

(De)colonizing Culture in Community Psychology: Reflections from Critical Social Science

Mariolga Reyes Cruz · Christopher C. Sonn

Published online: 30 October 2010

© Society for Community Research and Action 2010

Abstract Since its inception, community psychology has been interested in cultural matters relating to issues of diversity and marginalization. However, the field has tended to understand culture as static social markers or as the background for understanding group differences. In this article the authors contend that culture is inseparable from who we are and what we do as social beings. Moreover, culture is continually shaped by socio-historical and political processes intertwined within the globalized history of power. The authors propose a *decolonizing standpoint* grounded in critical social science to disrupt understandings of cultural matters that marginalize others. This standpoint would move the field toward deeper critical thinking, reflexivity and emancipatory action. The authors present their work to illustrate how they integrate a decolonizing standpoint to community psychology research and teaching. They conclude that community psychology must aim towards intercultural work engaging its political nature from a place of ontological/epistemological/methodological parity.

Keywords Culture · Colonialism · Critical theory · Decolonizing standpoint · Autoethnography · Critical ethnography

Community psychology has an expressed commitment to engage culture as a key dimension of community research and action. Several developments reflect the increasing attention that the notion of culture is gaining in community psychology (O'Donnell 2006). However, calls for fully integrating culture in community psychology are still founded on an implicit premise that should be subjected to critical reflection; that is, “culture” is something out there, external to the field and its practitioners, which can be integrated into community psychology work. On the contrary, we argue that community psychology is a cultural practice and a product. The field is an institutionalized endeavor molded by Western ways of being, knowing and doing (Gridley and Breen 2007). Most important, as a social science, community psychology is shaped by Western academic traditions, discourses and structures that reproduce historical power hierarchies intertwined with the legacy of colonialism (see Martín-Baró 1998; Parker 2007). As the field engages cultural matters more explicitly, particularly in diverse settings, what is required is a critical approach that accounts for the relationship between culture and power.

In this article we bring to bear theorizing from critical social science to propose a *decolonizing standpoint* for understanding culture that we think is vital for deepening emancipatory practices in community psychology. Broadly speaking, critical social science is a normative, practical, ethical and political endeavor. It aims to develop theory and practice that reveals distortions in individual and public discourse and action that serve to maintain systems

This article is the result of an ongoing collaboration between the authors. Correspondence concerning the paper should be addressed to both authors.

M. Reyes Cruz (✉)
Departamento de Psicología, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales,
Universidad de Puerto Rico, Recinto de Río Piedras, Puerto Rico
e-mail: mreyescruz@gmail.com

C. C. Sonn (✉)
School of Social Sciences and Psychology, Victoria University,
Footscray, VIC, Australia
e-mail: christopher.sonn@vu.edu.au

of oppression. Critical social science engages in “inquiry that fosters enlightened self-knowledge and effective social–political action...it rejects the idea of disinterested social science and emphasizes attending to the cultural and historical conditions on which the theorist’s own intellectual activity depends” (Schwandt 2001, p. 46). Thus, critical social science is also a self-reflexive endeavor (Schwandt 2001; see also Kincheloe and McLaren 2005, 2000).

As critical community psychologists, we are particularly interested in a decolonizing standpoint to culture that can disrupt essentialist understandings of cultural matters that have served historically to marginalize others. This standpoint brings into clearer view ways in which power/privilege/oppression are reproduced and contested through racialized and ethnicized practices and discourses; that is, how social inequality is maintained and challenged through culture. Working from this perspective should lead us to question: What about culture are we trying to understand, to what end, from whose perspective? How does our current understanding of cultural matters in a particular setting help us foreground dynamics of social oppression and liberation?

To lay the groundwork for a critical approach to culture we first consider how community psychology and other fields have explored cultural matters. We then locate the decolonizing standpoint within critical social science, particularly writings on the coloniality of power and knowledge from Latin American and Indigenous perspectives. Next, we present some of our work in diverse settings to show how we integrate critical social theories and methodologies to examine ways in which culture is implicated in the (re)production and contestation of inequality. First, we present critical ethnographic work in a racially and ethnically diverse school district where a colonial mentality permeates discourses about cultural difference and inclusion, masking ethnic and class exclusion. Then we turn to autoethnographic writing to show how a commitment to decolonizing practices is integrated with teaching psychology to mostly white students in ways that challenge the enduring legacy of colonialism at the level of social identities. We conclude by reflecting on the challenges and possibilities a decolonizing standpoint brings to community psychology. We hope such an endeavor would contribute to a community psychology that is critical, transdisciplinary and intercultural from where we can engage in emancipatory theory, research and action.

Culture in Community Psychology

Community psychologists have been increasingly aware of the role culture plays in community phenomena. The field

has adopted cultural relativity and social diversity as values to uphold (Trickett et al. 1994; Rappaport 1977; Sarason 1974). Several publications in the American Journal of Community Psychology (AJCP) and related journals (e.g., Journal of Community Psychology) have been dedicated to different topics regarding culture. Some authors have argued for incorporating notions of culture into community psychology understandings of diverse settings (e.g., Trickett 1996). Others have explored ways in which research and practice in communities can be culturally anchored (Hughes et al. 1993). Most recently, Harrell and Bond (2007) proposed an articulation of a diversity principle that fosters awareness of culture, power and “self-in-community.” Additionally, some theorists have pushed for interdisciplinary work that deepens community psychology understandings of the complexity of community life including its sociocultural dimensions (Maton et al. 2006; Christens and Perkins 2008; Reich and Reich 2006). Notwithstanding, the increasing number of articles addressing culture directly, these are exceptions rather than the rule. Methodologically speaking, while the field has embraced alternative research methods such as qualitative interviews and community-based participatory research, studies for the most part continue to be anchored in positivist epistemologies. One is hard pressed to find in AJCP articles that address or use interpretive research methods. For instance, we found only 13 articles that engage ethnographic research and none that use discourse analysis. Thus, as reflected in the published literature, the field still struggles theoretically and methodologically to see culture in its full complexity.

