The Counseling Psychologist

Training Counseling Psychologists as Social Justice Agents: Feminist and Multicultural Principles in Action

Lisa A. Goodman, Belle Liang, Janet E. Helms, Rachel E. Latta, Elizabeth Sparks and Sarah R. Weintraub

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://tcp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/32/6/793

Published by:
$SAGE Publications
http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

Ψ₁₇

Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association

Additional services and information for *The Counseling Psychologist* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://tcp.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://tcp.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations (this article cites 49 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
http://tcp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/32/6/793

- **Major Contribution**

Training Counseling Psychologists as Social Justice Agents:
Feminist and Multicultural Principles in Action

Lisa A. Goodman
Belle Liang
Janet E. Helms
Rachel E. Latta
Elizabeth Sparks
Sarah R. Weintraub
Boston College

Despite recent calls for counseling psychology to embrace social justice-oriented work, there has been little discussion about what such work actually looks like. The first part of this article derives a set of principles from feminist and multicultural counseling theories that counseling psychologists should consider as they engage in social justice work. These include (a) ongoing self-examination, (b) sharing power, (c) giving voice, (d) facilitating consciousness raising, (e) building on strengths, and (f) leaving clients the tools to work toward social change. The second part of the article describes a program designed to integrate social justice work into the core curriculum of the Boston College doctoral program. The authors discuss ways in which the above principles have shaped students; activities, and some of the ethical dilemmas that have emerged. Finally, the article underscores professional obstacles that counseling psychologists doing social justice work are likely to face, and offers recommendations for overcoming them.

In recent years, an increasing number of counseling psychologists have echoed calls from critical, community, and liberation psychologists that we engage more systematically in social justice work (Blustein et al., 2001; Fouad, 2001; Ivey & Collins, 2003; McWhirter, 1998; D. W. Sue, 2001; Vera

793

& Speight, 2003). In 2001, for example, the Fourth National Counseling Psychology Conference in Houston focused on setting the profession's agenda for social justice–oriented research, practice, and training (Blustein, Elman, & Gerstein, 2002; Fouad et al., 2004). At a town-hall meeting at the end of this conference, an impressive 88% of the attendees voted to support the idea that counseling psychologists should reclaim a social advocacy agenda. And in May 2003, *The Counseling Psychologist* sponsored a forum on social justice. As major contributors to that forum, Vera and Speight (2003) called on counseling psychologists to recognize that multicultural competence cannot be achieved without a commitment to social justice. This commitment means an expansion of our professional activities beyond counseling and psychotherapy to advocacy and intervention at the community and policy levels. Without such an expansion, they and others asserted, psychologists are simply maintaining the status quo rather than working toward social change (Albee, 1996; Martin-Baro, 1994; Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2002; Speight & Vera, 2004; Vera & Speight, 2003).

Although these and other efforts have provided a critical set of aspirations, goals, and ideals for the field, they have not resulted in much discussion about what social justice work actually looks like or what kinds of principles and struggles such work entails. Indeed, as a group of students commenting on the Houston conference claimed, "It is likely that rhetoric regarding the reclaiming of social advocacy will remain just that, unless the apparent widespread interest in social advocacy within the field is more actively mobilized" (Grove McCrea, Bromley, McNally, Koketting O'Byrne, & Wade, 2004, pp. 84-85). Following a brief review of how a social justice orientation fits within the history and mandate of counseling psychology, we (a) extend feminist and multicultural counseling theories to describe a set of tenets central to both conceptual systems that we have found useful in our endeavors to engage in social justice work, (b) describe one way that our doctoral program has integrated social justice work into our training requirements, (c) explore the ways in which the tenets we describe give rise to specific ethical dilemmas, (d) underscore some of the personal and professional obstacles that counseling psychologists are likely to face as they do this work, and (e) make some recommendations for counseling psychologists interested in moving toward fuller participation in the creation of a socially just world. The ideas that we discuss in each of these sections emerge from our own work as researchers, advocates, consultants, and teachers as well as from conversations we have had with each other, other colleagues, and community members over the past several years.

