these subsamples.

Ten trainees were recruited for this investigation, including five White/European American-identified participants and five Black/African American-identified participants. This sample size yielded an appropriate interpretive balance between individual and group level meanings. Of less concern in IPA research, though nonetheless important, this sample size was also sufficient to reach saturation of themes by subsample. Participant profiles, including a separate background description of each participant, are presented in the Results/Discussion section. Here, demographic characteristics are briefly provided by subsample.

All participants ($N = 10$) were enrolled in an APA-accredited doctoral counseling psychology training program. Eight of the participants had been enrolled in their doctoral training programs for at least four years. One of these eight participants was in her fifth year of training on pre-doctoral internship. One participant, because of a training program's unique structure, had completed the equivalent of three years of training in terms of semesters. Another

participant was completing a fourth year of graduate school and second year of doctoral training. Having completed a master's program in counseling in the same institutional department, there was some overlap in coursework and training environment with his doctoral program (e.g., multicultural counseling course).

Subsample of Black participants. In the subsample of Black participants ($n = 5$), two participants identified as male and three as female. This gender composition was consistent with 2009 demographic survey data on the representation of African-American trainees in counseling psychology training programs (Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs, 2013). The average age of Black participants was 27 years. All Black participants identified as heterosexual and as temporarily able-bodied. None identified as international students. Two participants identified as first-generation college students. Also worth acknowledging is that three of the African-American participants attended historically Black colleges or universities (HBCUs) at the undergraduate level. Religiously/spiritually, two participants identified Christian, one as Christian/spiritual, one as non-denominational (with a background in the African Episcopal Methodist Church), and one as agnostic. In terms of social class identity/background, two participants identified as middle class, one as middle class with fluctuation due to job loss in the family, one as upper-middle class, and one as lower-middle class. Two participants grew up in the Southern U.S., one in the Midwest, one in the East, and one in the West. Participants' training programs were located in a variety of locations, with three programs in the Southern U.S., one in the Southwest, and one in the Midwest.

Subsample of White participants. Of those participants identifying as White ($n = 5$), four identified as female and one as male. This gender composition was also consistent with 2009 demographic survey data on the representation of White trainees in counseling psychology

training programs (Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs, 2013). The average age of White participants was 27.4 years. All White participants identified as heterosexual and as temporarily able-bodied. None identified as international students or first-generation college/graduate students. Religiously/spiritually, one participant identified as Jewish, one as agnostic, one as agnostic atheist, one as spiritual, and one as Roman Catholic. In terms of social class identity/background, two participants identified as middle class, one as upper-middle class, one as lower-middle class, and one as "mixed," noting that her parents (divorced) differed in their access to resources. Three participants grew up in the Midwestern U.S., one in the West, and one in the East. Regarding the geographic location of training programs, two programs were in the Midwestern U.S., one in the South, one in the East, and one in the West.

Researcher-as-instrument statement. I played a very active role in this study. Like participants, my voice was present during interviews through questioning and reflection, and therefore played a co-constructive role in shaping their responses. Furthermore, my voice is present in the analysis and interpretation of data. Because my participation was also so integral to the study, it was important that I draft the following statement on my own background and biases (Morrow, 2005; Stiles, 1993) prior to conducting the study.

I am a White, heterosexual, temporarily able-bodied male in my late 20s. I was raised in a middle to upper-middle class suburb in the Midwestern U.S. I was raised by two parents, a Jewish mother who worked as a teacher, and a Catholic father employed in the trades. I am becoming increasingly aware and knowledgeable about the many social privileges I have stemming from several different but intersecting identities. One marginalized identity I possess is that of being of Jewish descent.

This study marked my entry into the realm of qualitative research. I prepared for this

monumental undertaking through extensive reading and consultation with faculty with qualitative research expertise. My interest in conducting this study had at least three major and interrelated influences: (a) rediscovering the concept of White privilege while in graduate school after having the privilege to forget about it for over three years; (b) intimate discussions with colleagues and close friends, both White and of color, from a number of training programs; and (c) a growing commitment to social justice and a desire to benefit those colleagues, students, supervisees, and clients I encounter and serve. Whereas social action and/or political change were not direct aims of this study, I do view the act of talking critically about race and privilege as consistent with my social justice orientation. I was mindful of this value as I strove to maintain an empathic and intellectual openness to participants' views and experiences.

I did have assumptions and expectations about the findings of this study, which were acknowledged while designing the investigation. Here, I "bracket" them and make them explicit to myself and the reader. First, I assumed that White privilege was a part of counseling psychology trainees' experiences in their training programs. Second, I assumed that counseling psychology trainees would be able to reflect upon and discuss their experiences and encounters with White privilege. Third, I believed that there would be differences and similarities in the reports of Black and White participants, such that each subsample would notice some things that the other would not, and vice versa. Fourth, I believed that Black participants would be keenly aware of events and experiences involving White privilege, perhaps more so than White trainees. Fifth, I assumed that Black individuals share encounters and knowledge of oppression and White privilege that White people do not. Sixth, I assumed that White privilege is experienced uniquely and similarly in different contexts (e.g., in counseling psychology training programs vs. at a restaurant). Seventh, I believed that experiences and encounters with White privilege would

span the areas of counseling psychology training (e.g., counseling, supervision, coursework/classroom, general training environment). Other strategies employed to manage subjectivity will be discussed.

Auditor. Another key "participant" in the research process was the study's auditor, S.P. S.P. is a psychologist and trusted colleague who I first met during my pre-doctoral internship. She was asked to assist with this study due to her wealth of knowledge in the area of multicultural psychology. Moreover, I believed that her unique experiences as a person of color and a woman would lend an alternative racial and gender worldview to interpretation of the data, so as not to privilege only a White male researcher's perspective. The auditing process is further detailed in the section on Establishing Trustworthiness.

Social context of the study. Finally, I also considered the social and cultural context of this study as an undeniable presence affecting results (Stiles, 1993). Racism in systems and individuals, although more subtle than in previous decades (e.g., color-blind racism), remains a lingering problem (Doane, 2003). For many Whites, racism is an outdated issue, and the notion of privilege is met with looks of bewilderment, resistance, or both. On a smaller scale, while the fourth force of multiculturalism and the fifth force of social justice in counseling psychology have flourished in recent decades (Leong et al., 2011), professional psychology is still predominantly driven by Eurocentric research, theories, ethics, and practices (e.g., intrapsychic focus, medical model) which can make it difficult for appreciation and affirmation of cultural diversity (in all its forms) to thrive. Furthermore, all of the participants were enrolled at predominantly White institutions. With these considerations in mind, it was assumed that the participants (even as relative experts in or pursuers of multicultural knowledge) would not be immune to these contextual realities, which for some may make the topics of dialogue more

salient. For other participants, the topics of discussion may be more inaccessible.

Materials

Participants were interviewed via Skype (a free downloadable internet service used for interactive live video chatting). A computer and specialized audio recording software (eCamm Call Recorder) for Skype were used. Apart from the background questionnaire and the interview protocols, recruitment emails and a consent form were the only other materials used in this study.

Background questionnaire. Upon consenting to participate in the study, trainees were asked to complete a typed background questionnaire (see Appendix A). Items were selected to provide the researcher with knowledge of participants' intersecting identities, training program characteristics, and professional experiences that could be especially relevant to building rapport and understanding participants and their responses. These questionnaire items were also used to create the participant profiles presented in the next chapter.

The questionnaire contained 15 items, nine of which addressed participants' social identities (age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, social class, religious/spiritual identity, disability/ability status, first-generation college/graduate school status, and geographic background). On all nine items, participants could clarify their social identity selection or provide an additional identity or response that was not listed. The next six items, which were more open-ended, addressed participants' training status, their interest in psychology/counseling psychology, their reasons for choosing to attend their training programs, characteristics of their training programs, multicultural training experiences, their interests and pursuits in the field of counseling psychology, and their career plans.

Interview protocols. A semi-structured individual interview format was chosen, both common to IPA research and amenable to the constructivist and criticalist underpinnings and

phenomenological design of the proposed study. Questions were designed to be relatively jargon-free, neutral, and open (Smith & Osborn, 2003). The interview protocols were developed by reviewing the available literature and consulting with the dissertation chairperson, Dr. Kathleen Chwalisz, and with White colleagues and colleagues of color who are knowledgeable about multiculturalism and White privilege. Separate protocols were created for White trainees (see Appendix B) and African-American trainees (see Appendix C) to reflect differences in their social experiences. For example, since people of color do not technically *have* or *experience* White privilege, but rather *encounter* and are *impacted* by it, questions that would have inferred the former were altered to reflect the latter.

The protocols contained four major topical sections: Introduction/Informed Consent, White Privilege, White Privilege in Training, and Closing. The Introduction provided an opportunity to once again review informed consent and answer any remaining questions prior to the interview. An opportunity was also taken during the Introduction portion to acknowledge the importance of intersectionality—that despite the interview's primary focus on racial identity, participants should feel free to incorporate other identities as they saw fit. Fifteen minutes were allotted for this portion of the interview.

During the next section (White Privilege), the focus shifted to participants' understanding of and experiences/encounters with White privilege generally. Questions in this section were intended to acclimate participants to the tenor of the discussion. Five questions focused on racial understanding, racial identity development and awareness, and personal experiences outside of counseling psychology training. Questions in this section included: "How would you explain 'White privilege' to someone who was unfamiliar with the term?" and "Please tell me a little about the process through which you've become aware of White privilege?" Across the two

interview protocols, the wording of questions is essentially identical. Probes were occasionally used to elicit or focus responses, for example, on a "significant event" or a meaningful "personal discussion." Despite the 15-30 minutes initially allotted, this portion of the interview typically lasted 45 minutes. Participants shared a great deal about their racial identity development and personal experiences.

Following this discussion, the majority of time (approximately one hour and 15 minutes) was allotted for the section of White Privilege in Training programs. In this section, participants were asked more specifically about their experiences and encounters with White privilege in training and the various meanings surrounding their racial identities in a training context. Some questions were more exploratory: "In what ways are White cultural values or norms represented or assumed intentionally/unintentionally in your training program?" and "Personally, how has being White impacted *your* experience in training?" Other questions entailed requests and probes for information about particular events, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, such as: "At the time, how did this experience affect you? How did you respond?" and "Looking back, what about this observation of/encounter with White privilege was most meaningful to you?" Probes and prompts in this section served to encourage sharing about experiences in different areas of training (e.g., counseling, supervision). A question was also included in this section to address the intersection of multiple identities. With the exception of one additional question on the Black/African-American interview protocol, the questions in this section of the protocol were very similar. As discussed before, the wording on some questions varied across subsample protocols to reflect unique racial experiences.

Finally, the Closing section consisted of five questions which allowed participants to reflect on their interview experience and share any remaining thoughts. Questions included:

"What are your reactions to our discussion today about White privilege in your training program?" and "What do you hope that I take away from our discussion today?" It was during this section of the interview that I also took time to share with participants what was most meaningful to me about what they had shared.

As is typical of qualitative research with semi-structured interviews, the protocols were flexible in their use and evolved somewhat in their content (Smith et al., 2009). Questions were not always asked in the same order or with the same probes to elicit responses. Protocol content remained fairly consistent across interviews, though some noteworthy changes were made. First, rather than limiting the focus on intersectionality to a question near the end of the interview, a decision was made to also include an invitation to participants to share about other identities germane to the discussion during the Introduction section.

Second, a change was made to some of the questions in the White participant interview protocol to make the wording less tentative. For example, the phrase "how do you think" was removed from the following questions, "Personally, how do you think being White has impacted *your* experience in training?" and "How do you think you have benefitted from being White?" This decision was made after an observation (through dialogue with a colleague) that White privilege was present in the actual question. Whereas the initial wording encouraged speculation about White privilege as a *possible* experience, more direct language (e.g., "How have you benefitted from being White?") *assumed* an experience of White privilege and minimized the likelihood of such speculation.

Recruitment

As is typical of IPA research, a purposive sample was sought for this study (Smith & Eatough, 2007). Eligible participants were advanced-level (i.e., third year and beyond)

counseling psychology trainees from APA-accredited training programs. By recruiting participants from accredited programs, uniformity in training experiences (e.g., multicultural and cross-cultural counseling or psychology courses) could be assumed. It was also reasonable to suspect that participants meeting these criteria would have had the necessary time to reflect upon, and training to converse about, issues of race, privilege, and oppression. To increase the likelihood that participants would be able to discuss issues relevant to the study at length, an additional criterion was added to the recruitment protocol inviting participants "open to discussing issues of racial privilege and oppression."

In order to increase homogeneity of the sample, racial/ethnic identity was restricted to those trainees identifying as White/European-American or Black/African-American. Because the experiences of people of color from various racial/ethnic backgrounds are so diverse, a decision was made to interview only Black/African-American participants to allow for greater depth and complexity in participants' narratives. An exclusion criterion for this study was international student status, as their experiences and understandings of race can be markedly different from those of domestic trainees.

A combination of sampling techniques, including referral, opportunity, and snowball sampling were used to recruit participants (Smith et al., 2009). First, referral sampling was used to reach counseling psychology trainees through their superiors. The names and email addresses of faculty members or training directors of APA-accredited training programs were obtained from the website of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs.

Seeking geographic homogeneity, a list of all potential programs was divided by geographic region. I began contacting faculty members or training directors at training sites in particular regions. They were notified via e-mail (see Appendix D) about the study and were

asked to forward a forthcoming e-mail message/research request to trainees (see Appendix E) with attached informed consent (see Appendix F) via their program's listserv. I requested that faculty members or training directors respond to the recruitment notification with an indication of whether or not they had forwarded the recruitment materials. If this response was not received within two weeks, a second recruitment attempt was made via email (see Appendix G).

Unfortunately, the response from faculty and their trainees was sparse. Initially, participants were to be reimbursed with a $15 gift card. This amount was increased to $25 to increase potential interest in the study. Also, whereas I had hoped for geographic homogeneity of training programs, it became apparent that proceeding by geographic region could be unproductive. Eventually, after contacting faculty members and training directors at all eligible training sites (at times, twice), eight participants meeting the inclusion criteria were recruited from eight separate programs.

I then attempted to recruit additional participants via snowball sampling, in which the study's participants were asked to assist with recruitment. Past participants were sent a new recruitment notification (see Appendix H) via email and asked to forward the initial recruitment email and consent form to their colleagues and acquaintances in counseling psychology training programs. This method of recruitment yielded one additional participant.

Finally, opportunity sampling was used by reaching out to my colleagues for assistance with recruitment. The inclusion criterion regarding years in one's training program was expanded at this time to allow for participants to be between their third year (originally fourth year) in training and second post-graduate year. Using a revised email recruitment notification (see Appendix I), I contacted colleagues I knew through my training program, my pre-doctoral internship, and other professional networks. They were asked to forward the recruitment

materials (described previously) to potential participants they may have encountered through their jobs, professional networks, and graduate training programs. A tenth participant was recruited using this method. The recruitment of participants occurred over a six-month period.

Procedure

Trainees were instructed in the recruitment email they received to review the attached informed consent form and then respond via email if they wished to participate. In responding to their emails, potential participants were again encouraged to review the informed consent form if they had not yet. They were also asked to arrange a 10 to 15 minute phone conversation with me to learn more about the study and address any questions or concerns.

During the phone conversation, it was again ensured that participants had familiarized themselves with the consent form. Then, I reviewed the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study. I also discussed the $25 gift card with which they would be compensated for their participation. Participants were then given space to inquire openly about the researcher and the study. Finally, participants were asked if they wished to voluntarily participate in the study.

If they then verbally consented to participating in the study, participants were asked to (a) schedule an interview time when privacy could be ensured, (b) to choose a pseudonym by which to be referred for all future purposes regarding this study, (c) to complete at least one day before the scheduled interview time the written background questionnaire which was to be sent via email by this researcher, (d) to provide a Skype address by which to be reached, and (e) to provide a phone number in the event that I could not reach them via Skype.

Participants were encouraged to schedule the interview for a time when they could expect to be alone for the duration of the interview (a maximum of two hours). Use of headphones by researcher and participant during the interviews was offered as an option to further protect

participants' privacy. When setting up a Skype account, various information is requested by the service provider. If participants had an existing Skype account, they were invited to create an alternate account using a fictitious name and a username not explicitly connected to their identities. This idea was offered as an additional measure to protect participants' confidentiality. Several participants chose to provide their pseudonym and Skype address at a later time.

All participants were thanked for the time they set aside for the phone conversation, and were again encouraged to contact the researcher by phone or email if any additional questions or concerns emerged. Several participants later mentioned that this brief phone conversation had been helpful for easing anxiety, exploring concerns, and building rapport. If participants had not returned a completed background questionnaire via email by the day before the scheduled interview, an email was sent as a reminder about the questionnaire and the upcoming interview.

Data collection. Prior to each interview, participants' background questionnaires were reviewed. Each participant was contacted via Skype on the date and time agreed upon for the interview. A contact request (similar to an instant message) was sent via Skype prior to the call to ensure participants' readiness. When Skype calls were answered, I thanked participants for their willingness to participate, reminded them about the expected length of the interview (approximately one to two hours), initiated the audio recording software (alerting participants of this), reviewed informed consent, obtained verbal consent to participate and be recorded, and then answered any remaining questions or concerns participants may have had.

After these initial steps and ensuring participants' readiness, I began asking the interview questions, gradually addressing the remaining three topical sections of the interview protocol: White Privilege, White Privilege in Training, and Closing. Smith and Osborn (2003) elaborated on an interviewer's approach to semi-structured interviewing in IPA:

. . . There is a wish to try to enter, as far as possible, the psychological and social world of the respondent. Therefore, the respondent shares more closely in the direction the interview takes, and the respondent can introduce an issue the investigator had not thought of. In this relationship, the respondents can be perceived as the experiential expert on the subject and should therefore be allowed maximum opportunity to tell their own story (p. 57).

In this way, I saw my role as interviewer as being an interested, empathic, and collaborative listener who occasionally inquired and probed. While I intended to follow the protocols as uniformly as possible, I occasionally strayed to accommodate novel and meaningful topics of discussion. At times, questions were not asked explicitly if participants answered them indirectly, and the order of questions varied to match the topical flow of responses. As participants responded to questions, I took notes about the content and process of what was shared. (These notes and other reactions were later entered as a post-interview journal reflection.)

Following the completion of the interview, participants were thanked graciously. They were reminded that a follow-up interview might be necessary to clarify conflicting or underdeveloped themes, they would be contacted at a later date for the purpose of member checking, they were entitled to a copy of their transcript, and that they would be contacted to review the details of their participants profiles. After the interview ended, participants were immediately emailed a $25 gift card, and digital audio files from the interview were transferred to an encrypted external hard drive and deleted from the computer's internal hard drive. The external hard drive was stored in a locked file cabinet. Lastly, I recorded my reflections and observations from the interview in a personal journal.

Data analysis

I alone transcribed and coded interviews from all 10 participants. Transcript files were password protected and stored on an encrypted external hard drive. Other sources of data (e.g., researcher journal, reflective diary) were similarly protected. Because of the sensitive nature of the interview, I also de-identified transcripts, disguising the identities of participants (e.g., specific and identifiable research interests) and their programs, colleagues, and faculty members. Thoughts and reflections were also recorded in a journal while transcribing and de-identifying.

Initial Analysis. IPA offers a flexible approach to data analysis that is not prescriptive (Smith & Eatough, 2007). However, immersion in the interview data through readings of each transcript is essential. Consistent with the recommendation of Smith and Osborn (2003), I immersed myself fully in one transcript at a time to remain true to the idiographic roots of IPA.

A three-column table was generated in a word processing software with a participant's transcript in the middle column. During the initial readings of a transcript, a second column was used to paraphrase content and record comments about a participant's responses. Comments reflected both the desire to deeply understand a participant's unique experiences through her/his exact words and an interest in that which was unstated (i.e., reactions to participants or their language; Smith & Osborn, 2003). Descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual comments were used. Descriptive comments center on what is most important to a participant at a given time and were used mainly as a form of content paraphrasing. Linguistic comments address specific word choices and other related phenomena such as silences, laughter, "repetition, tone," and "degree of fluency" (Smith et al., 2009, p. 88). Conceptual comments involve the researcher's interpretive thoughts and questions about participants' meaning-making (Smith et al., 2009) and are perhaps the best illustration of IPA's double hermeneutic (Shaw, 2010). After commenting

on a particular passage in a transcript, I summarized the combination of paraphrases, thoughts, and questions in a reflective diary (Shaw, 2010) to be used later as a source of triangulation. See Table 1 for an example of this process of analytic commentary (adapted from Smith et al., 2009).

Identification of themes. After completing this analytic commentary for a given transcript, I reviewed all existing journal and diary notes from an interview to orient me to a participant's experiences. In the remaining table column, I then proceeded through the transcript file—referring to the original transcript, commentary, and journal/diary entries as necessary— and recorded initial interpretive themes (the most detailed level of thematic content). These interpretive themes tended to be brief phrases connecting participants' words to my exploratory comments (Smith et al., 2009). As new interpretive themes were identified and viewed in the broader context of the interview, previously identified themes were altered as appropriate. All interpretive themes were checked against the original accounts of participants. During this stage of analysis, no interpretive themes were discarded (Smith & Osborn, 2003).

Next, a complete list of interpretive themes from a given interview was generated and printed. As one suggested method of analysis in IPA, the themes were cut apart and placed on a flat surface. This space was used to arrange and rearrange interpretive themes into clusters of possible superordinate themes (the broadest level of thematic content). While a number of techniques can be used at this stage of this analytic process, abstraction and subsumption were found to be the most useful. *Abstraction* involves the creation of a broader superordinate theme that reflects patterns in the meanings of interpretive themes. *Subsumption* is the process through which an interpretive theme actually becomes a superordinate theme and a useful mechanism for organizing other interpretive themes (Smith et al., 2009). It was also at this time that interpretive themes lacking sufficient depth or support were discarded. Once the tentative superordinate

themes had been formed and condensed, a collection of quotations corresponding to interpretive themes were compiled. This analytic process was carried out separately for each participant.

Analyzing across transcripts. As I proceeded, themes identified in earlier transcripts were used "to help orient the subsequent analys[e]s" (Smith & Osborne, 2003, p. 73). This process allowed for an elaboration on existing themes (Smith & Osborn, 2003). In order to avoid confirmation bias, I also attempted to welcome novel and disconfirming evidence. One particular method that I used to cultivate this analytic openness was resisting the urge to use identical or similar language from a prior analysis to label a familiar interpretive theme.

I attempted to analyze transcripts by subsample to preserve unique within-group findings. This was a mostly successful endeavor, with some exception. While analyzing the second transcript in the White participant subsample, I struggled to settle on superordinate themes. Feeling frustrated, I consulted a trusted colleague who advised me that I might be encountering a parallel process. More specifically, I discovered that just as one of the White participants was struggling with the fear of how White privilege awareness might require change to her personal and professional life, I was struggling with how willing I was to admit in the analysis thematic content that seemed critical of White participants' unrecognized privilege. This was potentially my own White privilege affecting the analysis. Indeed, I had the ability to overlook the ways in which White participants did not recognize their own privilege, instead focusing solely on their clear examples of White privilege awareness. My fear was that such an honest critique could do a disservice to those who had so graciously offered their time and effort to this study.

After some reflection, this indeed seemed to be the case. A decision was made to shift the focus to the African-American subsample in order more easily proceed with the analysis. I recalled that I had in some ways felt more connected to the African-American participants

through their willingness to share more consistently at an emotional level. As Israel (2012) acknowledged, privilege is more recognizable through oppression than through privilege. So, I decided to return to the analysis of the White participant subsample after setting aside time for personal reflection on my objectives for this study. Eventually, I realized that it was possible to both offer a genuine critique of participants' potentially unacknowledged White privilege (consistent with a Critical Whiteness Studies perspective) and stay close to their original responses (consistent with the phenomenological emphasis in this study).

The final stage of analysis for each subsample involved viewing the superordinate themes and their constituent interpretive themes at the subsample level. Reviewing all of the quoted passages across participants for particular superordinate themes, I attempted to condense the large number of interpretive themes into subthemes (moderate level of thematic content). Unfortunately, I was unable to find in the IPA literature on data analysis (e.g., Smith et al., 2009) a method for how to deal with an excessive number of interpretive themes composing a superordinate theme. Considering that dissimilarly labeled interpretive themes across participants often pointed to similar meanings, this was a useful way to address the problem. Supporting this decision was Smith and colleagues' reminder that "level of analysis is not prescriptive and the analyst is encouraged to explore and innovate in terms of organizing the analysis" (p. 96). Again, new subtheme labels were checked against participants' original words.

A table of all existing superordinate and subthemes was then created for each subsample. I came to conceptualize subthemes as the "chapters" in the "books" of superordinate themes. Looking over the table and reviewing quoted passages, I found that some subthemes could actually be clustered to create new superordinate themes or that some fit better with another superordinate theme. Through this process of arrangement and rearrangement, a final list of

superordinate themes and subthemes was determined for each subsample.

      Cross-sample analysis. Lastly, I compared and contrasted the themes by subsample. By doing so, I was able to determine how White privilege was experienced and recognized similarly and differently by White and Black trainees. I also referred back to the raw data of transcripts to gain a more holistic understanding of not just the content, but the process of how participants in each subsample spoke about White privilege, and what this might mean.

Establishing Trustworthiness

      Conducting trustworthy qualitative research is a complex endeavor. Whereas positivist quantitative researchers rely on validity and reliability in evaluating the merit or quality of research, Creswell (1998) noted that "multiple perspectives exist regarding the importance of verification in qualitative research, the definition of it, and the procedures for establishing it" (p. 197). The perspectives of Lincoln and Guba (1985), Stiles (1993), and Morrow (2005) are considered and integrated in addressing the trustworthiness of this study.

      Strategies for establishing trustworthiness. Several strategies were undertaken in order to establish trustworthiness in the proposed study. First, there was a need to manage subjectivity, which affects all research (Morrow, 2005). Lincoln and Guba (1985) discussed the importance of reflexive journaling to establish confirmability, or the qualitative research equivalent of objectivity in mainstream science. Stiles (1993) urged researchers to make explicit personal and theoretical biases, as well as the social context of the study. Morrow regarded issues of subjectivity (i.e., bias) and reflexivity (i.e., self-awareness) as central to good qualitative research undertaken from any paradigm. Taking into account these recommendations, I previously provided the reader with descriptions of the study's guiding paradigm, a researcher-as-instrument statement in which I "bracketed" my assumptions, and a statement about the social and cultural

context of the study. I also journaled about personal reactions to the interviews and kept a reflexive diary of methodological decisions and analytical thoughts and questions. To avoid bias, the journal and diary entries were revisited and checked against participants' accounts.

Second, conducting trustworthy qualitative research also necessitates an immersion in the cultural context of participants and the data if anything meaningful and accurate is to be determined. Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted the importance of prolonged engagement and persistent observation in achieving credibility, or the qualitative research equivalent of internal validity in mainstream science. Prolonged engagement is required to build sufficient rapport with participants to form a broad understanding of their cultural context. Persistent observation is used to achieve greater depth and focus in one's observations of a particular phenomenon. Similarly, Stiles (1993) and Morrow (2005) discussed the need to engage deeply with participants and data. Morrow further explained the need in constructivist-interpretivist research for fairness, or the "solicit[ing] and honor[ing]" of multiple constructions of reality (p. 252). Researchers should aspire to achieve a "deep understanding" of what participants share and mean (Morrow, 2005). In accordance with Erickson (1986), Morrow explained that adequacy of interpretation necessitates "immersion in the data" throughout data collection and analysis (Morrow, 2005, p. 256).

Taking into account these ideas about immersion in the context and phenomenon of interest, I did the following. I attended to rapport building through the use of recruitment phone conversations, appropriate self-disclosure, active listening skills, and in-depth interviewing. Having spent five years as a counseling psychology trainee, I was already quite immersed in the context and culture of a training program. However, I did not assume that my training experiences were identical to those of other trainees. So, I remained open to learning about their

unique experiences and revising my assumptions and expectations.

Third, there is general agreement about the importance of triangulation as a contributing factor to trustworthiness. Triangulation involves the use of multiple sources, methods, researchers, and/or data. Such variety can strengthen the implications of consistent findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For Lincoln and Guba, triangulation contributes to dependability, or the qualitative research equivalent of reliability in mainstream science, and therefore, to credibility (i.e., similar internal validity) as well. Stiles (1993) commented on the general importance of triangulation for establishing validity in qualitative research. He also included testimonial validity and consensus in his validity typology for qualitative research. Researchers can establish testimonial validity by sharing and confirming findings with participants (commonly called member checks; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Consensus involves the use of multiple researchers to confirm that the findings are reasonable, such as through auditing or peer debriefing. Morrow (2005) acknowledged the need for "adequate variety in kinds of evidence," or multiple data sources, which she likened to triangulation.

I incorporated triangulation of sources, data, and researchers in a number of ways. I interviewed multiple participants from different APA-accredited training programs, used multiple data forms (e.g., interviews, journal, diary), conducted member checks to verify the study's findings with participants (through an emailed summary of themes), and involved S.P., an auditor (Morrow, 2005). S.P. was recruited to review the acceptability of the overall research process and the resulting interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). She familiarized herself with the study's research questions, methodology, and participants' transcripts. After I had determined the initial themes for a given subsample, I would arrange a phone conversation with S.P. During four such "meetings," each lasting 60 to 90 minutes, she critically observed my

analytic process and the conclusions at which I had arrived regarding thematic content. She also provided feedback in a number of forms (e.g., validation, questioning, alternative ideas). There were no significant disagreements about the findings. However, S.P. did observe that some themes lacked meaning or specificity. By honoring S.P.'s feedback, initial theme ideas that were overly general were honed through additional analysis. S.P.'s feedback also led in part to my more intentional use of subthemes to convey meaning and nuance. Following our discussions, I sometimes reanalyzed, reorganized, or renamed themes. Finally, I sent a table summarizing themes and subthemes to S.P. for review.

Regarding member checks, four participants (three White-identified and one Black-identified) briefly responded to my email request for them to review the results and offer feedback. I included a summary of the findings (Appendix J) with my email request. The single Black participant noted the consistency of the findings with what he shared during the interview, and what other trainees of color have shared with him in the past. One White participant acknowledged the fit of the findings with what she discussed, and the final two White participants commented on the quality of the results (e.g., "terrific," "interesting"). I believe that member checks might be enhanced in future studies of this nature if more specific questions are posed to participants (e.g., What was it like to review the findings for the White participant subsample? For the subsample to which you did not belong? What surprised you?).

Fourth, the potential for research to empower or incite social action or change can impact trustworthiness. Stiles (1993) discussed related types of validity, such as uncovering/self-evidence, or the empowerment of readers through interpretations and findings. Catalytic validity stems from the empowerment of participants through interpretations and findings. Finally, reflexive validity implies that existing theory or the researchers' thinking was changed through

the research. Morrow (2005) discussed some similar concepts, including social validity, educative and catalytic authenticity (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; as cited in Morrow, p. 252), and consequential validity (Patton, 2002; as cited in Morrow, 2005, p. 253). Social validity involves the applicability or relevance of research to society's needs. Morrow used the example of social justice-oriented research in counseling psychology. Educative authenticity and catalytic authenticity are transformative criteria associated with the empathic and intellectual growth participants, or their ensuing action, respectively. Consequential validity is the equivalent of Stiles' concept of catalytic validity and Guba and Lincoln's concept of catalytic authenticity.

Morrow (2005) noted that certain trustworthiness criteria are paradigm-dependent. For example, empowering participants to take action is often an objective of critical-ideological research (Morrow, 2005; Ponterotto, 2005). "Social and political change" was not a primary goal of the proposed study (Patton, 2002; as cited in Morrow, 2005, p. 253). From a phenomenological standpoint, I was more concerned with co-constructing an understanding of trainees' experiences and encounters with White privilege. Still, I saw this study as potentially enlightening for both participants and researchers through the co-constructive research process, and facilitative of dialogue and disciplinary introspection. The following measures influenced the likelihood that the study's findings would empower, raise consciousness, and effect change.

The empowerment of readers was dependent on my ability to provide clear, nuanced, and meaningful interpretations to which they could connect. My ability to provide such lucid interpretations depended on rapport building, prolonged engagement, persistent observation, and openness to co-construction with participants and their contexts, as well as management of biases through reflexive journaling and auditing. For participants, the use of member checks tightened the fit of findings, thus strengthening their impact and empowering potential. Keeping a journal

and reflexive diary, a co-constructive spirit, and immersion in the data altered the ways I think about the phenomenon in question. Finally, in the discussion that follows, I recontextualized participants' meanings by attending to "social, cultural, and . . . theoretical" implications of findings (Larkin et al., 2006, p. 104; Morrow, 2005) for participants and counseling psychology.

Finally, along with the implications of research for empowerment and change, I considered the issue of power in research (Morrow, 2005). Using power responsibly as a researcher was very important to me. Participants were recruited voluntarily through informed consent and rewarded for their participation. They were also given choices and options to protect them whenever possible (e.g., use of pseudonym, right to review participant profiles and transcripts). In order to further redistribute power, data collection and analysis were driven by a desire to co-construct meanings, remain tentative, gain a deep understanding of participants' accounts, and to be continuously self-reflective. Also, interpretations were shared with participants through member checks and monitored by an auditor. Lastly, the inclusion of perspectives of African-American trainees in this study was an active attempt to address power and privilege in the study of Whiteness.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the sections that follow, results are presented by subsample and then examined concurrently. Findings are then summarized, conclusions and recommendations made, and the study's limitations and implications for future directions are considered. In order to situate this study's multiple levels of findings most efficiently in the context of the extant literature, the results and discussion have been combined for ease of understanding. Participant profiles are also provided by subsample to acquaint the reader with the participants, as a means of providing context for the ideas emerging from the interviews.

Black/African-American Subsample

Again considering the personal and scholarly reflections of Israel (2012), it can be easier to see privilege from a perspective of oppression. Indeed, many of the African-American participants observed White privilege in their training programs through their experiences of marginalization. Therefore, I hope that presenting findings from the Black subsample first will enhance the reader's critical lens for digesting the results for White trainees.

Black/African-American Participants

The participants chose pseudonyms that you will come to know through this section. They are Isaiah, Naomi, Jason, Grace, and Ashley. All participants in this subsample approved the details of their participant profiles.

Isaiah. Isaiah identifies as African-American/Black, currently able-bodied, agnostic, heterosexual, and male. He is in his late twenties. He grew up in the rural South and comes from a middle-class family background. Isaiah was not the first in his family to attend higher education. He currently holds a master's degree in counseling.

Isaiah's identity as a male intersects meaningfully for him with his racial identity. Perhaps most relevantly, he is the only Black male in his counseling psychology training program—a relatively invisible presence in the recent history of the program. The intersection of gender and race is also salient for Isaiah in his recollections of his parents' early and strict management of his appearance and dress as a Black male in U.S. society.

Isaiah became interested in pursuing a counseling-related career path as an adolescent when a popular helping professional inspired him. After initially aiming to pursue a more medically-oriented career, Isaiah made the decision to focus instead on counseling. His training program is located in a highly populated city in the South.

Isaiah was attracted to his current training program because of the university's reputation, his advisor's status as a prominent African-American scholar, and his connection to other trainees working with his current advisor. Isaiah's training program is comprised of a predominantly White, female, and affluent student body. The program utilizes a scientist-practitioner background and has a strong emphasis on research. Isaiah perceives a "surface" focus on multiculturalism in his program, noting that many students do not seek out cultural coursework opportunities beyond the required multicultural counseling course.

Isaiah has extensive training in issues of power, privilege, oppression, and cultural diversity, with coursework covering topics on race and racism, feminism, and counseling and research with populations of color. Isaiah's research focuses on ecological and academic factors in the Black community and the recruitment of future psychologists of color. Isaiah looks forward to a career as a tenure-track professor.