Culture is not an easy concept to define, and there is no (inter)disciplinary agreement on a single meaning. Although historically the study of culture has been the domain of anthropology, such a disciplinary border has been blurred; the study of culture is now of interest to a variety of disciplines and fields including cross-cultural and cultural psychology, cultural studies, post-colonial studies and community psychology (Ribeiro 2005; Jahoda and Krewer 1997; Shweder 1990; for recent examples of studies in community psychology see Guerra and Knox 2008; Lavee and Ben-Ari 2008; Gonzales et al. 2008; Roosa et al. 2009). Broadly speaking, culture is often used to refer to shared values, beliefs, practices, products and norms of social groups (e.g., nation-states, ethnic groups). Other forms and levels of social organization and stratification have also been recognized as “having” a culture. For instance, families, people with disabilities, institutions, corporations, are said to have their own cultures. Griffin (2000; see also Greenfield 1997) notes that in psychology culture is often seen as the backdrop for engaging with and understanding social practices. Yet in other instances, culture is simply used as a euphemism, a proxy signaling

dimensions of social inequality and oppression by way of race, ethnicity and/or class.

Rappaport (2000) asserts that “the language chosen inevitably leads to the nature of interventions developed in exactly the same way that in science and problem solving the way the question is framed predetermines the answers obtained” (p. 109). It is evident that some community psychological understandings of culture seem to draw mainly upon conceptualizations developed by mainstream anthropology and cross-cultural psychology (e.g., Dinh et al. 2008; Lavee and Ben-Ari 2008; O’Donnell 2006). These inter- and intra-disciplinary conversations are important for expanding the ways in which we understand and engage with human diversity. However, as some have observed (e.g., Harrell and Bond 2007; Trickett et al. 1994; Watts 1992), there remains a tendency in the field to present culture as “some-thing,” as static, an essence, that exists outside of the observer (i.e., researchers and practitioners).

A rudimentary review of publications in 2008 to 2009 issues of the AJCP reveals few studies (e.g., Berg et al. 2009) that have engaged interpretive approaches to understanding people in context. Yet, most studies still rely on positivist models of knowledge production that position researchers as neutral expert knowers outside the phenomena of study (Dinh et al. 2008; Lavee and Ben-Ari 2008; Guerra and Knox 2008; for constructivist perspectives see Ibáñez 2001; Gergen 1996). From our perspective, advances in postcolonial and cultural studies and critical psychology can reposition community psychology’s engagement with culture. Such understandings highlight the ways in which social categories emerge, are negotiated and sustained within relations of domination. In this sense, critiques leveled against mainstream approaches to culture in other disciplines also apply to community psychology. If we are to extend theorizing in community psychology to develop deeper understandings of cultural matters, the field must attend to contemporary debates that problematize how culture has been approached by different disciplines.

Bhatia and Ram (2001; also Espiritu 2003; Griffin 2000), for instance, have questioned the assumptions that underlie cross-cultural work using the notion of acculturation to illustrate the issues. The acculturation work developed by Berry (1997), among others, presents an ecological model for understanding the cultural and psychological changes that follow ongoing firsthand contact between different groups. Bhatia and Ram argued that the model assumes a kind of psychic unity of “mankind”, that is, acculturation will take place in the same way for everyone. Little attention is given to how the distinct histories of colonialism and the ongoing dynamics of oppression and liberation in different (post)colonial

contexts shape adaptation to a new society. In some of our own work we have argued that memories of home and experiences of racialized exclusion turn acculturation and identity making into an ongoing process of negotiating power relations within broader social, cultural and economic structures (Sonn 2002; Reyes Cruz 2002, 2006). To take Bhatia and Ram’s argument further, the standard against which successful acculturation is assessed is often determined by the dominant group, silencing diversity and dissent within the host society.

Recently, Okazaki et al. (2008) extended these discussions to argue for a critical consideration of colonialism in the psychology of culture that goes beyond the East–West dichotomy to also consider the histories of colonial relations between and within countries. They draw on the work in the area of colonialism to show the role of social, political and historical forces in shaping lives. The authors’ point to similar critiques as those highlighted above to suggest that cross-cultural and cultural psychological models, and in our view community psychological approaches, need to be expanded to consider how major geopolitical and historical factors shape everyday lives.

For the purposes of this article, culture is understood as a product and process, an ongoing social construction that speaks of the ways in which we learn to live and make sense of life always in relationship to others within specific social/economic/political/historical contexts (see Geertz 1973; Jessen 2007).

...culture is a historically situated, collective product constituted by the values, beliefs, perceptions, symbols, and other humanly created artifacts which are transmitted across generations through language and other mediums...culture is simultaneously a product of human action as well as a determinant of future action, a composite of meanings and associated traditions, which define, inform, and constitute the range of our understandings and investments (Misra and Gergen 1993, p. 226).

In sum, culture refers to a historical product, a process and a means for action.

To the extent that community psychologists are interested in addressing issues of power and social justice, understandings of culture need to be placed within critical frameworks that examine the dynamics of the social reproduction and contestation of inequality. This is not to say that matters of diversity, translation, sensitivity and knowledge of different groups are irrelevant to community psychology. However, taking concrete steps to becoming increasingly aware of cultural issues in research and practice without a critical standpoint runs the risk of perpetuating the ills of colonial relations (see Gone 2007).

Coloniality of Power, Culture, and Knowledge: Crafting a Decolonizing Standpoint

Part of the difficulty the field experiences in seeing culture in its complexity stems from the continuing legacy of coloniality in the social sciences (psychology included). Western thought has been characterized by a longstanding tendency to partition reality and build knowledge on such multiple separations (e.g., “human beings/nature,” “mind/body,” “self/other,” “object/subject”) (Lander 2005; Ladson-Billings 2003; Smith 1999). This worldview would have been just one among many if it had not been central to the globalization of the European colonial project launched with the conquest of Abya Yala—name some indigenous movements give to what is otherwise known as the American continent. The convergence of Western thought and ways of knowing with Eurocentric colonialism resulted in the imposition of a hierarchical articulation of difference (e.g., “civilized/uncivilized,” “modern/primitive,” “expert knowledge/general knowledge”, “development/underdevelopment,” “saved/condemn,” “European/Other,” “White/Other”) to the benefit of the ruling classes.¹ Western/Modern social science was built upon this conceptualization of the world and has served to justify and naturalize this world order as “the way things are” (Cole 2003; Lander 2005; Smith 1999), rather than a result of the history of power (Quijano 2000). The convergence among these forces and its continuing legacy is known as coloniality of power, culture and knowledge (see the edited volume by Lander 2005; also Quijano 2000, 2007). Thus, to challenge coloniality we must recognize that “all social and historical phenomena are part of or express a social relation or a web of social relationships. As such, social–historical phenomena cannot be understood outside the relational field it belongs to, its socio-historical totality” (Quijano 2000, p. 352).