Any attempt to explore counseling psychologists' role in bringing about social justice is predicated on an a priori conceptualization of social justice

itself. Recognizing that the development of such a definition has taken up the entire professional lives of philosophers and scholars (see, e.g., Freire, 1970/1990; Rawls, 1971, 1993, 2001), we nevertheless propose, for the purposes of this article, Janna Smith's (2003) notion that a socially just world is one in which every person has access to the following:

> Adequate food, sleep, wages, education, safety, opportunity, institutional support, health care, child care, and loving relationships. "Adequate" means enough to allow [participation] in the world . . . without starving, or feeling economically trapped or uncompensated, continually exploited, terrorized, devalued, battered, chronically exhausted, or virtually enslaved (and for some, still, actually enslaved). (Smith, 2003, p. 167)

Given this definition, we conceptualize the social justice work of counseling psychologists as scholarship and professional action designed to change societal values, structures, policies, and practices, such that disadvantaged or marginalized groups gain increased access to these tools of self-determination. Drawing on an ecological model of social analysis, we propose that social justice work occurs on three different levels: the micro level, including individuals and families; the meso level, including communities and organizations; and the macro level, including social structures, ideologies, and policies (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Gunnings, 1976; Moane, 2003; Trickett, 1996). The idea that counseling psychologists interested in social justice must work to change social structures, not just individuals, is implicit in this conceptualization (Gunnings & Lipscomb, 1986; McIntosh, 1988; Young, 1990).

WHY COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY?

The history and core values of the field of counseling psychology are consistent with our conceptualization of social justice work. From its inception, counseling psychology as a specialization of psychology has emphasized the role of environmental factors in shaping individuals' well-being (American Psychological Association, 1999; McWhirter, 1998). In the early part of this century, Frank Parsons's work in vocational psychology and his commitment to issues of justice and fairness provided early models of socially responsible counseling (Davis, 1969; Hartung & Blustein, 2002). Counseling psychologists Leona Tyler and John Darley, among others, were centrally involved in the founding of the American Psychological Association, Division 35 (Women) (Ivey & Collins, 2003) and have been at the forefront of the development of feminist psychological theories (see, e.g., Ballou & Brown, 2002; Brabeck, 2000; Enns, 1997; Fitzgerald & Nutt, 1986; Gilbert & Scher, 1999;

Lerman & Porter, 1990). Similarly, counseling psychologists have played key roles in the development of multicultural psychology (see, e.g., Arredondo & Arciniega, 2001; Helms & Cook, 1999; D. W. Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992) and in defining the standards for multicultural competence (see, e.g., American Psychological Association, 2003; Fitzgerald & Nutt, 1986; both cosponsored by Division 17).

Feminist and multicultural counseling psychology grew out of a sense of dissatisfaction with the way in which traditional theories of psychology incorporated the lived experiences of women and people of color. The early feminist and multicultural writers mounted well-documented critiques of the ethnocentric nature of most of this scholarship, arguing that traditional theorists ignored the roles that oppression and culture play in psychological development and functioning (Espin, 1992; Sparks & Park, 2000; D. W. Sue & Sue, 1990). By contrast, both feminist and multicultural counseling psychology (a) emphasize the ways in which social oppression (e.g., racism, classism, ethnocentrism, and/or sexism) contributes to the mental health problems that clients present (Brown, 1994; Comas-Diaz & Greene, 1994; Helms & Cook, 1999), (b) argue that survival responses under oppressive conditions are often mistaken for pathology (Brown, 1994; Gunnings & Lipscomb, 1986; Worell & Remer, 1992), and (c) provide ways to help clients directly address various oppressive conditions in their lives (Brabeck, 2000; Brown, 1994, 2000). As a result, many students graduate from counseling programs equipped to understand the social and institutional hurdles faced by women, people of color, low-income families, disabled persons, and gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals, among others, as well as the strengths individuals derive from culture, family, and community (Atkinson & Hackett, 1995; Comas-Dias & Greene, 1994; Ivey, D'Andrea, Bradford Ivey, & Simek-Morgan, 2002).