Naomi. Naomi identifies as Black/African-American, currently able-bodied, Christian/spiritual, heterosexual, and female. She is in her late twenties. Her social class

background is lower-middle class, although this identity has fluctuated at times throughout her life. She grew up in a metropolitan area of the Midwestern U.S. and also spent a great deal of time with her family in the inner city of that same area. Naomi's family instilled in her an appreciation of her Black identity as natural and valuable. Naomi and her sister were the first to attend college in her nuclear family, although members of her extended family have received college and graduate educations. Naomi has earned a master's degree in counseling.

Naomi observed how different identities she possesses intersect with race. There is significant meaning for her in the interaction of race and social class. Growing up, she spent time in two different parts of her native city, one being predominantly middle class and the other lower class. It was through these experiences that she acquired bicultural knowledge and flexibility that helped her to effectively navigate environments that are predominantly Black and lower-class, and predominantly White and middle-class.

Naomi also explained that she has tended to focus on her own doubly marginalized status as a Black woman. However, through a relationship with a close friend who identifies as lesbian, she has become more reflective about her own social privileges, such as heterosexual privilege. Naomi also recognizes the privilege of her Christian/spiritual identity, further sharing her sense that this identity may have protected her from White racism in the past and created a bridge in cross-racial encounters with White people.

It has always been Naomi's aspiration to help others and give back to her personal and cultural communities. Throughout her life, she witnessed times during which loved ones could have benefitted from counseling, but due to a variety of barriers, were unable to receive this type of support. Naomi sought out an enjoyable and altruistic career path. Counseling psychology, with its emphasis on diversity, was a meaningful fit for her.

Naomi was drawn to her current training program because of its generalist focus and individualized training opportunities. The training program, located in a moderately populated Midwestern city, utilizes a scientist-practitioner model. She has observed a lack of cultural diversity representation among students and faculty, yet her training program offers a number of clinical and research opportunities to serve culturally diverse populations. Naomi has observed that each year, at least one racial/ethnic minority-identified student is admitted to her program. Within her cohort, Naomi was the only student of color admitted. The trainees in her program are predominantly female. At the time of the interview, Naomi was in her fourth year of counseling psychology training.

Naomi has received extensive training on issues of culture, power, privilege, and oppression. At the undergraduate level, she specialized in African American studies. At the graduate level, Naomi has taken a number of culturally-focused courses on race and gender. Additionally, her research maintains an emphasis on issues of diversity. She investigates phenomena of interest to the Black community and other marginalized racial/ethnic populations. Naomi's future career plans are to achieve a faculty position (with a focus on teaching) and engage in part-time clinical work.

Jason. Jason identifies as Black, heterosexual, Christian, currently able-bodied, and male. He is in his late twenties. Jason comes from a middle-class background. He grew up in the rural Southern U.S. Although Jason was the first in his family to attend college, subsequently, his mother earned her bachelor's degree and his younger brother attended technical college.

Jason observed the intersections of identities he possesses, such as gender and religion/spirituality, with his racial identity. In describing his upbringing, he discussed his

parents' efforts to educate him about Black culture and their close monitoring of his behavior.

Looking back, Jason sees that the pressure placed on him to understand race and act in particular

ways was to ensure his "survival as a Black man growing up" in the U.S. He has also felt the

intersection of maleness and Blackness through his experience as the only Black male in his

training program. Jason's Christian identity has helped him create meaning and purpose in the

racial struggle he has endured navigating the dominant cultural context of his graduate program.

Through his Christian beliefs, he finds resilience and realizes the unique bicultural strength and

flexibility he has gleaned from difficult experiences.

As an undergraduate student, Jason attended a historically Black university. It was there

that he took a psychology class that interested him because of its focus on self-reflection,

community service, and an attention to real-world concerns. After earning a bachelor's degree,

Jason worked in a helping profession. While doing so, he realized that additional learning would

be necessary for him to realize his aspirations. With its generalist focus and commitment to

social justice issues, counseling psychology seemed like a natural fit with Jason's goals. At the

time of the interview, Jason was a fourth-year student in his counseling psychology training

program, which is located in a large Southern city.

Jason was drawn to his current training program for several reasons, including the option

to conduct research of interest, a focus by some faculty on multicultural research, a flexible

curriculum, the program's proximity to home, and a sense of being genuinely welcomed by

faculty and students. Jason explained that his training program incorporates a generalist training

model, preparing students to apply their skills to work with a variety of populations. To varying

extents, multiculturalism is emphasized in the research of all faculty members. Jason perceives a

great diversity of thought and experience among the program's constituents. However, there is

less diversity in terms of social identities, with most students representing dominant cultural backgrounds. Jason is the only Black-identified male in his program. The faculty is predominantly White. His sense is that the program has made efforts to cultivate diversity through ongoing dialogue, environmental changes, and a recruitment of students interested in the focus on multicultural research by certain faculty members.

Issues of power, privilege, oppression, and multiculturalism were incorporated into all of Jason's undergraduate coursework. Furthermore, he studied internationally during his graduate training, and is bilingual. Apart from formal diversity training received through multicultural counseling course, Jason cites therapy encounters and classroom discussions as additional multicultural learning opportunities.

Jason's research interests center on racial/ethnic diversity and the study of psychotherapy barriers and outcome for diverse populations. He has also had a broad range of clinical experiences in terms of therapeutic modality (i.e., individuals, couples, families), focus (e.g., substance use issues), client's spoken language, and client age. Jason hopes to one day operate a private practice providing accessible counseling services to people from diverse backgrounds. He also aims to apply his skills as an organizational consultant promoting mental health in various arenas.

Grace. Grace identifies as Black, currently able-bodied, heterosexual, Christian, and female. She comes from an upper-middle class family background. Grace is currently in her late twenties. She was the first in her immediate family to attend graduate school, although some extended family members have graduate level education. She grew up in the Eastern U.S. Grace received her undergraduate education at a historically Black university. She currently holds a master's degree in counseling.

For Grace, social class interacts meaningfully with her racial identity. Growing up in an upper-middle class neighborhood, Grace encountered racial stereotyping and microaggressive behavior surrounding the intersection of these identities. Specifically, she recalls several incidents in which White acquaintances and families were surprised to see that her lifestyle and home environment were similar to theirs. Grace has had similar microaggressive experiences in her graduate program. In particular, she has observed White colleagues deny their racial privilege because Grace's family had accumulated greater financial wealth than did their families.

It was after taking an introductory psychology course that Grace became interested in psychology. Her counseling psychology graduate program is located in the Southwestern U.S. in a moderately populated city. Grace was drawn to her training program because of its focus on multiculturalism and diversity, as well as an emphasis on progressive practices in the delivery of mental health services. At the time of the interview, Grace was in her second year of training.

Grace describes her training program as having a racially/ethnically diverse student body. The faculty are predominantly White. At the time she was admitted to the program, Grace was the only Black-identified student. She also shared that her training program attends to the integration of social justice in practice more so than in research. At the graduate level, Grace has completed a course on multicultural psychology. Prior to this, she attended an HBCU, where issues of cultural diversity, oppression, and privilege were incorporated into the curriculum. Her research and practice interests center on incarcerated youth and ethnic identity. She aspires to obtain a psychologist position in a juvenile justice facility.

Ashley. Currently in her mid-twenties, Ashley identifies as Black/African-American, female, heterosexual, temporarily able-bodied, and non-denominational Christian (formerly

affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Church). She describes her socioeconomic status as middle class, while noting the fluid nature of this identity throughout her life. Ashley explained that growing up, she "didn't want for anything." However, this changed during late adolescence when her mother lost her job and her family's access to resources became much more limited. Personally, Ashley further shared that she has struggled financially during graduate school. Ashley was not the first member of her family to attend college or graduate school. She completed her undergraduate education at a historically Black university. Ashley grew up in the Western U.S.

Ashley observed several identities that interact with her racial identity to inform her understanding of race and privilege. She learned recently that ancestors on opposite sides of her family were slaves and slave owners. With a lighter skin tone than some of her family members, Ashley is often reminded of this reality. Whereas she formerly resisted this confluence of opposing identities, she now wishes to embrace her embodiment of colonizer and colonized to more effectively navigate the complexities in how others view her, and how she desires to identify. Ashley also discussed the importance of religion in her life. Her spiritual beliefs have served as a protective factor from racism. Still, Ashley has wondered how her spirituality might provide some explanation for the personal struggle and pain she has faced continuously in her training program. Finally, Ashley acknowledges that being a woman has intersected with her racial identity to shape the unique assumptions, expectations, and stereotypes she encounters regularly.

Ashley was initially attracted to psychology when she "started flipping through" a psychology textbook while in a history class. She also observed the unique challenges she and her family faced due to a family member's chronic physical illness. Navigating this struggle

with her family further deepened her interest in psychology and the counseling profession.

At the time of the interview, Ashley was in her fourth year of training in her counseling psychology program pursuing a Ph.D. Her training program is located in a moderately populated city in the South. She was drawn to the program because of the opportunity to pursue her research interests with faculty on issues of coping and adjustment related to chronic illness. Ashley also appreciated the small community feel of her program within a larger university context. She describes her training program as fairly diverse in terms of ethnicity, age, and gender. The faculty is predominantly White. A scientist-practitioner training model is utilized, with some flexibility for students to focus more on either research or practice.

Ashley has received extensive training in areas of culture, power, privilege, and oppression, having taken numerous classes on these topics at the undergraduate level and several with such an emphasis at the graduate level. Ashley's research and clinical interests center on coping and adjustment related to chronic illness for individuals and families, gender issues, LGBT issues, cultural identity, life transitions, and trauma. Ashley aspires to have a career involving both work at a university counseling center and non-profit work. She also hopes to one day own and operate a wellness center.

Black/African-American Subsample Themes

Four superordinate themes were identified from interviews with Black participants: White Disregard/Disconnection, Belonging and Support, (In)Security, and Double Burden. Twelve subthemes are discussed to provide additional meaning and detail to their overarching superordinate themes. Table 2 provides an overview of these themes and subthemes. In keeping with the spirit of IPA as an idiographic research approach, subthemes showcase individual participant contributions to group-level phenomena. Following a presentation of each

superordinate theme, its significance and relevance to the extant literature are discussed. This

method of presentation will initially preserve individual meanings before later incorporating

global reflections (Smith et al., 2009).

White Disregard/Disconnection

Black trainees conveyed a sense that White individuals with whom they engaged in

training at times seemed removed from, uninterested in, or unwilling to understand their racially

unique experiences. In possessing the option to overlook Black participants' realities and remain

silent in discussions of race, White individuals experienced racial privilege. This disregard

seemed unwitting at times, but occasionally, like an active choice. The theme of White

Disregard and Disconnection captured, perhaps more than any other theme presented here, the

personal and painful impact that exhibitions of White privilege and racial power had on Black

participants in their training programs. Four subthemes emerged as fundamental to White

Disregard/Disconnection: Affective Disregard/Empathic Disconnection, Active

Avoidance/Choice, Powerful/Disempowering Silence, and Integrity.

Affective disregard/empathic disconnection. Several Black participants reported

experiencing a personal, emotional or empathic disregard on the part of White individuals in

their training environments. This disregard was often of Black trainees' race-related

experiences. Throughout the interview, Jason repeatedly emphasized his White colleagues'

understanding in terms of a cognitive-affective dichotomy. This signified the importance of an

empathic impasse to his encounters with White privilege. At one point, he described an incident

in which he was deeply affected by a class discussion of the evolutionary history of in-group/out-

group dynamics. As the only Black trainee in his program, he risked sharing his reactions with

classmates, recognizing that his White colleagues were likely unfamiliar with the realities of

people of color:

> JASON: . . . . I was like, 'You know guys, reading this book is very discouraging for me, because it's interesting, because I, it's hard reading it and then coming in here and listening to you guys talk. Because I feel like our experience of reading this is just very different.' And I'll just say something like that and just put it out there. And I think they, it's interesting because I love my colleagues to death, and I think they are some of the smartest people ever. I really do. And I think that oftentimes they get me from a cognitive standpoint, but I think affectively there's a piece that's missing. It's like I talk to my friends a lot and we use this word. We use this phrase. We'll say, 'I feel you.' Or, and I think there's a lot of meaning to it. It's not just like, I hear you and I understand you. It's like I literally, I'm right there with you. Like I'm in it with you. I sometimes think that like in this instance, that even though some of my colleagues may have connected to it intellectually and cognitively, that affectively they were not able to kind of maybe not empathize with that . . . .

From Jason's perspective, his White colleagues appeared to undertake an exploration of race and White privilege mainly as an intellectual enterprise. To him, they could not "empathize or sympathize in a way that I think is possible" with the pain that he had endured related to race in his training. Nor did they understand the ways they were implicated in that pain by virtue of the privilege they experienced. As Jason imagined his White colleagues' reactions were they to listen to our interview, it seemed clear that he felt his world was a foreign territory to them: "I think they'd be shocked . . . . I don't think they would have known that I had felt that way, so."

The phenomenon of Affective Disregard/Empathic Disconnection also extended beyond the walls of the classroom to friendships with colleagues. More specifically, Naomi recounted a

recurrent experience of White colleagues overlooking her concerns about her safety in chosen

social gathering spots outside of school. When confronting them about this issue, they never

seemed to quite understand her reluctance. Like Jason, Naomi cared for her White colleagues,

but in some ways, this care did not seem reciprocal because of the element of disregard. She was

troubled by their lack of understanding and disregard of her experience.

> NAOMI: Um, it's frustrating and it's saddening because I really care for them, and I feel
>
> like if they can't really see—'cause many of them—and it's sad to say 'cause we had this
>
> conversation just last week. Many of them approach cultural diversity as this color-blind
>
> . . . . So, if you're not seeing color, you're using something in order to judge what is
>
> normal and abnormal. But they don't get that conversation. They don't understand that.
>
> So, it's a little bit dismissive to me that they can't see where I'm coming from, and it
>
> does affect our friendship. Um, so it's saddening. It's frustrating. And I used to find
>
> myself wanting to explain that this is what I experience. And the moments of those times
>
> when I was explaining, I don't, I don't really think they heard me nor cared. At least
>
> that's what it felt like. They may have cared. And they may have been able to empathize
>
> with the feeling. But as far as really understanding what it is that I was saying, or um,
>
> that this is a reality for people of color, I don't think they got that.

The profound emotional impact of Affective Disregard/Empathic Disconnection on Black

participants also defined its centrality to understanding the meaning White privilege in training.

Following the viewing of a class video on a major historical event related to racism, Isaiah

observed a seemingly superficial class discussion that quickly shifted away from the topic of

race. He depicted his White colleagues' disregard for his emotional reactions to the video as

inevitable if he were to speak up. He noted the privilege his White colleagues possessed in their

"ability" to maintain this emotional distance.

> ISAIAH: And I'm like, I know if I start really talking about this, I probably will start crying and [inaudible]—are not going to, they're not gonna understand, like why are you crying? That wasn't your mom. That wasn't your dad, but there's sort of this collective mindset or this collective connection to these experiences that I don't think White students have that same reaction. So, there's an ability to distance from this really hard conversation . . .

Feeling silenced by White colleagues and faculty through failed discussions of race had taken its toll on Isaiah. He revealed this pain, becoming tearful. He seemed most struck by his colleagues' apparent inability to connect empathically to his emotional struggle as a Black trainee with an acute racial awareness. The pain he felt was compounded by his perceived closeness to some White trainees who were still so disconnected from his experience.

> ISAIAH: Um. It's powerful. It's very powerful. [Isaiah becomes tearful] [18 seconds silence]

> ISAIAH: I think it's interesting to sit in the space that we, with people that you may call your friends—or that you could potentially call your friends—and have them be unable to acknowledge or see the pain that comes with, [9 seconds silence] that comes with just seeing things or questioning things. [Isaiah remains tearful] It's almost easier, it's almost like it's easier for me to be ignorant—to go through life with blinders on. It would be easier to get through if you don't see anything. That's what's most powerful to me, is it almost feels like we're pushed to be educated, but not *that* kind of educated.

Isaiah conveyed a sense of betrayal as well, his experience having gone unacknowledged by supposed friends. It appeared as if Isaiah longed for the same comfort that his White

colleagues experienced in their separation from the invisible yet potent emotional realities unfolding before them. He focused here on the affective disregard that was reinforced by a comfortable education, in which deeper discussions of racial realities did not occur.

Active avoidance/choice. Several Black participants considered the distance, unawareness, unfamiliarity, and even "ignorance" that White individuals in their personal lives and training programs exhibited surrounding communities of color. Although participants took note of this unawareness, the significance of this theme emerged from their concern with disconnection and disregard as a *volitional* process on the part of the White faculty and colleagues. Patterns of unwillingness and choice emerged in Black participants' experiences of disregard.

In a general discussion of White privilege, Ashley distinguished between awareness and choice in Whites' responses to racial privilege. What stood out was an active resistance to the idea that one could be implicated in a system of privilege or oppression.

ASHLEY: I guess one of my pet peeves is when people disown [White privilege]. Or they acknowledge it, they know that it's there, but they fight so hard for it to—'But no, I'm not part of it. No, I'm not like that' . . . .

In this next passage, Isaiah reflected on faculty and cohort members' struggle to see the difficulties he faced as a researcher of color working with racially/ethnically diverse samples.

ISAIAH: Okay. Um, I think sort of recently I've been grappling with this idea of White researcher privilege . . . . And there's also, in that process there's a lack of awareness again on the part of individuals from my cohort, and even individuals, professors here, to not recognize or even acknowledge that this process is much more difficult for students who are researchers of color to complete their work in a timely manner. There's a lot

more hoops you have to jump through to collect data versus individuals that only study

White people or only study—they say they're studying broad phenomena—but having

200 people with 25 students of color in there.

From that example, words such as "awareness," "recognize" and "acknowledge" still

pointed to a more benign removal from his experience. However, later in the interview, Isaiah

articulated a different reaction to the lack of intimate racial dialogue in the classroom.

ISAIAH: It's most painful because it's coming from the people that would call

themselves your friends. They're people that are in my cohort. I've been to their houses.

They've been around me. They know me. They know my name. They know stuff, but

then on some level, they really don't know. They really don't *look* to know. I think that's

the part of it. I think that's where a huge piece of privilege comes in, is because you have

the ability to not know. You have the ability to ignore and to not really grapple with the

pain.

Words and phrases such as "ignore" and "don't *look* to know" now reflected a more

active and willing avoidance on the part of his White colleagues to maintain an emotional

distance in racial dialogue. The feeling of betrayal discussed previously was heightened by

Isaiah's language in this second passage. Furthermore, a clearer sense of his White colleagues'

accountability emerged here as well.

Jason confronted a clinical difficulty when a White family repeatedly questioned his

credibility as their child's counselor. He brought this concern into a practicum course hoping for

constructive dialogue. Rather than an exploration of race-related barriers surrounding perceived

credibility, though, the class discussion centered on Jason's role as counselor.

JASON: . . . there was not [inaudible] a conversation that happened in class regarding

White privilege. I felt that the conversation was, in class was mirroring my, it was more

so about what I need to do as a therapist, or what it is about my clinical skill set that is

not, you know, is not working or is not helping. When I think, and truthfully I was young

in my career. I'm sure that there were things that I could've done differently and gained.

But I do think that they were not—and I guess I'll even use a stronger word. I won't say

not willing, but I think that they were in some ways avoiding the piece that White

privilege does play a role, you know? That my colleagues in that class don't really have

to. Most of the clients they see are White clients. They're White therapists, and so the

idea of White privilege, if it comes up at all, it's very rare.

Like Jason in the previous passage, it was interesting that Naomi also attended in the moment to

her choice of words to indicate White individuals' active role in their disconnection. It was

through such hesitations and subtleties in participants' language that I distinguished this

subtheme of Active Avoidance/Choice from mere unawareness: "And they, I was about to say

choose not to see it. I think part of that is that they choose not to see it."

    Powerful/disempowering silence. Whether inadvertent or active, White individuals'

disregard and disconnection created silence around racial dialogue and the experiences of

trainees of color. However, participants' experiences revealed that silence was by no means

innocuous, void of meaning and impact. On the contrary, there was power and privilege in the

disempowering silence African-American participants observed. Isaiah elucidated this reality

that the privilege of silence for some means the loss of voice for others.

    ISAIAH: . . . . I would say a piece of White privilege is being able to not have those

conversations, and being able to have the power to keep others from having those

conversations and moments. So, I would say there have been numerous moments I felt

like we could have deeper conversations around race, racism, all those kinds of things. And we sort of skirt the issue or they're just very surface, 'Yeah, that was an issue, but let's move on.' It's very limited.

Isaiah later went on to describe a "self-congratulatory" dialogue at a roundtable regarding his program's multicultural efforts. He felt voiceless among the White faculty who did not offer an invitation for constructive criticism or alternative viewpoints. In this way, even well-intentioned multicultural dialogues could engender a disempowering silence. White individuals' silence was also powerful enough to thwart Black participants' professional development. Both Jason and Naomi discussed training needs that went unmet because of the lack of dialogue surrounding race and White privilege in supervision. As a result of such silence, they both questioned their effectiveness as therapists, and their supervisory relationships also suffered.

> NAOMI: . . . . And my supervisor was a White woman . . . And she knew that multiculturalism was an area of interest for me. But we never really had conversations or dialogue about White privilege even within the supervision relationship . . . . And I remember trying to initiate that conversation and her not really understanding it, and kind of being dismissive of it. That my experience as an African American sitting across the room from someone that is White—things may be coming up for me that—will they see me as effective? Will they see me as knowledgeable? And so having those own processes going on, I wanted to take that into supervision. And her not really, not seeing it, but not really wanting to engage that conversation . . . .

Integrity. Regarding the final subtheme of White Disregard and Disconnection, Ashley made an important contribution of her own. In practicum and classroom discussions, she

witnessed White staff and faculty openly acknowledging the impact of White privilege in their personal and professional lives. As opposed to previous examples of disregard, these more positive experiences shared an important characteristic. As she spoke about these experiences, she used words like "authentic," "genuine," "frankly," "honestly," and "openly," revealing the role of integrity in one's choice to acknowledge the reality of White privilege.

> ASHLEY: And so that's why it was a pleasant surprise, because it was like, okay. So, you do realize you have it. Okay, that just feels so much more authentic and genuine. And that's what I value in relationships, in the professional world. And that's what I believe is valued and one of the cornerstones in the field that we work in—is being genuine and authentic. So, to have that not just be like a momentary, okay, 'time for me to give my spiel on diversity.' But to actually kind of live it was like, oh. Okay, this is really refreshing.

Discussion: White disregard/disconnection. A superordinate theme labeled White Disregard/Disconnection was identified consisting of four subthemes: (a) Affective Disregard/Empathic Disconnection, or White individuals' maintenance of emotional distance from the realities of racial oppression and trainees' race-related experiences and emotions; (b) Active Avoidance/Choice, or White individuals' active avoidance or apparent unwillingness to engage in racial dialogue or acknowledge unique racial realities; (c) Powerful/Disempowering Silence, or White individuals' power to create silence around racial dialogue through disregard; and (d) Integrity, or viewing Whites' disregard of racial difference, racial oppression, and White privilege in a training environment as a matter of personal and professional integrity.

Consistent with Black participants' experiences, the social and psychological disconnection of White people from the realities of people of color is a commonly observed

phenomenon (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006; Helms, 1984; Wise, 2005). Even liberally-minded White people (including counselors and counselors-in-training) have been found to respond frequently with apathy to racial issues (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1999). This commonplace disconnection of White people relates to what Johnson (2001) termed Whites' "luxury of obliviousness" of privilege (p. 24).

In this study, Whites' empathic and affective disconnection from Black participants was central to White Disregard/Disconnection. Black participants observed an impoverishment of these empathic qualities among White colleagues and faculty. Wang et al. (2003) addressed and operationalized *ethnocultural empathy*, a unique form of empathy comprised of factors related to one's cross-cultural awareness or knowledge, acceptance of others' cultural backgrounds, willingness to imagine the emotional and experiential worlds of people of color, and emotional and verbal responses to instances of discrimination/prejudice and the affect and experience of people of color.

Members of a privileged group need not reciprocate the attention they receive from marginalized people (Johnson, 2001). The power to deny or disregard non-White realities is central to color-blind racism (Neville et al., 2001). Black participants' experiences with White colleagues and faculty were reminiscent of this form of racial subjugation. High levels of color-blind racial attitudes among counselors may be related to diminished empathy for clients (Burkard & Knox, 2004) and less complex statuses of White racial identity development among graduate psychology trainees (Gushue & Constantine, 2007). The behavioral corollary of such color-blind attitudes, as reported by participants in this study, resembled Sue and colleagues' (2007) concept of microinvalidations, or "communications that exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of a person of color" (p. 274).

Black participants observed a characteristic silence and avoidance in racial dialogue and difference on the part of their White colleagues and friends. The *Contact* status in Helms' (1995) model of White Racial Identity Development is characterized by information-processing strategies of obliviousness, denial, and color-blindness. In the same vein, Ancis and Szymanski (2001) identified a theme of *Lack of Awareness of and Denial of White* Privilege in counseling trainees' reactions to Peggy McIntosh's list of racial privileges. This theme resembled the active resistance to racial understanding that Black participants encountered from White colleagues and faculty. Also, among other findings in their grounded theory investigation of race with White undergraduate students, Todd and Abrams (2011) identified dialectic themes of *Closeness and Connection in Multiracial Relationships* (relational depth vs. shallowness) and *Color-Blindness* (color-blindness vs. consciousness of racial differences). Such themes reflect the challenge of Whites to connect intimately with Black participants and acknowledge their unique experiences.

As developing counselors, Black participants also experienced White Disregard/Disconnection as a barrier in clinical supervision. Survey-based and qualitative methods have also been used to examine the supervision experiences of psychologists-in-training. From these studies, a hallmark of culturally-insensitive supervision was White supervisors' silence and avoidance surrounding cultural issues (Burkard et al., 2006; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Hird et al., 2004). Burkard and colleagues' results, especially, mirrored the current findings in terms of both unintentional and intentional disregard of cultural concerns by White supervisors.

Despite the presence of similar phenomena in the literature, the theme of White Disregard/Disconnection remains a significant discovery in several ways. From the unique perspective of some Black trainees, White privilege was viewed as the perceived lack of

curiosity, concern, and effort of White individuals in their programs regarding racial issues and Black trainees' personal racial experiences in training. By attending to the role of volition in Whites' disconnection from personal and professional issues of race, participants conveyed a surprising degree of accountability (and culpability) among White program constituents quite unprecedented in the counseling psychology training literature.

Also, participants' observations of White Disregard/Disconnection spanned training areas and activities, including the classroom, supervision, counseling, and research. Across these areas, participants experienced the impact of White Disregard/Disconnection not only professionally, but on highly personal level as well. Black trainees observed the ability of White Disregard/Disconnection to preclude cultural dialogue, do personal emotional damage, and negatively affect relationships. Therefore, White Disregard/Disconnection was both a powerful and broadly evident phenomenon in participants' training programs.

Finally, an interpretation of Ashley's experiences highlighted the role of integrity in a White person's choice of whether or not to acknowledge White privilege and the experiences of people of color. Interestingly, Todd and Abrams (2011) had encouraged a process of *White authenticity*. Through this process, White individuals openly embrace the tensions of being White in order to achieve a deeper connection to race and racism personally, interpersonally, and societally. By willingly struggling in this way, one can simultaneously have privilege and still challenge the system that maintains it. The subtheme of Integrity in this study supports the idea that those who choose to acknowledge their White privilege are benefitting themselves and others through their genuineness.

Belonging and Support

Central to the observations of White privilege in training for Black trainees was a theme

of Belonging and Support. Generally, this theme addressed how comfortable and connected

Black trainees felt to others in the social milieu of their training environments. Emerging

repeatedly in their responses were issues surrounding presence and representation, acceptance

and rejection, inclusion and exclusion, identification and shared experience, and support and

validation. These comforts and resources were discussed as more available to White colleagues

and faculty. Three subthemes made up Belonging and Support: Representation/Presence, Lack

of Support/(Cultural) Rejection, and Identification/Shared Experience.

Representation/presence. In their training environments, Black trainees encountered

limited access to certain practices and images reflecting their racial/ethnic identities and cultural

heritages. Overall, they communicated a sense of invisibility and a lack of acknowledgment.

Participants commented on their programs' practices surrounding celebrations and culturally-

sanctioned holidays. Naomi discussed the prominence of "straightforward" or "White holidays

that are celebrated in this country." Both Naomi and Grace observed that certain celebrations

were more prominent than others during the month of February. The privilege of feeling visible

and valued through the celebration of one's culture was revealed.

> GRACE: And I think about things like in our program, in the office they decorate for
>
> holidays for Halloween, for Valentine's Day. Nothing for Black History Month. So, it's
>
> like every holiday is decorated for but we don't do anything for this. It's like, you could
>
> if you wanted to, but I would be the only one doing it.

Grace also described the absence of other African Americans' photographs in the

hallways of her building. Quite remarkably, she, Isaiah, and Jason addressed this very same

phenomenon. Something so rarely noticed and easily taken for granted by Whites loomed over

Black participants. They seemed to suggest that this form of subtle representation symbolized

access to success, power, and as Jason explained, belonging.

> JASON: . . . when I first got there to the program, I got this idea that it was a very White program. Um, [laughs slightly] and I say that because the, like I looked at the, they had pictures of some of the past graduates on the wall. And they were all White graduates. I looked at the names of those people, and I guess you could say I was doing my own stereotyping, but they were very Eurocentric, American names you know? I mean the professors in the program were all White professors, and there was just not a lot of affirmation, I guess, regarding my own race. And that was just based on the things that I saw. And I think that the environment kind of played a huge role in my understanding of whether I would be affirmed or not . . . . I was walking down the hall looking at the walls and like, *Wow, this is, do I belong here? Do I fit in here?*

It appeared that unintentional, nonverbal cues could sometimes have a significant negative impact. Without anything being done or said, "just" the mere sight of predominantly White graduates and professors on the wall left Jason questioning the extent to which he belonged in his program. Those images alone influenced how acknowledged and supported he felt in his new training environment. For these participants, the White advantage of widespread representation and easily felt presence was one impossible to overlook, loaded with psychological implications for social comfort and acceptance.

Lack of Support/(cultural) rejection. The theme of Belonging and Support was also depicted through participants' experiences of limited support from faculty regarding personal and professional issues, and barriers faced in bonding with other students on a more personal level. Furthermore, participants' interpersonal struggles with White peers ranged from a superficial acceptance to outright rejection. Loneliness and isolation were implied or explicit

outcomes of these relational barriers. *Cultural* has been included as parenthetical facet of this subtheme to denote relational barriers involving cultural interests and values, and the observed racial privilege afforded to White individuals in their access to abundant and satisfying relationships.

In reviewing the many barriers to support confronting Black participants, it became apparent that to be a White trainee meant having increased access to academic and peer support. Isaiah explained that as a trainee of color interested in multicultural research, there were not many research advisors "to latch onto" for guidance and support. To his detriment, many of the White professors were not "interested" in multicultural issues. Their lack of interest also seemed to carry additional meanings for Isaiah regarding how supported and valued he and other researchers of color might have felt in the program.

As opposed to academic support from faculty, Ashley perceived limited support for personal matters. She noticed the strong presence of White American cultural values surrounding rugged individualism and a Protestant work ethic in her program, making it difficult to attend to familial difficulties (specifically, a chronically ill relative). Ashley contrasted the support received at her undergraduate institution (an HBCU) with that received from faculty in her current training program.

> ASHLEY: . . . . Well, I know for me being here and away from home and my family, that has definitely been a difficult adjustment for me. In undergrad, I was definitely away from home, but it wasn't nearly, it wasn't, it really wasn't difficult, actually. There was hardly ever a moment that I was homesick, or anything like that. And it's probably because of the support that I had, that I experienced, it was very solid, and stable, and secure. And so being here and still having that close, that strong family connection

importance, it could be difficult sometimes managing what I know is going on at home, and still maintaining my focus and accomplishing the tasks that I need to accomplish . . . . unfortunately, the message that I've received is that unless someone has died, you should still be able to perform. That's the message that I've received. Like there, okay, somebody's sick, okay, well you still need to get your things done. To where I feel any other students, that's happening and it's like, it's okay.

The support Ashley received at the HBCU served as a buffer in coping with personal and familial difficulties. Her language also suggested a sense of safety and comfort accompanying the understanding in that environment, now absent. And although it is not known whether or not the messages about illness or death were explicit, it is clear that Ashley felt support was unavailable from her current faculty, leaving her struggling more with school. Ashley had also contrasted the lack of support from faculty with that encountered at an external practicum site, noting the "refreshing" nature of "experiences of understanding, and care, and valuing." Her use of contrast accentuated a need unfulfilled. Near the end of the passage, she also alluded to an observation of favoritism among White students, for whom support was readily accessible. It seemed that to be a White trainee meant that one's personal concerns could be given greater priority by faculty.

In their programs, participants also struggled in peer relationships with White trainees. Isaiah discussed how "extremely isolating" it could feel as a trainee of color "[un]accustomed to being around White people." Similarly, Grace explained that the activities and interests that were culturally "familiar" to her were foreign to others. There was also the sense that what she preferred was not socially acceptable or valued by her peers.

Jason's experience as a cultural outsider among White trainees poignantly conveyed the

sense of rejection and alienation identified by other participants.

> JASON: . . . . There was a lot of emphasis in the program on students bonding and cohorts bonding. And so my interest was in music and going to concerts. And so I like a lot of R&B music, jazz music, soul music. And there was no one I could think of who was interested in that in the program. And I would even ask people, 'Hey, I'm gonna go to this concert. Would you be okay with that?' And I think true enough, they were busy. So, I mean it's grad school. So, I understand that. But whenever I would offer something like that, it would be rejected or turned down. Or [inaudible] people would be busy. Or we would have these potlucks, and one time I offered to have it at my house, and nobody really responded to that email that I sent out about it. And so I think that I was looking for ways to kind of be accepted and just affirmed amongst my peers, and really didn't get that . . .

> ME: That sounds like it would've been really isolating, Jason.

> JASON: Yeah. It was in a way. I think I spent my whole, that whole, at least first semester. I would venture to say the whole first year feeling isolated, feeling alone in [inaudible] process. And for that reason I think I didn't really connect with the program as much as I think I could have. I spent most of my time when I wasn't in school just doing things by myself, or with family, or going out of town to different places. Because being at, being near the program was like the last place I wanted to be . . . .

Despite his genuine efforts to connect with other trainees in his program, the rejection and loneliness he encountered made his program nearly insufferable. I asked Jason about his thoughts on the interpersonal experiences of White trainees. He distinguished between their questioning of academic belongingness (i.e., Should I be here? Am I good enough to be here?)

versus social belongingness (i.e., Do I fit in here?). Free from the same "cultural struggle" with social belongingness, White trainees can flourish seamlessly in peer relationships.

Identification/shared experience. African-American trainees also emphasized the relational benefits of cultural similarity in predominantly White training programs. In this sense, White trainees and faculty were able to identify more easily with each other through shared experience of racial identity and culture. What emerged from their experiences was a symbolic value of Whiteness that created a sort of cultural transference or stimulus value aiding the formation of supportive relationships.

Grace acknowledged how the cultural similarity of White trainees and faculty allowed for a "different camaraderie" with them that she did not have. This camaraderie was not available to Grace, as she might "never see another Black person" for days in her program's building. White trainees could easily take for granted their cultural identification with White faculty.

GRACE: And so I think that White students in my program get a little bit of an advantage because they can identify with the faculty. Faculty looks like them. They have some of the same experiences . . . .

Isaiah also shared his perception of facile identification among White trainees in his predominantly White training program. He further discussed this phenomenon as an insurance policy for continued connection if cohort relations were strained.