There is a body of work that shows how coloniality shapes understandings of culture, and subsequently identity, to position the West as the standard in relation to other cultural groups and justify their oppression and marginalization (e.g., Bulhan 1985; Hermans and Kempen 1998; Holdstock 2000; Said 1979; Sinha and Kao 1997; Smith 1999). In Australia, some have argued that the Cartesian model of knowing that is dominant in social science research underpins much of the knowledge constructed about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people representing them as an inferior other and universalizing “whiteness” (Dodson 2003; Dudgeon and Fielder 2006; Martin 2003; Moreton-Robinson 2004). Similarly, Smith

(1999) argued that Western knowledge production processes have privileged Western ways of doing and being while it has dehumanized Maori and Maori knowledge, practices and language. In Puerto Rico, school children learn about the history of slavery from the perspective of the white slave owners and white abolitionists while the dominant public discourse emphasizes an interracial national identity that silences everyday experiences of racism (Godreau et al. 2008).

These debates signal that ethnicity and race are not static, neutral or objective markers but rather subjective, flexible and politicized processes. Social group memberships based on ethnicity, race, gender, afford people differential access to power and privilege in different contexts. Power is (re)produced in and through cultural means, and this is manifested in everyday interactions. Seeing culture through the lens of coloniality unveils the masks of neutrality and objectivity that are part of this legacy (Quijano 2000). Decolonizing culture requires actively deconstructing notions of the other based on the enduring legacy of colonial relations, beginning to understand the meaning of difference, its micro-politics as well as its sociological/historical/economic/political context, examining “the dialectic between the local and the global” (Rizvi 2007, p. 262).

Hall (1996) suggests that “questions of culture and ideology” are given “a formative, not merely expressive, place in the constitution of social and political life” (p. 443). From this perspective, culture is seen as a “system of continually contested meanings in which ‘societies’ and ‘individuals’ are (re)produced and transformed, but within a nexus of social relations around domination and subordination” (Griffin 2000, p. 20). Such a complex conceptualization of culture can lead us to deeper understandings of the interconnectedness between culture and power.

Approaching Culture from a Decolonizing Standpoint: Notes from the Field

This article is part of a broader effort concerned with developing a critical and transformative community psychology committed to decolonization, collective empowerment and liberation (e.g., Huygens 2006; Nelson and Prilleltensky 2005; Moane 2003; Montero 2007, 2009; Watts and Serrano-Garcia 2003; Glover et al. 2005). Although still far from mainstream, some social and community psychology work examines the intersections between culture, coloniality and empowerment (e.g., Borg 2006; Gone 2007; Moane 2003; Reyes Cruz 2008a, b; Riggs and Augoustinos 2005; Serrano-Garcia 1994; Sonn 2004a, b). We wish to contribute to this broader project by articulating a decolonizing standpoint from where to

¹ This particular form of Eurocentric power is intricately linked with the emergence of capitalism as the dominant economic and values system. Its establishment came about at the cost of vanquishing other ways of being and knowing that existed in what came to be known as Europe (see Lander 2005).

understand culture within an awareness of a broader set of social/political/historical/economic arrangements.

A decolonizing standpoint is a transdisciplinary and political stance grounded in critical social theories and methodologies to understand and expose the continuing legacy of coloniality. Our decolonizing standpoint is informed by writings in critical feminism (Hooks 1990; Anzaldúa 1999); critical race theory (Ladson-Billings 2003; Ladson-Billings and Donnor 2005); whiteness studies (Fine et al. 1997; Green et al. 2007); liberation and critical psychology (Freire 1972; Martín-Baró 1994; Montero 1997/2001, 2007; Parker 2005), coloniality of power and knowledge (Quijano 2000, 2007) and the study of social reproduction of inequality (Bourdieu and Passeron 2000; Lareau and Horvat 1999; Lareau and Weininger 2003). These different theoretical lenses are consonant with community psychology's general commitment to developing ways of being, knowing and doing that contribute to decolonization and liberation. Shared within these theoretical lenses is a focus on the workings of power, where power is seen as produced in and through symbolic means within the broader context of social relations. Therefore, a key element of a decolonizing standpoint is to de-ideologize (Martín-Baró 1994), to deconstruct ideologies and discourses that obscure the workings of power. As Smith (1999) has indicated, this requires researchers and practitioners to examine the motivations and the basic assumptions that inform knowledge production within contexts of intergroup relations. The deconstruction opens the way to transformation as we recognize different ways of knowing and value the lived experiences and voices of the marginalized.

Our aim here is to show how we attempt to engage different settings from a decolonizing standpoint. First, we present material from Mariolga's critical ethnographic work with Mexican immigrant parents that revealed colonial ways of approaching the ethnic-other in an ethnically and racially diverse school district in the Midwest of the United States. Next we offer autoethnographic writing by Christopher that shows the ways in which Indigenous theorizing and whiteness studies are translated to a diversity class with mainly white students in Australia. In both these sets of notes from the field the intersections between power, culture and knowledge are made evident to unmask coloniality in everyday discourse and action.

Notes from the Field Part I: Culture, Politics and Capital in a Diverse School District

Public schools galvanize multiple stakeholders toward actions that reflect common, collective, and conflictive interests. Thus, schools cannot be understood without grappling with politics and power. For several years I have

been developing strategies to integrate critical ethnography with education organizing working as a witness/actor in ground-up mobilization efforts (Reyes Cruz 2008a, c). Critical ethnography is ethnographic work framed within critical theory traditions. Just as in traditional ethnography, the ethnographer engages in prolonged participant-observation, writing field notes, conducting informal and formal interviews, analyzing public documents and artifacts. However, critical ethnographers aim to develop situated, self-reflexive work that connects everyday life experiences of people and communities with the workings of power in ways that amplify the voices of the oppressed and contribute to their struggle for liberation (Carspecken 1996; Kincheloe and McLaren 2000; Trueba and McLaren 2000).

After working in social services and academic research in New York City for several years, I moved to the US Midwest to pursue a doctorate in community psychology. The town, mostly white and European descent, had experienced a substantial increase in monolingual Latino American immigrants in recent years. The challenges of ethnic diversity were becoming apparent as I began to engage in community work for education equity. I was no stranger to cultural dislocation; a racialized (post)colonial subject, a brown immigrant woman from the US territory of Puerto Rico, growing up between Puerto Rico, Spain and the US. While I could recognize significant differences between other immigrants from south of the border and myself (e.g., immigration status, formal education), I thought at least my experiences as a bilingual/bicultural immigrant could be useful to new immigrants facing the challenges of being a racialized and ethnicized minority.