It should be noted that feminist scholars have been criticized for ignoring White women's advantaged position in a power structure that derives from racial privilege (e.g., Dill, 1983). Nevertheless, the discourse on White privilege that characterized White feminism in the 1970s (e.g., Chambless, 1976) has been revived in the "multiracial feminism" of the 1990s, which "stresses the importance of race [and Whiteness] as a power system that interacts with other structured inequalities" (Zajicek, 2002, p. 157). On a similar note, Helms (1994) objected to the generic use of the adjective *multicultural* because such usage shifts the focus of scholarship and practice away from systemic structures that create a racial hierarchy to more nebulous euphemisms such as culture and context. Consequently, she contends that racial inequities are often invisible in multicultural counseling psychology. With

these concerns in mind, we have attempted to purposefully include racism as an explicit focus of our calls for social advocacy in deriving principles for doing social justice work.

Also critical to note is that for the most part, counseling psychologists have adapted multicultural and feminist counseling theories for use in the psychotherapy context. At best, therefore, they have practiced social justice at the micro level rather than engaging in systemic change efforts more directly (Vera & Speight, 2003). Although alleviating individual suffering and promoting individual strengths are worthy goals, many counseling psychologists have joined critical, community, and liberation psychologists (such as Fox, 2003; Freire, 1970/1990; Martin-Baro, 1994; Maton, 2000; Moane, 2003; Prilleltensky, 2001; Rappaport, 2000; and Sarason, 1996) in the view that these endeavors are insufficient as ends in and of themselves. Unless fundamental change occurs within our neighborhoods, schools, media, culture, and religious, political, and social institutions, our work with individuals is destined to be, at best, only partially successful (Brabeck, Walsh, & Latta, 2003; Frankenberg, 1993; Steiner-Adair, 1994; Vera & Speight, 2003). As Prilleltensky (1999) wrote,

> Psychological problems do not exist on their own, nor do they come out of thin air; they are connected to people's social support, employment status, housing conditions, history of discrimination, and overall personal and political power. [Therefore,] promoting complete health means promoting social justice for there cannot be health in the absence of justice. (p. 99)

Thus, the target of intervention in social justice work is the social context in addition to or instead of the individual. Of course, the social context is not some abstract set of disembodied structures. Individuals comprise a social context and shape policies, cultural practices, and social norms. The point here is that social justice–oriented psychologists locate the source of individual suffering in these social conditions and then work to change them.

The obvious challenge is moving from theoretical understanding to practice and action. As a group, applied psychologists are much more adept at diagnosing environmental influences on individual well-being than at redressing those very systems and structures from which individual and community difficulties originate. Put differently, counseling psychologists have not yet developed skills in working at the systemic level—or as Albee (1986, 1996) put it, "with the causes of the causes." In the next section, we describe how principles useful in the practice of feminist and culturally competent individual psychotherapy can be extended to help guide counseling psychologists' work with and for communities.

SOME USEFUL PRINCIPLES FOR SOCIAL
JUSTICE WORK IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

Given counseling psychologists' involvement in the development of feminist and multicultural counseling theories, their relative inattention to social and structural change is strikingly incongruent. After all, the heart of feminist and multicultural practice is a recognition that the individual struggles experienced by so many people actually are rooted in oppressive social, political, and cultural forces and that these struggles cannot truly be resolved without changing the systems and structures from which they arise (Atkinson, Thompson, & Grant, 1993; Morrow & Hawxhurst, 1998). The idea that individual struggles may be created or aggravated by oppressive systems is captured in the well-known feminist phrase "the personal is political."