ISAIAH: . . . there's quite a lot of other students with whom they can connect across cohorts, just because the program is predominantly White. So within, you have forty to fifty people in there. Even if you don't connect with the four other people that are in your cohort, you also have other cohorts that are above you with whom you're able to connect. With whom you're able to share resources. With whom you're able to share

conversations and just informal interactions . . . . I would say another way would be around that the professors are predominantly White in the program. And so there's much more—I don't think there's a stress or a worry about being able to connect with a professor due to race. So, you may be able to talk with one professor that's at the end of the hallway, and they probably have an aunt or a cousin or a nephew or a niece that looks like you. Or maybe acts like you. So, then maybe there's an easier way that you all are able to connect over some shared experiences that perhaps other students may not have access to.

Isaiah also noticed a range of potential supports that White trainees might "share" more readily, from "informal interactions" to "resources." Furthermore, he astutely observed the symbolic privilege of resembling someone close to White faculty members. As the only Black male among predominantly White faculty and colleagues, Isaiah could not effortlessly exercise this interpersonal edge like his White colleagues. His observation indicated that White trainees and faculty may experience a form of cultural transference that draws them to each other. Trainees of color may also be more attuned to this cultural and interpersonal dynamic as they watch Whites engage in this way.

The power of identification and shared experience through White racial similarity was also exemplified for participants through unequal access to the social advantage of consensual validation. Jason acknowledged his utter astonishment at his White colleagues' unfamiliarity with his reference to renowned Black psychologist, Kenneth Clark. He illustrated his White colleagues' immunity to such an invalidating cultural experience.

JASON: Yeah. I think that it was, because part of, I think part of my desire was, like you said, to be affirmed, to be understood, to be validated. And I think that in class when my

colleagues would mention an experience that seemed to be true to them, at least from my

perspective, they would get nods, like head nods, and just kind of signals from people.

Nonverbals as well as verbal cues that they had understood what they were saying and

they were in agreement with them . . . .

Similarly, Grace had not anticipated that her colleagues would be unfamiliar with the historically

significant L.A. race riots. Indeed, there is White privilege in the comfort and belonging that

comes from knowing that "at least one person" can relate. Stimulus value, cultural transference,

and consensual validation are inconspicuous yet significant advantages reaped by White trainees.

Discussion: Belonging and support. Belonging and Support was another superordinate

theme identified from these interviews with Black counseling psychology trainees. This theme

encompassed participants' views of White privilege in their training programs in terms of access

to inclusive, validating, and supportive experiences and relationships. Belonging and Support

was comprised of three subthemes: (a) Representation/Presence, or minimal acknowledgment or

presence in their training programs; (b) Lack of Support/(Cultural) Rejection, or a dearth of

supportive academic and personal relationships with White colleagues and faculty; and

(c) Identification/Shared Experience, or social barriers surrounding cultural dissimilarity in

predominantly White training environments.

McGregor and Hill (2012) reminded racial/ethnic minority graduate students in

psychology that a perception of limited support from colleagues and faculty is common, only to

be exacerbated by the isolation of scarce racial diversity in many graduate programs. Social

support and contact appear to be important to the psychological health of psychology graduate

students (e.g., Nelson, Dell'Oliver, Koch, and Butler, 2001), and one's psychological sense of

community in counseling psychology training can predict such outcomes as burnout, and buffer

against the effects of stress on career choice satisfaction (Clark, Murdoch, & Koetting, 2009).

Black participants in this study struggled with their sense of belonging in their graduate training programs and appeared particularly sensitive to experiences of personal/cultural invisibility, rejection, or isolation. More so than White students and professionals, members of marginalized or underrepresented groups in various contexts are susceptible to a state of *belonging uncertainty* in which they feel "uncertain of the quality of their social bonds and" are "thus more sensitive to issues of social belonging" (Walton & Cohen, 2007, p. 82). In a study of junior high, high school, and college students, Mallett and colleagues (2011) found that reflecting on one's marginalized racial/ethnic status or experiences of discrimination could heighten a sense of belonging uncertainty. Greater belonging uncertainty can have strong implications for one's sense of academic fit and potential (Walton & Cohen, 2007). The researchers further noted that "subtle events that confirm a lack of social connectedness have disproportionately large impacts" on racially marginalized students (p. 86). In examining the experiences of school psychology graduate students ($N = 400$), Clark and colleagues (2012) found that trainees of color experienced less belongingness than White trainees. The current findings provide a detailed look at how subtle and overt experiences of rejection with trainers and peers can affect the felt belongingness of trainees of color.

These findings also revealed that Black trainees felt culturally unrepresented in their immediate training environments. Similarly, Maton et al. (2011) found that unlike White students, psychology graduate students of color were more likely to feel unrepresented in psychology and training curriculum. Perceptions of cultural diversity were also found to be particularly important to African-American trainees and their satisfaction with their studies. Maton and colleagues explained that, overall, more satisfied graduate students perceived a

variety of available social supports and mentors. Unfortunately, Black participants in this study perceived significant limitations in their relationships with White faculty and students in their predominantly White graduate programs. Alternatively, they observed White trainees and faculty bonding rather easily through shared experience and cultural similarity.

The theme of Belonging and Support in this study extends and deepens previous findings in the literature. In the context of these participants' narratives, a sense of social connection to others in one's training program is not merely a protective factor to be sought out or cultivated, but a luxury more accessible to some than others based on White racial identity. Without similar access to relationships and a sense of belonging, Black trainees were—despite their incredible strength and resilience in coping with such experiences—discouraged, frustrated, hurt, and alienated. Perhaps most significantly, Black participants helped to highlight how subtleties of training environments that may go undetected by White individuals (e.g., photographs on walls, knowing glances and nods in classes), spoke volumes to Black trainees about how accepted and valued they were. In this sense, the privileges of Belonging and Support afforded to White trainees and faculty were highly symbolic, psychological, and interpersonal (Feagin, 2010; Neville et al., 2001).

Informed by Critical Race Theory, Johnson-Bailey, Valentine, Cervero, and Bowles (2009) used mixed methods to retrospectively study the social experiences of Black graduate student alumni (graduating between 1962-2003) from a Southern U.S. research university. Quantitative and qualitative results indicated a preponderance of experiences of loneliness, isolation, and rejection across the decades at a predominantly White university. In many ways, the responses of Black trainees in this study eerily echo the struggles with isolation, loneliness, and rejection encountered by alumni from the study by Johnson-Bailey and colleagues—a likely

indication of lingering institutionalized racism in counseling psychology training environments.

(In)Security

Matters of safety and security in training programs emerged as recurrent themes for African-American trainees. In order to avoid professional and personal jeopardy, alienation, and racial stereotyping, Black trainees engaged in a process of ongoing risk analysis in their programs to ensure their safety. This process entailed meticulous self-awareness and a healthy mistrust of White students, faculty, and spaces. To ensure their professional and personal security, participants' silenced and edited themselves in various contexts. The lack of guaranteed safety in certain contexts was also limiting. Threats to Black trainees' sense of security resulted in shattered expectations for how counseling psychology training programs might offer an oasis from racism and unchecked White privilege. (In)Security contained three subthemes: False Sense of Security, Analyzing Risk, and Containment and Consequence.

False sense of security. The subtheme of False Sense of Security included Black trainees' experiences with unmet expectations of multicultural awareness and affirmation in their training programs. The privilege lies in White trainees' immunity to such culturally disappointing experiences, which seemed to be particularly insulting to Black participants' hopes and undermining of their sense of safety. Realizations of insecurity were often accompanied by feelings of disappointment, shock, embarrassment, frustration, and anger. Naomi shared about her reactions to classmates' "resistance and backlash" to a class discussion on White privilege.

> NAOMI: . . . . 'Cause I know growing up there, I always had an awareness that when it comes to race, you have to make sure who's in your company. You can't talk about these things with everybody. And so then I think I came into counseling psych, or at least into this program, and to some of these courses—'cause not everybody in my program acts or

believes this way but—I came into counseling psych kind of believing that we can have open dialogues about this stuff. We can just finally talk about it. And then seeing the reactions, um, made me feel as if I were naïve, 'cause I, I just expected for everyone to be able to be open and talk about this and believe in this. And that wasn't the case.

Discovering that one's training environment was not as affirming as expected could also be incredibly damaging to one's confidence. Jason shared the mortifying experience of a program potluck that left him feeling exposed, perhaps having overestimated his colleagues' comfort with aspects of his cultural self.

JASON: . . . . And they were like, everybody looked at me weird when I walked in the door with the Kool-Aid. And I was like, oh my god, this is like, in my head, I was thinking, this is a cultural beverage. I think that maybe this was inappropriate to bring. And, you know, so they just kind of looked at me weird. And then I was like, okay, I should have just went with Sprite [laughs]. The Kool-Aid was too much of me. It was too much of a cultural reference. And I felt like in that moment, I was like, *man, I just revealed a part of who I am. What if they don't accept this? What if they don't, what if it's too different than the other beverages they have at the potluck?* And so, and I feel like the idea of White privilege, kind of connecting it back, I don't feel like my colleagues have to think about stuff like that, or you know, have to wrestle with those ideas.

The experience of False Sense of Security also left some participants feeling manipulated and used for their racial identity. Grace was dismayed at this discovery that a White male trainee in the program had endorsed her admission so that he could have another Black friend, and that he had spoken to others about this objective before her arrival. She shared her concern about this

matter with a faculty member who did not entirely deny this reality. Apparently, Grace had been admitted as a forerunner for future Black trainees—an ascribed role about which she was not informed. Grace further described the personal and interpersonal consequences she faced as a result of this shocking realization.

> GRACE: I was angry. I felt like I was tricked by the program when I first got there . . . .
> This is, I felt like it was hard for me to connect to other students because I was a
> [inaudible; topic?] of discussion before I even got here . . . .

In participants' examples, their security was threatened by the harmful and insensitive actions of White trainees and trainers. To act in such ways without concern for the devastating impact on trainees of color is an undeniable privilege. Finally, Ashley had observed White colleagues' complaints that while trainees of color received scholarships, White people "don't get anything . . . ." Her astonishment at this multicultural insensitivity and denial summarizes well the characteristic sentiment of False Sense of Security: "I was under the impression that we were supposed to be these diverse-minded, multicultural people."

Analyzing risk. Black participants weighed the costs and benefits of responding to enactments of White privilege or addressing racial issues, interacting genuinely with faculty and trainees, and entering particular settings. Part of Analyzing Risk was a mistrust of White individuals. Unlike many White trainees, concerns for their safety as racial/ethnic minorities were often at the forefront of their thinking. Naomi shared the immense difficulty she faced in responding to a White classmate who noted her distaste for ongoing cultural dialogue. Before deciding whether or not to respond, she had to consider a litany of personal questions related to her safety.

> NAOMI: . . . . Or feeling as though, before I could even assess whether or not I could

take care of it, I had to go through all of these things in my head. *Is it safe for me to take care of it? What will they see me as? Will—how will I be perceived if I am to address it? Will this affect my status, my impression, whatever in the program? Will people see me differently? Will they feel me differently? Will they not want to work with me because I might come off as too radical? Might this turn into something that I don't want it to turn into? Might there be people in the room that feel a certain way about ethnic minorities, about African Americans? May that be revealed? If so, at this point in time, I don't, I don't want to see it right now, 'cause I just want to get through the class. So, if I address it, there's all these other layers that could be uncovered . . . .* I was angry that it's unfair that I have to address all these things before I can decide whether or not I can answer a question that seems simple to me.

Naomi's extensive questioning of potential consequences in responding to a microaggressive comment was startling to say the least. As trainees of color worry and evaluate situations in this way, White colleagues may have no idea about the internal struggle unfolding silently before them. Naomi also watched her friend respond on her behalf with seemingly little concern for her safety as a White person. This seemed to further confront Naomi with the privilege she could not have in that classroom situation.

Mistrust of White individuals was also central to understanding the subtheme of Analyzing Risk. Isaiah's process of risk analysis entailed an attunement to interpersonal dynamics with White faculty members. Although he did not explicitly address the issue of safety, his attention to White faculty's potential distance and discomfort with Black people indicated that security might be an underlying apprehension.

ISAIAH: . . . . Because even for some of the professors who are in the program, even

when they're talking to you there's this level that they're, there's almost a feeling that

they're uncomfortable with you . . . . But with a lot of the White professors, I felt that

way. And so I don't know if White students have a similar type of experience in terms of

this level of discomfort. It's almost like the professors aren't used to talking to Black

people up close and personal, and then it's kind of weird for them to be in these close

quarters with you having a conversation or talking to you.

Coping with a personal or professional limitation as a psychology graduate student can be

particularly difficult. Doing so privately is likely more distressing and can lead to impairment,

jeopardizing one's own and others' welfare. Trainees of color may have firm misgivings about

bringing personal and professional concerns to White faculty. White trainees may not similarly

hesitate.

ISAIAH: . . . . But if it was something where I had to talk about a limitation or a

weakness that I had, or a concern that I was having, I would not go to any of them to talk

about those experiences—even if it was within the program. Because [inaudible] create a

space where it doesn't feel safe to actually go talk to them.

The risk of negative professional consequences was at the heart of the process of Analyzing

Risk. Grace had touched on the taxing process of cost-benefit analysis for self-protection, and

the looming consequence of "troublemaker" status for people of color in her program that is of

less or little concern to her White colleagues. Isaiah had developed a keen awareness of the

professional risks involved in speaking authentically. His White colleagues were unburdened in

this way.

ISAIAH: . . . . Earlier in the process, I was probably a little bit more vocal. Now, I'm

moving more toward graduation and saying these people are going to be colleagues for

the rest of my life. And so it may not be as wise to always just speak your mind. Even if you speak truth and even if you have research to back it up, or all those things, it may just be wiser to step back.

It appears that from his risk analysis, Isaiah had determined that silence meant protection. This last passage leads well into the subsequent subtheme of (In)Security, called Containment and Consequence.

Containment and consequence. Closely tied to the subtheme of Analyzing Risk was Containment and Consequence. In adapting to real and perceived threats to personal and professional security, Black trainees silenced and edited themselves. Moreover, the potential risks in certain situations precluded options available to White individuals. The term *containment* was chosen to represent the ways in which participants felt silenced and restricted in striving to maintain their safety as racial/ethnic minority trainees.

Grace had shared with a friend that she felt a need to 'close [her] mouth' when issues of race and ethnicity emerged in her program, so as not to be labeled an 'angry Black woman.' Here, she returned to the issue of self-censoring.

GRACE: I have, and I think I would feel freer to say more what I wanted to say without feeling like, that people are judging me that it's coming from a place of anger. I'm not even angry most of the time. But as soon as I say something that's challenging or giving another perspective, it's like I'm angry. Like I'm holding the whole anger of my race in me . . . And it's like, I think as a White person I would be able to say something like that and it wouldn't be—like when people agree with me, then they're not viewed as angry . . . . And so, I think it's being free to say what you want to say.

Grace imagined the freedom White trainees had in speaking authentically without fear of race-

related judgment and stereotyping. Similarly, Naomi reflected on an experience in which she witnessed a White male colleague respond vehemently to a topic in class, observing how different her experience had been as a result of her racial identity.

> NAOMI: . . . . I can't communicate that same passion, because the fear for me is that they won't hear me. They won't understand, and I'll be seen as being angry, and as Black, and maybe even as racist—not racist, but as being discriminatory or—so I can't approach it the same way that a White woman or a White male may be able to, because they have that privilege. They can say it. They can step back and not really have to reap the repercussions . . . . And it's tiring. It's very tiring. It's very frustrating. I would just like to speak as freely as everyone else, but I can't. I can't do that. 'Cause it may be misconstrued. That could be used against me that she's radical and she's angry and she's Black. And so, you know, when Black people act that way they could be unpredictable. I can't. I can't just be as free as, as them when I'm talking about these things.

It is noteworthy that not only did Naomi feel constrained by the same stereotype of the angry Black woman, but she and Grace also used the same language referring to how "free" they perceived their White colleagues to be. Naomi believed that a genuine response could trigger the stereotypic assumptions of others, thus endangering her. It is clear that Naomi felt constrained, especially considering her repeated use of the phrase "I can't." Freedom of expression is an entitlement for all U.S. citizens. And yet, from these examples, this freedom resembles a racial privilege more than a universal right. Underscoring this reality, Jason explained that he felt restricted not just in *what* he could say, but *how* he could say it. Again, he exemplified the containment of authentic parts of himself. For Jason, this was an effort to avoid alienation.

> JASON: Yeah, my language was big. I love studying language, as I respect linguists

highly . . . . But in this setting, I didn't feel like I could use a language that was true to me. I felt like I had to speak, you know, Standard English at all occasions. I didn't feel like I could bring in any of my own cultural references.

Another defining feature of Containment and Consequence was emotional stifling. Returning to a previous example, Naomi described the emotional impact of a White colleague's culturally-insensitive remark that left her contemplating her safety in responding: "And so, I was kind of there, kind of boiling and kind of shaky, and just sitting in my seat seeing how I'm going to approach this." Interestingly, Isaiah described an almost identical emotional reaction to the absence of dialogue on race in his classroom following a powerful video. Silenced by the lack of dialogue (i.e., White Disregard), he had no choice but to contain his reaction in order to protect himself.

> ISAIAH: . . . . So, I was just sitting there boiling on the inside. I really want to say what's on my mind. I really want to say: this is why when we look at the dropout rates for treatment in terms of mental health treatment, the no-show rates for clients of color. These are issues that we really need to address and talk about and figure out how we deal with these things. But we didn't have the conversation there . . . . And so I left that room just kind of boiling . . . .

Containment and Consequence was not restricted to the realm of the verbal and emotional. Self-editing for survival also entailed Black participants' careful control over their appearance.

> ISAIAH: So, there's still this issue around impression management. I don't come to class with shorts on . . . . I almost always would dress up. I always would have on my dress pants and my dress shirt. My hair would always be together. I would have all these

things in line. So, there's a lot of issues around impression management that perhaps other students may not even think about or even deal with, or even know. I think they recognize, *oh yeah, Isaiah's always dressed up . . .* but I don't know if they recognize that in some ways, there's a racial aspect to why I'm doing, why I dress the way I dress, why I act the way I act, why I'm very, I try to be careful about even what I say, even what I meant.

Jason noted a similar preoccupation. His degree of self-monitoring was particularly extreme.

 JASON: It was just a lot of pressure, so I did a lot of editing myself in school. I wasn't able to be who I really wanted to be that first year because I was too busy wondering if what I'm saying is coming out the right way. Interacting with professors, it was things that I look back and are silly to me, like making sure that my posture is correct [laughs slightly].

Lastly, Ashley's struggle with self-blame due to recurrent negative experiences in her program illuminated the insidiousness of containment for the sake of survival.

ASHLEY: And a big part of White privilege is this sense of invisibleness. It's not something that you can see, you can touch. It's not always directly pinpointed. So, the fact that a lot of the time it went unnoticed is a big factor of what it is. Like it went unnoticed because White privilege is kind of like this ghost that moves throughout. . . . . And I feel like it's not, as a function of society and White privilege and all that, it's not readily acceptable to incorporate that as part of my experience or why things are happening the way they're happening. It's not really acceptable to say, you know, pull the race card or to raise this issue. Or incorporate it as part of my experience and why things are happening the way they're happening. So, I think it probably has just kind of

fed into that idea of, does it exist? Doesn't it exist? Well, it doesn't exist, so it's your

fault. You need to take acceptability or accountability for that.

In her training program, Ashley felt unable to invoke race and White privilege as plausible

explanations for negative experiences with colleagues and faculty. This resulted in uncertainty,

which is arguably another form of insecurity. Instead, she attributed her problems to personal

failures. Ashley's experience of containment was profound. She not only maintained a public

silence about the realities of race and privilege impacting her. As she more clearly saw the

presence of White privilege in her training experience during the interview, it seemed the power

of her intuition to sense injustice had been contained for the sake of survival as well. In this

sense, the power of White privilege to silence could lead to a sort of internalized racism.

Discussion: (In)Security. A third superordinate theme called (In)Security emerged from

the data. In general, this theme incorporated the ways in which a lack of security and safety were

integral to Black trainees' encounters with White privilege in their training programs.

(In)Security was comprised of three subthemes, including: (a) False Sense of Security, or

experiences of being misled and deceived, and unmet expectations of a multiculturally-affirming

training environment accompanied by shock, frustration, and disappointment; (b) Analyzing

Risk, or concern over personal or professional jeopardy, meticulous self-awareness for self-

protection, or mistrust of White people and predominantly White settings; and (c) Containment

and Consequence, or Black trainees' active attempts to edit or silence themselves for protection

from perceived negative personal or professional consequences.

Participants' experiences of (In)Security were shaped largely by the multiculturally-

insensitive acts and unacknowledged privilege of White colleagues and faculty. Participants had

not anticipated that their sense of security would be undermined in the multiculturally-

progressive field of counseling psychology. They had arrived believing that they would be accepted for who they were, that they earned their admission to their programs, and that White colleagues would understand the realities of racial inequity. Realizing that they had been mistaken was jarring and deeply painful for participants. As members of the dominant group, White trainees' are likely immune to the shock and dismay of such discoveries.

White privilege in training also emerged in the form of certain freedoms. These included the freedom from preoccupation with risks to one's personal and professional safety, and astonishingly, the freedom of expression. More specifically, participants observed that White trainees had the freedom to speak and emote freely without fear of professional alienation or personal and race-related judgment. Conversely, Black trainees' narratives were marked by painfully acute self-awareness, extensive impression management, and emotional and verbal stifling. They employed these strategies to survive in their programs.

The experiences of participants in this study, while valid in their own right, call into question the multicultural competence and social justice atmosphere of programs that might contribute to threatening environments for trainees of color. Rogers and Molina (2006) noted that "Departments and graduate programs in psychology at predominantly White institutions may not know how to create educational and training environments that are perceived as welcoming and sustaining by students of color" (p. 144). Singh et al. (2010) found that counseling psychology trainees struggled to define *social justice* and reported a lack of formal training and supervision in social justice activities. And survey-based results ($N = 260$) from a study by Beer, Spanierman, Greene, and Todd's (2012) indicated that master's- and doctoral-level counseling trainees may have been dissatisfied with their programs' perceived level of focus on social justice. These findings support and contextualize Black trainees' experiences of

(In)Security as perhaps a result of programmatic shortcomings in multicultural and social justice development.

The insecurity participants felt often resulted from the thoughtless and harmful actions of White people. Researchers have observed that counseling trainees respond predictably to racial issues in ways that may account for Black participants' experiences. White trainees' reactions are often characterized by disinterest, anger, and awareness without intent for activism (D'Andrea & Daniels; 2001). White trainees also struggle to acknowledge their White racial identity, tend toward superficial dialogue on racial issues, exhibit notable discomfort, and occasionally deny the current significance of race and racism (Utsey, Gernat, and Hammar; 2005). Moreover, recent research has revealed that microaggressions against Black counseling psychology supervisees (Constantine & Sue, 2007) and faculty (Constantine et al., 2008) may be a common occurrence. Taken together, these findings provide further evidence that participants' experiences were perhaps not unusual, that a confluence of conditions threaten the security of people of color in counseling psychology training programs.

Understandably, participants' concerns for their safety reflected a *cultural mistrust* of Whites, or "the belief acquired by African Americans, due to past and ongoing mistreatment related to being a member of that ethnic group, that Whites cannot be trusted" (Terrell, Taylor, Menzise, and Barrett, 2009, p. 299). Terrell and colleagues (2009) further clarified that cultural mistrust has behavioral and affective corollaries, such as unease about providing certain information, withholding information, and avoiding some interactions. These corollaries seem to closely resemble the strategies used (and imposed on) Black participants in subthemes of Analysis of Risk and Containment and Consequence. Due to limited space, I was unable to present several stories shared by participants of experiences with White racism growing up.

Barring those experiences, any cultural mistrust harbored by participants was validated by their experiences in their training programs alone, where acceptance and freedom from deception could not be guaranteed.

Double Burden

Considered in the last superordinate theme, Double Burden, is the twofold challenge that African-American trainees experienced. The label *burden* is used to emphasize the additional effort and energy involved in managing or surpassing these challenges, beyond what is required by White trainees to navigate their training successfully. First, Black participants contended with perceptions, expectations, and assumptions that left them feeling diminished, marginalized, or excluded. Second, participants were also met with expectations of multicultural competence and participation in diversity-related roles because of their racial identity. These expectations were not placed on White colleagues. Not surprisingly, greater effort was required by Black participants to maintain, succeed, and defy lower expectations as professionals in the field. Participants also struggled in pursuits of educational and clinical opportunities involving people of color. The twofold struggle of Black trainees is acknowledged in the subthemes of Burden of Diminishment and the Additive Burden of Expectation.

Burden of diminishment. Thus far evident is the reality that Black trainees contended with a variety of expectations, perceptions, and assumptions that, at times, left them feeling disregarded, unsupported, and unsafe. This struggle against harmful expectations and assumptions was an integral part of the Double Burden; participants felt themselves and their capabilities diminished. In other words, Black participants were *reduced* to the meanings others ascribed to their appearance, and they were *limited* by dominant cultural beliefs and values. Early in his interview, Jason commented on this reality, noting the personal impact of racial

perceptions as a person of color in the U.S.

> JASON: And it's a constant battle. I like to describe it in the sense of the self/other dynamic. You're constantly trying to make sense of who you are while also trying to understand how it is that other people perceive you. And you're doing that specifically in the context of skin color. . . .

Grace acknowledged a ubiquitous struggle with race-based expectations underestimating her abilities.

> GRACE: Right. And I think that there's always also an expectation of less from me. So, it's almost, I find that, almost like fighting an uphill battle all the time. It's like I'm pushing against like proving that I belong here, but because your expectations are lower, you're content with letting me be—

Despite her efforts to circumvent negative expectations and stereotypes, this struggle remained a fixture of her training experience. She could not unload the Burden of Diminishment.

> GRACE: . . . . I actually was [laughing slightly] last semester informed—I was talking to one of the people in my cohort. And I was like, 'I always feel like I have to close my mouth when we're talking about certain subjects around racial and ethnic identity, because I don't want to come across as the angry Black woman. Like, and every time I question it, it becomes like I'm just being negative about it.' And he's like, 'Well.' I'm like, 'People already think I'm the angry Black woman?' And he's like, 'Yeah.' And I was just like, 'I'm not even like, I feel like I was trying so hard not to . . . .'

Ashley felt the weight of others' negative perceptions of her, juxtaposing the faculty's view of her with their apparent favoritism for White trainees.

> ASHLEY: But if all of the White students are viewed, there isn't, I can't think of one

that's deemed as like, aw, here comes so and such. Or, oh, of course so and such doesn't

have their stuff together. And that's definitely not the case. Like it's definitely not true

that, oh yeah, they're these model students. It's kind of, that's how I feel like that White

privilege is in action, because it's kind of assumed for that person that, oh yeah—

In contrast to White trainees, Ashley seemed to suggest that her presence was dreaded, and a lack

of preparation assumed. She also felt limited and excluded by expectations in her program that

seemed to endorse White cultural values and beliefs related to action orientation, mastery of

one's environment, and a rugged individualism (e.g., Katz, 1985).

ASHLEY: There is, there's definitely this idea, you need to be a go-getter . . . . You be

like the model students and whatever it takes, get that experience. Get that opportunity.

Be on that research team. Go to the conference. Do essentially whatever it takes to make

the most out of your experience. Which to me is very very similar to the idea and

concept of, you know, pull yourself up by your own bootstraps kind of concept. And it's

like, that's not the way that everyone works, and that's not the way that everyone

communicates. So, is that necessarily like a White cultural thing? I only say yes based

on my program and the people who are deemed as those model students, and who I've

even heard from them make those statements of, 'Oh, you have to go get what you want

and what you need. And you just have to go get it. You know, closed mouths don't get

fed.' Like you need to—this whole idea of this proactive. Which in some cases can

seem proactive, but also seem overbearing and kind of ruthless at time.

Ashley observed that those who seemed to most easily meet expectations were "model" White

trainees. She experienced the paths to success in her program as cutthroat, and her program as

unaccommodating of other preferred paths. It seemed that the inconspicuous presence of

Eurocentric values in programmatic norms could be particularly harmful and restricting.

Additive burden of expectation. Paradoxically, whereas certain perceptions, expectations, and values left participants feeling unworthy or excluded, higher expectations were placed on them for multicultural competence and representation of diversity. Contrasted with the Burden of Diminishment, something additional was given to or required by participants. The Additive Burden of Expectation resulted in more responsibilities.

> GRACE: . . . . And on the backside of it, [faculty] use us a lot to be in the forefront. So, it's like, 'Oh, well, it looks good that you got this.' And 'Grace, we're gonna do this.' And we're going to, 'Do you want to be on this committee?' I got appointed to a lot of committees my first year, and I was like, I don't even want to do all this. I just started. But it was like, 'Oh, you'll be on this committee' . . . .

Grace recalled that she was appointed to a number of committees apparently because of her racial identity, and sometimes despite her wishes. At the master and doctoral level, she had a similar experience with clinical and outreach duties.

Naomi, too, felt that more was expected of her professionally because of her race. Having accepted the inevitability of such perceptions of multicultural competence, she recognized that she was essentially representing her race, whether she wanted to or not. This was another feature of the Burden of Additive Expectation; it could be both imposed and binding.

> NAOMI: . . . . So, people may look at me and say, 'Well she should know because she's Black.' So, I think, what I and what other African Americans or Black Americans do in this role having this expectation puts on another layer for me. It means that I'm not going to be a representative or a spokesperson. But this is an area that I want to continue to

study and that I feel this even—I say obligation, but I don't mean to say that as if it's a

burden. I feel this obligation and responsibility to kind of be a champion of this and

study it so that I can help those who are Black, who are not in this professional world

who may be affected—who might be affected by it. So, I feel this responsibility that I

have to give back. They may be doing this because they wanted to be a psychologist and

there's an area of interest that they're invested in it. So, they might feel somewhat that

responsibility—may feel it all the way. But for me I think it's, and I think for many

people of color, it may be more clear that since we're already seen as kind of maybe a

representation or a representative for our cultural groups, that I have to—I have an

obligation to do this and to do well. Because people may see me and who may have not

had contact with Black people may think or may stereotype Black people off of who I am

and how I interact . . . .

Naomi felt required to know two psychologies, traditional Eurocentric and also Afrocentric, in

order to survive as a professional and protect her cultural community with intellectual "weapons

and tools." The additional effort required to undertake this duty is undeniable.

Contrarily, participants observed that White trainees were expected by faculty to be less

multiculturally competent, thereby excusing them in some way from the pressure and

responsibility of assumed knowledge. Grace stated, "I think a lot of times they're given passes

on multicultural issues." Isaiah watched a similar phenomenon unfold in two separate courses in

which White trainees were not challenged to the extent that trainees of color were around their

multicultural development.

ISAIAH: . . . . And both times there's been this soft-pedaling or this, I feel like there's a

catering to making sure the White students in the room are very comfortable. And so I

understand there's a, that there has to be a balance there, but I've always felt like White students' perspectives, even in the multicultural class, and even more so in other classes, it's always given sort of precedence and is always, there's always this, sort of this bowing to a White perspective in terms of not really challenging or really questioning any issues around Whiteness . . . .

The Additive Burden of Expectation also involved the extra effort entailed to acquire desired knowledge and clinical experiences with racially/ethnically marginalized populations.

NAOMI: If I want to see what my culture, my people have put into this whole development of psychology, I'm gonna have to study that as a special topic. It's something different. It's not core curriculum. It's not reflected in the curriculum that we're required to learn about. It's something in addition to . . . something special that has to be added to what is just expected for you to know . . . .

Naomi received the message that the contributions of cultures of color to the field of psychology were extraneous knowledge to be sought independently. Like Naomi, Isaiah found that the onus was on him to create opportunities to work more closely with people of color.

ISAIAH: . . . . It's very interesting, there's a historically Black college that's [nearby], and they have a counseling center. We do not have a relationship with them. And I talked with the practicum director, and he said, part of it is that, if we, if I wanted to have a practicum site with them, with the HBCU, I would need to contact them and create that relationship. And I'm thinking, this program has been around for fifty plus years. I don't understand why there isn't a relationship with these programs . . . . We have strong relationships with a lot of local counseling places, a very wide variety of places. But when you look across those clinical settings, most of them are predominately, see

predominately White clientele.

Isaiah seemed rather astonished that a relationship with the HBCU had not been established, especially considering his program's ties to other local counseling centers serving a primarily White clientele. With such limited opportunities, Isaiah further shared about the additional effort that would be required to attain clinical experience with clients of color and why this was troubling to him: "Particularly because we don't call our, we don't label our program as: 'If you come in here you'll be able to work quite well with White people.'" He felt particularly conflicted and disappointed, knowing that his professional identity and interests as a Black psychologist were not necessarily supported by the experiences that were made available to him. On the other hand, Isaiah felt that trainees interested in serving predominantly White populations had many opportunities to do so, noting astutely the invisibility of this rather automatic specialization.

Finally, Jason briefly acknowledged an occasional inexplicable exhaustion after school. He was unable to pinpoint the cause as he reflected on his day. I asked Jason about the extent to which he replayed race-related events during his reflecting. He responded ". . . . if I had to put a percentage on it, I'd say probably thirty to forty percent of what I reflect on from my day at school is probably related to race." Following his disclosure, I shared my shock at this estimate. Many White trainees can preserve for their training the additional psychological energy needed by students of color to reflect on the implications of their racial identities in training.

Discussion: Double Burden. The fourth and final theme identified from interviews with Black counseling psychology trainees was Double Burden. The Burden of Diminishment subtheme encompassed reports of others' negative race-based expectations, assumptions, and perceptions that felt diminishing to participants. Also discussed were the dominant cultural

expectations that felt restricting, yet benefitted their White counterparts. The Additive Burden of

Expectation captured the extra responsibility placed on participants to satisfy others'

expectations surrounding Black trainees' multicultural competence, and the effort required to

pursue experiences of racial diversity outside of the realm of dominant cultural training. The

theme of Double Burden reflected: (a) how participants felt diminished by dominant cultural

expectations and assumptions, and (b) the additional requirements to meet or defy expectations

and norms.

Negative perceptions of people of color in racist and microaggressive environments are

still a glaring reality of university life for undergraduate and graduate students (Harwood, Huntt,

Mendenhall, & Lewis, 2012; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000). Similarly to the Black trainees in

this study, Black counseling psychology faculty have encountered students and staff who have

harbored negative perceptions, assumptions, and expectations regarding their credentials and

credibility. These faculty members have also reported institutional or departmental expectations

to undertake additional activities and responsibilities that other White faculty members wished

not to (Constantine et al., 2008). Some of these responsibilities, as for participants in the current

investigation, were related to culture and race (e.g., outreach with a specific population).

Participants in this study also felt the weight assumed expertise in multiculturalism.

Some evidence has indicated that students of color may possess greater multicultural awareness

than White students after limited multicultural training. Though, race/ethnicity does not seem to

moderate the effect of training on multicultural knowledge (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2011).

Also, the results of two meta-analytic investigations suggested race/ethnicity were not significant

predictors of multicultural education outcomes in mental health fields (Smith, Constantine,

Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006). Apart from being blatantly stereotypical, there is also not

clear evidence to suggest that people of color are more multiculturally competent than White people.

As reported by participants in this study, trainees of color may have to put forth additional effort as they contend with race-related barriers in their training environments. In a self-report analysis of a diverse sample of doctoral-level psychology graduate trainees, African American participants encountered more academic barriers (i.e., with "peers," "professors," "advisor," and "school/staff administration") than White trainees. And more so than White trainees, African American, Latina/o, and Asian American students perceived that these barriers were related to their racial/ethnic identities (Maton et al., 2011). The current findings perhaps provide some insight into the details of these barriers, such as contending with negative perceptions, dominant cultural expectations, and additional responsibilities.