At first I became a volunteer at an after-school program serving working-poor Latin American children and their families. Soon I was asked to be the program liaison to a public elementary school. This work led me to engage with school and school district staff in different efforts to address the needs of the new immigrant population. In the process I also became an ally to a group of Mexican immigrant parents organizing to advocate for their children's educational rights. In the course of four years, I took on the thorny role of becoming a cultural broker for immigrants and others, translating language and cultural meaning in different settings, facilitating and negotiating communication across cultural and experiential divides (Reyes Cruz 2008a).

Initially, I entered the field in response to a community identified need for multicultural/bilingual professionals who could work with the new ethnic minority. But as the work developed, it became apparent that—beyond ethnic-based cultural differences—the main problems that marginalized immigrants faced had to do with power inequities in their relationships with institutionalized structures embodied by men and women, White, Black, Latino/a and Mexican. The ways in which power was organized in school settings were

entrenched in a culture that kept the poor and marginalized in a subordinate place. An understanding of the coloniality of power moved this work from focusing on issues of ethnic-based cultural rights (e.g., access to materials in Spanish) towards the social reproduction of inequality, particularly how cultural and political capital were enacted to maintain ethnicized working-poor immigrants at the margins of school decision-making.

The concept of cultural capital, as articulated by the late French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, links macro and micro-levels of analysis to account for the intersections between culture and power in everyday life. Cultural capital speaks about the ways of knowing, knowledge and practices of the ruling classes *and* their capacity to establish their norms as the main criteria for evaluating what is good, valid and worthwhile (Lareau and Weininger 2003). The norms are not fixed or inherently “good” but rather serve the interest of the dominant classes and thus, can and do continuously change.

One of the main sources of contention between Latin American immigrants and the school system was bilingual education. It was the first time the school district was mandated to offer services in Spanish. With limited resources and expertise, the school district implemented a bilingual program that was far from what many Latino American parents had hoped.

The district indicated they wanted parent input on what types of programs would be implemented in the upcoming years and the coordinator wanted to make sure parents made informed decisions...For several [public] meetings district staff described different models and their effectiveness...Lucero [a Mexican mother, wanted the program that] would facilitate the students’ bilingualism, support parent–child relationships by strengthening the children’s knowledge of the home language, and equalize the academic-racial hierarchy of the schools.

Hasta ahorita el programa que más me ha convencido es el de dual immersion...O sea, ahora sí, no sé quién me dijo, “Estamos en Estados Unidos, tenemos que aprender inglés.” Entonces, pero uno también como madre no quiere que sus hijos sólo agarren inglés. Imagínate al rato ¿qué comunicación voy a tener con ellos?...A lo mejor si se llega a hacer lo del dual immersion sean equitativas las cosas porque tanto como los americanos se van a tener que esforzar para aprender la materia.

So far the program that has convinced me the most is dual immersion. Now, I don’t know who said, “We are in the United States we have to learn English.” But as a mother I don’t want our children to learn only English. Imagine then, what kind of communication am I going to have with them? And maybe if they end up having the dual immersion program things will be more equitable because Americans would also have to make an effort to learn the subjects [in a second language].

When parents and staff finally met to decide what program they wanted implemented...district staff presented [choices] that had not been discussed before...A mother asked...“What do you know about the effectiveness of these program options?” The district staff replied those were the options other districts were implementing; although they did not know how effective the programs were they believed it would be better than what the schools currently had (Reyes Cruz 2008a, 138–139).

While the school district engaged Latino American immigrant parents in symbolic participation, Mexican parents mobilized to demand authentic participation in school decision-making (Reyes Cruz 2008a; see also Anderson 1998). The parents were adopting the cultural norms valued by the schools (e.g., attending meetings, volunteering, working with their children at home) and raising the stakes for public accountability. However, their efforts were rebuffed and the Mexican parents did not have the necessary political capital to have a say. That is, at that time, they did not have the needed capacity and strength to influence decisions about public matters to their benefit (Mediratta 1995). The group was fraught with their own internal conflicts. And they were struggling against a fundamentally antidemocratic school culture. Despite the prevalent discourse on advancing parent participation in decision-making, building school-community collaboration, embracing diversity and multiculturalism,

certain cultural practices promoted individual over collective interventions couched in a colonial discourse that emphasized the deficits of marginalized families and their debt to those helping them. Most of the people involved, regardless of their position in the power hierarchy, would at times adopt the colonial discourse. This discourse served to squelch dissent with dominant school practices (Reyes Cruz 2008a, p. 153).

The colonial discourse reflects what Memmi (1957/1983) describes as a “colonial mentality”: “the psychological consequences of oppression for both dominant and oppressed groups” (Reyes Cruz 2008a, p. 173).

Laura, a light-skinned Mexican immigrant mother, had summoned the principal, her daughter’s teacher (both white US Americans), the bilingual teacher (a light-skinned woman of Mexican descent) and myself (the brown Puerto Rican ally-translator) to discuss some of her concerns regarding her child’s schooling. The school was located in a predominately poor and African American neighborhood. Its students were mostly African Americans and immigrants from Latin America.

[Laura] expressed her concern with what she described as “lack of respect in the school”...She had seen staff mistreating children, particularly African American students. Her child was also being mistreated by other children and the adults were not intervening...The principal explained that not all parents had the same vision as Laura, they were not interested in getting involved in the school or what their children do, they didn’t teach their children respect, and that was what the school had to deal with...Laura insisted the issue was a school-wide problem. She suggested that the staff work on the staff end and she could work with other parents...The principal broke the silence, “You should encourage your daughter to come to the staff when others are bothering her and we will deal with the situation”...On our way out...Laura said to me, “*No pueden ver más allá* (They can’t see beyond their noses)...they want to make it about my child.” (Reyes Cruz 2008a, p. 153–154)

Coloniality worked at different levels: from the racialized/ethnicized ways in which staff enacted their cultural capital deciding what counted as valid knowledge, to the ways in which they promoted child-focused individualistic parent participation separating the personal from the communal/public quieting potential claims of collective discontent. By actively engaging in critical conversations about public education with different social actors the Mexican parents opened spaces for challenging colonial relations. The parents showed they were critically watching, seeing what was being done to the children, communicating they were not going to stand for it.