Despite this gap, however, both feminist therapy and multicultural counseling theories describe principles of psychotherapy that could be adapted to fit social justice–oriented work in the community. Our goal here is not to provide an analysis of the overlap between feminist and multicultural counseling theories, nor is it to develop a comprehensive set of principles for doing social justice work. Instead, we aim to articulate some of the major tenets that run through both feminist and multicultural counseling frameworks and to demonstrate how the two conceptual systems can interweave to guide counseling psychologists as they work toward social justice. We hope that this articulation will begin rather than restrict a conversation about foundational principles for counseling psychologists doing social justice work.

Specifically, we identified six recurring themes or principles that emerged in some of the leading sources on multicultural counseling (e.g., American Psychological Association, 2003; Atkinson et al., 1993; Helms & Cook, 1999; Sue & Sue, 2003) and feminist therapy (e.g., Brown, 1994; Enns, 1997; Gilbert & Scher, 1999; Worell & Johnson, 1997; Worell & Remer, 1992) and in our own efforts at doing and teaching social justice work. These include (a) ongoing self-examination, (b) sharing power, (c) giving voice, (d) facilitating consciousness raising, (e) building on strengths, and (f) leaving clients with the tools for social change. These tenets are useful across a range of social justice practices, including research, program design, policy development, and community intervention. In some sense, these distinctions become artificial in the social justice context because each type leads seamlessly to the others. Research is done to determine community needs, programs are developed to meet those needs, these programs are evaluated to determine their effectiveness in ameliorating problems, and this research then informs policy.

Ongoing Self-Examination

In both feminist and multicultural theories of counseling, we are called on as mental health providers to engage in a process of ongoing self-evaluation (Brown, 1994; Helms & Cook, 1999). As the multicultural guidelines (American Psychological Association, 2003) note, "it is quite common to have automatic biases and stereotypic attitudes about people in the out-group, and for most psychologists, individuals in racial/ethnic minority groups are in an out-group" (p. 383). These deep biases potentially shape the counselors' feelings, thoughts, and behaviors toward their clients with regard to racial dynamics and the conceptualization and treatment of clients' problems (Helms & Cook, 1999). Moreover, the deeply emotional reactions that are evoked in discussions about race may interfere with counselors' ability to perceive and acknowledge their own hidden biases and preconceived notions toward culturally diverse populations (Sue & Sue, 2003). One of the first principles of culturally competent counseling is, therefore, that clinicians and researchers engage in critical self-assessment, as captured in the familiar phrase "counselor, know thyself" (D. W. Sue et al., 1992; Sue & Sue, 2003).

Likewise, feminist theorists recognize that because sociohistorical and sociopolitical forces shape individual development, feminist therapists must be aware of how these forces shape the therapists' own identities and subsequent understanding of their clients. In a related vein, feminist-therapy theorists also point out the impossibility of a value-free therapist and underscore the requirement that counselors clarify their own values and impact on clients (Enns, 1997). Feminist and multicultural theorists therefore remind researchers and practitioners to reflect on and make explicit the values and biases they bring into their clinical practices or the assumptions on which their research questions are based (Brabeck, 2000; Egharevba, 2001; Wyche & Rice, 1997).

Clinicians and researchers are also expected to recognize the role that power plays in their interpersonal interactions with clients or participants (Ballou & Brown, 2002). Feminist and multicultural theorists highlight the need to examine one's "positionality," or relative power with respect to race, ethnicity, and culture as well as gender (Ballou & Brown, 2002; Brabeck, 2000; Brown, 1994; Friedman, 1995; Helms & Cook, 1999; hooks, 1993; McIntosh, 1988). As Brabeck and Brown (1997) wrote,

> As feminist practitioners, we attend to hierarchies of power and dominance among and between people in all practice settings. We notice the ways in which we are both oppressed and oppressor, dominant and marginal, as well as the interactive relationships that emerge from these different positions of power. (p. 25)

Extending this principle of purposeful self-examination to social justice work necessitates that counseling psychologists engage in constant vigilance regarding the assumptions and values underlying their views of the communities they aim to support, the goals they hope to achieve, and the commitments that undergird their work (Prilleltensky, 1997; Tseng et al., 2002). It also means that counseling psychologists need to be aware of the power dynamics in their relationships with community members. What kinds of strengths and vulnerabilities do members of the collaboration bring to the table, and how do these shape the relative power of each member?