The Maton and colleagues' (2011) results are consistent with this study's findings in terms of perceived cultural diversity as well. These participants perceived limited cultural diversity in terms of course offerings and counseling opportunities, noting the extra effort and responsibility required to seek them out. Maton and colleagues found that particularly for Black trainees, perceived cultural diversity was significantly linked to academic satisfaction. Bearing this in mind, they encouraged training programs to promote access to cultural diversity in many forms, like counseling opportunities with clients of color and diversity-infused courses.

Summary and Conclusions: Black/African-American Subsample Themes

Semi-structured interviews conducted with Black-identified participants on the topic of White privilege in counseling psychology training programs revealed some noteworthy and novel findings. Generally speaking, the effects of White privilege were a prominent and continuous feature of Black participants' training experiences. Contending with the conscious

and unconscious enactments of White privilege by White trainees, supervisors, and faculty were experienced as highly personal and emotionally distressing by Black participants. Participants observed White privilege as broadly present in multiple areas of their training experience: the classroom, clinical supervision, counseling practica, research, and the general training environment. Furthermore, the negative impact of White privilege was experienced in professional and extracurricular relationships with those in participants' training programs.

Four superordinate themes (and 12 subthemes) emerged from Black participant interviews: White Disregard/Disconnection, Belonging and Support, (In)Security, and Double Burden. White Disregard/Disconnection captured the power of White individuals in training to actively disregard the racial realities of Black trainees and remain empathically disconnected from their struggles. The ability of White individuals to impose silence around racial dialogue served to disempower Black trainees in a variety of contexts. And quite notably, the choice of acknowledging one's White privilege and the diverse realities of Black trainees was discussed as a matter of integrity, and therefore has implications for ethical functioning as a psychological professional (American Psychological Association, 2002).

In terms of Belonging and Support, Black participants observed White individuals' easier access to supportive relationships and felt presence in their training contexts. Isolation and rejection related to race were central to participants' experiences. The theme of (In)Security reflected the strategies employed by participants to survive in their training environments, including ongoing risk analysis, heightened awareness of personal and professional consequences, and containment of voice and emotion. Coincidentally, Black participants reported that navigating cultural insensitivity and ignorance of White privilege was not something they had expected in counseling psychology training programs.

Finally, participants described a Double Burden. Considering the race-related nature of these burdens, White individuals were assumed to be free from such additional challenges in their training experience. One burden entailed White individuals' expectations and perceptions that diminished Black participants' abilities and personal integrity. A second burden addressed White individuals' expectations for Black participants to possess greater knowledge or carry out additional responsibilities as a result of their racial identities. Participants perceived a need to expend greater effort to acquire knowledge and experience with communities of color, and to survive as Black psychologists in a Eurocentric field.

The findings from this qualitative investigation may illuminate the nature of some of the race-related barriers identified by graduate psychology trainees of color in broader scale investigations (e.g., Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011). Considering the small sample size of this study, these findings are not generalizable to Black trainees or psychology training programs. However, the startling overlap in the language and experience of Black participants in this study points to an unsettling reality in their training programs. Furthermore, these similar experiences spanned five different APA-accredited training programs and various regions of the country. Therefore, despite obvious limitations in external validity, the sobering reality of these findings should at the very least pique the curiosity of trainees and faculty about the training experiences of students of color, who may very well be confronting the deleterious effects of White privilege discussed here.

White/European-American Subsample

Before exploring themes identified among White subsample participants, their participant profiles are presented. The five White participants were Kate, Sarah, Emily, Dave, and Beth. All participants reviewed and approved their profiles for accuracy.

White/European-American Participants

  Kate. Kate identifies as a White, heterosexual, currently able-bodied, and female. She is in her early thirties. She describes her social class background as lower-middle class. Spiritually/religiously, she identities as agnostic atheist. Kate grew up in the Midwest in a major metropolitan area. Kate holds a master's degree with a focus on counseling and was not the first in her family to pursue higher education.

  Certain other identities that Kate possesses have been central to her racial identity development and understanding of White privilege. Growing up in a family with limited financial resources, Kate observed the interaction of White privilege with her family's social class background. She saw that despite financial hardship, her parents were still able to provide her with prestigious educational opportunities. Kate also emphasized the importance of her identities as a woman and feminist. As a feminist, Kate developed a voice of opposition that empowered her to actively respond to threats to social justice. Kate also came to see through feminism that focusing strongly on her own oppression as a woman could shield her awareness from the ways she benefitted from other social identities, such as race. This awareness motivated her to look at herself more holistically, which entailed the development of a humble curiosity about the experiences of people of color and her participation in institutional racism.

  Kate experienced several years of career indecision post-baccalaureate. During that time, she was a full-time worker and part-time student with a growing interest in psychology. Encouragement from a professor and volunteer work at an outreach agency led her to the field of counseling psychology. Kate's counseling psychology program is located in a moderately large Southern city and aims to train scientist-practitioners to work in a variety of roles and settings applying principles of social justice and an ecological framework. The student body of her

program is predominantly White and female. Although the faculty is predominantly White, people of color are represented. At the time of the interview, Kate was in her fourth year of training pursuing a Ph.D. in counseling psychology.

Kate sought out her current counseling psychology training program at the personal recommendation of a trusted professor. She was additionally encouraged by the compatibility of the program's values with her social justice orientation. Kate describes the students in her program as diverse in sexual identity, racial/ethnic background, and religious/spiritual affiliation.

She has completed many undergraduate and graduate courses in areas of social justice, privilege/oppression, and diversity and multiculturalism—also attending and providing additional trainings in these areas. Kate's clinical and research interests span multiple topics, including counseling process and outcome, gender issues, social privilege, and substance use work. In the future, Kate hopes to work as a practitioner applying her clinical interests. She would also like to offer trainings on issues of diversity and privilege.

Sarah. Sarah identifies as White, heterosexual, currently able-bodied, and female. She is in her mid twenties. Spiritually/religiously, Sarah identifies as spiritual without any religious organizational affiliation. She describes her family social class background as "mixed," noting that her mother (lower class) and her father (upper-middle class), who are divorced, had differential access to resources related to employment and income. She grew up in a metropolitan region of the Western U.S. Sarah attended a "diverse public school in a poor area" and had several friends of color there. She attended a predominantly White undergraduate university and was not the first in her family to pursue higher education. Sarah currently holds a master's degree in psychology.

Sarah shared about a number of identities that have interacted with her racial identity

development and understanding of White privilege. First, Sarah maintains a deeply held spiritual

belief in the inherent goodness and equality of human beings. However, she also feels

challenged by an apparent incompatibility of this view with the stark realities of racial

oppression. Second, Sarah explained that she possesses marginalized identities herself, namely

as a woman. Particularly on internship, examining racial privilege has been difficult due to a

sense that her marginalized identities have been overlooked in the process. Third, Sarah has

observed the interaction of educational privilege with White privilege, noting that many of her

White family members have attained professional degrees. She acknowledged the role of White

privilege in increasing the likelihood that one will pursue higher education or professional

training. Furthermore, having a number of highly educated family members has afforded her

access to networks of knowledge for navigating educational systems effectively.

Sarah reported that personal and familial experiences surrounding mental health and

illness impacted her desire to seek training in counseling psychology. Her graduate training

program, which utilizes a scientist-practitioner model, is located in a moderately large city in the

Western U.S. that is "over 90% identified as White." The student body of the program is

predominantly female. The faculty is predominantly male and all-White. At the time of the

interview, Sarah was a fifth-year student in her training program pursuing a Ph.D., and was on

internship at a university counseling center in the Western U.S.

She was drawn to her training program for several reasons, including its interdisciplinary

focus, research offerings, strong reputation, and high internship match rate. Sarah shared her

belief that while her program does offer strong clinical training, there is relatively little training

on social justice principles and diversity. Alternatively, Sarah explained that her internship site

has offered her a broader and more systemic view of multicultural issues and places a great deal

of emphasis on White privilege exploration. She has taken several college and graduate courses on issues of culture, power, privilege, and oppression in areas of sociology and psychology. Her clinical and research interests span several mental disorders and include assessment. Regarding career aspirations, Sarah hopes to work as a specialized private practitioner.

Emily. Emily identifies as White, female, heterosexual, agnostic, and currently able-bodied. She is currently in her mid-twenties. Emily identifies her social class background as middle class. She was not the first in her family to attend college or graduate school. Emily grew up in the Eastern U.S.

Other identities that Emily possesses have interacted with race to inform her understanding of White privilege. As a woman, she is well-acquainted with experiences of gender-based oppression. Yet she has become aware of how focusing on her gender as a marginalized identity can sometimes distract from the ways she has racial privilege. Social class is another important identity to Emily. Growing up, she attended a private high school composed of a very affluent and predominantly White student body. Coming from a middle-class family background, Emily found it difficult to relate to some of the students because of this difference in social class. She further observed the incredible struggle faced by Black students recruited from a nearby inner city.

Coming from a family of divorce, Emily developed an interest in the psychology of relationships. Hoping to provide the same help to others that she received during challenging times in her life, Emily decided to pursue graduate study in counseling psychology. She was drawn to her current training program because of its small size, multicultural focus, "rigorous blend" of professional activities (e.g., research, clinical work, teaching), a strong match with her advisor, feeling a "good vibe" during the interview process, and the prestige of the university.

Emily's training program is located in a small city in the Eastern U.S.   At the time of the interview, Emily was in her fourth year of training.

Emily's training program utilizes a scientist-practitioner model. The focus of training is multifaceted, emphasizing trainees' skill development in a variety of professional activities, including supervision, counseling, research, and teaching. Multiculturalism and social justice are philosophical tenets of the program. Students are required to complete multiple courses on issues of diversity, and all courses offered must incorporate some aspect of diversity or social justice. Emily observes that many forms of diversity are represented by the student body of her program, in terms of sexual orientation, ethnicity, and country of origin. However, students identify as predominantly female and able-bodied. Nearly half of the faculty members have identities that include racial/ethnic minority backgrounds.

Emily has had rather extensive training on issues of diversity, social justice, privilege, and oppression. At the undergraduate level, she took several courses in gender and women's studies, and has completed two courses with a major focus on multiculturalism in psychology or counseling. She further notes her program's attention to diversity and social justice issues in all courses offered. Emily also received significant exposure to multicultural issues through practicum training and supervision experiences. Lastly, she volunteers as an escort for patients at a local abortion clinic.

Emily's areas of interest and specialization include psychotherapy supervision, interpersonal process theory, and work with individuals enduring family distress (with resulting anxiety and depression). Although her future career plans are still taking shape, Emily enjoys the full array of professional activities of counseling psychologists. Currently, she aspires to pursue a faculty position and maintain a connection to psychotherapy supervision, perhaps as a

training director for a counseling psychology training program or accredited internship site. Operating a private practice part time is yet another possibility Emily is considering.

Dave. Dave identifies as White, heterosexual, currently able-bodied, Catholic, and male. He is currently in his mid-twenties and grew up in a moderately populated city in the Midwestern U.S. Dave indicated his socioeconomic background as middle class. He was not the first in his family to attend college or graduate school. Dave currently holds a master's degree in counseling.

Dave appeared highly attuned to the ways in which social identities interact. During the interview, this awareness emerged through his careful, almost tentative, considerations of cultural factors influencing privilege and oppression in various contexts. A significant milestone in his awareness of race, racism, White privilege, and intersectionality was an intimate relationship with a partner possessing both marginalized racial/ethnic and religious/spiritual identities. Dave observed the interconnectedness of these identities in how others' viewed his partner in U.S. society. Also, growing up and attending school in rather rural areas of the Midwest, Dave developed an appreciation for how geographic identity can interact with race in shaping racial attitudes in predominantly White spaces.

It was an introductory course that first drew Dave toward the field of psychology. After observing the benefits of psychotherapy for himself and others, and learning more about the unique issues involved in military psychology, Dave decided to pursue graduate training in counseling psychology. At the time of the interview, Dave was in his fourth year of graduate training and his second year in the doctoral program (pursuing a Ph.D.), having completed a terminal master's degree in counseling in the same department.

Dave's training program is located in a rural Midwestern town. He was attracted to the

program because of its proximity to his home, generous funding, supportive environment, and strong reputation. Dave's program demonstrates a commitment to diversity and multiculturalism through the research conducted and the students recruited. A significant number of students in the program identify as international. The program's faculty is predominantly White, although faculty of color are represented.

Dave acquired some knowledge of racial/ethnic relations at the undergraduate level. His graduate program attempts to infuse a multicultural focus in all classes, and he has taken a course on multicultural counseling. Dave explained that although multiculturalism is not a clinical or research area of interest, these issues fascinate him.

Dave's clinical and research interests center on a variety of subjects related to psychological assessment, cognitive functioning, the military, and veterans. In the future, Dave will spend some time as a military psychologist. Subsequently, he looks forward to one day operating an assessment- and team-oriented private practice.

Beth. Beth identifies as White, female, heterosexual, currently able-bodied, and Jewish. She is in her late twenties. She comes from an upper-middle class background. Early in her life, Beth lived in a populated Midwestern city. Her family then moved to an affluent suburb of that same city. Beth was not the first in her family to attend college or graduate school.

Other social identities important to Beth have informed her understanding of race and White privilege. As an Ashkenazi Jew, Beth has observed a privilege of acceptance in the Jewish community not similarly afforded to Jews of color she knows. As a woman, Beth noted that her marginalized gender identity allows her to connect with women of color in discussions of privilege and oppression in her training program in ways that she is unable to join with White males at times. Finally, Beth acknowledged an interaction between her family's White racial

identity and their education and financial wealth. These "accumulated generational" privileges have afforded her "social capital" as she has navigated professional contexts in graduate school.

Beth's interest in psychology emerged from a fascination with the existential and intergenerational impact of trauma, a personally relevant topic in her family's history. Beth was drawn to her current counseling psychology training program by the promise of continued work with her undergraduate advisor, from whom she aspired to deepen her knowledge of scholarly activities in academia. At the time of the interview, Beth was in her fourth year of doctoral training pursuing a Ph.D. Her training program is located a moderately large Midwestern city.

There is an emphasis in Beth's program on multicultural and social psychological approaches in training. A large number of students in the program identify as international or racial/ethnic minority students. The program's faculty is predominantly White.

At the undergraduate level, Beth completed courses exploring Judaism and cultural issues in music. In her graduate studies, she has taken a number of courses addressing issues of diversity in areas of personal and social psychology, developmental psychology, and multicultural counseling. Beth has also attended trainings related to intergenerational trauma, sexual assault, and leadership in a Jewish-affiliated campus organization. Beth's clinical and research interests center on trauma and particular research and statistical methodologies. She looks forward to a career equally devoted to research and practice. Beth aspires to provide counseling to military veterans.

White/European-American Subsample Themes

Four superordinate themes and 12 subthemes emerged from interviews with White participants. An overview of these themes can be found in Table 3. As compared with the analysis of Black subsample data, it was more challenging to move beyond a merely descriptive

analysis of White subsample data. Despite White participants' advanced training status, racial privilege is an "elusive" topic, especially for Whites (McIntosh, 1988). Some of their discussion lacked the affect, immediacy, and subtle observation that allowed for the richer interpretations of Black participants' data.

And yet, the more descriptive themes were necessary to highlight the differences in Black and White participants' socially constructed realities. In other words, it sometimes took the contrasting experiences of these two subsamples to shed light on the White students' conceptualizations and experiences of White privilege. Viewed in this context, seemingly surface-level observations became profound in their meanings. This is not surprising, considering that instances of racial oppression often serve to highlight routine and hidden privileges (Israel, 2012). Therefore, there will be some overlap between the presentation of the White participant subsample themes, and the Cross-Sample Examination that follows.

Incorporating the ideas of Ricoeur (1970), Smith and colleagues (2009) explained that the balance in IPA research is "between a hermeneutics of empathy and a hermeneutics of suspicion" (p. 106). To move beyond the merely descriptive and uncover more elusive elements of privilege in White participants' accounts, I also leaned at times toward a hermeneutics of suspicion. I sought not only to reveal the obvious unearned advantages in White participants' discussion, but also those hidden in their language and experience. In order to do so, I attended not only to the content of what they shared, but the process by which they shared. This dual interpretation was especially useful in developing the theme of Impact and Involvement.

For example, some White participants observed the differential impact of certain programmatic occurrences on themselves compared to trainees of color. Such an observation was often content-based, or an obvious point being made through participants' examples.

Alternatively, process-based examples of Impact and Involvement required my use of a more active interpretation to identify the unacknowledged seeds of White privilege embedded in participants' responses. For example, through the telling of their stories, some participants seemed to regard White privilege as a critical matter with significant implications for themselves and trainees of color. Other participants conveyed experiences of White privilege rather mundanely or vaguely. Some participants perceived a personal role in occurrences of White privilege. Others looked beyond themselves for sources of accountability.

Awareness

Issues surrounding White participants' awareness of racial identity and White privilege were key to understanding their experiences. Four subthemes make up the theme of Awareness: Recent Awareness, Unawareness: Routine/Optional, People of Color as Illuminators, and Empowerment. In general, the theme of Awareness addressed the *when* and the *how* of participants' awareness (and unawareness) of White privilege and race. Although Awareness and its subthemes are more descriptive than interpretive, these patterns in the data possess significant meaning in the right context.

Recent/Academic Awareness. Despite varying levels of complexity in their understanding of race and White privilege, these White participants' realization of racial privilege was no more than a few years old. White participants' relatively recent awareness of White privilege was noteworthy, considering that most of the Black participants noted a vague, even clear understanding of racial difference or privilege in their teens or earlier. In this way, White participants were afforded the privilege of unawareness of their racial identities and unearned advantage for much of their adolescent and young adult lives.

For several of the White participants, the recent impetus to explore White privilege

occurred formally in an academic context, as through internship training or a conference

presentation. For example, Emily described how her counseling psychology training program

had marked a major turning point in her awareness.

> EMILY: And I think it's almost why it's hard to identify before being in this
>
> counseling psych program, like what exactly was happening with my race. Because I
>
> wasn't thinking about my race until it was a big part of my training.

Emily seems to suggest that without some form of didactic intervention, she would have

remained unaware of herself as a racial being. For Black participants, formal training was not

essential to inform what they had already known for years. At most, it put words to a familiar

experience of inequity or exclusion.

Unawareness: Routine/optional. White participants were also quite forthright in sharing

their routine unawareness of their racial identities and privilege as trainees, despite their

familiarity with the concept of White privilege. Kate, who possessed incredible knowledge and

passion about issues of privilege and oppression, still bluntly discussed this reality. She

considered the influence of her frequent presence in predominantly White contexts: "And the

instances where I'm surrounded by a bunch of other White people, which is, you know, 98% of

my life, I'm not aware of my race." Juxtaposing this estimate alongside Jason's (Black

participant), that 30-40% of his daily reflections involved race, the psychological benefits of

routine unawareness for White trainees are astonishing. Dave recognized that unawareness of

White privilege was a typical occurrence for him.

> DAVE: . . . . How I feel like oftentimes, when I think of what White privilege is, it's not
>
> something that I notice very regularly because I feel like it's this skating through. It's like
>
> that's what life is supposed to be . . . .

 Interestingly, he seemed to overlook how viewing his life as normal was a privilege in itself that contributed to this routine unawareness.

Without making a conscious effort, White trainees can remain disconnected from the realities of racial inequity in their programs. Apart from their unawareness being routine, White participants also discussed racial privilege awareness as optional, invoking notions of choice and preference. Kate's language, specifically her use of the phrase "can be" seemed to indicate a realistic acknowledgment that she could choose to be unaware of the race-related barriers faced by trainees of color in her program.

> KATE: . . . . But there are definitely some dynamics that play out in our program that also play out in larger society too. So, I can be oblivious about the fact that people of color don't have the mentorship opportunities that I do. Or I can remain oblivious to the fact that somehow students of color in our program have been given critical feedback about their writing skills that it doesn't seem like White people have . . .

As she reflected on the interview discussion, Sarah's language resembled Kate's in the reflection of choice and intention: "I can put this down and walk away from it, and that it doesn't impact, my race doesn't impact my overall impression of my training or my career as much as it does for other people."

Black participants in this study frequently reflected on race. The risks they perceived, the consequences they feared, and the oppression they encountered *necessitated* this reality—*imposed* it. Still, they too acknowledged an occasional unawareness of racial privilege and oppression. But more often than not, Black participants did not choose to be unaware. It seemed that in order to cope and survive the perpetual race-related challenges of training, the heightened awareness that protected them also had to be unconsciously rested to preserve their sanity. But

again, their unawareness was not a choice or a preference.

In stark contrast, Sarah struggled with the extent to which she was willing to let White privilege awareness impact her life.

> SARAH: . . . . But it's like, well, yeah, but I have a ton of White privilege and I don't want to hate these people who are my partner's parents' friends and my partner's parents and stuff. Like I don't want to have any negative feelings toward people who are not as hyper-aware of all the systems that I am. But I want to have enough awareness that I'm not hurting people. You know? Like I want to be aware enough of my privilege so that I can use it to be helpful.

Despite her good intentions, this personal struggle entailed unearned advantage. In a society that continuously reminds them of their difference, people of color are not afforded the option of preference in how aware they are of their racial identities.

People of color as illuminators. For most of the White participants, their awareness of racial difference and privilege was influenced by the experiences of people of color in their lives and training programs. Through personal relationships with people of color and observations of racism, their White racial identities and privilege were thrust to the foreground of awareness. Kate reflected on a tendency toward "passive awareness" of White privilege through which the normalcy of her experience was called into question by "evidence" to the contrary presented by trainees of color.

> KATE: . . . . There's this idea that my experience is typical somehow. And of course I don't consciously think this, but there's sort of that attitude about it. My experience is typical and it takes me hearing reports about someone else's experience or having conversations with people of color to get evidence of it not being true. And I think I

know, I feel like I know that my experience as a White person is different from people of

color. But it's hard for me to know how that is, how it is different, until I hear these

stories or hear reports from other people about other people of color's experiences in the

program.

Dave explained White privilege in terms of differential treatment compared to people of color.

He clarified that noticing his own preferential racial treatment was often more difficult than

noticing when people of color were discriminated against.

DAVE: Like it's harder for me to figure out when I'm being treated well, and it's easier

for me to think about other times when somebody else who was non-White is being

mistreated. I can see that. But I almost think myself, I just, everything happens because

of just being regular.

He later observed the importance of an intimate relationship with a person of color in promoting

his awareness of White privilege beyond simply an awareness of racism.

DAVE: I don't think it's something that I honestly really learned or appreciated as much

until I started dating [a woman of color]. And just being able to learn more about her

experience of her daily life. Or her friends' experiences of daily life . . .

It is commendable that White participants were willing to learn from the people of color in their

lives. As previously discussed, choosing not to value the experiences of people of color is a

defining feature of White Disregard, as experienced by Black participants. It is also a form of

color-blind racism (Neville et al., 2001). However, a deeper interpretation of this finding

suggested that this pattern of passive awareness was not void of privilege.

It seemed that White participants were relying very heavily on people of color and

incidents of racism for knowledge about themselves as racial beings. Quite simply, when

curiosity turns to dependence, "active awareness" as Kate termed it, is discouraged. Then, self-reflection on one's Whiteness occurs at convenient times, and privilege only exists through the trauma of another.

Empowerment. Lastly, some White participants regarded experiences of racial privilege awareness as empowering. This sentiment was made obvious by the positive tone with which they depicted such experiences, their emphasis on a newfound sense of personal control/influence, or through a feeling of having made a difference with their awareness. Awareness provided participants with options and opened doors for change.

For example, as Kate discussed her process of racial identity development, it was clear that a developing awareness of White privilege left her feeling empowered. Her optimism shone through as she contemplated how she might use her privilege responsibly to offer people of color a unique experience with a White person. She recognized that her awareness provided her with "weapons . . . to use in conversations" marred by racism, rather than simply feel uncomfortable. And through her awareness, she was able to practice equanimity in a classroom dialogue on race despite feeling hurt, and remain open to hearing the sentiments her colleague of color was expressing.

Emily's empowering experience of awareness came after learning that some clients of color were dissatisfied with the services at her practicum agency. She realized that intakes were approached using a Eurocentric framework that could marginalize clients of color.

EMILY: . . . . But given my awareness that I do have, I was thinking, *Okay, well, if this was a White client from a different background, they might not have had that reaction, and might've just come back next week for the same thing. 'Cause they understand more culturally what therapy is.* So, I guess it's been really cool for me to actually

pull from all of my training and put it into an actual practice that I named it. I wrote

the forms. I'm running it. So, for me it's so cool to be able to put these things into

practice and really challenge myself in a real-world setting . . . .

From this example, it can be seen that Emily reacted very positively (i.e., "so cool") to having

personally used (i.e., "I named it," "I'm running it.") her awareness of White privilege to

deconstruct racial barriers for clients.

Black participants also shared experiences of empowerment (e.g., bicultural flexibility,

using a system for training experiences that used them for their racial identity), but overall, their

encounters with White privilege were painful and disempowering. What was so noticeable about

some White participants' experiences was the positive and empowering tone with which they

conveyed them. It is plausible that this quality of sharing helped White participants to distance

themselves from more personal and painful dialogue about White privilege. To distract and deny

in this way can be seen as a feature of privilege. Despite this possibility, their focus on using

privilege to effect positive change was noteworthy.

Discussion: Awareness. A superordinate theme labeled Awareness emerged from the

data. White participants understood White privilege in their training programs as a matter of

awareness, discussing how and when they became aware of White privilege, and in what ways

this impacted them. The theme of Awareness consisted of four subthemes: (a) Recent

Awareness, or awareness of White privilege forming in the past few years; (b) Unawareness:

Routine/Optional, or unawareness of White privilege as typical and elective; (c) People of Color

as Illuminators, or relationships with people of color and the visibility of racism as integral to the

formation of White privilege awareness; and (d) Empowerment, or White privilege awareness as

an empowering experience. In general, many of the findings surrounding the theme of

Awareness are consistent with Johnson's (2001) concept of the "luxury of obliviousness" (p. 24).

Dominant cultural members are normally unaware of their privileged status, and can only

challenge this routine unawareness through ongoing and intentional resistance.

In some ways, it is not surprising that Awareness emerged as central to White

participants' accounts of privilege. Among a dominant culture that encourages Whites'

obliviousness of their own privilege and the lives of people of color (McIntosh, 1988), awareness

and effortful dialogue about White privilege are anomalies. As a result, participants' awareness

may have been very important to them. The meanings of White privilege awareness could have

been especially salient for participants, as many had become aware of this privilege in recent

years. Case (2007) acknowledged that increasing racial awareness is an integral objective of

diversity curriculum in psychology. Therefore, while students are not expected to enter their

programs as culturally-aware individuals, White trainees' degree of awareness arguably has real

implications for how they contribute to a system of White privilege and racial oppression in their

training programs with colleagues, faculty, and clients.

Psychological scholars have dedicated a great deal of theoretical and empirical attention

to the racial awareness of White people (e.g., Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1984, 1990, 1995;

Pinterits et al., 2009, Todd & Abrams, 2011). Awareness is central to challenging systems of

privilege and oppression. Many identity development models depict statuses or continua in

which development is characterized as a greater personal connection to White racism and

empowered action is experienced. These models provide perspective for the empowerment

participants experienced with greater awareness of White privilege in their lives and training.

In particular, the subtheme of Empowerment has implications for training social justice-

oriented trainees. Participants in this study described a number of positive thoughts, emotions,

and behaviors associated with growing White privilege awareness. As White trainees become more aware of the ways they experience privilege and contribute to racism personally and professionally, colleagues and faculty can frame these instances of deepening awareness as opportunities for growth rather than personal failures. Additionally, trainers should remain skeptical of White trainees who overemphasize their positive, activist efforts. This may be a potential distraction from painful, yet critical, developmental milestones for White trainees. Along this line, Kate reminded herself that in learning about and responding to racism, she must not lose sight of herself as a perpetrator.

Characteristics of participants' awareness in this study extend and deepen previous qualitative findings that White master's-level counseling trainees' racial privilege awareness varied from unawareness and denial, to awareness with unwillingness to change, to awareness with a commitment to activism (Ancis and Szymanski, 2001). All participants in this study were, to some degree, aware of racial privilege as a reality in their lives and training programs. Still, some participants directly and subtly acknowledged awareness of White privilege in training and everyday life as a matter of intention and preference. Their responses reflected the role of choice in how frequently and to what extent they could display awareness. Similar to the theme of White Disregard/Disconnection among Black participants, this finding points to the role of personal responsibility in Whites' awareness. Uniquely, this observation was made among advanced-level doctoral counseling trainees. For those trainees who were aware but reluctant to challenge White privilege, Ancis and Szymanski (2001) observed the power of predominantly White settings to limit opportunities for resistance.

In support of this idea, a number of White participants also reported a privilege of routine unawareness of privilege that was interrupted by the disparate experiences of people of color and

incidents of racism. The willingness to engage with and learn from the experiences of people of color is a critical multicultural skill for White people (Sue et al., 1992). Oppression can reveal often invisible privileges. At the same time, Kate shared how this strategy may lead to "passive" rather than "active awareness." In training programs with increasingly diverse student bodies, White trainees may come to rely too heavily on the experiences of people of color, sacrificing personal opportunities for active self-reflection. The burden must be on White people to challenge themselves to see privilege in various contexts, otherwise a system of privilege is reinforced.

Impact and Involvement

In reviewing the experiences of the five Black participants in this study, it is clear that systemic White privilege has a significant *impact* on people's lives, whether its benefits are received or denied. Furthermore, the choices and actions of White people are intimately *involved* in maintaining this system. The superordinate theme of Impact and Involvement addressed the degree of significance (Impact), connection, and responsibility (Involvement) felt by White trainees in response to (a) experiences of White privilege in training, and (b) the way White privilege was discussed in the interview. To develop this theme in particular, I drew on the deeper levels of interpretation described previously, attending to both the surface-level content of *what* was shared and the underlying process of *how* it was shared. Two subthemes comprised Impact and Involvement: Magnitude of Impact and Degree of Involvement.

Magnitude of impact. The subtheme Magnitude of Impact addresses the felt force or quality of impact of White privilege on participants and others in their training programs. For instance, Kate experienced a lack of racial/ethnic diversity among clients in her clinical work as a mostly professional issue. Whereas the effects (i.e., the Magnitude of Impact) of serving

majority White clients seemed far more personal for her colleagues of color.

> KATE: You know, when I say, 'Well, it'd be nice to get more experience working with X population,' that has more to do with my professional development it seems like. And it would absolutely have personal implications, but it feels more personal when my friends talk about it. My friends of color talk about, you know, it's like this, 'I've been *starved* of the opportunity to work with people who look like me, who maybe have some similar experiences to me as a person of color.'

Quite simply, although lack of client diversity affected Kate, the cut seemed deeper for her colleagues of color. Along this line, Emily surmised that a practicum expectation to present challenging therapy moments might have disparate meanings for White trainees and trainees of color: ". . . airing out your mistakes in front of your cohort can be really intimidating. And I'm sure it's even more intimidating doing that as a person of color at   an institution like [this one]." These were more obvious, content-based observations of White privilege's impact.

More process-based observations of White privilege's Magnitude of Impact were illustrated through different ways that White participants discussed White privilege. One recurring phenomenon was participants' listing or layering of identities. Rather than conveying the compounding effects of intersectionality (e.g., the power and privilege of identifying both as White and male in a given situation), the prominence of White privilege was obscured when participants listed multiple identities to clarify its presence in their examples. The specificity of White privilege was diluted and its impact diffused. I asked Beth about the benefits of being a White trainee in her program, and the impact that being White has had on her experience.

> BETH: I don't know if it's unique to the training program that I am in specifically, in my institution, but I'd say as a clinical trainee, or counseling trainee, just feeling the same

ease of being able to go—that we're talking about that happens in communities at large, society at large—that I have that ease when I go to training sites. When I go into the hospital, I feel very at ease in a hospital setting. My [family member's] a doctor. I've been in these environments my whole life. I feel at home. I know how to work things even when I'm sort of, have my head underwater and I don't know what's going on, I still kind of know how to know. And I'm accepted as a, I mean I know that there's some sexism and it's—but I don't feel like maligned as a female practitioner. And so I think that I'm accepted. I walk into the room as a young, okay, woman, okay—but White, I look like kind of a doctor. I look like an authority figure, especially when I get dressed up in work clothes . . . .

Beth touched on different identities in this passage, including her family member's educational privilege and her gender identity. However, the presence of White privilege and its effect on her life remained somewhat unclear. Some participants also relied on hypothetical examples of White privilege. In doing so, a focus on the potential, rather than the real, diminished the particular effects of White privilege.

DAVE: Yeah, I am very confident that if my [friend of color] was at the [prac site] with me, and she was doing the exact same [type of] assessments that I was doing, I would have had at least at this point, I would have had at least one person who either: a) refused to meet with her, or b) just treated her poorly . . . .

Degree of involvement. In participants' examples of White privilege in training, a perpetrator emerged. That is, a person or process responsible for exhibiting or perpetuating White privilege could be identified. Perpetrators included, but were not limited to, faculty members, supervisors, colleagues, or "systems." Most participants viewed themselves and other

people as responsible agents or recipients of White privilege some of the time. However, it became clear that there was still a luxury of distance in not recognizing the active and personal involvement of Whites in maintaining the system that benefits them. Many of the interpretations for this subtheme were also process-based. I attempted to honor the participants' direct accounts while also moving beyond the explicit content of what was shared.

As one example of Degree of Involvement, Sarah turned her attention to the racial characteristics of her faculty. By focusing on the context of a predominantly White environment, the people who support a system of privilege through their actions, and Sarah's personal involvement in that system as a White trainee, were not considered.

SARAH: Well, I mean I guess the fact that our faculty is White. I mean by and large, used to be more racially diverse and now as people leave the institution or whatever, it's becoming less so. And that people are being hired on are White and male . . . .

Dave detailed a programmatic conflict that led to a division primarily between White faculty/trainees and trainees of color. The nature of the conflict has been heavily disguised to protect Dave's confidentiality, but certain students of color voiced their concern about a lack of programmatic support. Here, Dave acknowledged the divide that occurred between trainees and his lack of support for their cause. He believed that the students of color were receiving sufficient resources.

DAVE: . . . . I felt very similar to what a lot of the other White students were saying, and it's just that I think part of it was really coming in defense of the faculty. I mean these are people who we work closely with, people we care about by and large. And to hear you slander or talk negatively about a friend or a colleague, especially when I feel like that friend or colleague is really bending over backwards to help you out, like I can't sit

by and let that happen. I mean, or at the very least, I can't agree with your opinion. I

can't support, I can't support you in this. And that's what I think a lot of the White

students did. It wasn't like we really formed our own committee to fight against them,

but rather we just didn't offer support.

Despite acknowledging his position on the issue, it seemed that Dave did not fully recognize his

involvement in curbing the progress of certain trainees of color. Phrases like "other White

people" and "a group that" highlighted this point later in the interview.

DAVE: You want to belong to a group that you can be proud in, or proud of. And I'm

proud to be White, but at the same time it's hard, because you know there are other White

people out there who are suppressing the power and benefits of others . . . . Yeah, I mean

I'd rather everyone receive those same benefits. I mean it's tough to belong to a group

. . . that is stopping the benefits from others.

By divorcing his actions from the system they maintained, Dave illustrated a privilege of

peripheral involvement. White trainees may struggle to see the ways in which they participate in

a system of privilege, not only in society at large, but in their immediate training environments.

Discussion: Impact and involvement. A second superordinate theme, Impact and

Involvement, emerged from White subsample data. Two subthemes comprised Impact and

Involvement. These included: (a) Magnitude of Impact, or issues pertaining to the degree of

White privilege's impact on oneself (i.e., significant benefits) and others (i.e., others' benefits,

significant negative consequences); and (b) Degree of Involvement, or the extent of focus on self

and others in maintaining White privilege in training through their actions.