Notes from the Field Part II: Autoethnographic² Reflections toward Decolonizing Interventions into Race Relations

I was a ‘coloured’ South African moving to Australia when, before I knew it, I was committed to the decolonization agendas of Indigenous Australians. I grew up during the Apartheid era in South Africa. My family immigrated to Australia in the mid 1980s, partly to find better economic opportunities and partly to find a way out of Apartheid. As I got immersed in Australian society, it became apparent that racism here was of a different kind. It was not a legal system; racism was more subtle, emerging through discursive networks and the micro-politics of power. In South Africa I was labeled coloured and positioned in-between black and white. The membership

afforded me privileges while being discriminated against by the same people imposing marginality on me. In Australia there was no such explicit hierarchy, yet, I was constructed as a racialized outsider in relation to an ostensibly white majority.

For the last 14 years, I’ve work in a predominantly white academic context as a researcher and educator in community psychology teaching mostly non-Indigenous students. I was already sensitive to how community psychology uses notions like race, ethnicity and culture to categorize groups often misrepresenting people like me. But that became further complicated as I engaged with the writings of Indigenous scholars in Australia and Aotearoa (often known as New Zealand) (Martin 2003; Oxenham 2000; Smith 1999). They were writing back, writing about decolonization and anti-colonialism, to assert Indigenous ways of knowing, doing and being in the world. As I engaged in this work nagging questions emerged. What are the implications of these writings for my research and teaching? How would I engage in empowerment praxis when the dominant ways of being, knowing, and doing of the discipline are named as problematic? I began to explore possible answers through collaborating in projects led by Indigenous Australians, raising the stakes for our white colleagues and students in research and teaching settings.

Part of my work as an ally to Indigenous Australians has been to work with the Centre for Aboriginal Studies at Curtin University in Western Australia to incorporate issues of diversity into psychology courses and to research individual and community responses to oppression. I was learning about the history and continuing oppression of Indigenous people and wanted be involved in responding without imposing my agenda. The writing and activities of the Centre, particularly those focused on Indigenous Australians rights to self-determination, made even more salient how some of the assumptions and theoretical tools that underpin psychology actually worked to silence and undermine Indigenous voices (e.g., being trained as “expert” and “objective knower” of others, developing models privileging Western ways of being and knowing, building theory based on core values such as individualism).

The exchanges with Indigenous Australian colleagues and our shared experiences led me to turn the gaze away from a superficial understanding of the cultures of others onto examining one’s own culture in relation to other cultural groups. My discomfort recognizing the disempowering effects of the knowledge production practices of my discipline and from being othered in different contexts moved me to problematize normativity. I began deconstructing dominance through research and teaching while affirming the cultural identities and aspirations of those silenced in Australia’s Eurocentric psychology. And then I

² Autoethnography is “an autobiographical genre of writing that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural” (Ellis and Bochner 2000, p. 739).

discovered the critical writings in whiteness studies and privilege.

Critical whiteness writers argue that whiteness signals “...the production and reproduction of dominance rather than subordination, normativity rather than marginality, and privilege rather than disadvantage” (Frankenberg 1993, p. 236). Those who belong to this group are typically not asked to reflect on their cultural identities because their culture is the norm. Thus, whiteness is often invisible; members are blind to the privileges that they have by virtue of their group membership. The invisibility of whiteness is what makes it so powerful; people are rendered blind to the ways in which culturally sanctioned practices can work in an exclusionary and often colonising manner. These writings resonated deeply within me. After all, I feel the brunt of it.

I am outside whiteness because I am a black person, an immigrant in Australia, keenly aware of how racism is significant in the lives of people of color. And yet, I belong to a white institution and have been trained in a historically Eurocentric academic discipline. I am inside whiteness. My colleagues and the majority of the students in psychology programs in Australia are ostensibly “white.” I had seen white colleagues “being helpful” without necessarily considering or understanding the different discourses that position non-Indigenous people as helpers and Indigenous people as requiring help and the implications of these for empowerment work. Everyday we see how mainstream institutionalized systems in Australia privilege the knowledge and tools of Eurocentric psychology while looking suspiciously at Indigenous ways of being, knowing and doing (Dudgeon and Oxenham 1990). Indigenous colleagues and I witness the ways in which non-Indigenous allies end up taking over spaces created for Indigenous people often becoming recognized as experts on Indigenous matters.

As a response, a diverse group of colleagues—including Indigenous scholars—and I began to integrate as a key part of the Race Relations and Psychology course the history of race relations in Australia focusing on Indigenous writers. Students were challenged to explore key concepts (race, ethnicity and culture) used in psychological research to examine difference to then turn to the whiteness literature shifting the focus from the “other” to their own group memberships. This turn exposes taken for granted social positions and the privileges afforded because of those positionings. Problematizing how the cultures of “others” are typically treated as static and antiquated was central; this served to reveal how understandings of self and others are produced through historically situated discourses, taken for granted knowledge and everyday practices within social and political contexts. Ultimately, the challenge is to grasp the implications of those understandings for everyday interactions.

Teaching about whiteness to ostensibly white students has proven to be quite challenging. The notion of whiteness is contested by most students, and so it should be. Typically the students’ initial response is to resist or reject the notion. The initial rejection, more often than not, is about equating whiteness with racism and they do not want to be seen as racist. The response is to disconnect from the history of race relations and engage in us/them constructions without considering the societal arrangements that whiteness speaks to.

John, an older student who identified his Irish ancestry, wrote in his journal for the class:

I honestly believe that I had a head start though. I honestly think that I’ve been a person that’s always been fairly sensitive to these issues. The fact that I had an Indian brother in-law from the age of 7, and grew up amongst lots of Italians and Greeks has probably helped—but I don’t want to sell my own personality short either. Some people’s hearts are in the right place.

Stewart another older student who identified as third or fourth generation Australian, wrote:

A final thought occurred regarding privilege. Previously although I have stated that I recognize the privileges afforded to me due to my ancestry/identity, one sentence uttered by a fellow student; “Privilege is not something earned or deserved” has really caused me to question my ontology.

Their responses also get more complicated. Students fragment whiteness turning to hyphenated identities (Italian-Australian, Greek-Australian, or Macedonian-Australian) in an attempt to ethnicize their Australian-ness. However, a hierarchy within whiteness is created with Australian (meaning Anglo-Celtic) remaining undisturbed at the top. I had to breathe deeply and find ways to empathize with the students struggle. Luckily I was not alone in this.