Some feminist theorists have introduced the notion of multiple selves in the context of social justice research and action (Fine, 1992; Joseph, 1996; LeCompte, 1995; Reinharz, 1997). When researching or collaborating with community groups, psychologists' roles can shift and change, particularly in situations requiring lengthy involvement. For example, researchers conducting qualitative interviews on domestic violence may, at different points, find themselves drawing on their roles as women or men, as mothers or fathers, as academics, as counselors, and finally, as researchers. Each of these selves should be acknowledged and examined to understand how they may be shaping the research narrative that emerges (Joseph, 1996; Reinharz, 1997). Similarly, psychologists working toward change in communities may draw on multiple roles. Rather than pretend objectivity, they should simply recognize each of the selves that emerge over the course of the work. Likewise, they should pay careful attention to how they are seen by community members. Without such knowledge, they may do damage unwittingly. For example, in an ethnographic study on living with HIV in Uganda, Spittal, Nakuti, Sewankambo, and Willms (1997) sought to interview individuals living with HIV about their experiences. The researchers came to be known in the community as *basawo basilimu* (AIDS doctors). They did not realize initially that their repeated visits to participants' homes for interviews stigmatized these individuals. Visits by any member of the researcher team confirmed to neighbors that an individual was infected with HIV, even if they were not ill. A better understanding of their roles, or selves, in the community and what these represented to its members could have prevented this type of stigmatization.

Sharing Power

One of the central goals of feminist and multicultural counseling theory is to facilitate shared power between clinicians or researchers and the individuals with whom they work (Brabeck, 2000; Brown, 2000; Gunnings & Lipscomb, 1986; Ivey et al., 2002). To the extent possible, the therapeutic relationship in feminist therapy is based on consensual decision making

wherein the therapist's "expertise [is] understood as simply another source of information rather than the best or the most 'objective' of such sources" (Brabeck & Brown, 1997, p. 26) and the possibilities and limits of shared power are made explicit (Morrow & Hawxhurst, 1998). In one particular feminist theory, relational-cultural theory, the notion of sharing power within relationships is termed "mutuality" (Jordan, 1986; Miller & Stiver, 1997; Surrey, Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, & Stiver, 1991). The assumption here is that both parties grow and develop within the context of mutual relationships and that finding ways to share power contributes to the maintenance of these growth-fostering interactions.

Similarly, multicultural counseling theories share an underlying assumption that clinicians should always remain cognizant of the inherent power differentials that exist when working with individuals from disenfranchised minority groups (Helms & Cook, 1999). Professionals are called on to make every effort not to abuse the power they hold within these relationships and, whenever possible, to use this power to secure resources for their clients of color and/or to advocate on their behalf (American Psychological Association, 2003).

When translating the notion of shared power into social justice–oriented community work, Lather (1991) warns against the danger of placing ourselves in the position of "the-ones-who-know-how-to-emancipate-the-oppressed." Indeed, it is imperative that counseling psychologists establish themselves as resources or "co-learners" rather than as experts. By resisting direct service roles and amplifying community members' roles, counseling psychologists may help facilitate community building and foster community members' sense of ownership and efficacy. In turn, this sense of ownership can help community members to view their families and communities as effective change agents. Law (1997), for example, describes a project that began as a study of the environmental challenges faced by parents of children with disabilities. As part of the study, the researchers held focus groups and follow-up interviews with parents. Through these interviews, parents repeatedly mentioned their desire to meet again as a group. In response, the researchers set up a meeting with all of the participants. After hearing the summary of results of the research, parents talked about forming a lobby group to address systemic issues that had come up in the research. As the parents began to take control of the project, the researchers described their own roles shifting. The researchers helped connect the parent group with a national organization that helps parents of special-needs children set up parent support groups. Eventually, the research participants became leaders of the project, with the researchers as supporters. Without flexibility and a willingness to share power on the researchers' part, this kind of outcome would not have been possible.