As they compared their experiences to those of trainees of color, White participants

perceived significant qualitative differences in training experience based on race. The same

training phenomenon could have more profound meanings and consequences for trainees of color (e.g., presenting one's counseling mistake in a practicum course). White participants described not only the unearned benefits they received that were denied to their colleagues of color, but the distinct impacts of receiving or being denied those benefits. Their insights regarding Magnitude of Impact provided a more nuanced perspective on how privilege operates to shape race-related barriers in training programs (Maton et al., 2011). Participants' observations remind us about the existence of multiple realities and the importance of looking critically at how a singular experience can have multiple and varied impacts depending on one's social identities.

Participants highlighted significant racial disparities in the impact of program experiences, and yet, the *ways* they spoke about White privilege during the interview sometimes diminished the magnitude of its impact. By responding to questions with hypothetical situations or referring to several social identities in examples, participants obfuscated the unique contribution of White privilege to their own training experience. At times, this gave the impression that racial privilege was irrelevant or insignificant to participants. These findings may reveal subtler forms of *White talk*, or the speech-tactics by which White people maintain distance from critiques of Whiteness (McIntyre, 1997). This difference in content and process of what participants shared marked a significant discrepancy between their beliefs (or values) and behaviors, and may support the dialectical framework proposed by Todd and Abrams (2011), involving the tensions of White identity. It was also discrepant that participants acknowledged having racial privilege, yet in their stories and ideas they attributed responsibility to contexts or other White people, rather than their own and others' choices and actions.

Other recent studies have revealed the tendency for Whites to convey a personal

disconnection from the perpetuation of racism despite acknowledging it as reality (Smith, Constantine, Graham, & Dize, 2008; Todd & Abrams, 2011). The findings from this study extend this tendency to the realm of White privilege and the microcosm of counseling psychology training programs. In these findings emerged another racial advantage: personal disconnection from White privilege impact and accountability in one's immediate training environment.

Social Supports and Contextual Barriers

These White participants identified a number of race-related social supports and contextual barriers in their training programs. White privilege was apparent in the supports enjoyed by White participants that trainees of color did not receive, and in the barriers confronting trainees of color, but not White participants. Many of the supportive factors (e.g., widespread racial representation, perceived favoritism) afforded to White participants shaped their sense belongingness in various areas of training. Those barriers confronting trainees of color often resulted from unacknowledged Eurocentric values in program norms or expectations, as well as faculty's disregard for the unique cultural contexts of people of color. Two subthemes, Representation/Belonging, and Values and Context, exemplified the superordinate theme of Social Support and Contextual Barriers.

Representation/Belonging. Participants' Whiteness brought them a seamless connection to White faculty and supervisors, course curriculum, and their clinical work, all of which seemed to contribute to their sense of representation and belonging in their programs. I consider such factors that enhanced one's social experience as a trainee to be *social supports*. For example, Dave recalled an experience of favoritism that allowed him access to the support of a prominent White faculty member.

DAVE: One example that's coming to mind—and I guess, obviously it's related to race—is I have a faculty member here who ever since he's first met me has very much treated me different, like a favorite. And he's always joked because, in part, it's because I remind him of [a family member]. I look like his [family member]. So he's always sort of treated me as like a [family] type figure . . . .

Similar to Isaiah's (Black participant) observation of cultural transference, Dave experienced the symbolic value of his White racial identity for a close relationship with a leading faculty member. Dave further conceded, "It's a benefit to know that I was able to build the relationship that easily . . . because of the way that I look . . . ." Having the ability to connect to people, especially individuals in leadership positions, because of one's appearance, is an undeniable asset and an immense social comfort. In predominantly White training programs, this form of social support, and all of its implied perks, are not accessible to trainees of color.

The privilege of Representation/Belonging extended beyond relationships with faculty to participants' clinical work. Emily reflected on the multitude of predominantly White practicum placements available through her training program. She acknowledged the relative interpersonal and psychological ease that came with serving primarily White clients as a White trainee.

EMILY: Yeah. And then also, our practicum opportunities tend to be like ninety percent with college students. And those college students tend to be fairly White at the universities that we typically work at. So, it may be easier as a White trainee to feel effective and feel connected to your practica clients, perhaps in my program. Because you tend to work majority with White individuals. Unless you really feel like commuting all the way to [a more urban city] . . . . So, I think being a White trainee, that you don't have to hurdle as many barriers to bring that discussion into the room, because there's

almost that assumption that you'll relate from the client.

She also noted the physical separation of her program from more racially/ethnically diverse clinical settings, and therefore, the cultural isolation confronting trainees of color at a number of practicum placements. For trainees of color to connect with clients of color was no easy task. The reality of effortless cultural belongingness for White trainees is accentuated when one considers Isaiah's observation: training programs essentially offer, but do not advertise, a specialization in counseling a White clientele.

As White participants described the many circumstances in which they felt represented, they seemed to convey a perpetual sense of blending in. From admission to internship, White trainees could expect to see themselves represented in most contexts.

> SARAH: Well, I think it's, I mean I know it's probably easier than not being White, 'cause everything is sort of tailored to what my racial background is. So, all the materials that I read or most of them, by and large, are written by White people for White people. And most supervisors I've had have had the same racial background as myself. I've worked in institutions where most of my clients and I had the same racial background. Most of my clients have been White. My research doesn't really examine race. There are huge gaps in the literature on how that might be an impacting factor in what I look at. When I go to a practicum site or a job interview, I'm likely interviewing with someone who is the same race as I am . . . .

Also noteworthy is the privilege inherent in Sarah's comment that her "research doesn't really examine race." Although it appeared she was referring to marginalized racial/ethnic populations, her area of research (not mentioned explicitly per her request) had indeed maintained a focus on the *White* race through the study of mostly White populations. It seemed that another byproduct

of widespread representation—racial invisibility—had emerged unwittingly in Sarah's language.

Finally, participants seemed to convey that the credibility of Whiteness was a unique type of belonging they experienced. Dave and Beth acknowledged their inconspicuous presence at practicum placements, and a ready acceptance from clients and staff as knowledgeable "authority figure[s]." Kate recounted the experience of an African-American friend in the doctoral program whose credibility had been questioned by a White male in a different program. This experience had implications for how she had experienced a privilege of credibility.

> KATE: He was accepted to the master's program. And he made a comment, and I
> don't know what the exact quote was, but he made a comment implying something about
> affirmative action is the reason why this guy got into the doctoral program, my friend got
> into the doctoral program and this White male didn't. In that moment I kind of, I kind of
> thought about, you know, being a person who, being a person in this program who's
> White, never having to have anyone question my qualifications, question my capability,
> you know . . . .

Values and context. At the same time White trainees experienced widespread racial representation in multiple training settings, their dominant cultural value system was also represented. The unacknowledged privileging of Eurocentric values, often by faculty, led to biased expectations and norms. It is interesting to note that without prompting, participants did not discuss how they benefitted or how trainees of color struggled as a result of imposed White cultural values. In responding to my interview question about Eurocentric values, they simply identified values in their programs. It was through a deeper analysis that I determined the imposition of Eurocentric values, which also meant the disregard of other cultural contexts, thus creating the greatest barriers for trainees of color. To reach this conclusion, I also considered

other racial benefits (e.g., Representation/Belongingness) for White trainees that would have put trainees of color at a greater disadvantage when faced with expectations laden with dominant cultural values.

Rugged individualism (Katz, 1985), as opposed to collaboration and mutual responsibility, was an oft-cited Eurocentric value in programs. With a minor prompt, Sarah revealed her faculty's imposition of rugged individualism on trainees through an expectation that they dress like a "cookie-cutter therapist." To do so required access to financial resources that not all trainees had.

> SARAH: Right, and also there's sort of what I perceive as I guess like an unsympathetic or maybe angry tone when people couldn't access those resources, or when people weren't doing good enough, or when people didn't have the right clothes. It was sort of like to punish that individual and like giving them feedback or telling them they need to change things, or having it come up on the evaluation rather than sort of investigating why that might be. It's sort of just the expectation that if you don't have this, you better figure out a way to get it, which to me feels pretty White.
>
> ME: Can you say a little bit more about that? When you say it 'feels pretty White?'
>
> SARAH: It feels like a bootstrap sort of thing, you know? If you don't have the resources, then just figure it out. It's not that people can't figure it out. It's that people just don't have whatever you're asking them to have. And the unhelpful attitude toward, like if somebody can't afford something or somebody can't dress in a certain way, the reaction of blaming it on that individual rather than offering your resources for them. To me that feels like a huge way that White privilege operated in my program.

White participants and trainees could also have been affected negatively by such a value-

laden expectation. However, without access to other privileged resources (e.g., social supports), and possessing a potentially different value system, it stands to reason that trainees of color would encounter the greatest struggle. Dave's experience illustrated this idea. His faculty similarly promoted a value on rugged individualism on a major assignment: "And there was very little instruction told to us about anything related to [the assignment] . . . . So, a lot of it, it's on your own to be able to figure it out." As many trainees relied on information from past cohorts to successfully complete the assignment, it appeared that the faculty also assumed trainees' access to social/informational networks. This was a potentially egregious oversight of the contextual needs of trainees of color.   Bearing in mind the previous findings from Representation/Belonging, access to such informational networks may have indeed been easier for White trainees in a predominantly White training program.

    Discussion: Social Supports and Contextual Barriers. A third superordinate theme, Social Supports and Contextual Barriers, was identified. White participants reaped the social benefits of feeling automatically comfortable, connected, and credible with people (e.g., clients, faculty) in multiple predominantly White contexts (subtheme of Representation/Belonging). At times, it was by virtue of their appearance alone, or the symbolic value of Whiteness, that participants connected on a more personal level with other White individuals. Such social benefits would be inaccessible to trainees of color in predominantly White settings.

    Beyond these social supports, freedom from contextual barriers also seemed to be a part of participants' narratives. Participants recognized that White cultural values were present in their programs. They did not, however, directly acknowledge the racial benefits and barriers that resulted from the exhibition of these values. Their examples suggested that Eurocentric values were imposed on all trainees, and therefore, the contexts of trainees of color were disregarded.

Without access to the other racial privileges White participants identified, trainees of color would encounter significant barriers when dominant cultural values were imposed.

Focusing solely on the limited social supports by trainees of color in psychology (McGregor and Hill, 2012) is a myopic perspective. Viewed from an alternate angle, these limitations are actually denied privileges. Survey-based findings have shown that European-American trainees perceived greater belongingness (Clark et al., 2012) and cultural diversity in their training programs , as well as fairer racial representation in the curriculum and field of psychology (Maton et al., 2011).

As this study's findings illustrate, White trainees experienced social and psychological benefits of greater representation in their day-to-day training activities and relationships. In their clinical work, supervision, research, and relationships with faculty, White participants experienced a greater sense of representation and belonging than their racially marginalized counterparts. Training programs and clinical practica saturated with White people contributed to their perceptions of greater belonging and support. In these settings, the luxury of cultural identification facilitated their connections to faculty and clients alike. White participants also described the limited options for trainees of color to serve a racially diverse clientele, which seemed to further widen the gap of representation between White trainees and trainees of color. Opportunities to serve racially/ethnically diverse clientele may enhance perceived cultural diversity for trainees of color in their programs. In turn, this may increase their satisfaction with their training experience (Maton et al., 2011).

Participants' identified Eurocentric values embedded in programmatic norms and expectations. Through interpretation of their experiences surrounding these values, it was determined that these values were imposed on trainees, thus eclipsing the cultural contexts of

trainees of color. Through faculty-trainee interactions, research, and training milestones (e.g., prelims), participants noted the presence of White cultural values and a lack of cultural/contextual considerations. In light of survey-based evidence of the race-related barriers confronting trainees of color (Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011), these findings provide more detailed accounts of the origin and features of these barriers. The findings also uniquely situate the lingering White cultural values of counseling (Katz, 1985) more specifically in a training context. The importance of recognizing dominant cultural values and attending to cultural context in psychological research and counseling (Betancourt and López, 1993; Katz, 1985; Sue et al., 1992; Sue, 2001) is by no means a novel idea. White participants' observations of racial privilege serve as a reminder of the need to similarly attend to values and contexts in the procedural and social milieus of training programs.

Risk and Safety

A theme of Risk and Safety was integral to understanding White participants' unearned advantage in their training programs. Experiences of Risk and Safety dealt not only with participants' immunity to the risks endured by trainees of color, but also particular risks confronting White trainees. Some privileges surrounding Risk and Safety were quite evident from participants' accounts. Other potentially unacknowledged privileges were derived from the use of a "hermeneutics of suspicion" (Smith et al., 2009, p. 108) described previously. Risk and Safety was comprised of four subthemes: Protection, Program as Safe Haven, Transgression/Incompetence, and Impression Management.

Protection. As White trainees, participants were offered protection from instances of cultural insensitivity and racism in their training programs and the surrounding community that trainees of color experienced as threatening. Protection is similar to the subtheme of Magnitude

of Impact presented previously, as it involves the disparate racial impact of programmatic

occurrences. It is unique in that it deals specifically with issues of fear and safety. Sarah

described feeling protected from the "threatening" impact of practice interviews conducted by

faculty, which trainees privately recognized as discriminatory. To be White meant to be free

from feeling targeted or exploited by faculty with simulated interview questions about one's

race.

> SARAH: . . . . Because things that are most sensitive and painful to me are not obvious
>
> in my appearance. I can withhold details about what really can hurt me, but for another
>
> person who maybe that's tied to an identity that's visible to them. To other people, you
>
> can go straight at somebody's most sensitive sort of thing just by virtue of it being visible.
>
> So, I think I'm able to hide a lot of the stuff, because the more painful experiences of my
>
> life are not tied to my race.

Sarah recognized that the relative invisibility of her Whiteness offered her defense from

such questioning and exploitation. She went on to discuss inequities in the fear trainees felt

surrounding the interviews. Trainees of color seemed to experience an additional and unique

apprehension: "I mean everybody's fearful of the exam, but I don't have to be fearful on a level

of having my race questioned . . . ."

From what Sarah explained, this interview process appeared culturally-insensitive and

racially discriminatory. When programs exhibit multicultural shortcomings, cultural

insensitivity, or racism, White trainees may be unsettled, but likely not unsafe. Sarah observed

her protection from the particularly devastating effects of the practice interviews: "And I don't

have to feel the brunt of that because I'm White."

Some White participants also recalled racist incidents that occurred on their campuses or

in their communities. Despite the distress and surprise that White participants experienced when these events occurred, their sense of safety was not undermined. White privilege entails a greater assurance of safety in training.

> KATE: . . . . The White privilege, for me the White privilege awareness came out of the fact that I heard students of color talking about being really scared. And I was just aware of the fact that I was creeped out by it, but it didn't have the urgency that it did when students of color talked about it. So, that was just, so that's kind of that relation to White privilege, is just something really terrible and racist can happen on our campus, and I might be offended by it. I might be offended by it and angered by it and creeped out by it, but ultimately I still feel safe on campus.

Program as safe haven. Several White participants perceived their training programs as uniquely multiculturally-affirming or savvy, unsullied by racism and exhibitions of White privilege. The label *safe haven* captured these perceptions, which seemed to suggest that participants viewed their programs as oases for people of color in an unjust and racist society. Taken at face value, these reports could reflect a program's outstanding attention to multiculturalism and social justice. Viewed through a more powerful analytic lens, this was indicative of White privilege. These perceptions of Safe Haven appeared to convey a unique form of White privilege. Free from racial barriers, White trainees may have been more likely to experience their programs positively and securely.

> ME: So, in your training program, Beth, what does it mean to be a White trainee compared to a trainee of color?
>
> BETH: I don't—I don't know. It feels to me like in the hallways and in the offices that, that there's not much of a difference. It means something else, though, not on campus,

but at like the VA. There's a number of [women of color] in my program. And so, they

have to deal with anywhere from asinine to out and out racist comments by vets about

them being [people of color] in therapy. So, that's corrosive. So, then that's what they

have to deal with. You know, particularly in our training setting—I mean that's

everywhere they have to deal with that sometimes. But you know, in our training settings

where we're at the VA a lot. A lot of our training placements are at the veterans'

administration. So, there's I think maybe more exposure to people who are particularly

racist [inaudible]. But also it means I think in our program, kind of positively, to be a

person of color, that experiences of people of color are really explicitly valued, and

people are interested in them.

The privilege in Beth's account is evident in the assumption of a uniform training experience for

all trainees. Beth's discussion of racism at the VA hospital seems to serve a juxtaposing purpose

as she compared such a hostile setting to the safe and affirming environment of her training

program. When considering how easily Black participants identified racial inequities in their

programs, such a perception of safety is suspect—a potential byproduct of racial advantage.

Compared to privilege, racism is easy to notice. Beth's observation may further indicate that

White trainees overlook subtle, yet significant forms of racial inequity that play out in training as

a result of privilege. The privileges discussed in this study thus far may be harder to recognize

than overt racism, but they are no means benign in their impact.

Similarly, Emily distinguished her program from others in terms of its exceptional focus

on social justice, implying a lack of significant differences in trainees' race-based experiences.

EMILY: . . . . I think I'm a pretty biased participant in your study because my program is

so invested in these subjects that I think that's also why it's so hard for me to answer some

of these questions. Globally, I think we do a really good job, considering all of the factors in training our students on social justice. I've met a lot of students from other programs, and they don't even know what social justice means or that White privilege exists . . . .

Later, she recalled a racist incident on her program's campus and further established a sense that her training program was distinctly safe from the effects of racism.

EMILY: Yeah. I feel like when you're at a multiculturally-focused program, you can, a lot of times you feel like you're in this little happy bubble where everyone's tolerant and accepting. And then when an event like that happens, it's like, holy crap! People are still this far behind in terms of, especially racial acceptance? . . . . Everyone isn't as progressive and aware as we are in our little happy programs . . . .

Unfortunately, even in a progressive field like counseling psychology, feeling safe and affirmed in one's program may be a privilege, not a guarantee.

Risk of Transgression/Incompetence. Like Black participants, White participants also perceived race-related risks unique to their experiences as trainees. Generally, White participants feared *transgressing*, or offending people of color, or being seen as racist or multiculturally-*incompetent*. For participants, these risks were part of what it meant to be a White trainee in a field explicitly dedicated to social justice and multiculturalism. And yet, their anxiety, embarrassment, hesitation, and discomfort in sharing these risks told a different story. These reactions indicated to me that on some level, White participants recognized the privilege in the risks they perceived.

Both Kate and Beth acknowledged the looming risk of appearing racist or inadvertently harming someone in dialogue.

BETH: . . . . Certainly for the first couple of years, I just didn't have much experience being in really intense intellectually, but also emotionally engaged environments talking about personal things with people of different ethnic groups. Yeah. So, there was a lot of kind of just sitting through the anxiety of worrying that I was going to say something wrong. That perhaps I'm going to be unintentionally racist. You know, and of course, that's the worst thing to be.

For Beth and Kate, to enact racism and harm another person was the "worst" or most "devastating" outcome imaginable. These descriptors indicated the intensity with which they perceived these risks. Furthermore, both participants used the word "unintentionally," suggesting that any harm they might do could occur outside of their awareness and control. Therefore, there was an element of powerlessness influencing their fear of transgressing. But as real as their fears were, they were limited to conversations about race. Therein lies the privilege. Outside of programmatic dialogues about race, it seemed that their fears would not have existed, or would have at least been assuaged. Black participants encountered risks in most avenues of their training.

Participants also perceived a risk of appearing multiculturally incompetent. As White trainees, they felt the stakes were higher to portray an image of competence in this area.

EMILY: To be a White trainee. You know, sometimes, it almost sometimes can feel more challenging in my program specifically, simply because the expectation of growing to understand multiculturalism is higher if you're White if that makes sense. 'Cause I think we value diversity so much that we love having people from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds come in. And then, and I remember feeling almost like not as competent or not as well-versed in multiculturalism, because it was so much, there

was more expected of me as a White person to grow in that domain than—there's almost

an assumption that people from diverse backgrounds in my program already have a

certain level of awareness, which is not true. Maybe that's another way that [inaudible]

privilege comes into this. It's almost like the reverse situation. It's like they, there's an

assumption that people from diverse backgrounds are aware of what it's like. And so

there's a lot more pressure I think then on the White students to really understand and

grow and show that growth. So, I think it's been challenging to be a White person in a

program that's so focused on multiculturalism.

Emily later reported that discussing this perception of risk was one of the hardest things to admit

during the interview. She admitted anxiety and appeared somewhat embarrassed. The tone of

the interview noticeably shifted after this admission, becoming less personal. However, as Kate

illustrated, Emily was not completely alone in perceiving a pressure to exhibit multicultural

competence.

KATE: I think on the flip side of that, sometimes being a White person in our program

can feel danger—not dan—risky . . . . A lot of students who apply to the doctoral

program are, usually they come into the program pretty aware, multiculturally aware . . . .

Like Emily's anxiety, Kate's hesitation to say "dangerous," a word that feels qualitatively more

extreme than "risky," also pointed to an intuition about the presence of privilege. Validating this

notion, Kate later put her statement in a different perspective, adding, "I think sometimes being

White can feel risky. That being said, being a person of color is definitely more risky."

As with the risk of Transgression, the risk of multicultural Incompetence was restricted to

one developmental area of training, multicultural growth. Black participants contended with

personal fears and others' expectations of their incompetence in multiple areas of training: for

instance, the admissions process, clinical work, and supervision. For White participants', there were clearer boundaries around the contexts in which they perceived risk. The freedom from risk they experienced beyond those boundaries is a privilege.

Impression Management. In their training programs, White participants' responded to the risks of being seen as racist or multiculturally incompetent with occasional self-silencing and impression management. At times, they felt unable to authentically express themselves as a result of the consequences they feared. This subtheme resembles the Black participant subsample theme of Containment and Consequence. Although, as I will explain, privilege distinguishes them. To begin, Dave discussed his careful response to a cross-cultural conflict in his program.

> DAVE: Yeah. I didn't get too involved myself—enough to voice some opinions amongst friends, but not enough to join the committee or to voice my opinions at the committee. In part, 'cause that can be dangerous. I don't want to put my opinion out there in a way that it's gonna come off racist, that's gonna come often insensitive. And then have faculty or other students look at that, form opinions of me which may be very well [inaudible; unfounded?], and have that follow me for the next part of my academic career.

Emily acknowledged the discomfort and self-editing she experienced during the interview. It seemed that she was concerned that I might judge her or paint her experiences in a negative light.

> EMILY: No, I definitely feel, I think some anxiety with speaking with some of these things, 'cause I feel like almost a, I'm sure I'm doing this to myself, a pressure to like say the best thing, or to present myself in the best way, or articulate things the most accurate way. I think there's, like I said before, this taboo about race results in people feeling like

they need to walk on eggshells so they don't say the wrong word or imply the wrong

thing. And I think that reflected some of my anxiety about how I'm phrasing things.

Knowing that I don't have the opportunity to type up responses and then edit them, and

then make sure they sound okay, and then send them to you . . . . So, I think I felt some

anxiety with making sure that I'm coming across as a multiculturally competent person.

Despite the risk, anxiety, and self-editing White participants described, racial privilege was

integral to understanding the subtheme of Impression Management. For Black participants, self-

editing and self-silencing were ongoing battles in their training environments. They also more

heavily edited themselves in a number of ways across training contexts. Black participants'

process of Containment led to verbal, emotional, and even intuitive silencing. Therefore, it

seemed that White participants shared their experiences of impression management without

realizing how perpetual and severe this process could be for their colleagues of color.

Adding to this element of privilege, a distinct pattern related to safety arose across

participants as they responded to a question about speaking with a White interviewer. Passages

from Sarah, Kate, and Beth illustrate this point in response to the same question.

ME: What was it like to do this interview with a White interviewer?

SARAH: Um, I guess less threatening. [inaudible] a person of color—I know that that

probably sounds terrible—but I think that I've had some of the more difficult

discussions about White privilege with people of color, and you know, rightly so that

they're, they can be upset about how unaware I can be of like all the ways that my

privilege pervades my life. So, I guess I was more comfortable than I assume it would

have been.

KATE: I think it's, I think it probably felt, I think I felt safe talking about it with you. If

you had been a person of color, I think that definitely would have changed the dynamics. I think it would have felt more challenging to be candid in some of the ways that I was. To be honest and some of the ways that I was in our conversation. I hope that I would have been honest, but I think the fact that you're White made it feel safer for me to say some of those honest things.

BETH: . . . . Maybe, I think especially at the beginning of the conversation aware that talking with a White interviewer could, um, could have its own sort of ease and privilege of not talking to a person of color, but sort of like, I don't have to be as attentive because you can get it. Or I don't have to worry about stepping on your toes or saying something that's inadvertently a microaggression or racist. I don't have to be worried about coming off as racist or uninformed [inaudible] telling you about my development, that you're going to judge me in the same way . . .

The simple act of talking with a White interviewer provided White participants greater comfort and freedom to authentically express themselves. Conversely, discussing race and White privilege with people of color evoked fears of condemnation and unintended racism. While this may seem obvious, in the predominantly White contexts of their programs, White trainees are more likely to find refuge from their fear and impression management among the many White people they are sure to encounter.

Discussion: Risk and Safety. Emerging from White participants' responses was a fourth superordinate theme, Risk and Safety. These themes convey the idea that perceived safety in one's counseling psychology training program is not a guarantee, but at least in part, an unearned benefit of being White. In a field where individuals are trained to create safe and trusting relationships with people who may be at their most vulnerable, this is a troubling and remarkable

finding. From participants' experiences, it was clear that to be White offered one protection from certain risks posed to trainees of color. Paradoxically, to be White also meant navigating some risks of one's own related to race. Although being White could be difficult, even scary at times, a skeptical analysis revealed privilege in the risks White participants perceived.

Risk and Safety was comprised of four subthemes: (a) Protection, or White participants' immunity to certain risks and consequences not similarly afforded to trainees of color; (b) Program as Safe Haven, or White participants' perceptions of their training programs as multiculturally competent and inviting settings; (c) Risk of Transgression/Incompetence, or White participants' anxieties related to offending trainees of color, or appearing racist and multiculturally incompetent; and (d) Impression Management, or White participants' strategies to protect themselves from perceived consequences associated with their racial identity.

These White participants felt protected and unthreatened by various risks and negative outcomes associated with cultural insensitivity and racism in their programs, campuses, and communities. This experience was consistent with some of the protections of White trainees as observed by the Black participants. The findings suggested that programmatic shortcomings in multiculturalism can negatively impact White trainees, but trainees of color may be more likely to feel unsafe as a result. In my discussion of the Black participant theme, (In)Security, I reviewed some existing scholarship that might account for Black participants' struggles to feel safe in their training programs. Alternatively, White participants in this study provided a unique perspective on the unearned racial privileges that ensure greater safety for some than others.

Interestingly, White participants admitted that their dominant cultural membership did not assure them freedom from risk. They feared being perceived as racist and multiculturally-incompetent for the saying the wrong thing. Previous research has documented such risks in the

form of discomfort and anxiety White trainees experience in racial dialogue (e.g., Utsey et al., 2005). Also, Whites in modern society attempt to avoid prejudice (Plant & Devine, 2009) due the "risks of misunderstanding and social sanction" (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008, p. 918). Therefore, the risks participants' perceived may be common apprehensions for Whites.

Viewed in isolation, some examples of Risk and Safety shared by White participants appeared quite unremarkable. Taken at face value, to view one's training program as culturally-affirming and free from racism is merely a perception of reality. So too is the pressure to appear multiculturally-competent and discuss issues of race in non-incriminating ways. However, the advantages of Whiteness are often invisible and taken for granted (McIntosh, 1988), and therefore, an additional level of analysis helped to expose privileges disguised as commonplace perceptions. By situating White participants' experiences of risk and safety alongside those of people of color in this study and beyond (cf., vulnerability and fear with White supervisors; Burkard et al., 2006), the subthemes of Program as Safe Haven, Transgression/Exposure, and Expression took on new meanings.

Although real and significant experiences, the risks that White participants perceived, the consequences they feared, and the ways they censored themselves, were all qualitatively different from those described by Black participants, whose struggle with race-related risks occurred more intensely and extensively. What is more, White participants reported the lack of discretion they felt in sharing their experiences with a White interviewer. Surrounded by White people in their programs, their ease in discussing privilege with me revealed just how easily they could obtain relief from the weight of risk and impression management in their daily lives. As McIntosh (1988) observed, Whites possess a "power to escape many kinds of danger or penalty" that people of color may not (p. 14).

Summary and Conclusions: White/European-American Subsample Themes

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with five White-identified counseling psychology trainees about the meaning and experience of White privilege in their training environments. The results indicated that advanced-level White doctoral trainees can recognize the presence of White privilege specifically in the context of their counseling psychology training programs. This is a novel and promising finding. It is also troubling in that it further indicates the presence of racial inequity in training programs. Participants openly depicted White privilege as a process that buffers against particularly harsh and unsafe experiences that trainees of color endure, and provides access to a felt belongingness and representation. They further observed that their unawareness of White privilege on a daily basis in training is routine, and their awareness a matter of choice.

However, because White culture and meanings are often invisible to Whites (Katz, 1985), I expected that some features of White privilege would go unacknowledged by participants. Therefore, a more acute analysis revealed that these White trainees may also be unfamiliar with some of the significant unearned advantages they reap in their programs. These unacknowledged advantages included the ability to: learn passively (rather than actively) White privilege from people of color, perceive their programs as secure and affirming, remain detached from the ways they and other people perpetuate White privilege, discuss White privilege in ways that overlooks its major impact on people, identify White cultural values without also seeing the resulting benefits and barriers, and underestimate or neglect some considerable risks and consequences of being a trainee of color.

Through analysis, four superordinate themes and 12 subthemes were revealed. Superordinate themes included: Awareness, Impact and Involvement, Social Supports and

Contextual Barriers, and Risk and Safety. First, the theme of Awareness encompassed unearned advantages related to participants' recent, routine, and optional awareness of White privilege and race. White participants also explained that the experiences of people of color heightened their awareness of racial privilege. While their willingness to learn from people of color was unique and commendable, this tendency highlighted the advantage of passive, rather than active, self-reflective, awareness. And more often than not, increases in awareness of White privilege empowered White participants by providing them with options to challenge privilege and engage in anti-racist behaviors. They viewed their empowered efforts positively, which must be viewed optimistically, as important to motivate continued antiracist behavior, and cautiously, as a possible distraction from the pain of carrying the burden of racism.

Second, Impact and Involvement dealt with the degree to which White participants were impacted by or implicated in experiences of White privilege in their programs. White participants considered how certain program occurrences affected them less significantly or personally than trainees of color. Ironically, they also spoke about these experiences in ways that diminished the magnitude of privilege's impact and the role of behavior in perpetuating it, thus indicating a luxury of personal distance.

Third, White participants detailed the benefits of support and representation they perceived in their programs due to their race. They also commented on programmatic expectations that were influenced by Eurocentric values. At the same time, they did not directly acknowledge how they benefitted from these values, and how the imposition of these values eclipsed other cultural contexts, thus creating barriers for trainees of color. The theme of Social Supports and Contextual Barriers captured such experiences and observations.

Fourth, the theme of Risk and Safety included experiences and observations related to

risk, consequence, and safety. White participants felt protected in some ways from the noxious effects of cultural insensitivity and racism in their programs and surrounding communities. Similarly, the experience of one's training program as a safe and affirming environment emerged as a potential advantage of being a White trainee. Finally, offending students of color or appearing racist and multiculturally incompetent were ongoing risks for White participants. These risks were of course meaningful and real to them. Yet, compared to the risks Black participants encountered, White participants were less consistently and personally affected.

In light of the experiences of Black participants, White participants' observations of White privilege provide a more holistic view of the nature of systemic racial privilege in counseling psychology training. For White trainees to acknowledge the privileges they receive in training does not further validate the experiences of Black participants. Their experiences are real and valid in isolation. What it does do is challenge the system that disempowers trainees of color and unfairly advantages White trainees. Also, by speaking openly about their experiences of privilege in a training context, White participants blazed an unmarked trail in the counseling psychology literature.

Cross-Sample Examination

Together, Black and White participants wove a tapestry of knowledge representing their encounters and experiences with White privilege in counseling psychology training programs. To this point, the unique contributions to the tapestry by each subsample have been largely considered separately. Now, I view the tapestry as a whole, perusing it for patterns and divergences in technique and texture across subsamples. By doing so, I hope to further examine the similarities and differences (some already apparent) in how Black and White participants understood racial privilege in a counseling psychology training context, and potential meanings

of these differences.

Some of the ideas and conclusions presented in the Cross-Sample Examination resulted from formally comparing and contrasting themes and subthemes across subsamples. Others are based on cross-sample observations made while interviewing, reviewing transcripts, and analyzing data. I present this discussion according to privileges that emerged from the data, which I summarize and reflect upon for broader meanings and implications surrounding White privilege in a training context.

To digress momentarily before proceeding, a dialogue about privilege and oppression is necessarily critical and harsh. Indeed, these issues have monumental implications for people's lives. However, I wish not to minimize the strengths and protective factors evident in each participant's experiences. A brief summary of these strengths and protective factors can be found in Appendix J.

Belonging and Support

To be White in counseling psychology training programs meant having greater access to social resources that provide a sense of belonging, comfort, resilience, and even power, depending on who one connected with based on race. In some ways, participants' experiences converged around Belonging and Support as a privilege. For instance, just as Ashley had observed White faculty favoring White trainees, Dave admitted to being favored by a White faculty member in his program. That faculty member who felt connected to Dave because resembled a family member brought to life Isaiah's sense that White trainees remind White faculty of those most close to them. Also, Black and White participants recognized the greater racial representation that White trainees experienced in a number of contexts: at practicum placements, in research topics, and in general coursework. Another commonly observed

phenomenon across subsamples was White trainees' greater access to racially/ethnically similar mentorship. Without greater diversity among faculty, trainees of color were limited in this regard.

However, Black and White participants also differed significantly in their experience of belonging and support as a privilege. Some of the Black participants' most salient and painful observations of White privilege came from the isolation, disregard, and empathic divide they experienced from White peers. Whereas they noticed White trainees interacting comfortably and readily befriending each other, Black participants were not guaranteed safe and supportive relationships with White trainees. Subtle images (e.g., photographs and walls) and processes (e.g., consensual validation among Whites, cultural transference) also forcefully communicated a message of invisibility and isolation to Black participants. Alternatively, White participants in this study also did not perceive a greater sense of inclusion or access to satisfying relationships with White peers as a race-related benefit. Nor did they share about trainees of color experiencing isolation or painful disregard in relationships with White trainees or participants themselves.

Conclusions: Belonging and support. Despite some similarities in the experience of Belonging and Support as a privilege, the lack of overlap in observations of cross-cultural peer relations is startling. White participants focused on their own representation and visibility. Black participants attended to experiences of undervaluation, isolation, rejection, willing disregard from White peers and faculty, and a lack of empathy and safety in relationships with them. Bearing in mind this disparity of experience, it suggests that Black and White trainees may experience two completely different social realities in their training environments. Stated differently, White trainees reap the many benefits of a more comfortable and connected social

reality in training.

This is a relatively unexplored area of racial privilege in training. Quantitative investigations have identified a lack of cultural representation and belongingness as part of the experience for trainees of color in psychology (Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011). However, the details of this study suggest that the significance of survey-based findings can be underestimated. Survey-based endorsements cannot capture the extensive pain and isolation that trainees of color endure as a result of subtle symbols and interpersonal processes that indicate to them they do not belong and are not valued by White colleagues and peers. Such studies also have not captured the incredible ease with which White trainees blend in seamlessly to the social fabric of their programs, and the social resources they enjoy because of the color of their skin.

Responsibility and Choice

Trainees of color may tend toward understanding White privilege through the *actions* of people in their programs. In this way, the perpetuation of harm to trainees of color occurs through the unawareness of White trainees and faculty, the beneficiaries of White privilege. White trainees may occasionally see themselves and other people as perpetrators of White privilege. However, they may be more likely to attribute racial privilege to context rather than behavior. That is, predominantly White settings (e.g., programs, practica) are erroneously equated with privilege.