The experience with students of color has been the opposite. The topic of whiteness is exciting, they want to hear about it, engage with it. For them it is obvious; they live and experience whiteness. They know how they are positioned as “perpetual strangers” in a country that imagines itself as “white” (Hage 2000). These students, the Indigenous, the refugee, the immigrant and the children of immigrants, sense of belonging are regulated by whiteness in different ways in everyday settings and often through seemingly innocuous micro practices including questions such as: Where are you from? and statements such as “you are just like us”.

This work creates contact zones, spaces where separated people come together, feel vulnerable and at risk

(Somerville and Perkins 2003). The powerful ways in which we are positioned as “other” by and through discourses begin to be questioned. These contact zones represent opportunities for unmasking coloniality engaging identity politics to examine dynamics of oppression and possibilities for liberation. The work requires going beyond static and fixed understandings of self and other to engage conceptualizations of culture that are concerned with lived experiences. This is the work that called me into community psychology in the first place.

Summary and Concluding Remarks

Community psychology aims to address collective distress as a product of social dynamics of inequality taking into account the multiple dimensions of diversity. The field has made important strides in developing an awareness and practice consistent with its positioning in favor of diversity in its multiple dimensions recognizing deeper cultural processes that impact the problems we attend. However, we think community psychology still has work to do to understand the ways in which culture is intertwined with power/oppression/exploitation and locate those processes within historical/social/political contexts.

In this article we have engaged in critical reflection of the ways in which the field’s view of culture and those thought of as “other” is shaped by the continuing legacy of colonial relations. We contend that culture should be central to the field to the extent that community psychologists are committed to abandoning colonizing approaches to the marginalized other. Analyses of diversity and culture devoid of a critical understanding of the politics of context can easily fall into essentializing social inequality as issues of poor/rich, black/white, immigrant/non-immigrant, or “cultural” (to mean racialized and ethnicized) differences without challenging the roots of oppression/exploitation. Cultural matters, we argue, need to be approached from a decolonizing standpoint to understand how power, privilege and oppression have historically been intricately linked within “the cultural” in the multiple facets of community psychology work.

This article goes further in current community psychology theorizing by locating culture within coloniality and power, and showing alternative methodologies to engage culture from a decolonizing standpoint at the level of teaching, writing and community research and action. Without a decolonizing standpoint for understanding cultural matters the struggles of recent immigrant working-poor families in a school district would have been left at the level of, for instance, differences in cultural practices and understandings, lack of translation and quality of bilingual services. What would remain hidden is how

cultural capital is enacted in everyday practices to maintain marginalized minorities subordinate to the ways of being, understanding and doing of the dominant school culture (in our exemplar, white-middle class). Without a decolonizing standpoint, teaching diversity to a predominantly white student body in a racialized society would end up reproducing the marginalized “other” (e.g., focusing on understanding the culture of the ethnicized and racialized groups) rather than revealing the ways in which the colonial legacy has shaped the dominant culture positioning whiteness as a norm in academic and other practices.

While it continues to be vital for psychologists to develop their conceptual, intellectual and personal capacities to work with diversity issues, this should not be an aim in itself but a road to an intercultural and critical praxis within community psychology. By interculturality we mean a stance of recognition of the cultural rights of different groups and the imperative to learn from each other from a place of ontological, epistemological and methodological parity (see Dávalos 2005; Bonilla 2004; Quijano 2007). That is, working towards interculturality is working to eliminate cultural capital in its normative function, chipping away at institutional processes that marginalize historically oppressed ways of being, knowing and doing, including knowledge itself.

In our work we have come to realize the importance of critically reflecting on our discipline and our own multiple positionings—those that afford us power within broader social/political/historical contexts and those that keep us at the margins. *Critical reflexivity* is more than individual-level self awareness. It also requires that we constantly evaluate ways in which we contribute to both liberation and oppression. To this end, we agree with others, that *trans-disciplinarity* focused on critical social theory is central to the development of an emancipatory community psychology, one devoted to transformative research and action. This is as much an academic as an ethical and political stance.

As we craft our decolonizing standpoint, we have found extremely valuable writings in critical race theory, whiteness studies, feminist critique, Indigenous research and coloniality. These literatures are concerned with decolonization by identifying deeper process of exclusion and oppression, de-centering the dominance of Western ways of knowing and doing, and bringing to the foreground indigenous and other marginalized knowledges. With this come new opportunities to engage innovative methodologies to achieve socially just and transformative research and action. This includes going beyond the dominant modes of knowledge production (such as logical positivism) to include different practices that will affirm the knowledges of marginalized communities and thereby also contribute to social transformation.

We believe community psychology can and should make important contributions to the study of cultural matters by revealing and addressing the experiential intersections between culture, power, and empowerment in everyday contexts. As a field we recognize, as did Dewey (1938), that “in actual experience, there is never any such isolated singular object or event; an object or event is always a special part, phase, or aspect, of an environing experienced world” (p. 67 as cited by Cole 2003, p. 132). We believe the field must reinvent its institutional practices to develop and support intercultural, critical and transdisciplinary praxis. To this end, we would like to see increasing concerted efforts to (a) develop intercultural competencies such as multicultural and multilingual skills (e.g., requiring students to take a second language and work in diverse settings where their social positions are de-centered); (b) examine the social and political history of the communities we work with as these are intertwined with issues of health, equity and self-determination; (c) expand community psychology’s theoretical and methodological horizons for understanding the micro-politics of culture, power and knowledge in specific settings; and (d) create spaces and opportunities for critical reflexivity to explore and challenge our positions in power hierarchies. Ultimately, we hope that understanding cultural matters from a decolonizing standpoint will move us closer towards realizing the emancipatory values of community psychology.

Acknowledgments Writing by the first author was supported in part by the Instituto de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias, Universidad de Puerto Rico en Cayey grant number 5P20 MD001112-02 from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The article contents are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the NIH official position.