It is my contention that the condition is not necessarily the cause, and the symptom is not the disease. A faculty of White antiracist activists is less likely to perpetuate a system of privilege than an all-White faculty that denies the existence of racism. By viewing privilege as a context or as the racial characteristics of people, one overlooks the *actions* of others or oneself. These actions are what lead to the reaping of racial benefits, an avoidance of this reality, and the

perpetuation of a harmful system for trainees of color. This tendency to equate contexts or people with privilege also reduces White privilege to White bodies, making efforts of resistance seem much more futile (Rowe & Malhotra, 2007). After all, it is much easier to change a person's behavior than the person her/himself.

Choice may be another critical aspect of White privilege in training. More specifically, White trainers and trainees may exhibit an *unwillingness* to acknowledge and connect with the unique experiences of trainees of color, rather than a mere unawareness of their realities. In this study, Black participants observed this phenomenon, and it was incredibly painful for them to endure such willing disregard. White participants did not discuss this phenomenon. However, what they did address was the choice in their degree of privilege awareness. White participants noted how their awareness of race and privilege could be a matter of preference and intentionality.

Conclusions: Responsibility and choice. Obliviousness does not excuse the harmful effects of perpetuating privilege, but this is a common way of understanding the process of White privilege. Often, people speak of "unacknowledged" White privilege (e.g., McIntosh, 1988). To me, this word is somewhat benign. It implies an accidental unawareness. It neglects dimensions of choice and responsibility evident in these findings.

There is evidence to suggest that White people and counseling trainees are disconnected from the lives of people of color (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006; Helms, 1984; Wise, 2005). Moreover, White counseling trainees may deny the significance of race (Utsey et al., 2005) or remain indifferent to the lives of people of color (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1999). However, the active role that White counseling psychology trainees and trainers play in perpetuating White privilege through *chosen* disregard and *elected* ignorance, is a novel and critical finding.

Members of the counseling psychology community might have to reframe how we think about the social justice action (and inaction) of our White constituency. Counseling psychology is a progressive field, but we may have much further to go in our social justice development.

The implications of this finding are unsettling, yet promising. White Disregard, as it was labeled in this study, means that White trainers and trainees are culpable. But if it is a choice to remain self- and culturally-aware, connect with trainees of color, and remain curious about their experiences, this is empowering too. It means that we can use privilege responsibly to make better choices. Interestingly, equating contexts with White privilege can undermine such efforts by excusing our behaviors. No matter what context we are in, predominantly White or not, we can choose justice.

Professional Burdens and Barriers

To identify as White in counseling psychology training programs may also ensure freedom from certain professional burdens and barriers confronting trainees of color. Across subsamples, participants acknowledged that trainees of color inherited additional responsibilities, some of which were imposed on them. White trainees were not burdened like their colleagues of color by an assumed multicultural expertise or minority group representation. Both White and Black participants observed that White faculty had, at times, "tokenized" or "pigeonholed" trainees of color in terms of their abilities or knowledge base. Emily noted that programmatic multicultural initiatives for change often seemed to fall on the shoulders of a trainee of color. Kate recalled a trainee of color being asked to join an all-White research team, and who experienced the invitation as a disingenuous effort to increase diversity. Grace experienced first-hand the pressures of being asked to join committees and participate in outreach programs, apparently because she was Black.

Participants in both subsamples also acknowledged the barriers trainees of color confronted due to a lack of client racial/ethnic diversity in their clinical work. Several participants discussed the reality that most practicum placements served a predominantly White clientele, and that there were limited opportunities to work with clients of color. The psychological toll of counseling primarily White clients as a trainee of color, and the additional effort required to connect to more diverse practica, were also addressed across subsamples.

Conclusions: Professional burdens and barriers. Researchers have found that trainees of color in psychology report more academic barriers and more race-related barriers (Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011). In these investigations, barriers pertained to racial microaggressions, belongingness, limited perceived cultural diversity, and the social context of training (e.g., advisors, peers). Additionally, faculty of color have reported being burdened by expectations to carry out duties related to multicultural issues (Constantine et al., 2008).

This study supports these findings, suggesting that White trainees encounter fewer barriers than trainees of color related to programmatic responsibilities and a lack of diversity in their clinical work. Amidst hectic schedules, it may be easier for White trainees and faculty to ignore the ways in which they are relatively unburdened. This disparity provides an entry point for White allies to share responsibilities often placed on trainees of color and advocate for practicum placements that serve racially diverse clientele.

These findings also shed new light on the context, detail, and depth of race-related barriers and burdens in training. It is through these subsequent ideas that White trainees and trainees of color may diverge most meaningfully in their understanding of the burdens and barriers. These ideas were mostly overlooked by White participants in this study.

First, negative racial perceptions and assumptions that diminish the person or capabilities

of trainees of color may be quite prevalent in counseling psychology training programs. Second, social barriers reported by trainees of color (Maton et al., 2011) may result from these negative racial attitudes. Third, there is significant energy expended as trainees of color reflect on daily racial encounters and seek out opportunities to connect to multicultural issues in curriculum and clinical work. This extra effort and depletion of energy is a barrier. Fourth, Eurocentric values may be embedded in programmatic functions that create barriers for trainees of color by eclipsing their cultural contexts. Fifth, without access to the same privileges as their White counterparts, these barriers and burdens are reinforced. By overlooking these significant barriers faced by trainees of color, it is easy for trainers and trainees to assume a uniform training experience where one does not exist.

Safety and Risk

In counseling psychology training programs, issues of safety are intimately tied to the meaning of White privilege. To some extent, both Black and White participants recognized this as a reality. White participants understood that they were less likely to feel injured in racial dialogue, harmed by a program's culturally-insensitive practice/procedure, or unsafe when a racist incident occurred on campus. Whiteness can offer protection from the looming concerns of security afflicting trainees of color, such as being judged, ostracized, discriminated against, and psychologically harmed because of one's race.

Another significant unearned racial advantage is access to a safe training experience. For Black trainees, their sense of security was threatened upon realizing that counseling psychology training programs were not as culturally open and aware as they had hoped. The psychological damage of encountering race-based manipulation and unchecked White privilege included disappointment, embarrassment, anger, and hurt. Conversely, White participants' tended to

experience their programs as multiculturally progressive, or distinctly more culturally-affirming than, for example, external practica. Although it is important to take pride in the objectives and achievements of the field, we must be careful not to overlook racial inequities in training. To do so is to deny reality, a feature and psychological cost of unchecked White privilege (Neville et al., 2001).

Like trainees of color, White trainees may also perceive some race-based risks in training and engage in impression management to circumvent them. In particular, White participants in this study feared appearing racist or multiculturally-incompetent as a result of saying the wrong thing. Their concerns were genuine, and not uncommon for White people responding to issues of race (Apfelbaum et al., 2008; cf. White supervisors in Constantine & Sue, 2007). Yet, the risks were not free from privilege. As a dominant cultural member, exploring multiculturalism can leave one feeling uneasy. However, this anxiety can keep one focused inward, granting the privilege to not honor the unique threats facing trainees of color.

The risks White participants perceived were limited to racial dialogue and their multicultural development. To censor themselves, they attempted to say the right thing or kept their views private. Black participants, though, were constantly evaluating their safety in various situations: in the classroom, in clinical supervision, with White faculty members, and in programmatic meetings. Furthermore, Black participants' impression management entailed behavioral components (e.g., dress, posture) and emotional stifling not observed with White participants.

Conclusions: Safety and risk. White privilege again seems to be revealed through the two separate realities of White and Black trainees. Rather than a guarantee, safety in one's training program is, at least in part, a racial privilege. Black participants' continuous risk

analysis, meticulous impression management, and understandable mistrust toward White faculty and trainees are alarming. Such experiences serve as a reminder that, despite the field's best intentions and efforts to emphasize multiculturalism (e.g., Sue et al., 1992; APA, 1999), social justice (Speight & Vera, 2008), and even privilege ("Exploring Privilege," n.d.), our own trainees still feel unsafe because of their racial group membership.

The degree of impression management that Black participants depicted is another key finding, and calls into question trainees' freedom of expression in training. As counseling professionals, we value honest and open dialogue, but how possible is this if not everyone can engage genuinely without fear? Considering the self-censoring of both Black and White trainees, it is clear that critical dialogues are not being had, and safety and trust are the reasons.

White participants' perceived risks as members of the dominant culture serve a critical function too. As unsure and anxious as Whites may feel navigating topics of race, our concerns can too easily overwhelm the ability to see the ways in which we are protected from the perils of marginalized group status in training.

Awareness

For White trainees and trainees of color, the onset of White privilege awareness may occur at very different times. Both Black and White participants discussed their awareness of racial identity and White privilege. For Black participants, their awareness of racially disparate experiences and White privilege began in childhood and early adolescence. Naomi recalled playing dress-up on her first day of kindergarten and the lack of playthings and articles of clothing suitable for her hair type. Informal talks with their caregivers and siblings about racism were common and ongoing. Jason's parents had exposed him to a number of books and movies celebrating Black culture and exploring the realities of racism.

White participants' awareness of their racial identity and White privilege tended to come later, in late adolescence and early adulthood. Formal didactic training also appeared to be the medium through which most White participants formed an understanding of White privilege. Beth was introduced to the concept of White privilege through a conference presentation in college. Emily reflected on the significance of a fundamentals counseling course as a catalyst for her privilege awareness. Considering that "whites are carefully taught not to recognize white privilege" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1), it is not surprising that White participants developed their racial and privilege awareness later than Black participants.

Conclusions: Awareness. If trainees of color and White trainees are entering graduate school with different levels of awareness of race and White privilege, this is a noteworthy discrepancy. And to make matters more complex, there may be different levels of White privilege awareness (i.e., among Whites; Ancis & Szymanski, 2001). Obviously, we recognize the importance of enhancing racial awareness through curriculum (Case, 2007), but how often do we consider how trainees' differing levels of awareness impact cross-racial dynamics, perceptions of safety in the program, and access to social support?

Personal and Emotional Impact

The personal and emotional impact of White privilege on a trainee may vary greatly based on one's dominant or marginalized racial/ethnic group status. Overall, the interview topics noticeably affected Black participants personally and emotionally. They tended to discuss first-hand encounters with White privilege—what *they* observed and how *they* were affected.

Rather than focus on personal and proximal benefits of possessing racial privilege, White participants more frequently described others' receipt of White privilege; for instance, how a White faculty member's unacknowledged privilege affected a trainee of color one knew. Or as

mentioned previously, they focused on contexts as the source of privilege. This proclivity of White participants may also have been an artifact of some of the interview questions that focused on less personal topics, like White cultural values and norms. However, in their responses to the same questions, Black participants frequently cast themselves as the central and affected characters in the stories they told. This is not surprising. Talking first-hand from a place of pain about what one is denied may be easier than similarly discussing a taken for granted benefit.

For White trainees, it may be that it is easier to recognize another's privileged behavior than one's own. To do the latter would mean admitting that one participates in a system of White racism, which is a struggle for Whites (Sue et al., 2007). The cognitive dissonance of this admission might be too much, especially considering that some White participants viewed their programs as multicultural *safe havens*.

Black participants' personal connection to the interview material was also apparent on an affective level. Isaiah became tearful as he conveyed the hurt and betrayal associated with White Disregard and Disconnection. Ashley recognized that she was experiencing strong feelings for which she could not even find words after sharing how a White colleague denied racial privilege.

Some White participants also shared feelings of sadness, guilt, and frustration as they acknowledged the realities of White privilege in their training programs. However, their affect was not as consistently congruent with the emotional words they used. An example of this is saying one is "sad" about privilege and oppression after yawning without any accompanying changes in speech or nonverbal presentation. From my perspective, the most emotional moments for many White participants involved their own anxieties, fears, and sadness about discussing and confronting privilege in their lives and training programs. As mentioned previously, it may be difficult for White trainees to move beyond their own emotional struggles

with race to see the pain that their colleagues endure because of White privilege. This may be a matter of disconnection or empathy, to be discussed.

Conclusions: Personal and emotional impact. Overall, trainees of color appear to be more affected than White trainees by racial privilege in their counseling psychology programs. Quite simply, the pain of being denied a training benefit may outweigh the banal satisfaction of receiving it routinely. It makes sense that those who stand to lose the most from a system of privilege and oppression are the most noticeably affected by it.

While it was not expected that advanced-level White trainees would be as personally affected by issues of White privilege in their training programs, they exhibited a meaningful level of personal and emotional detachment. As in society (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006; Helms, 1984; Johnson, 2001; Wise, 2005), White trainees may be disconnected from the realities of their colleagues of color and the painful impact White privilege has on them. This may be an illustration of the empathic disconnection that Black participants observed among Whites in their programs. If White trainees understood the extent of damage being done to their colleagues of color, might they respond differently to the topic of White privilege? Healthy cultural mistrust of Whites may be a barrier to the exchange of honest dialogue on these issues, but White trainees can build trust by practicing and maintaining curiosity and empathy. It is also important to remind oneself that the term *privilege* can be misleading; White privilege is a critical matter of "conferred dominance" and power over others (McIntosh, 1988, p. 14). This may further help in efforts to reframe thinking about privilege in training as an especially critical matter.

Intersectionality

Everyone possesses multiple identities that interact in unique ways in given contexts (e.g., Brown, 2009) and influence our experiences of privilege or oppression. Interestingly, how

trainees talk about their multiple identities related to issues of privilege says something about the privilege they have (or do not have). All participants in the study were encouraged to consider the ways in which multiple identities intersected with racial identity. There was a qualitative difference, though, in the ways that Black and White participants incorporated various identities into the interview.

Two White participants described how a deep connection to one's oppressed gender could stymie White privilege awareness. These seemed like powerful examples of intersectionality. More often, though, I observed that White participants frequently listed numerous social identities when discussing examples of White privilege. At times, this occurred almost to the extent that they seemed to be equating White privilege with other social privileges related to class and education, for instance. Also, when discussing the racial oppression faced by people of color in their lives and training programs, White participants more often referenced other oppressed identities they possessed (e.g., class). These seemed like attempts to relate through pain.

In contrast, Black participants focused much more consistently on race and the privileges of Whiteness. When they referenced other identities, it was usually to further emphasize the disparity between the benefits of Whiteness and the ways they were marginalized. For example, being Black and male, Isaiah felt especially invisible when he looked at the photographs in the hallway of his program's almost exclusively White graduates.

Conclusions: Intersectionality. Taken together, these tendencies suggest that some advanced-level White trainees may have a difficult time recognizing the unique influence of White privilege on certain training experiences. Mixing identities or relating through alternate oppressed identities, as some White participants did, can dilute the presence of White privilege,

thereby maintaining its invisibility (McIntosh, 1988). This tendency may also prove problematic in cross-cultural training dialogues in which people of color strongly feel the outcomes of their racial/ethnic identities very clearly. White trainees and faculty are encouraged to practice clarifying whenever possible the unique and interactive effects of the identities they explore.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recent efforts in counseling psychology have been dedicated to better understanding social privilege (e.g., "Exploring Privilege," n.d.). However, exploring the meaning of White privilege within the field has been rather uncharted territory. Ancis and Szymanski (2001) encouraged research around "the particular ways in which White privilege influences one's personal and professional life" (p. 563). They realized that McIntosh's (1988) list of White privileges, while helpful, may not be generalizable to all people and contexts. White trainees and trainees of color in counseling, clinical, and school psychology have also recently reported markedly different experiences, with trainees of color perceiving more barriers and race-related barriers in training than their White counterparts (Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011). Therefore, there was room to investigate the presence and meaning of White privilege within counseling psychology training programs.

Using semi-structured interviews, I recruited a representative and geographically diverse sample of Black- and White-identified trainees in APA-accredited doctoral counseling psychology training programs to explore their observations and experiences of White privilege. Consistent with reflections on Critical Whiteness Studies (Marx, 2003), Black participants were recruited to honor their unique knowledge about the dominant culture. Here, I briefly summarize the findings of this study, consider their implications, and make appropriate recommendations for the field of counseling psychology.

General Conclusions

Several key conclusions can be drawn from this phenomenological investigation that have significant implications for the field of counseling psychology. Although to varying

degrees, all participants recognized the presence and impact of White privilege in their training programs. It is a noteworthy discovery that White trainees and faculty perpetuate White privilege in ways that contribute significantly to racial inequities in counseling psychology training programs. These findings illustrate a lack of adherence to the APA (2009) cultural diversity standard for professional psychology programs. More specifically, some of the findings indicate that a supportive learning environment could not be ensured for trainees of color because of racial privilege. The presence of White privilege and its damaging effects on trainees of color is also inconsistent with counseling psychology's social justice agenda (e.g., Fouad et al., 2004). In general, these findings point to a pressing need for training programs to assess the presence and effects of unearned racial advantages on trainees and faculty. The need for such an assessment is accentuated upon considering the findings from the Cross-Sample Examination that White trainees and trainees of color experience two distinct realities in training. The White trainee reality is more likely to be laden with comforts of belonging, safety, and power. The reality for trainees of color is more likely to be one of risk, containment, and isolation.

Black participants in this study keenly observed features of White privilege. Navigating White privilege was an ongoing battle for them. From their marginalized racial perspective, clarity and nuance was added to survey-based reports of the racial barriers encountered by trainees of color (Clark et al., 2012; Maton et al., 2011). Denied the racial benefits their White colleagues receive, trainees of color may feel marginalized and oppressed in their training programs. From a marginalized racial perspective, White privilege increases the likelihood that White trainees will experience their training programs as safe, affirming, accepting, and free from excessive burden and racially biased perceptions. Furthermore, the perceived benefits of

Whiteness in a training program may appear in different forms. They may be subtle, yet potent, as through greater access to nonverbal consensual validation or easy identification with other White people. Or these benefits may be obvious and extreme, such as the privilege to speak freely without fear in most contexts, and the ability to assert power through silence and active disregard for the experiences of trainees of color.

From interpreting Black trainees' accounts, it became apparent that White privilege must not be viewed as merely "perks" that White trainees receive. Rather, real harm has been and can be done to trainees of color through an intricate system of unearned advantages that maintains the power, protection, and connection of White trainees and trainers. Meanwhile, trainees of color may encounter fear, isolation, and disregard.

An analysis of White trainees' experiences also yielded some significant findings. Some of their experiences led to clear conclusions about the benefits of Whiteness in training. From a dominant racial perspective, White privilege means: greater racial representation in all contexts of training (e.g., curriculum, clinical work, supervision, etc.), easier access to social support through racial similarity and cultural transference, protection from instances of cultural-insensitivity and racism, facing fewer barriers and responsibilities related to race, experiencing fewer negative outcomes associated with universal program experiences (e.g., lack of diversity in clinical work), and having the ability to remain routinely unaware of White privilege by choice (without significant consequence).

And yet from a White racial perspective, some benefits may be harder to see, more prone to the characteristic invisibility of White privilege (McIntosh, 1988). These less visible privileges include: experiencing one's program as safe and culturally affirming, learning passively from people of color about racism and privilege, perceiving risks related to being

White that are relatively limited in scope and intensity, responding to race-related risks with relatively minimal self-editing, easily escaping risk and self-editing through greater access to people who are trusted simply because they are White, recognizing Eurocentric values in one's training without explicitly acknowledging the benefits and barriers they create, and discussing White privilege in ways (e.g., using hypothetical situations) that minimizes its power and personal responsibility for its perpetuation.

Compared to the privileges that may be easier to see from a dominant racial perspective (e.g., widespread racial representation), those that go unacknowledged entail greater empathy to understand the severity of harm done to trainees of color by systemic privilege (e.g., risk and impression management), or that call for greater attention to the behaviors of others and oneself as responsible perpetrators (e.g., discussing White privilege in hypotheticals). To acknowledge these privileges, entails a greater level of effort and acceptance, meaning greater pain and loss. Essentially, resisting certain privileges in training more acutely threatens the comforts of a privileged racial worldview. In subsequent sections I provide concrete recommendations for challenging White privilege in a training context.

For better or worse, both White and Black participants acknowledged that White privilege affected them as trainees in the field. More prominent were the harmful effects of systemic racial privilege on Black participants and the benefits to White participants. Less obvious perhaps are the costs of White privilege and racism to Whites, which have long been recognized, such as a denial of reality and meaningful connection to people of color (Katz & Ivey, 1977).

With each unearned advantage for White trainees and trainers comes a cost: (a) interpersonal separation from meaningful relationships with trainees of color; (b) a denial of

racial inequity in training; (c) resistance to acknowledging one's accomplishments as a counselor, researcher, supervisee, and student as not entirely the result of one's hard work and dedication; (d) a lack of professional integrity; and (e) a use of power and privilege that harms trainees of color. Clearly, many of these costs of White privilege in training stifle one's personal and professional growth. In acknowledging these costs, though, there is much we can do to challenge their impact.

Personal Conclusions and Reflections

In the Method section, I bracketed my assumptions as one strategy to ensure trustworthiness. Now I return to some of these assumptions to discuss my reactions to the findings. Overall, a number of my assumptions emerged as realities. All participants acknowledged White privilege as part of their training experience and were able to dialogue about these issues. Although my analysis of the White participant subsample data was especially critical, I was struck at times by the ability of White participants to describe privileges in their training environments. I found myself wondering occasionally, *If I were in their position, would I also have been able to describe these privileges in such detail?* Dave's ability to recognize his resemblance to a White faculty member's family member as a privilege stands out to me. As does Kate's discussion of "passive" versus "active awareness" of privilege. Without their own personal efforts to understand privilege, they might not have been able to discern the privilege in these experiences.

Additionally, I think the co-constructivist nature of the interview played a role in some of the more lucid accounts of privilege shared by White participants (and Black participants, too). In other words, I recall from the interviews that ideas about privilege, like those of Dave and Kate, were derived from my questioning of their experiences and following up on intriguing

statements they made. If the interview questions helped to paint reality, this is a promising notion. It means that White trainees and faculty can uncover elements of their privilege through dialogue and curiosity, thereby constructing a reality of awareness.

Among the many findings, I was most amazed by how disparate the realities of Black and White trainees could be. White participants also enacted this reality when they appeared particularly disconnected from the implications of the privileges they were describing for their own lives and others'. Ultimately, I was left feeling that counseling psychology trainees, especially those who are White, can fall into a trap of viewing "privilege" as one of a zillion concepts about which we learn and about which we are *supposed* to care. The results of this study remind me that privilege is not merely an idea, but a process with the power to shape realities. Privilege prevents me and other White trainees and trainers from realizing how we disenfranchise and even harm the people in our programs through our actions and inactions. It keeps us from seeing that our lives and training experiences are not isolated, but rather interconnected. People of color do not hurt *while* we enjoy the comforts of privilege. They hurt *because* we enjoy those privileges. If nothing else, I am reminded that White privilege (and its effects on trainees) is not a matter to be taken lightly. All too easily, unawareness can turn to negligence, and negligence to harm.

Recommendations

The current findings provide an entry point to understanding White privilege as a real and complex aspect of the counseling psychology training program experience. They remind us that the White supremacy and racism so central to the history of the U.S. and psychology continue to be more a part of our field than we would like to think. That despite our best efforts as counseling psychology professionals, we may have to look more intentionally in our own

backyards before we step out into the world to help others.

Participants' experiences revealed that White trainees may reap benefits of Whiteness personally, interpersonally, professionally, symbolically, and psychologically in multiple areas of training: supervision, counseling, research, and relationships with trainers and peers. Meanwhile, Black participants were denied such benefits and navigated sometimes incredibly painful and unwelcoming environments. Counseling psychology trainers and trainees are encouraged to use the findings of this study as an assessment or educational tool (e.g., in cross-cultural or multicultural psychology courses) to raise awareness, encourage self-reflection, and move toward more just training environments.

To aid such efforts, I have constructed a developing list of White privileges (Appendix L), adapted from McIntosh's (1988). However, this list is uniquely based upon the experiences and observations of participants in this study. It contains "conditions of daily experience that" a White trainee might "[take] for granted, as neutral, normal, and universally available to everybody," specifically in the context of counseling psychology training programs (p. 100). In the spirit of distinguishing the features and effects of Whiteness from White bodies (Rowe and Malhotra, 2007), this list summarizes the benefits of Whiteness for a generic White counseling psychology trainee, and simultaneously, the costs of Whiteness to trainees of color.

This list can be used as a didactic tool to encourage White trainees and trainers to reflect on racial privilege in the context of their training programs, however similar or different their experiences may be. The list of privileges may also encourage awareness of racial privilege as a unique phenomenon in different settings and circumstances (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001). Furthermore, this list may affirm the observations and marginalized experiences of trainees of color.

The list is written from the perspective of a White trainee for the sake of simplicity and accountability. However, White faculty, supervisors, and advisors can also use these ideas for reflection on White privilege in their programs. I use the term "trainees of color" rather than "Black trainees," not to generalize experience across racial/ethnic groups, but to acknowledge that all trainees of color are harmed by systemic White privilege. Along this line, I do not assume that the experiences of participants are generalizable to all training programs. However, their experiences and my interpretations of them are a starting point for further exploration and curiosity. This list is a work in progress and is expected to change and grow with future empirical investigation and personal experience.

So, equipped with such a list of privileges and a spirit of self-reflection, I believe many may still be asking: *Okay, so what* now? *What can we* do? *How do we* eradicate *White privilege from our training environments?* I believe that awareness is a starting point. I contend that we must first be curious about the experiences of our trainees. We must assume the existence of White privilege in our training programs. We must search for its presence in the perceptions and experiences of our trainers and trainees in every nook and cranny of training, and expose it. We must expect that our field's trainers and trainees—White, Black, and Brown—benefit and hurt because its existence.

But what does action look like? Can White privilege be relinquished? As many of this study's participants acknowledged in their descriptions of White privilege in the U.S., unearned advantage is an inherited and inherent part of living with White or light skin. I tend to think that White privilege is not something that can be given up by those who have it, but instead used responsibly to undermine its effects. Consider a chainsaw, which used wrongly, can harm others and its operator. Used responsibly, it can free us from barriers. Antiracist activist, Tim Wise

(2005), concluded that "there is something to be said for confronting the inevitable choice one must make in this life between collaborating with or resisting injustice, and choosing the latter" (p. 176). We can choose to know and resist injustice in our training programs.

As I will demonstrate, every item on the developing list of privileges encompasses a path of resistance for White trainers and trainees. Some of these suggested paths may be difficult or uncomfortable. All of them require self-awareness.

We can inquire about the role of race in our own clinical work and that of our supervisees (White and of color). We can monitor our interpersonal preferences for certain people based on race. Accordingly, we can reach out warmly to those we normally might not because of the White racism we harbor. We can address the unique barriers faced by trainees conducting research with communities of color and make appropriate accommodations. We can seek the limitations of our own privileged realities by choosing to be curious about the realities of people of color in our programs. We can cultivate empathy for the experiences of trainees and faculty of color by deeply respecting and listening to what they say. We can realize trainees of color may feel especially isolated and unrepresented while in training. Therefore, we can celebrate the holidays that matter to them and gather in spaces where they feel safe and comfortable. We can question whether our expectations and practices surrounding comprehensive exams and other training milestones are biased by White cultural values. When trainees of color are silent, we can question whether or not we have contributed to their silence through our own silence, fear, or ignorance. We can extend our efforts to recruit trainees and faculty of color (Roger & Molina, 2006). We can hold ourselves and other White trainers and trainees accountable for reflecting and acting in all of these ways whenever possible.

This list and the results of this study may also be used as a springboard for dialogue

among trainees. It became clear from this investigation that trainees from different racial/ethnic backgrounds could learn from each other what I learned from them. However, as the findings illustrated, White trainees may fear saying the wrong thing, and trainees of color may not trust that their experiences will be honored. Furthermore, trainees may be at very different developmental places in terms of White privilege awareness.

In courses addressing the fundamentals of counseling, trainees are taught the importance of active listening skills and encouraged to nonjudgmentally enter the worlds of their clients, remaining curious. Along this line, I recall my first-year instructor's emphasis on the Exploration stage of Hill & Obrien's (2004) model of helping skills, with Insight and Action being of secondary importance. These skills are not only valuable in counseling scenarios; they are also applicable to exploring the lives and experiences of people in our immediate training environments and how they experience training uniquely based on their racial/ethnic background. Similarly, in multicultural counseling courses, time may be set aside from a focus on clients from diverse backgrounds to learn about each other's day-to-day experiences in training. In these dialogues, White privilege can be framed as a barrier to deeply knowing the experience of a person of color, since those with privilege may take their experience to be the norm (e.g., Katz, 1985). In these dialogues, we may fear what we will hear. But left unsaid, we cannot respond.

Limitations and Future Directions

Just as important as what this study has accomplished is what it has not, and what remains to be accomplished based on the findings. Despite novel and meaningful results, this investigation was not without its limitations. To begin, I consider the characteristics and motivating factors of participants.

I attempted to recruit participants who, among other criteria, were "open and willing" to be interviewed about White privilege in a training context. However, I failed to explicitly ask a valuable question about one's personal and professional reasons for participating. Many participants seemed to have a story to tell, a private reason for participating in a particularly challenging study that indirectly addressed my unasked question. For example, Jason commented on the power of looking back over a difficult journey in training before moving forward with his career. Sarah wrestled with how her White privilege awareness would impact her personally and professionally. It is possible that many of those who chose to participate were especially impacted by White privilege and racism in their training programs and lives, and so had the most to say on the topic. Therefore, their experiences may not be the typical experience of Black and White trainees with racial privilege. In any case, qualitative research welcomes and honors atypical experience as one of many valid realities. Even if uncommon, these participants' experiences still count among the many other possible realities involving White privilege in training.

A few participants humorously and honestly acknowledged "research karma" as one motivating factor for volunteering, in addition to a willingness or interest in discussing White privilege. Also, the compensation of a $25 gift card could have attracted some trainees who would not have participated for a lesser or a different reward (e.g., course credit). Participants varied, too, in their awareness and understanding of White privilege; and I did not make use of quantitative measures of White privilege awareness or attitudes.

Considering these participant characteristics and motivating factors, a similar study could address sampling biases by openly inquiring about participants' reasons for participating. Quantitative measures could also be used during recruitment to assess for White privilege

attitudes and awareness (e.g., Pinterits et al., 2009). Such strategies could be employed to control for individual differences, ultimately yielding a more similar participant base and unified perspective on the topic. And because qualitative research offers a complex and particular perspective on a phenomenon, future quantitative studies more focused on White privilege in training may provide a broader, common snapshot of the experiences of trainees from varied racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Next, Black participants were recruited to reveal a glimpse of White privilege in a training context from a single marginalized perspective. This sampling decision was made to encourage depth and complexity in the results by examining the training experiences of one marginalized racial/ethnic group uniquely affected by a history of White supremacy and racism in the U.S. Therefore, the experiences of trainees of color from other racially/ethnically marginalized backgrounds remain to be seen. Further qualitative and quantitative research should address the unique training experiences of Latina/o, Asian/Pacific Islander, Arab, Native/Alaskan Native, and additionally, other White-identified trainees in counseling psychology. This study may also serve as a catalyst for future research about other social privileges in a counseling psychology training context. These include, but are not limited to, heterosexual privilege, Christian privilege, able-bodied privilege, and male privilege. Deep qualitative and broad survey-based quantitative research will both be necessary media to explore the nature and presence of these phenomena.

Some findings with significant implications, while striking, are in need of further investigation. Overall, White and Black participants entered their training programs with differing levels of awareness about White privilege and race. Black participants also felt betrayed by training environments that were not as safe and culturally-aware as expected.

Further empirical studies should focus on trainee perceptions of safety and cultural awareness in training programs, and on White trainees' awareness of race and privilege. For people of color considering or entering the field of counseling psychology, this information could serve a protective function, easing or precluding the bewilderment and disappointment that comes from entering an environment different than what was expected.

Finally, as with all empirical studies, researcher bias must be considered. I employed a number of strategies to bracket and undermine such biases (e.g., auditing, member checking, reflective journaling). Although these efforts contributed to more trustworthy research, they do not guarantee that the results were free from the influence of my experiences and biases.

Indeed, this study was important to me. It addressed an area I am personally and professionally passionate about. People I have cared about and worked with have been affected by White privilege in a training context. I have benefitted from it. Knowing also of this, I expect and welcome constructive criticism of this study's methods and findings. I am also hopeful, though, that criticism is paralleled by personal and programmatic reflection.

This qualitative exploration provides an important glimpse at White privilege in counseling psychology training programs from the perspective of trainees. It is a self-reflective study, in that members of a field dedicated to multiculturalism and social justice were given the chance to describe honestly what racial privilege meant in the places they developed as culturally-aware professionals. Uniquely, the perspectives of trainees of color and White trainees were incorporated to honor both marginalized and dominant cultural experiences surrounding privilege.

White privilege is a reality for White counseling psychology trainees who regularly procure its comforts. For trainees of color, it is a monumental and daily burden to navigate.

White privilege was determined to function in a number of meaningful and insidious ways across training contexts (supervision, clinical work, etc.) to benefit White trainees and oppress trainees of color. For Black participants, the meanings of White privilege were profound and painful. Alternatively, White trainees recognized some benefits with ease, whereas others went unacknowledged in their language, only to be depicted through a careful and skeptical analysis. What emerged were actually two distinct realities for Black and White trainees training related to matters of safety, belongingness, power, and responsibility. Some of these findings were particularly alarming and demand attention from a field striving for justice in the lives it touches.

Table 1

Example of Initial Transcript Analysis with Commentary

Comments	Transcript	Interpretive Themes
'even'; Surprised? Extensive? **Expects something different/more from friends? Still friends despite huge disconnect? What might this feel like? What might this mean?** *'have to', Requirement; Responsibility* **For Naomi, understanding WP is not a choice? Safety not guaranteed?** Friends *'choose'* to not be interested or aware in MC and WP w/o consequence. *'safe' and 'prepared'*	. . . . Even in some of the interactions with some of my friends in the program. That they choose not to kind of be aware of or interested in, um, these areas. Like these cultural conversations and White privilege. They can choose not to. They just, they don't have to and they would still be safe, sound, and well prepared for the field.	Disconnected/Unconcerned Additional responsibility Choice v. requirement Professional immunity/ protection/resilience

Note. Descriptive comments are in plain font. Linguistic comments are italicized. Conceptual comments are in bold font. Table layout and types of commentary were adapted from Smith et al. (2009).

Table 2

Overview of Superordinate Themes and Subthemes from Black/African-American Subsample

_____

White Disregard/Disconnection

- Affective Disregard/ Empathic Disconnection

- Active Avoidance/Choice

- Powerful/Disempowering Silence

- Integrity

Belonging and Support

- Representation/Presence

- Lack of Support/(Cultural) Rejection

- Identification/Shared Experience

(In)Security

- False Sense of Security

- Analyzing Risk

- Containment and Consequence

Double Burden

- Burden of Diminishment

- Additive Burden of Expectation

_____

Table 3

Overview of Superordinate Themes and Subthemes from White/European-American Subsample

---

Awareness

- Recent/Academic Awareness

- Unawareness: Routine/Optional

- People of Color as Illuminators

- Empowerment

Impact and Involvement

- Magnitude of Impact

- Degree of Involvement

Social Supports and Contextual Barriers

- Representation/Belonging

- Values and Context

Risk and Safety

- Program as Safe Haven

- Risk of Transgression/ Incompetence

- Impression Management

- Protection

REFERENCES

About counseling psychologists (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.div17.org/students
_defining.html

Acevedo-Garcia, D., & Osypuk, T. L. (2004, July/August). Racial disparities in housing and
health. *Poverty and Race, 13*(4). Retrieved from http://www.prrac.org/fulltext.php?
textid=993&itemid=9313&newsletterid=75&header=Search%20Results

American Psychological Association. (1999). Archival description of Counseling
Psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*, 589-592.

American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of
conduct. *American Psychologist, 57*, 1060-1073.

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training,
research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist,
58*(5), 377-402.

American Psychological Association (2009). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of
programs in professional psychology*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from
http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/policies/interns.aspx

Ancis, J. R., & Szymanski, D. M. (2001). Awareness of white privilege among white
counseling trainees. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*(4), *548*-569. doi:10.1177/
0011000001294005

Anderson, M. L. (2003). Whitewashing race: A critical perspective on whiteness. In A. W.
Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out* (pp. 21-34). New York: Routledge.

Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist?
Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and*

Social Psychology, *95*(4), 918-932. doi: 10.1037/a0011990

Arredondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S. P., Sanchez, J., Locke, D. C., Sanchez, J., Stadler, H. (1996). Operationalization of the multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 24*(1), 42-78. Retrieved from http://www. multiculturalcenter.org/jmcd/

Beer, A. M., Spanierman, L. B., Greene, J. C., & Todd, N. R. (2012). Counseling psychology trainees' perceptions of training and commitments to social justice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*(1), 120-133. doi: 10.1037/a0026325

Bergerson, A. A. (2003). Critical race theory and white racism: Is there room for white scholars in fighting racism in education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 51-63. doi:10.10 80/0951839032000033527

Bernard, J. M. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook, Priest, and Fukuyama. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *34*, 159-171.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review, 94*(4), 991-1013. Retrieved from http://econ.duke.edu/~hf14/teaching /povertydisc/readings/bertrand-mullainathan2004.pdf

Betancourt, H., & Lopéz, S. R. (1993). *American Psychologist, 48*(6), 629-637. doi:10.1037 /0003-066X.48.6.629

Black, L. L., & Stone, D. (2005). Expanding the definition of privilege: The concept of social privilege. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 33*(4), 243-255.

Retrieved from http://www.multiculturalcenter.org/jmcd/

Blitz, L. V. (2006). Owning whiteness: The reinvention of self and practice. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 6*(2/3), 241-263. doi:10.1300/J135v06n02_15

Bonilla-Silva, E., Goar, C., & Embrick, D. G. (2006). When whites flock together: The social psychology of white habitus. *Critical Sociology, 32*, p. 229-253). doi: 10.1163/156916306777835268

Brah, A., & Phoenix, A. (2004). Ain't I A Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality. *Journal of International Women's Studies, 5*(3), 75-86. Retrieved from http://vc.bridgew.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1543&context=jiws&sei-redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Dbrah%2Band%2Bphoenix%2B2004%26btnG%3D%26hl%3Den%26as_sdt%3D0%252C14#search=%22brah%20phoenix%202004%22

Brown, L. S. (2009). Cultural competence: A new way of thinking about integration in therapy. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 19*(4), 340-353. doi: 10.1037/a0017967

Burkard, A. W., Johnson, A. J., Madson, M. B., Pruitt, N. T., Contreras-Tadych, D. A., Kozlowski, J. M., . . . Knox, S. (2006). Supervisor cultural responsiveness and unresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(3), 288-301. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.3.288

Burkard, A. W., & Knox, S. (2004). Effect of therapist color-blindness on empathy and attributions in cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*(4), 387-397. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.51.4.387

Callis, R. R. (2010). *U.S. Census Bureau News: Residential vacancies and homeownership in the second quarter 2010*. (Publication No. CB10-103). Washington, DC: U.S. Census

Bureau. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hvs/qtr210/files/ q210press.pdf

Carter, R. T. (1990). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 69*(1), 46-50. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/publications/journals .aspx

Case, K. (2007). Raising white privilege awareness and reducing racial prejudice: Assessing diversity course effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 34*(4), 231-235. doi: 10.1080 /00986280701700250

Chao, R. C.-L., Wei, M., Good, G. E., & Flores, L. Y. (2011). Race/ethnicity, color-blind racial attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence: The moderating effects of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *58*(1), 72-82. doi:10.1037/ a0022091

Chow, G. W. (2011, Winter). The model minority myth. *Independent School*. Retrieved from http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ISMagazine/Pages/The-Model-Minority-Myth.aspx

Chwalisz, K., Patel, N., & Chu, S. P. (2008, March). *Positive and negative multicultural supervision: A task analysis*. Poster presented at the International Counseling Psychology Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Claney, D., & Parker, W. M. (1989). Assessing White racial consciousness and perceived comfort with Black individuals: A preliminary study. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 67*, 449-451. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org /publications/journals.aspx

Clark, C. R., Mercer, S. H., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Dufrene, B. A. (2012). Barriers to the Success of Ethnic Minority Students in School Psychology Graduate Programs. *School Psychology Review*, *41*(2), 176-192. Retrieved from http://www.zeigler-hill.com/uploads/7/7/3/2/ 7732402/clark_mercer_zeigler-hill__dufrene_2012.pdf

Clark, H. K., Murdoch, N. L., Koetting, K. (2009). Predicting burnout and career choice satisfaction in counseling psychology graduate students. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*(4), 580-606. doi: 10.1177/0011000008319985

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, *64*(3), 170-180. Retrieved from http://www.sfu.ca/iirp/documents/resources/Cole%20- %20Intersectionality%20in%20research%20psychology.pdf

Constantine, M. G. (1997). Facilitating multicultural competency in counseling supervision: Operationalizing a practical framework. In D. B. Pope-Davis, & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.)*, Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision*, (pp. 310-324). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Constantine, M. G. (2001). Multiculturally-focused counseling supervision: Its relationship to trainees' multicultural counseling self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20*(1), 87-98. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/cou/index.aspx

Constantine, M. G. (2007). Racial microaggressions against African American clients in cross-racial counseling relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.1.1

Constantine, M. G., Smith, L., Redington, R. M., Owen, D. (2008). Racial microaggressions against black counseling and counseling psychology faculty: A central challenge in the multicultural counseling movement. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*(3), 348-

355. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/Publications/Journals.aspx

Constantine, M. G., & Sue, D. W. (2007). Perceptions of racial microaggressions among black supervisees in cross-racial dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(2), 142-153. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.2.142

Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (2013). *Summary of descriptive data on counseling psychology programs – 2009*. Retrieved from http://ccptp.org/images/ CCPTP _Annual_Survey_Data_2008-2009.pdf

Council of Economic Advisors. (1998, September). *Changing America: Indicators of social and economic well-being by race and Hispanic origin*. Retrieved from http://www.gpoaccess. gov/eop/ca/pdfs/ca.pdf

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Crissey, S. R. (2009). *Educational attainment in the United States: 2007*. (Publication No. P20-560). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from http://www. aauwnorthstar.org/CensusBureau-Educational%20Attainment%202007.pdf

Critical Whiteness Studies Group and the Center on Democracy in a Multiracial Society. (2006). *Towards a bibliography of critical whiteness studies*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Office of Printing Services. Retrieved from http://cdms.illinois.edu/pages/ Research / 06-07/CriticalWhiteness/Bibliography.pdf

D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (2001). Expanding our thinking about white racism: Facing the challenge of multicultural counseling in the 21st century. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 289-310). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(2), 169-180. doi:10.1080/713845282

Denavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Smith J. C., U. S. Census Bureau (2010). *Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2009*. (Publication No. P60-238). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from http://www.census. gov/prod/2010pubs/p60-238.pdf

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Doane, W. (2003). Whitewashing race: A critical perspective on whiteness. In A. W. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out* (pp. 3-18). New York: Routledge.

Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive "snapshot" of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 131-145. Retrieved from http://www.multiculturalcenter.org/jmcd/

Dyer, R. (2008). The matter of Whiteness. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 9-14). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. (Reprinted from *White: Essays on race and culture*, pp. 1-10, 2002).

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Essandoh, P. K. (1996). Multicultural counseling as the "fourth force": A call to arms. *The Counseling Psychologist, 24*(1), 126-137. doi:10.1177/0011000096241008

Exploring privilege. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.div17.org/epstg/index.html

Feagin, J. R. (2010). *Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Feagin, J. R., & O'Brien, E. (2003). *White men on race: Power, privilege, and the shaping of cultural consciousness.* Beacon, MA: Beacon Press.

Fine, M., Powell, L. C., Weis, L., & Wong, L. M. (1997). In M. Fine., L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power and society* (pp. vii-xii). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fischer, A. R., & DeBord, K. A. (2013). Critical questioning of social and feminist identity development literature: Themes, principles, and tools. In C. Z. Enns & E. N. Williams (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of feminist counseling psychology* (pp. 87-111). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Fischer, A. R., & Moradi, B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity: Recent developments and needed directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander, *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 341-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fouad, N. A., McPherson, R. H., Gerstein, L., Blustein, D. L., Elman, N., Helledy, K. I., & Metz, A. J. (2004). Houston, 2001: Context and legacy. *The Counseling Psychologist, 32*(1), 15-77. doi:10.1177/0011000003259943

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *The social construction of whiteness: White women, race matters*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Fryer, R. G., & Levitt, S. D. (2006). The Black-White test score gap through third grade. *American Law & Economics Review, 8*(2), 249-281. doi:10.1093/aler/ahl003

Giorgi, A., & Giorgi, B. (2003). Phenomenology. In J. A. Smith, *Qualitative psychology* (pp. 25-50). London: Sage.

Gloria, A. M., & Pope-Davis, D. B. (1997). Cultural ambiance: The importance of a culturally

    aware learning environment in the training and education of counselors. In D. B. Pope-

    Davis, & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.)*, Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment,*

    education and training, and supervision, (pp. 242-259). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grillo, T. (1995). Anti-essentialism and intersectionality: Tools to dismantle the master's house.

    Berkeley Women's LJ, *10*, 16-30. Retrieved from http://faculty.law.miami.edu/zfenton/

    documents/TrinaGrillo.pdf

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gushue, G. V., & Constantine, M. G. (2007). Color-blind racial attitudes and white racial

    identity attitudes in psychology trainees. *Professional Psychology: Research and*

    Practice, 38(3), 321-328. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.38.3.321

Guthrie, R. V. (1998). *Even the rat was white.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hardiman, R. (1982). White identity development: A process oriented model for describing the

    racial consciousness of White Americans. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section*

    B. Sciences and Engineering, 43(1-A), 104.

Harwood, S. A., Huntt, M. B., Mendenhall, R., & Lewis, J. A. (2012). Racial microaggressions

    in the residence halls: Experiences of students of color at a predominantly White

    university. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 5*(3), 159-173. doi:10.1037/

    a0028956

Hays, D. G., & Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity

    development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*, 134-

    145. Retrieved from http://www.unco.edu/ces/

Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A

Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 153-165. doi:10.1177/001

    1000084124013

Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*.

    Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1992). Why is there no study of cultural equivalence in standardized cognitive

    ability testing? *American Psychologist, 47*(9), 1083-1101. doi:10.1037/0003-066X

    .47.9.1083

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's white and people of color racial identity models. In

    J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander, *Handbook of*

    multicultural counseling (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Inventory. In

    J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity development: Theory, research, and*

    practice (pp. 67-80). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2008). Science and counseling. In P. P.

    Heppner, B. E. Wampold, & D. M. Kivlighan, *Research design in counseling* (3rd ed.,

    pp. 2-21). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.

Hill, C. E., & O'Brien, K. M. (2004). *Helping skills: Facilitating exploration, insight, and action*.

    Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hird, J. S., Tao. K. W., & Gloria, A. M. (2004). Examining supervisors' multicultural

    competence in racially similar and different supervision dyads. *The Clinical Supervisor,*

    23(2), 107-122. doi:10.1300/J001v23n02_07

hooks, b. (2008). Representations of whiteness in the black imagination. In P. S. Rothenberg

    (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 19-23).

New York, NY: Worth Publishers. (Reprinted from *Black Looks*, 1992).

Israel, T. (2012). 2011 Society of Counseling Psychology Presidential Address: Exploring privilege in counseling psychology: Shifting the lens. *The Counseling Psychologist, 40*(1), 158-180. doi: 10.1177/0011000011426297

Ivey, A. E., & Collins, N. M. (2003). Social justice: A long-term challenge for counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*(3), 290-298. doi:10.1177/001100 0003253156

Jensen, R. (2008). White privilege shapes the U.S. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 133-136). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. (Reprinted from *Baltimore Sun*, July 1998).

Johnson, A. G. (2001). *Power, privilege, and difference*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Johnson, A. G. (2008). Privilege as paradox. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 117-121). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. (Reprinted from *Privilege, power, and difference*, 2001)

Johnson-Bailey, J., Valentine, T., Cervero, R. M., & Bowles, T. A. (2009). Rooted in the soil: The social experiences of Black graduate students at a southern research university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(2), 178-203. doi: 10.1353/jhe.0.0040

Katz, J. H. (1985). The sociopolitical nature of counseling. *The Counseling Psychologist, 13*(4), 615-624.

Katz, J. H., & Ivey, A. (1977). White awareness: The frontier of racism awareness training. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, *55*(8), 485-489. doi: 10.1002/j.2164-4918.1977. tb04332.x

Keith, V. M., & Herring, C. (1991). Skin tone and stratification in the Black community. *The*

American Journal of Sociology, 97 (3), 760-778. Retrieved from https://campus.fsu.edu/ bbcswebdav/institution/academic/social_sciences/sociology/Reading%20Lists/ Stratification%20(Gender,%20Race,%20and%20Class)%20Readings/Keith-AJS-1991.pdf

LaFleur, N. K., Leach, M. M., & Rowe, W. (2002). *Manual: Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale.* Unpublished manual.

Larkin, M., Watts, S., & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 102-120. doi:10.1191 /1478088706qp062oa

Leahey, T. H. (2001). *A history of modern psychology* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lee, J. (2002). Racial and Ethnic Achievement Gap Trends: Reversing the Progress Toward Equity? *Educational Researcher, 31*(1), 3-12. Retrieved from http://weraonline.org/ uploadedFiles/Journals_and_Publications/Journals/Educational_Researcher/3101/3101_ Lee.pdf

Lee, J. (2004). Multiple facets of inequity in racial and ethnic achievement gaps. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(2), 51-73. doi**:**10.1207/s15327930pje7902_5

Leong, F. T. L., Savickas, M., & Leach, M. M. (2011). Counseling psychology. In P. Martin, F. Cheung, M. Kyios, L. Littlefield, M. Knowles, B. Overmeir, & J. M. Prieto (Eds.), *International Association of Applied Psychology Handbook of Applied Psychology* (pp. 137-161). Oxford, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

LeRoy, M. (Producer), & Fleming, V. (Director). (1939). *The wizard of Oz* [Motion Picture]. United States: MGM.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging

confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*

(2nd ed., pp. 163–188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mallet, R. K., Mello, Z. R., Wagner, D. E., Worrell, F., Burrow, R., & Andretta, J. R. (2011). Do

I belong? It depends on when you ask. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority*

Psychology, 17(4), 432-436. doi: 10.1037/a0025455

Martin, J. N., Krizek, R. L., Nakayama, T. K., & Bradford, L. (1996). Exploring whiteness: A

study of self-labels for white Americans. *Communication Quarterly, 44*(2), 125-144.

doi:10.1080/01463379609370006

Marx, S. (2003). Reflections on the state of critical whiteness studies. *Qualitative Studies in*

Education, 16(1), 3-5. doi:10.1080/0951839032000033491

Maton, K. I., Wimms, H. E., Grant, S. K., Wittig, M. A., Rogers, M. R., & Vasquez,

M. J. T. (2011). Experiences and perspectives of African American, Latina/o, Asian

American, and European American psychology graduate students: A national

study. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(1), 68-78.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F.

Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125).

New York: Academic Press.

McGregor, L. N., & Hill IV, G. W. (2012). Important considerations for ethnic minority graduate

students. In P. J. Giordano, S. F. Davis, & C. A. Licht (Eds.), *Your graduate training in*

psychology: Effective strategies for success (pp. 53 - 68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see*

correspondences through work in women's studies. Unpublished manuscript, Center for

Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.

McIntosh, P. (1995). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see

correspondences through work in women's studies. In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins

(Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (2nd ed., pp. 76-87). Belmont, CA:

Wadsworth.

McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white

teachers*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

McNeill, B. W., Horn, K. L., & Perez, J. A. (1995). The training and supervisory needs of

racial and ethnic minority students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and

Development, 23*(4), 246-258. Retrieved from http://www.multiculturalcenter.org/

jmcd/

Middleton, R. A., Stadler, H. A., Simpson, C., Guo, Y., Brown, M. J., Crow, G., . . . Lazarte,

A. A. (2005). Mental health practitioners: The relationship between White racial

identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of

Counseling & Development, 83*(4), 444-456. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/

publications/journals.aspx

Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling

psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 250-260. doi:10.1037/0022-

0167.52.2.250

Morrow, S. L. (2007). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: Conceptual foundations.

The Counseling Psychologist, 35, 209-235. doi:10.1177/0011000006286990

Morrow, S. L., Raksha, G., & Castañeda, C. L. (2001). Qualitative research methods for

multicultural counseling. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M.

Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 394-424).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murdock, N. L., Alcorn, J., Heesacker, M., & Stoltenberg, C. (1998). Model training program in

counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 658-672.

Murguia, E., & Telles, E. E. (1996). Phenotype and schooling among Mexican Americans.

Sociology of Education, 69(4), 276-289.

Mustard, D. B. (2001). Racial, ethnic, and gender disparities in sentencing: Evidence from the

U.S. federal courts. *Journal of Law and Economics, 44*(1), 285-314. Retrieved from

http://time.dufe.edu.cn/jingjiwencong/waiwenziliao1/004109.web.pdf

Nakayama, T. K., & Krizek, R. L. (1995). Whiteness: A strategic rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of

Speech, 81*(3), 291-309. doi:10.1080/00335639509384117

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997, January). *Integrated postsecondary education

data system (IPEDS): "Fall Enrollment" survey*. Washington, DC: Author.

Nelson, N. G., Dell'Oliver, C., Koch, C., & Buckler, R. (2001). Stress, coping, and success

among graduate students in clinical psychology. *Psychological Reports, 88*(3), 759-767.

doi: 10.2466/pr0.2001.88.3.759

Neville, H. A., Heppner, M. J., Louie, C. E., Thompson, C. E., Brooks, L., & Baker, C. E.

(1996). The impact of multicultural training on White racial identity attitudes and therapy

competencies. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 27*(1)*, 83–89. doi:10.10

37/0735-7028.27.1.83

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R., Duran, G., Lee, R., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial

validation of the Color-Blindness Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of

Counseling Psychology, 47(1)*,* 59–70. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

Neville, H. A., Worthington, R. L., & Spanierman, L. B. (2001). Race, power, and multicultural counseling psychology: Understanding white privilege and color-blind racial attitudes. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander, *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 257-288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Palmer, R. E. (1969). *Hermeneutics: Interpretation theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological nigrescence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17*(2), 187-226. doi:10.1177/0011000089172001

Parker, W. A., Moore, M. A., & Neimeyer, G. J. (1998). Altering white racial identity and interracial comfort through multicultural training. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 76*(3), 302-310. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/publications/journals.aspx

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Perry, R. J. (2007). *"Race" and racism: The development of modern racism in America*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pieterse, A. L., Evans, S. A., Risner-Butner, A., Collins, N. M., & Mason, L. B. (2009). Multicultural competence and social justice training in counseling psychology and counselor education: A review and analysis of a sample of multicultural course syllabi. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*(1), 93-115. doi:10.1177/0011000008319986

Pinterits, E. J., Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2009). The white privilege attitudes scale: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(3), 417-429. doi:10.1037/a0016274.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2009). The active control of prejudice: Unpacking the intentions guiding control efforts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*(3), 640-652. doi: 10.1037/a0012960

Ponterotto, J. G. (1997). Multicultural counseling training: A competency model and national survey. In D. B. Pope-Davis, & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.)*, Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision*, (pp. 111-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 126-136. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.12

Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B., Grieger, I., D'Onofrio, A., Dubuisson, A., Heenehan, M., . . . Sax, G. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*(6), 1026–1031. doi:10.11 77/0013164495055006011

Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2008). Further validation of the psychosocial costs of racism to whites scale among employed adults. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(6), 871-894. doi:10.1177/0011000007310002

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,* 741–763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

Privilege. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary*. Retrieved August 5, 2012, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/privilege

Quintana, S. M., Troyano, N., & Taylor, G. (2001). Cultural Validity and Inherent Challenges in

Quantitative Methods for Multicultural Research. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander, *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 604-630). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Quintana, S. M., & Atkinson, D. R. (2002). A multicultural perspective on principles of empirically supported interventions. *The Counseling Psychologist, 30*(2), 281-291. doi:10.1177/0011000002302005

Ratts, M., D'Andrea, M., & Arredondo, P. (2004, July). Social justice counseling: 'Fifth force' in field. *Counseling Today,* pp. 28-30.

Richardson, T. Q., & Molinaro, K. L. (1996). White counseling self-awareness: A prerequisite for developing multicultural competence. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74,* 238-242. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/publications/journals.aspx

Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and philosophy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Roediger, D. R. (Ed.). (1998). *Black on white: Black writers on what it means to be white*. New York, NY: Schocken Books Inc.

Rogers, M. R., Molina, L. E. (2006). Exemplary efforts in psychology to recruit and retain graduate students of color. *American Psychologist, 61*(2), 143-156. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.2.143

Roman, L. G. (1993). White is a color! White defensiveness, postmodernism and antiracist pedagogy. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 71-88), New York: Routledge.

Rothenberg, P. S. (2008). *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

Rowe, A. C., & Malhotra, S. (2007). (Un)hinging whiteness. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson

(Eds.), *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race* (pp. 271-298). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 189-213). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, D. A. (2009). White male identity development and the world of work: Using the key model. In G. R. Walz, J. C. Bleuer, & R. K. Yep (Eds.), *Compelling counseling interventions: VISTAS 2009* (pp. 21-29). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association. Retrieved from http://www.counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas09/ Article_3_Scott.pdf

Scott, D. A., & Robinson, T. L. (2001). White male identity development: The Key Model. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*, 415-421. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/publications/journals.aspx

Shaw, R. (2010). QM3: Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In M. Forrester (Ed.), *Doing qualitative research in psychology*, (pp. 177-201). London: Sage.

Singh, A. A., Hofsess, C. D., Boyer, E. M., Kwong, A., Lau, A. S. M., McLain, M., Haggins, K. L., (2010). Social justice and counseling psychology: Listening to the voices of doctoral trainees. *The Counseling Psychologist, 38*(6), 766-795. doi: 10.1177/ 001100001 0362559

Slater, R. B. (1995, Summer). Why socioeconomic affirmative action in college admissions works against African Americans. *The Journal of Black in Higher Education,* 8, 57. Retrieved from www.jbhe.com/

Smith, J. A., (1996). Beyond the divide between cognition and discourse: Using interpretative

phenomenological analysis in health psychology. *Psychology & Health, 11*, 261-271.

Smith, J. A. (2004). Reflecting on the development of interpretative phenomenological analysis and its contribution to qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 1*(1), 39-54.

Smith, J. A., & Eatough, V. (2007). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In E. Lyons & A. Coyle (Eds.), *Analysing qualitative data in psychology* (pp. 35-50), London: Sage.

Smith, J.A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method, and research.* London: Sage.

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2003). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J. A. Smith, *Qualitative psychology* (pp. 51-80). London: Sage.

Smith, T. B., Constantine, M. G., Dunn, T. W., Dinehart, J. M., & Montoya, J. A. (2006). Multicultural education in the mental health professions: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *53*(1), 132-145. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.132

Smith, L., Constantine, M. G., Graham, S. V., & Dize, C. B. (2008). The territory ahead for multicultural competence: The "spinning" of racism. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *39*(3), 337-345.

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*, 60-73.

Spanierman, L. B., & Heppner, M. J. (2004). Psychosocial costs of racism to whites scale (PCRW): Construction and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*(2), 249-262. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.51.2.249

Spanierman, L. B., Oh, E., Poteat, V. P., Hund, A. R., McClair, V. L., Beer, A. M., & Clarke, A.

M. (2008). White university students' responses to societal racism: A qualitative investigation. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(6)*,* 839–870. doi:10.1177/0011000006295589

Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Beer, A. M., & Armstrong, P. I. (2006). Psychosocial costs of racism to whites: Exploring patterns through cluster analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(4), 434-441. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.4.434

Spanierman, L. B., & Soble, J. R. (2010). Understanding whiteness: Previous approaches and possible directions in the study of white racial attitudes and identity. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander, *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (3rd ed., pp. 283-299). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Speight, S. L., & Vera, E. M. (2004). A social justice agenda: Ready or not? *The Counseling Psychologist, 32*(1), 109-118. doi:10.1177/0011000003260005

Speight, S. L., & Vera, E. M. (2008). Social justice and counseling psychology: A challenge to the profession. In S. D Brown, & R. W. Lent (Eds.)*, Handbook of counseling psychology* (4th ed.), (pp. 54-67). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Stiles, W. B. (1993). Quality control in qualitative research. *Clinical Psychology Review, 13*(6), 593-618.

Stoltenberg, C. D., & McNeill, B. W. (2010). *IDM Supervision: An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Sue, D. W. (2001). Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*(6), 790-821. doi: 10.1177/0011000001296002

Sue, D. W. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the "invisible" visible. *American Psychologist, 59*(8), 761-769. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.761

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling and competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*(4), 477-486. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/publications/journals.aspx

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271-286. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and Practice* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Sue, S. (1999). Science, ethnicity, and bias: Where have we gone wrong? *American Psychologist, 54*(12), 1070-1077. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.54.12.1070

Sullivan, S. (2006). *Revealing whiteness: The unconscious habits of racial privilege*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Teo, T. (2009). Psychology without Caucasians. *Canadian Psychology, 50*(2), 91-97.

Terrell, F., Taylor, J., Menzise, J., & Barrett, R. K., (2009). Cultural mistrust: A core component of African American consciousness. In H. Neville, B. Tynes, & S. O. Utsey (Eds.), *The Handbook of African American Psychology* (pp. 299 - 310). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Terry, R. W. (1981). The negative impact on values. In B. Bowser & R. H. Hunt (Eds.), *Impacts of racism on Americans* (pp. 119-152). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Three Rivers, A. (1991). *Cultural etiquette: A guide for the well-intentioned.* Indian Valley, VA: MARKET WIMMIN

Todd, N. R., & Abrams, E. M. (2011). White dialectics: A new framework for theory, research, and practice with white students. *The Counseling Psychologist,* 39(3), 353-395.

Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D. B. (2004). Critical incidents in

multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 66-83. Retrieved from http://www. multiculturalcenter.org/jmcd/

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2012). *Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity, 2011*. (Report No. 1036). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/cps /cpsrace2011.pdf

Utsey, S. O., Gernat, C. A., & Hammar, L., (2005). Examining White counselor trainees' reactions to racial issues in counseling and supervision dyads. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33*(4), 449-478. doi: 10.1177/0011000004269058

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*(3), 253-272. doi:10.1177/0011000002250634

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 82-96. doi:10.1037/ 0022-3514.92.1.82

Wang, Y.-W. (2008). Qualitative research. In P. P. Heppner, B. E. Wampold, & D. M. Kivlighan, *Research design in counseling* (3rd ed., pp. 256-295). Belmont, CA Thomson: Brooks/Cole.

Wang, Y.-W., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy: Development, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(2)*,* 221–234. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.221

Watts, R. J. (2004). Integrating social justice and psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 32*(6), 855-865. doi:10.1177/0011000004269274

Wertz, F. J. (2005). Phenomenological research methods for counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 167-177. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.167

White, M., & Epston, D. (1991). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York, NY: Norton & Company, Inc.

Wildman, S. M., & Davis, A. D. (2008). Making systems of privilege visible. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 109-115). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. (Reprinted from *Santa Clara Law Review, 35*, p. 881, 1995).

Wise, T. (2005). *White like me: Reflections on race from a privileged son*. Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press.

Wise, T. (2008). Membership has its privileges: Thoughts on acknowledging and challenging whiteness. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism* (3rd ed., pp. 133-136). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. (Reprinted from *ZNET Commentary*, June 2000).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Participant Background Questionnaire

Please respond as best you can to the following questions. As the point of this study is to better understand you and your unique experiences in your training program, having a working knowledge of your social identities and background is very important to me and the discussion we will be having. ***If you are uncomfortable with any of the following questions, you may refuse to answer without penalty****.*

1) How old are you? _____

2) How would you describe your gender identity? Please circle one of the following or indicate your response in the blank:

Transgender   Female   Male   Other Preferred Identity: _____

3) How would you describe your sexual orientation? Please circle one of the following or indicate your response in the blank:

Gay   Lesbian   Heterosexual   Bisexual   Queer   Questioning

Other Preferred Identity: _____

4) Where did you grow up? _____

_____

5) How do you identify racially/ethnically? _____

_____

6) How would you identify your socioeconomic status and/or that of your family? Please circle one of the following or indicate your response in the blank:

Lower class   *Lower-Middle Class*   *Middle Class*   *Upper-Middle Class*   *Upper Class*

Other Preferred Identity: _____

7) How would you describe your religious or spiritual identity? _____

_____

8) How would you describe your disability/ability status (e.g., orthopedic disability, temporarily able bodied, etc.)? _____

_____

9) Were you the first in your family to attend college or graduate school? Please circle one of the following and explain if responding "Yes."

No   *Yes* _____

10) What year are you in your training program? _____

11) How did you become interested in psychology? Counseling psychology?

_____

_____

_____

12) What attracted you to the training program that you are in now? If you are currently an intern or post-doctoral resident, please answer with regard to your home institution, not your internship/post-doc site.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13) Please tell me a little about your training program (e.g., diversity, philosophy, emphases, policies, training environment, size). Again, please respond with your home institution in mind.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

14) What courses have you taken at the undergraduate and graduate levels that dealt with issues of culture, power, privilege, and oppression (e.g., gender studies, cross-cultural psychology, etc.)? Please also include any other training experiences you believe to be relevant.

_____

_____

15) What have been your interests/areas of specialization in counseling psychology?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16) What are your future career plans as a counseling psychologist?

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol for White Trainees

With Sample Probes to Facilitate Discussion in Each Area

A. *Introduction/Informed Consent/Rapport Building (approx. 10-15 min.)*

   [*Review of informed consent*]

   1) What questions do you have before we begin?

   2) What would be helpful to know about me and/or the study before we begin?

   3) We'll be focusing a great deal on race as a social identity today. But I know there are other identities you have that are important to you. Please don't hesitate to incorporate those in our discussion too, as you see fit.

B. *White Privilege (approx. 30-45 min.)*

   1) In your own words, what does it mean to be a White person compared to a person of color in U.S. society?

   2) How would you explain "White privilege" to someone who was unfamiliar with the term?
      prompt: personal definition/description, defining features

   3) In what significant ways has White privilege impacted your life?
      prompt: significant events/experiences that stand out

   4) Please tell me a little about the process through which you've become aware of White privilege?
      prompt: significant events/experiences that stand out

   5) What have you done to further your understanding or awareness of White privilege and racism?
      prompt: readings, activities, personal or professional discussions

C. *White Privilege in Training (approx. 50-75 min.)*

   1) What opportunities have you had during your training to discuss White privilege? Are there times when White privilege should have been discussed but wasn't?
      prompt: who, where, when

2) In what ways are White cultural values or norms represented or assumed intentionally/unintentionally in your training program?

> *prompt: invisible norms, policies, practices (e.g., research conducted), ideas (e.g., theoretical orientation of faculty/supervisors), interpersonal environment (e.g., diversity on staff/among trainees)*

3) Have you reflected before on what it means to be White compared to a person of color in your training program? What does it mean to you?

> *prompt: benefits vs. disadvantages (material, symbolic, psychological)*

4) Personally, how has being White impacted *your* experience in training? How have you benefitted from being White?

> *prompt: benefits, sense of power, superiority, security, or entitlement; in various contexts (counseling practica, supervision, coursework/classroom, general training environment)*

5) Taking a moment to look back over your past few years in training, what events or experiences stand out to you involving White privilege?

> *prompt: counseling practica, supervision, coursework/classroom, with White peers/peers of color, when occupying roles with ascribed power as well (teacher, supervisor, counselor).*

6) At the time, how did you respond to this experience(s)? How did it affect you?

> *prompt: thoughts, feelings, behaviors*

7) Looking back, what about this experience(s) of White privilege was most meaningful to you?

8) What is it like to recount this/these experience(s) now?

> *prompt: thoughts, feelings, reactions*

9) Have there been any experiences involving White privilege that occurred outside of your immediate training program (e.g., other programs, at the department level, in the graduate school at large, elsewhere on campus) that you'd like to share?

10) How has your awareness of White privilege influenced your racial identity development?

> *prompt: understanding of self as racial being, view of people of color*

11) We've talked a lot about race today. Tell me about the other identities that you have. How do your other identities intersect/interact with race?

> *prompt: gender, SES, sexual identity, ability/disability status, religion/spirituality*

12) How do you think these intersecting identities are related to the experiences with White privilege that you shared with me today? Or to experiences of White privilege, generally speaking?

D. *Closing (approx. 10-15 min.)*

1) What are your reactions to our discussion today about White privilege in your training program? To discussing White privilege with a White interviewer?
   prompt: meaningful, surprising, difficult, frustrating

2) What question(s) should I have asked today about your experiences with White privilege that I didn't ask?

3) What are you going to take away from our discussion today?

4) What do you hope that I take away from our discussion today?

5) What else would you like to share with me before we wrap up?

APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol for Black/African-American Trainees

With Sample Probes to Facilitate Discussion in Each Area

A. *Introduction/Informed Consent/Rapport Building (approx. 10-15 min.)*

[*Review of informed consent*]

1) What questions do you have before we begin?

2) What would be helpful to know about me and the study before we begin?

3) We'll be focusing a great deal on race as a social identity today. But I know there are other identities you have that are important to you. Please don't hesitate to incorporate those in our discussion too, as you see fit.

B. *White Privilege (approx. 30-45 min.)*

1) In your own words, what do you think it means to be a person of color compared to a White person in U.S. society?

2) How would you explain "White privilege" to someone who was unfamiliar with the term?
     prompt: personal definition/description, defining features

3) What are some significant ways in which you have encountered/been impacted by others' White privilege in your life?
     prompt: significant events/experiences that stand out

4) Please tell me a little about the process through which you've become aware of White privilege?
     prompt: significant events/experiences that stand out

5) What have you done to further your understanding or awareness of White privilege and racism?
     prompt: readings, activities, personal or professional discussions

C. *White Privilege in Training (approx. 50-75 min.)*

1) What opportunities have there been in your training program to discuss White privilege? Are there times when White privilege should have been discussed but wasn't?
     prompt: who, where, when

2) In what ways are White cultural values or norms represented or assumed intentionally/unintentionally in your training program?

> *prompt: invisible norms, policies, practices (e.g., research conducted), ideas (e.g., theoretical orientation of faculty/supervisors), interpersonal environment (e.g., diversity on staff/among trainees)*

3) Have you reflected before on what it means to be White compared to a person of color in your training program? What does it mean to you?

> *prompt: benefits vs. disadvantages (material, symbolic, psychological)*

4) Personally, how do you think being Black/African-American has impacted *your* experience in training? What challenges have you encountered related to your race?

> *prompt: disadvantages, advantages, sense of security, identity*

5) How have you noticed White colleagues benefit as a result of their racial identity in your program?

> *prompt: counseling practica, supervision, coursework/classroom, general training environment*

6) Taking a moment to look back over your past few years in training, what events or experiences stand out to you involving White privilege?

> *prompt: counseling practica, supervision, coursework/classroom, with White peers/peers of color, when occupying roles with ascribed power as well (teacher, supervisor, counselor).*

7) At the time, how did this experience affect you? How did you respond?

> *prompt: thoughts, feelings, behaviors*

8) Looking back, what about this observation of/encounter with White privilege was most meaningful to you?