References

- Anderson, G. L. (1998). Toward authentic participation: Deconstructing the discourses of participatory reforms in education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(4), 571–603.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands, la frontera: The new mestiza* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Berg, M., Coman, E., & Schensul, J. J. (2009). Youth action research for prevention: A multi-level intervention designed to increase efficacy and empowerment among urban youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 43, 345–359.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5–34.
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Rethinking “acculturation” in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities. *Human Development*, 44(1), 1–18.
- Bonilla, A. (2004). La II Cumbre Continental de los Pueblos y Nacionalidades Indígenas de Abya Yala (Quito, 2004) [The II Continental Summit of the Indigenous Pueblos and Nationalities of Abya Yala (Quito, 2004)]. *Observatorio Social de América Latina*, 15, 257–266. Retrieved 21 Aug 2008 from <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/osai/osai15/bonilla15.pdf>.
- Borg, M. B. (2006). Engaging diversity’s underbelly: A story from an immigrant parish community. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 37(3/4), 191–201.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (2000). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London, UK: Sage.
- Bulhan, H. A. (1985). *Frantz Fanon and the psychology of oppression*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research*. New York: Routledge.
- Christens, B., & Perkins, D. D. (2008). Transdisciplinary, multilevel action research to enhance ecological and psychopolitical validity. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(2), 214–231.
- Cole, M. (2003). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Dávalos, P. (2005). Movimiento indígena ecuatoriano: Construcción política y epistémica [Ecuadorian Indigenous movement: Political and epistemic construction]. In D. Mato (Ed.), *Cultura, política y sociedad: Perspectivas latinoamericanas* [Culture, politics and society: Latin American perspectives] (pp. 337–357). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Dinh, K. T., Weinstein, T. L., Nemon, M., & Rondeau, S. (2008). The effects of contact with Asians and Asian Americans on White American college students: Attitudes, awareness of racial discrimination, and psychological adjustment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 42, 298–308.
- Dodson, M. (2003). The end in the beginning: Re(de)fining Aboriginality. In M. Grossman (Ed.), *Blacklines: Contemporary critical writing by Indigenous Australians* (pp. 25–41). Carlton, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Dudgeon, P., & Fielder, J. (2006). Third spaces within tertiary places: Indigenous Australian Studies. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 396–409.
- Dudgeon, P., & Oxenham, D. (1990). *The complexity of Aboriginal diversity: Identity and kindredness*. St Lucia: University of Queensland.
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733–768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (2003). *Home bound: Filipino lives across cultures, communities and countries*. Ewing, NJ: University of California Press.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L. C., & Mun Wong, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Off White: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of White women*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Ringwood, Australia: Penguin.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Boston Books.
- Gergen, K. (1996). *Realidades y relaciones: Aproximación a la construcción social* [Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction]. Madrid, España: Ediciones Paidós S.A.
- Glover, M., Dudgeon, P., & Huygens, I. (2005). Colonization and racism. In G. Nelson & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and wellbeing* (pp. 330–347). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Godreau, I. P., Reyes Cruz, M., Franco Ortiz, M., & Cuadrado, S. (2008). The lessons of slavery: Discourses of slavery, mestizaje, and blanqueamiento in an elementary school in Puerto Rico. *American Ethnologist*, 35(1), 115–135.
- Gone, J. P. (2007). “We never was happy living like a Whiteman”: Mental health disparities and the postcolonial predicament in

- American Indian communities. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 40, 290–300.
- Gonzales, N. A., Germán, M., Kim, S. Y., George, P., Fabrett, F. C., Millsap, R., et al. (2008). Mexican American adolescents' cultural orientation, externalizing behavior and academic engagement: The role of traditional cultural values. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 151–164.
- Green, M. J., Sonn, C. C., & Matsebula, J. (2007). Reviewing Whiteness: Theory, research and possibilities. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(3), 389–419.
- Greenfield, P. M. (1997). Culture as process: Empirical methods for cultural psychology. In J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga, & J. Pandey (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 301–346). Needham Heights, CA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gridley, H., & Breen, L. (2007). So far and yet so near? In S. M. Reich, M. Reimer, I. Prilleltensky, & M. Montero (Eds.), *International community psychology: History and theories* (pp. 119–139). New York, NY: Springer.
- Griffin, C. (2000). More than simply talk and text: Psychologist as cultural ethnographers. In C. Squire (Ed.), *Reconfiguring psychology and culture* (pp. 17–30). London, UK: Routledge.
- Guerra, N. G., & Knox, L. (2008). How culture impacts the dissemination and implementation of innovation: A case study of the families and schools together program (FAST) for preventing violence with immigrant Latino youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 304–313.
- Hage, G. (2000). *White nation: Fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural society*. Australia: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1996). New ethnicities. In D. Morley & K. Chen (Eds.), *Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 441–450). London, UK: Routledge.
- Harrell, S. P., & Bond, M. A. (2007). Listening to diversity stories: Principles for practice in community research and action. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 37, 357–364.
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Kempen, H. J. G. (1998). Moving cultures: The perilous problem of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist*, 53, 1111–1120.
- Holdstock, L. T. (2000). *Re-examining psychology: Critical perspectives and African insights*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hooks, B. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hughes, D., Seidman, E., & Williams, N. (1993). Cultural phenomena and the research enterprise: Toward a culturally anchored methodology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 21, 687–703.
- Huygens, I. (2006). Discourses for decolonization: Affirming Maori authority in New Zealand workplaces. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 363–378.
- Ibáñez, T. (2001). *Psicología social construccionista [Constructionist social psychology]*. México: Universidad de Guadalajara.
- Jahoda, G., & Krewer, B. (1997). History of cross-cultural and cultural psychology. In J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga, & J. Pandey (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 1–42). Needham Heights, CA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Jessen, R. A. (Speaker). (2007). *The shift of land, Part 8: The global perspective* (Radio Documentary). Retrieved 21 Aug 2008 from <http://www.prx.org/>.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279–313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 303–342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). It's your world, I'm just trying to explain it: Understanding our epistemological and methodological challenges. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1, 5–12.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Donnor, J. (2005). The moral activist role of critical race theory scholarship. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 279–302). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lander, E. (2005). Ciencias sociales: Saberes coloniales y eurocéntricos [Social sciences: Colonial and Eurocentric knowledge]. In E. Lander (Ed.), *La colonialidad del saber: Eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas* [Coloniality of knowledge: Eurocentrism and social sciences, Latin American perspectives] (pp. 11–40). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Lareau, A., & Horvat, E. M. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion: Race, class, and cultural capital in family-school relationships. *Sociology of Education*, 72(January), 37–53.
- Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and Society*, 32, 567–606.
- Lavee, Y., & Ben-Ari, A. (2008). The association of daily hassles and uplifts with family and life satisfaction: Does cultural orientation make a difference? *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 89–98.
- Martin, K. B. M. (2003). Ways of knowing, being and doing: A theoretical framework and methods for Indigenous and Indigenist research. *Australian Studies, Voicing Dissent. New Talents 21C: Next Generation Australian Studies*, 76, 203–214.
- Martín-Baró, I. (1994). Towards a liberation psychology (A. Aron, Trans.). In A. Aron & S. Corne (Eds.), *Writings for a liberation psychology: Ignacio Martín-Baró* (pp. 17–32). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Martín-Baró, I. (1998). *Psicología de la liberación* [Liberation Psychology]. Editado por A. Blanco. Madrid: Editorial Trotta.
- Maton, K. I., Perkins, D. D., & Saegert, S. (2006). Community psychology at the crossroads: Prospects for interdisciplinary research. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 9–21.
- Mediratta, K. (1995). *Community-building approaches: A survey of strategies and an agenda for future work*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Memmi, A. (1957/1983). *Retrato del colonizado* [The colonizer and the colonized] (5th ed.). Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor.
- Misra, G., & Gergen, K. J. (1993). On the place of culture in the psychological sciences. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28, 225–243.
- Moane, G. (2003). Bridging the personal and the political: Practices for a liberation psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31, 91–101.
- Montero, M. (1997/2001). Political psychology: A critical perspective. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 233–244). London: Sage.
- Montero, M. (2007). The political psychology of liberation: From politics to ethics and back. *Political Psychology*, 28, 517–533.
- Montero, M. (2009). Community action and research as citizen construction. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 43, 149–161.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2004). Whiteness, epistemology and indigenous representation. In A. Moreton-Robinson (Ed.), *Whitening race: Essays in social and cultural criticism*. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Nelson, G., & Prilleltensky, I. (Eds.). (2005). *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and wellbeing*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- O'Donnell, C. R. (2006). Beyond diversity: Toward a cultural community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 37, 1–8.

- Okazaki, S., David, E. J. R., & Abelman, N. (2008). Colonialism and psychology of culture. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(1), 90–106.
- Oxenham, D. (2000). Aboriginal terms of reference. In P. Dudgeon, D. Garvey, & H. Pickett (Eds.), *Working with Indigenous Australians: A handbook for psychologists* (pp. 109–125). Perth, Australia: Gunada Press.
- Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology: Introducing radical psychology*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Parker, I. (2007). *Revolution in psychology: Alienation to emancipation*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social [Coloniality of power and social classification]. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, VI(2), 342–386.
- Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 168–178.
- Rappaport, J. (1977). *Community psychology: Values, research, and action*. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart, and Traveling Thunder.
- Rappaport, J. (2000). Social responsibility and psychological language: Is anyone else up there? Commentaries on Prilleltensky and Nelson. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 10, 107–122.
- Reich, S., & Reich, J. A. (2006). Cultural competence in interdisciplinary collaborations: A method for respecting diversity in research partnerships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 51–62.
- Reyes Cruz, M. (2002). *Multiple contexts, multiple identities: Puerto Rican women's perspectives on race, ethnicity, discrimination and identity*. Unpublished masters' thesis. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Reyes Cruz, M. (2006). Mis muertos están conmigo [My dead are with me]: An autoethnographic text on racialization, identity and memory. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(3), 589–595.
- Reyes Cruz, M. (2008a). *Mexican immigrant parents advocating for school reform*. New York, NY: LFB Scholarly.
- Reyes Cruz, M. (2008b). What if I just cite Graciela? Working toward decolonizing knowledge through a critical ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(4), 651–658.
- Reyes Cruz, M. (2008c). Standing against coloniality: Claiming the right to democratic participation in the globalized neoliberal state. In M. Reyes Cruz (chair), *Racism, coloniality and representation: Examining dynamics of oppression and liberation in community research and action*. Paper presented at the II International Conference of Community Psychology, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Ribeiro, G. L. (2005). Post-imperialismo: Para una discusión después del post-colonialismo y del multiculturalismo [Post-imperialism: For a discussion after post-colonialism and multiculturalism]. In D. Mato (Ed.), *Cultura, política y sociedad: Perspectivas latinoamericanas* [Culture, politics and society: Latin American perspectives]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Riggs, D. W., & Augoustinos, M. (2005). The psychic life of colonial power: Racialised subjectivities, bodies and methods. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 461–477.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Postcolonialism and globalization in education. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, 7(3), 256–263.
- Roosa, M. W., Weaver, S. R., White, R. M. B., Tein, J., Knight, G. P., Gonzales, N., et al. (2009). Family and neighborhood fit or misfit and the adaptation of Mexican Americans. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 44, 15–27.
- Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sarason, S. (1974). *Psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Serrano-Garcia, I. (1994). The ethics of the powerful and the power of ethics. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 22, 1–20.
- Shweder, R. A. (1990). Cultural psychology-what is it? In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 1–43). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinha, D., & Kao, H. S. R. (1997). The journey to the east: An introduction. In H. S. R. Kao & D. Sinha (Eds.), *Asian perspectives on psychology* (pp. 9–22). New Delhi, India: Sage.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Somerville, M., & Perkins, T. (2003). Border work in the contact zone: Thinking Indigenous/non-Indigenous collaboration spatially. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 24(3), 253–266.
- Sonn, C. C. (2002). Immigrant adaptation: Exploring the process through sense of community. In A. T. Fisher, C. C. Sonn, & B. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Psychological sense of community: Research, applications and implications* (pp. 205–222). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Sonn, C. C. (2004a). Negotiating identities across cultural boundaries: Complicating cultural competence with power and privilege. *Critical Psychology: International Journal of Critical Psychology*, 11, 134–149.
- Sonn, C. C. (2004b). Reflecting on practice: Negotiating challenges to ways of working. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 305–313.
- Trickett, E. J. (1996). A future for community psychology: The contexts of diversity and the diversity of contexts. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 24, 209–229.
- Trickett, E. J., Watts, R. J., & Birman, D. (Eds.). (1994). *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Trueba, E. T., & McLaren, P. (2000). Critical ethnography for the study of immigrants. In E. T. Trueba & L. I. Bartolomé (Eds.), *Immigrant voices: In search of educational equity* (pp. 37–73). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Watts, R. J. (1992). Elements of a psychology of human diversity. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 20, 116–131.
- Watts, R. J., & Serrano-Garcia, I. (2003). The quest for a liberating community psychology: An overview. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31, 73–78.