9) What is it like to recount this/these experience(s) now?

> *prompt: thoughts, feelings, reactions*

10) We've talked a lot about race today. Tell me about the other identities that you have. How do your other identities intersect/interact with race?

> *prompt: gender, SES, sexual identity, ability/disability status, religion/spirituality*

11) How do you think these intersecting identities are related to the encounters with/observations of White privilege that you shared with me today? Or to encounters with/observations of White privilege, generally speaking?

D. *Closing (approx. 10-15 min.)*

1) What are your reactions to our discussion today about White privilege in your training program? To discussing White privilege with a White interviewer?
   prompt: meaningful, surprising, difficult, frustrating

2) What question(s) should I have asked today about your encounters with White privilege in your training program that I didn't ask?

3) What are you going to take away from our discussion today?

4) What do you hope that I take away from our discussion today?

5) What else would you like to share with me before we wrap up?

APPENDIX D
Initial Email Notification to Program Faculty Member/Training Director

Dear Dr. (Professor's Last Name),

I am a student in the Department of Psychology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, and I am conducting dissertation research under the supervision of Kathie Chwalisz, Ph.D. Your e-mail address was obtained from your university's directory or from Dr. Chwalisz.

For the purpose of my qualitative research study, I am seeking counseling psychology trainees who identify racially/ethnically as Black/African American or White/European-American to participate in interviews about White privilege in the context of graduate training. After reviewing the forthcoming request for participants (with attached Informed Consent document), I would very much appreciate it if you forwarded the message and attachment to the students in your training program.

Please respond to this e-mail message to inform me as to whether or not you have forwarded the research request to your trainees. *If you do not respond to this recruitment notification, you will be contacted again with this request one time during the next four weeks.*

Questions about this research project can be directed to me or to Dr. Kathie Chwalisz, Department of Psychology, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-6502. Phone: (618) 453-3541. E-mail: chwalisz@siu.edu

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in this research.

Sincerely,
Steve Andrews
312.403.1787
sandrews@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

APPENDIX E
Email Recruitment Request for Participants

Dear Counseling Psychology Trainees of (Institution's Name),

I am a student in the Department of Psychology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, and I am conducting dissertation research under the supervision of Kathie Chwalisz, Ph.D.

This request was forwarded to you because you are a graduate trainee in an APA-accredited counseling psychology program.

For the purpose of my study, I am seeking graduate student participants who would be open to participating in interviews about White racial privilege as it is observed and/or experienced by counseling psychology trainees from diverse racial backgrounds in their graduate training environments.

White privilege has been defined as "an invisible package of unearned assets" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1) afforded to White individuals that people of color do not similarly enjoy in a system of racial oppression. The purpose of this study is to investigate the phenomenon of White privilege in counseling psychology training programs. Despite a fervent and growing commitment to multiculturalism and social justice (e.g., Speight & Vera, 2008), the profession of counseling psychology is not immune to the history of racism and Eurocentrism in psychology and mental health (Guthrie, 1998; Sue & Sue, 2008). In professional psychology and counseling training programs, the experiences of White trainees and trainees of color are markedly different (e.g., Burkard et al., 2006; Maton et al., 2011).

In order to participate in this study, you must:

- Be in your third year of graduate training or beyond.
- Identify as Black/African-American and female, or White/European-American and male.
- Be open to or interested in discussing issues of racial privilege and oppression.
- Have access to a computer with Skype. Skype's video calling feature will be used during interviews, but only the audio from interviews will be recorded.

Your participation in this study will initially require approximately one to two hours of your time. Follow-up interviews may be conducted at a later time as well. All your responses will be kept confidential within reasonable limits. Only people directly involved with this project will have access to the data.

For your participation in this study, you will receive a $25 gift certificate to Amazon.com.

If you would like to participate in this study, **please first review the attached informed consent form to learn more about this research project.** Then, please contact Steven Andrews by sending an e-mail to sandrews@siu.edu or calling (312) 403-1787. At that time, you will have an opportunity to ask questions and learn more about the study. If you then choose to participate, you will be asked to schedule an interview time and to complete a brief written background questionnaire prior to that interview time.

Questions about this research project can be directed to me or to Dr. Kathie Chwalisz, Department of Psychology, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-6502. Phone: (618) 453-3541. E-mail: chwalisz@siu.edu

Sincerely,

Steve Andrews

312.403.1787

sandrews@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

APPENDIX F
Informed Consent

A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF WHITE PRIVILEGE IN COUNSELING
PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAMS: MARGINALIZED AND MAJORITY
PERSPECTIVES

You are being given the opportunity to volunteer to participate in a dissertation research study conducted through Southern Illinois University-Carbondale*. By contacting Steven Andrews and expressing an interest in participating in this study after reading this consent form, you are consenting to participate. Please keep the copy of this form that you received via e-mail.

- The purpose of this study is to explore, qualitatively and in depth, White privilege in counseling psychology training programs through the observations and experiences of graduate trainees who identify as Black/African-American or White/European-American. An ancillary objective of this study is to examine the unique ways in which Black and White trainees describe and make meaning of their encounters with and experiences of White privilege generally and in the context of their training programs.

- In order to participate in this study, you must: (a) identify as White/European-American and male, (b) be a trainee in an APA-accredited doctoral counseling psychology program, (c) be an advanced-level trainee (i.e., in 3rd year of training program or beyond; maximum 2 years post-graduate), (d) have an openness to or interest in discussing issues of racial privilege/racism, and (e) have access to a computer with Skype. Skype's video calling feature will be used during interviews, but only the audio from these interviews will be recorded. If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a brief written background questionnaire and a 1-2 hr. interview via Skype. You may also be contacted for a follow-up interview in the event that confirming/disconfirming evidence is needed. Details of a follow-up interview (if necessary) will be negotiated at the time of a request for additional participation. Also, random member checks will be conducted via telephone during which the researcher will share the study's findings with some participants and invite feedback. Once the study is complete, participants will be contacted via telephone to invite their approval/disapproval of the details of their participant profiles to ensure confidentiality. Participants will also have the option to request a copy of their transcript for review.

- There are some risks associated with this study. First, you will be asked to discuss and recall experiences involving White privilege or racism. These experiences may be a source of emotional discomfort. At any time, you may request additional support to process your reactions, and the researcher will work with you to identify appropriate resources/supports. Second, as the interview questions will focus partly on experiences in your graduate training program, it is understandable that you may be concerned about being identified by superiors or colleagues if results are published or presented in a public forum. With these risks in mind, several safeguards will be implemented to protect your confidentiality: (a) use of a chosen pseudonym during interviews, in the dissertation document and if interview data are published or presented; (b) disguising of potentially

identifying details about you and your training program in the dissertation document and if/when presenting data from your interview; (c) you will have the opportunity to approve of/disapprove of/request changes to the details as they are presented in your participant profile in the dissertation document; and (d) you may request your transcript for personal review.

- There are benefits associated with your participation in this study. First, your participation may illuminate how individuals from differing racial backgrounds observe and make meaning of racial privilege and oppression. Second, the interview data you provide may assist in raising awareness of issues of privilege, oppression, and racial inequity as encountered and experienced by counseling psychology trainees. This may serve to enhance the culturally-affirming training of counseling psychologists in more socially just environments. Finally, your participation in this study may eventually improve the quality of services that more culturally-aware counseling psychologists are able to provide to those they serve.

- For your participation in this study, you will receive a $25 gift card to Amazon.com.

- Refusal/Withdrawal: Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on your graduate training. **You are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. You may also refuse to answer any background questionnaire or interview questions with which you are uncomfortable without penalty.**

CONTACT

My name is Steven Andrews. I am currently a graduate student at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale in the Department of Psychology. If you have any questions regarding this study, you may contact me at 312-403-1787, or via email at sandrews@siu.edu. You may also contact my advisor, Kathleen Chwalisz, PhD.

Kathleen Chwalisz, PhD
SIUC Dept. of Psychology
Life Sciences II, 208A, MC 6502
Carbondale, IL 62901-4409
Email: chwalisz@siu.edu
618.453.3541

CONSENT

"I have read the above information and agree to participate in the study as described above. I have received a copy of this informed consent form and understand that participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time."

_____   _____
Signature   Date

AUDIO CONSENT

Audio Recording: Your responses will be digitally audio recorded using software that records only the audio of Skype video call conversations. If follow-up interviews are conducted, a digital audio recording device may be used to record the telephone conversation. Audio files and transcripts will be password protected and kept for 3 years. Printed paper materials will be kept in a locked file cabinet for 3 years. Afterward, these recordings and transcripts will be destroyed. Only Steven Andrews will have access to your identifying information.

I agree _____ I disagree _____to have my responses recorded on audio tape.

_____
Participant's Signature   Print   Date

I agree _____ I disagree _____ that Steven Andrews may anonymously quote me.

_____
Participant's Signature   Print   Date

_____

Researcher   Date

*This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

APPENDIX G
Follow-Up Notification Email to Program Faculty Member/Training Director

Dear Dr. (Professor's Last Name),

This message and a recruitment email intended for your counseling psychology trainees (with informed consent form attached) has been sent to you a second time, because no response was received from you since the message was first sent on (date first notification was sent). I apologize for any inconvenience if you've already forwarded the recruitment message to your trainees, or if you decided not to do so.

I am a student in the Department of Psychology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, and I am conducting dissertation research under the supervision of Kathie Chwalisz, Ph.D. Your e-mail address was obtained from your university's directory or from Dr. Chwalisz.

For the purpose of my qualitative research study, I am seeking counseling psychology trainees who identify racially/ethnically as Black/African American or White to participate in interviews about White privilege in the context of graduate training. After reviewing the forthcoming request for participants (with attached Informed Consent document), I would very much appreciate it if you forwarded the message and attachment to the students in your training program.

As this message will not be sent again, please respond to inform me as to whether or not you have forwarded the research request to your trainees.

Questions about this research project can be directed to me or to Dr. Kathie Chwalisz, Department of Psychology, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-6502. Phone: (618) 453-3541. E-mail: chwalisz@siu.edu

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in this research.

Sincerely,

Steve Andrews
312.403.1787
sandrews@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

APPENDIX H
Snowball Sampling Recruitment Email to Past Participants

Dear (Past Participant's Name),

I hope this message finds you well.

As I have progressed with my dissertation research, participation has waned. I am currently in need of two more participants at this time in order to move forward. In particular, for my sample to be representative of counseling psychology training programs, this study would currently benefit from the participation of one Black/African-American female and one White/European-American male.

I am writing to elicit your help in recruiting these next two and potentially final participants. If you are aware of colleagues or acquaintances who meet the inclusion criteria listed below, especially those who are outside of your program, I would greatly appreciate it if you could forward the attached recruitment flyer and informed consent form and encourage them to participate. You need not mention your own participation in the study if you would feel uncomfortable doing so.

You are by no means required to assist with this recruitment endeavor, and your refusal to do so will not affect you in any way.

Thank you so much again for your participation in this research project. If you have any questions about the study or this request, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone (312.403.1787) or email (sandrews@siu.edu). You may also contact my dissertation chairperson, Dr. Kathleen Chwalisz:

SIUC Dept. of Psychology
Life Sciences II, 208A, MC 6502
Carbondale, IL 62901-4409
Email: chwalisz@siu.edu
618.453.3541

Sincerely,

Steve Andrews

Inclusion Criteria

In order to participate in this study, you must:

- Be in your third year of graduate training or beyond.
- Identify as a Black/African-American female or a White/European-American male.

- Be open to or interested in discussing issues of racial privilege and oppression.
- Have access to a computer with Skype. Skype's video calling feature will be used during interviews, but only the audio from interviews will be recorded.

APPENDIX I
Opportunity Sampling Email Notification to Colleagues

Hello Colleagues,

I hope you're all doing well, especially those of you I haven't seen or spoken to for some time.

I am writing to ask for your support in recruiting (hopefully) the last couple of participants I need for my dissertation.

The study is a qualitative investigation of White privilege in a counseling psychology training context, and the participants are counseling psych. grad students (or recent grads) who identify racially/ethnically as Black/African-American and White/European-American (more details below).

I have tried a few different methods of recruitment, and some have been more successful than others, but I am still in need of one participant who identifies as White/European-American and male, and one participant who identifies as Black/African-American and female.

Here are the actual inclusion criteria for the study:

- Trainee in, or recent graduate of, APA-accredited doctoral counseling psych. program
- In 3rd year of graduate training or beyond (max. 2 years post-grad.)
- Identifies as Black/African-American and female, or White/European-American and male, and does not identify as an international student
- Is open to or interested in discussing issues of racial privilege and oppression
- Has access to a computer with Skype. Skype's video calling feature will be used during interviews, but only the audio from interviews will be recorded.

My hope is that some of you might know (from your jobs, professional networks, and grad programs) some potential participants who meet these criteria. If you could please pass along this information and encourage folks to participate, I would be forever grateful.

I also emailed: 1) a recruitment email for potential participants WITH 2) an attachment of the informed consent form. Please forward those materials to anyone you might have in mind as a potential participant.

Thanks so very much, and please don't hesitate to let me know how I can return the favor.

Take care,

Steve

APPENDIX J
Summary of Findings for Member Checks

The following is a brief passage from what will become the Acknowledgments section of my dissertation. I felt this was important to share with you before proceeding with a summary of the findings.

> *First and foremost, to the participants of this study, you devoted so much time and effort to this project. I know that many of you had to flex and challenge yourselves personally and professionally to participate in a study that dealt with very difficult topics. I hope that I have done your ideas and experiences justice. Also, I hope you understand that particularly critical interpretations of your responses and language were not an attempt to disparage your contributions, but rather to deconstruct and deeply explore the phenomenon of White privilege—the ultimate goal being empowerment of those in our field to self-reflect and change appropriately.*

Member checking in qualitative research—through which the study's findings are verified with participants—is a method of triangulation, a concept similar to reliability in quantitative research.

I would like to invite you to provide feedback in the form of questions or suggestions based upon the study's findings via email (sandrews@siu.edu) or phone (312-403-1787). There is no right or wrong way to provide feedback, and all feedback will be considered. Please respond no later than June 12, 2013, at 5:00 PM CST if you wish to participate in the member checking process. Whether or not you choose to provide feedback, you will not be penalized.

Beginning on the next page is a summary of the study's findings. I will present the results by subsample, of which there were two: the Black/African-American subsample, and the White/European-American subsample. There were five participants recruited for each subsample. For organizational purposes, I have provided tables summarizing the superordinate themes and the subthemes for each subsample. A brief summary of each superordinate theme and subtheme is also presented. Finally, although not a distinct theme, I consider the strengths and protective factors that emerged from the data. Please let me know if you would like to receive more detailed information about my analytic process, influenced by Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis.

As you review the results, it is important to keep in mind that you may not see your responses or experiences represented in the content of every subtheme. At times, all participants in a given subsample seemed to illustrate a particular subtheme. Other times, a subtheme emerged from one participant's significant contribution to a superordinate theme. You are welcomed and encouraged to review the findings for both subsamples.

My dissertation chairperson, Dr. Kathleen Chwalisz, has given me permission to proceed with member checks. However, as she is still reviewing the results, some minor changes may be made to the findings presented here for the final version of the document.

Black/African-American Subsample Themes

Overview of Superordinate Themes and Subthemes from Black/African-American Subsample

---

White Disregard/Disconnection

- Affective Disregard/
  Empathic Disconnection

- Active Avoidance/Choice

- Powerful/Disempowering Silence

- Integrity

Belonging and Support

- Representation/Presence

- Support/(Cultural) Rejection

- Identification/Shared Experience

(In)Security

- False Sense of Security

- Analyzing Risk

- Containment and Consequence

Double Burden

- Burden of Diminishment

- Additive Burden of Expectation

Superordinate Theme #1: White Disregard/Disconnection

Black trainees conveyed a sense that White individuals with whom they engaged professionally and personally through training at times seemed removed from, uninterested in, or unwilling to understand their racially unique experiences. In possessing the option to overlook Black participants' realities and remaining silent in discussions of race, White individuals experienced racial privilege. This disregard seemed unwitting at times, but occasionally, like an active choice. The theme of White Disregard/Disconnection captured, perhaps more than any other theme presented here, the personal and painful impact that exhibitions of White privilege had on Black participants in their training programs. Four subthemes emerged as fundamental to White Disregard/Disconnection: Affective Disregard/Empathic Disconnection, Active Avoidance/Choice, Powerful/Disempowering Silence, and Integrity.

1.1: Affective Disregard/Empathic Disconnection. Several Black participants reported experiencing a personal, emotional or empathic disregard on the part of White individuals in their training environments. This disregard was often of Black trainees' race-related experiences.

1.2: Active Avoidance/Choice. Several Black participants considered the distance, unawareness, unfamiliarity, and even "ignorance" that White individuals in their personal lives and training programs exhibited surrounding communities of color. Although participants took

note of this unawareness, they seemed more concerned with disconnection and disregard as a volitional process on the part of the White faculty and colleagues. Patterns of unwillingness and choice emerged in Black participants' experiences of disregard.

1.3: Powerful/Disempowering Silence. Whether inadvertent or active, White individuals' disregard and disconnection created silence around racial dialogue and the experiences of trainees of color. However, participants' experiences revealed that silence was by no means innocuous, void of meaning and impact. On the contrary, there was power and privilege in the silence African-American participants observed which served a disempowering function.

1.4: Integrity. At times, White staff and faculty openly acknowledged the impact of White privilege in their personal and professional lives. As opposed to previous examples of disregard, these more positive experiences shared an important characteristic. It seemed that the personal and professional choice of acknowledging (or not acknowledging) race and one's White privilege was a matter of integrity for White individuals.

Superordinate Theme #2: Belonging and Support
Central to the observations of White privilege in training for Black trainees was a theme of Belonging and Support. Generally, this theme addressed how comfortable and connected Black trainees felt to others in the social milieu of their training environments. Emerging repeatedly in their responses were issues surrounding presence and representation, acceptance and rejection, inclusion and exclusion, identification and shared experience, and support and validation. These comforts and resources were discussed as more available to White colleagues and faculty. Three subthemes made up Belonging and Support: Representation/Presence, Support/(Cultural) Rejection, and Identification/Shared Experience.

2.1: Representation/Presence. In their training environments, Black trainees encountered limited access to certain practices and images/symbols reflecting their racial/ethnic identities and cultural heritages. Overall, they communicated a sense of invisibility and a lack of acknowledgment.

2.2: Support/(Cultural) Rejection. The theme of Belonging and Support was also depicted through participants' experiences of limited understanding or support from faculty regarding personal and professional issues, and barriers faced in bonding with other students on a more personal level. Furthermore, participants' interpersonal struggles with White trainees ranged from a superficial acceptance to outright rejection. Loneliness and isolation were implied or explicit outcomes of these relational barriers. *Cultural* has been included as parenthetical facet of this subtheme to denote relational barriers involving cultural interests and values, and the observed racial privilege afforded to White individuals in their easier access to abundant and satisfying relationships.

2.3: Identification/Shared Experience. African-American trainees also emphasized the relational benefits of cultural similarity in predominantly White training programs. In this sense, White trainees and faculty were able to identify more easily with each other through shared experience of racial identity. Moreover, participants described the symbolic value of Whiteness,

which created a sort of cultural transference or stimulus value that aided in the formation of supportive relationships.

Superordinate Theme #3: (In)Security

Matters of safety and security in training programs emerged as recurrent themes for African-American trainees. In order to avoid professional and personal jeopardy, alienation, and racial stereotyping, Black trainees engaged in a process of ongoing risk analysis in their programs to ensure their safety. This process entailed meticulous self-awareness and a healthy mistrust of White students, faculty, and spaces. To ensure their professional and personal security, participants' silenced and edited themselves in various contexts. At times, unguaranteed safety in certain contexts was limiting. Threats to Black trainees' sense of security resulted in shattered expectations for how counseling psychology training programs might have offered an oasis from racism and unchecked White privilege. (In)Security contained three subthemes: False Sense of Security, Analyzing Risk, and Containment and Consequence.

3.1: False Sense of Security. As a result of the privileged actions of White individuals in their programs, Black trainees' experienced unmet expectations of multicultural awareness and affirmation. These experiences seemed to be particularly insulting to participants' hopes and undermining of their sense of safety. Realizations of insecurity were often accompanied by feelings of disappointment, shock, embarrassment, frustration, and anger.

3.2: Analyzing Risk. Participants weighed the costs and benefits of responding to enactments of White privilege or addressing racial issues, interacting genuinely with faculty and trainees, and entering particular settings. Part of Analyzing Risk was a healthy mistrust of White individuals.

3.3: Containment and Consequence. Closely tied to the subtheme of Analyzing Risk was Containment and Consequence. In adapting to real and perceived threats to personal and professional security, Black trainees silenced and edited themselves. Moreover, the potential risk of certain situations precluded some options available to White individuals. The term *containment* was chosen to represent the ways in which participants felt silenced and restricted in striving to maintain their security and safety as racial/ethnic minority trainees.

Superordinate Theme #4: Double Burden

Considered in the last superordinate theme, Double Burden, is the twofold challenge that African-American trainees experienced. First, they contended with perceptions, expectations, and assumptions that left them feeling marginalized or excluded. Second, participants were also met with expectations of multicultural competence and participation in diversity-related roles because of their racial identity. These expectations were not placed on White colleagues. Not surprisingly, greater effort was required by Black participants to maintain, succeed, and defy lower expectations as professionals in the field. Participants also struggled in pursuits of educational and clinical opportunities involving people of color. The twofold struggle of Black trainees is acknowledged in the subthemes of Burden of Diminishment and the Additive Burden of Expectation.

4.1: Burden of Diminishment. Black trainees contended with a variety of expectations, perceptions, and assumptions that, at times, left them feeling disregarded, unsupported, and unsafe. This struggle against harmful expectations and assumptions was an integral part of the Double Burden; participants felt themselves and their capabilities diminished.

4.2: Additive Burden of Expectation. Paradoxically, whereas certain perceptions, expectations, and assumptions of White individuals left participants feeling unworthy or excluded, higher expectations were placed on them for multicultural competence and representation of diversity. At times, this resulted in their being asked to undertake additional responsibilities.

White/European-American Subsample Themes

Overview of Superordinate Themes and Subthemes from White/European-American Subsample

---

Awareness

Recent Awareness

- Unawareness: Routine/Optional

- People of Color as Illuminators

- Empowerment

Impact and Involvement

- Magnitude

- Accountability

Supports and Barriers

- Representation/Support

- Values and Context

Pressure and Safety

- Safe Haven

- Transgression/Exposure

- Expression

- Protection

Superordinate Theme #1: Awareness

Issues surrounding White participants' awareness of racial identity and White privilege were key to understanding their experiences. Four subthemes make up the theme of Awareness: Recent Awareness, Unawareness: Routine/Optional, People of Color as Illuminators, and Empowerment. In general, the theme of Awareness addressed the *when* and the *how* of participants' awareness (and unawareness) of White privilege and race.

1.1: Recent Awareness. Despite varying levels of complexity in their understanding of race and White privilege, White participants' realization of racial privilege was no more than a few years old.

1.2: Unawareness: Routine/Optional. White participants were also quite forthright in acknowledging their routine unawareness of their racial identities and privilege in a training context, despite their familiarity with the concept of White privilege. Apart from unawareness being routine, participants also discussed White privilege awareness as optional, invoking notions of choice and preference.

1.3: People of Color as Illuminators. For most of the White participants, their awareness of racial difference and privilege was influenced by the experiences of people of color in their lives and training programs. Through personal relationships with people of color and observations of racism, their White racial identities and privilege were thrust to the foreground of awareness.

1.4: Empowerment. Lastly, White participants regarded experiences of racial privilege awareness as empowering. This sentiment was made obvious through the positive tone with which such experiences were depicted, or through a sense of having made a difference.

Superordinate Theme #2: Impact and Involvement
The superordinate theme of Impact and Involvement addressed the degree of significance, connection, and responsibility felt by White trainees in response to (a) experiences of White privilege, and (b) the way White privilege was discussed in the interview. With this theme in particular, White privilege emerged both through the content of *what* was shared and the process of *how* it was shared. For example, some White participants observed the differential impact of programmatic occurrences on themselves compared to trainees of color. Such an observation was often content-based, or an obvious point being made through participants' examples.

Alternatively, process-based examples of Impact and Involvement required my use of a more active interpretation to identify. For example, through the telling of their stories, some participants seemed to regard White privilege as a critical matter with significant implications for themselves and trainees of color. Other participants conveyed experiences of White privilege rather mundanely or vaguely. Some participants perceived a personal role in occurrences of White privilege. Others looked beyond themselves for sources of accountability. Two subthemes comprised Impact and Involvement: Magnitude and Accountability.

2.1: Magnitude. The subtheme of Magnitude addresses the force or quality of impact of White privilege on participants and others in their training programs. For instance, one participant experienced a lack of racial/ethnic diversity among clients in her clinical work as a mostly professional issue. Whereas for her colleagues of color, the implications of serving majority White clients seemed far more personal.

The subtheme of Magnitude was also illustrated through different ways that White participants discussed White privilege. One recurring phenomenon was participants' listing or layering of identities. Rather than conveying the compounding effects of intersectionality (e.g., the power and privilege of identifying both as White and male in a given situation), the prominence of White privilege was obscured when participants listed multiple identities to exemplify White privilege.

2.2: Accountability. In participants' examples of White privilege in their training programs, an agent of accountability often emerged. That is, a person or process responsible for exhibiting or perpetuating White privilege could be located. Agents of accountability included, but were not limited to faculty members, supervisors, colleagues, or "systems." And although most participants viewed themselves as responsible agents or recipients of White privilege some of the time, it became clear that there was still a luxury of personal distance from accountability.

Superordinate Theme #3: Supports and Barriers

White trainees identified a number of race-related supports and barriers in their training programs. White privilege was apparent in the supports enjoyed by White participants that trainees of color did not receive, and in the barriers confronting trainees of color but not White participants. Many of the supportive factors afforded to White participants shaped their sense of representation and belongingness in their training programs. The barriers participants observed for trainees of color often resulted from unacknowledged Eurocentric values in program norms or expectations, as well as faculty's disregard for the unique cultural contexts of trainees of color. Two subthemes, Representation/Belonging, and Values and Context, exemplified the superordinate theme of Supports and Barriers.

3.1: Representation/Belonging. Participants described how their White racial identity brought them a rather seamless connection to White faculty and supervisors, course curriculum, and their clinical work. Assumed credibility as a trainee/counselor was also discussed as a privilege of belonging.

3.2: Values and Context. White participants witnessed the enactment of White cultural values in their training programs (e.g., by faculty), which was most visible in programmatic expectations and norms. The privileging of Eurocentric values led to biased expectations (e.g., individual responsibility over collaboration) that disregarded the cultural contexts of trainees of color, thus creating barriers for them.

Superordinate Theme #4: Pressure and Safety

A theme of Pressure and Safety was integral to White participants' understanding of being White and possessing privilege in their training programs. Experiences of Pressure and Safety dealt not only with participants' immunity to the risks and pressures endured by trainees of color, but also those risks and pressures confronting White trainees. Pressure and Safety was comprised of four subthemes: Safe Haven, Expression, Protection, and Transgression/Exposure.

4.1: Safe Haven. Several White participants perceived their training programs as uniquely multiculturally-affirming or savvy, unsullied by racism and exhibitions of White privilege. The label "Safe Haven" captured these perceptions, which seemed to suggest that participants viewed their programs as oases for people of color in an unjust and racist society. These perceptions appeared to convey a unique form of White privilege. Free from racial barriers, White trainees may have been more able to experience their programs positively and securely.

4.2: Transgression/Exposure. Participants also perceived certain race-related pressures and risks that, intriguingly, they experienced uniquely as White trainees. Generally, participants

feared offending people of color in dialogues about race, or being exposed as racist or multiculturally-incompetent. Although the perceived risk was real, racial privilege emerges when considering that Black participants perceived risks in multiple aspects of their training programs, not just in multicultural dialogue and classroom discussions.

4.3: Expression. In their training programs, White participants responded to anxiety about being seen as racist or multiculturally incompetent with occasional self-silencing and impression management. At times, they felt unable to authentically express themselves as a result of perceived risks. Also, several White participants commented on the safety they felt interviewing with a White person, which afforded a privilege of openness and authenticity.

4.4: Protection. Participants conveyed a sense that as White trainees, they were offered immunity from instances of cultural insensitivity and racism in their training programs and the surrounding community.

Strengths and Protective Factors of All Participants

It would be remiss of me not to actively acknowledge that which is empowering and hopeful in the oppressive and painful. Whether brightly glowing or slightly flickering, a plethora of strengths and protective factors shone through participants' narratives. For Black trainees, some protective factors were passed on in childhood to educate and prepare them for the struggle ahead. Some strengths were personally gleaned. In either case, the result was resilience in coping with systems of White privilege and racism. These strengths and protective factors included, but were not limited to: bicultural flexibility; books, movies, and words of wisdom provided by caregivers to affirm participants' racial/ethnic identities; family and friend support networks; relationships with White allies; community outreach; and spiritual/existential meaning-making systems to cope with race-related struggles.

For White trainees, strengths and supports influenced their enduring commitment to understanding and ending racism. They encouraged their recognition and confrontation of White privilege. Their strengths and protective factors included, but were not limited to: personal and professional activism, curiosity about the experiences of people of color, personal relationships with people of color, and most notably, a willingness to take part in the subversive act of exploring White privilege for the purpose of this study.

Strengths were also evident among the people who shaped participants' training environments. For some White participants, their training programs offered them the first opportunity they had had to formally learn about White privilege, interact with racially/ethnically diverse people, and engage in meaningful cross-cultural dialogue. Both White and Black participants shared about the positive and enriching efforts of some faculty and supervisors dedicated to undermining a system of racial privilege and oppression.

APPENDIX K
Strengths and Protective Factors

Whether brightly glowing or slightly shimmering, a plethora of strengths and protective

factors shone through participants' narratives. It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge that

which is empowering and hopeful in the oppressive and painful. Here, I briefly summarize these

strengths and protective factors.

For Black participants, some protective factors were passed on in childhood to educate

and prepare them for the racial struggle ahead. Some strengths were personally developed over

time. In either case, the result was resilience in coping with systems of White privilege and

racism. These strengths and protective factors included, but were not limited to: bicultural

flexibility; books, movies, and words of wisdom provided by caregivers to affirm participants'

racial/ethnic identities; family and friend support networks; White allies (trainees, supervisors,

faculty members); community activism; and spiritual/existential meaning-making systems to

cope with incredible race-related struggles.

For White participants, strengths and supports influenced their enduring commitment to

understanding and ending racism. They encouraged their recognition and confrontation of White

privilege. Their strengths and protective factors included, but were not limited to: personal and

professional activism, curiosity about the experiences of people of color, personal relationships

with people of color, and most notably, a willingness to take part in the subversive act of

exploring White privilege for the purpose of this study.

Although this study critically examined training environments, strengths were also

evident among the faculty and staff who shaped those environments and acted as allies or

multicultural educators. For many White participants, their training programs offered them the

first opportunity they had had to formally learn about White privilege, interact with racially/ethnically diverse people, and engage in meaningful cross-cultural dialogue. Both White and Black participants shared about the positive and enriching efforts of some faculty and supervisors dedicated to undermining a system of racial privilege and oppression.

As revealed through the findings of this study, the constituencies of counseling psychology training programs acted in ways to engender and perpetuate White privilege. At the same time, it is clear that they also possess a number of strengths that can be capitalized on as they resist White privilege in training.

APPENDIX L
A Developing Summary of White Privileges in Counseling Psychology Training Programs
(adapted from McIntosh, 1988)

1. I can choose to disregard the unique experiences of trainees of color without noticeable and negative consequences to my own well-being.

2. I can choose to remain disconnected from the pain that I cause trainees of color when I disregard their unique experiences and realities—again, without noticeable and negative consequences to my own well-being.

3. I can choose to use my (developing) skills as an empathic counselor/psychologist to connect to clients, while not similarly honoring the experiences of my colleagues of color.

4. I have the power to silence trainees of color around issues of race, racism, and White privilege, simply by avoiding the topic or disagreeing with their experiences.

5. As a member of the dominant racial group, I can choose not to acknowledge White privilege or be curious about the experiences of trainees of color, and not see this as a matter of professional integrity.

6. I will likely perceive and experience my training program as safe and affirming.

7. Even though I may feel threatened or anxious in class discussions of race, racism, and White privilege because of my racial identity, I'll feel calm and secure once the discussion ends.

8. Even when I edit what I say to avoid being labeled "racist" or "multiculturally-incompetent," I don't have to censor myself once the discussion ends.

9. When people in my program act in culturally-insensitive ways, I will not feel the brunt of the impact.

10. I can openly express my thoughts and feelings in classes and program meetings—even if I am passionate or angry—without fear of being stereotyped or judged negatively because of my race.

11. When I walk down the halls of my program's building, I can be assured that I will see people who look like me in photographs on the walls.

12. My personal/cultural interests and activities are likely shared by others in my training program who readily engage in them with me.

13. I will likely not be ignored or rejected by my colleagues or peers because of my personal/cultural interests.

14. When I spend time with colleagues and faculty outside of my training program, it is likely in

a place where I'll feel safe.

15. I can easily find a mentor or make a friend in my program who looks like me.

16. I won't feel isolated or lonely in my training program because of my racial identity.

17. I am more likely to remind White colleagues and faculty of the people they most care about.

18. I likely won't be asked to take on additional professional responsibilities because of my race.

19. I can rest assured that I was admitted to my program because of my abilities.

20. Most clients will not question my skills as a counselor because of my race.

21. My clients, supervisors, faculty, and advisors will most likely look like me.

22. As a member of the dominant group, my cultural context is not likely to be disregarded or obscured by programmatic expectations or policies.

23. When incidents of racism occur in my program, on my campus, or in the surrounding community, I may feel disturbed, sad, or even outraged—but not unsafe.

24. I don't have to be aware of my racial identity (and related benefits) until trainees of color tell me about their experiences. Even then, I still don't have to be aware.

25. I can form a conceptual understanding of White privilege and racism, yet not be emotionally affected like my colleagues of color.

26. As I am learning about and questioning White privilege in my program, my colleagues of color may have long been aware of it as a reality with negative effects on their lives.

27. I can acknowledge the existence of White privilege in society and within my training program without recognizing my own role in perpetuating it.
28. In discussions about racism and White privilege, I can choose to focus on my oppressed identities to protect myself or to connect to the experiences of trainees of color, rather than acknowledge the racial privilege I possess.

29. When I experience challenging moments as a counselor, it is unlikely that they will be related to my race.

30. If my clinical supervisor also identifies as White, some of my greatest challenges as a counselor are not likely to be ignored or dismissed.

31. I can conduct psychological research that will most benefit my racial/ethnic community—and not communities of color—without even realizing it.

32. When I am asked to collaborate on professional activities by faculty, staff, or colleagues, I don't have to wonder if it was because of my race.

33. After familiarizing myself with the items on this list, my privilege of unawareness in idly receiving these benefits—without confronting their implications—becomes a privilege of choice.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Steven M. Andrews

smandrooz@gmail.com

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Bachelor of Science, Psychology, May 2007

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Master of Arts, Psychology, June 2009

Special Honors and Awards:
    Edmund J. James Scholar (2007)
    Phi Beta Kappa (2007)
    University of Illinois Summa Cum Laude Honors (2007)
    Southern Illinois University Master's Fellowship (2008-2009)

Dissertation Title:
    In Our Own Backyard: A Qualitative Investigation of Marginalized and Dominant
    Perspectives on White Privilege in Counseling Psychology Training Programs

Major Professor: Kathleen Chwalisz, Ph.D.

Publications:

    Rottinghaus, P. J., & **Andrews, S. M.** (in press). Exploring altruistic motives in career
    counseling. In M. Pope, L. Y. Flores, & P. J. Rottinghaus (Eds.), *The role of values in*
    careers. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.