Interestingly, feminist theorists have also highlighted the notion that because "sharing power" involves collaboration, it privileges the empowerment of groups and the development of the community as a whole over the empowerment of the individual (Riger, 1993). This idea differs sharply from other individualistic conceptions of empowerment that emphasize individual mastery and control. Thus, the notion of sharing power implicitly emphasizes the collective over the individual, the idea of community empowerment over the idea of individual agency.

Sharing power not only allows the voices of marginalized and oppressed groups to emerge, but it also requires that those who traditionally hold power reexamine their perceptions and opinions about the strengths of the more marginalized group. If they truly engage in sharing power, members of the "privileged" group come to see that the "less privileged" group they sought to help has something to teach them in return. If undertaken authentically, sharing power thereby enhances the growth of each collaborator.

Giving Voice

The image of voice is central to feminist theorizing (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Bond, Belenky, & Weinstock, 2000). As Reinharz (1994) noted, "voice" is increasingly appreciated as "a kind of megametaphor representing presence, power, participation, protest, and identity" (p. 183). Feminist theorists have built their theories around the understanding that women's voices have been silenced or suppressed in a patriarchal culture. For example, they describe the ways in which the dominant culture devalues subjective, relational, and collectivist ways of being, thereby devaluing women whose identities are shaped by these values (Belenky et al., 1986; Brown, 1994; Gilligan, 1982). Feminist therapists therefore underscore the importance of advocating for oppressed groups by amplifying their voices both within and outside the therapy office. Indeed, Brabeck and Brown (1997) described the process of feminist therapy as the "desilencing of the oppressed" (p. 26). Brown (1994) explained that to accomplish this "desilencing," therapists must help their clients learn their "mother tongue" or "native language." Once they do, narratives that have been suppressed or devalued by the dominant culture are given new life.

Similarly, multicultural theorists S. Sue and Zane (1987) argued that a therapist's credibility with a culturally different client depends on the therapist's ability to move away from abstract theorizing to conceptualize the problem in a way that is congruent with the client's belief system and cultural context. Moreover, multicultural theorists go beyond the expectation that counselors adopt the perspectives and methods of their clients to urge that they advocate for their clients. Atkinson, Jennings, and Liongson (1990), for

example, described the case of an immigrant who complains of depression after being constantly harassed by Immigration and Naturalization Service agents because he "looks" Mexican, despite his possession of a green card. In this situation, the counselor as advocate may literally give voice to clients who may not be able to represent themselves because of limited English-speaking facility (Atkinson et al., 1993; Sue & Sue, 2003).

Translating the commitment to "give voice" to oppressed groups means helping communities develop shared narratives about their lives, questions, and goals (Rappaport, 2000). For example, Lykes (2001) collaborated with Maya Ixil Women in Guatemala on a research project that employed photography and narrative in the service of healing and change following 36 years of war. Twenty women traveled through their native town of Chajul and neighboring towns, taking pictures and recording narratives about the photos as they went along, to "tell the story of violence" (p. 365) and record the ways in which Guatemalan women responded to the war. Each woman then chose some of her own photos and narratives to share with the other women in the group. After conducting thematic analysis of these photos and their related stories, the women decided to publish a visual and written narrative about their experiences in Guatamala (Lykes, 2001). The subsequent book, titled *Voices and Images: Mayan Ixil Women of Chajul* (ADMI & Lykes, 2000), allowed them to voice stories that had been silenced while creating a community through storytelling and bearing witness to the ways in which violence had torn apart their lives.

As Rappaport (1995) has noted, "the ability to tell one's story, and to have access to and influence over collective stories, is a powerful resource" (p. 802). Two principles follow from this idea. First, counseling psychologists should approach communities with the belief that communities themselves know what questions or problems they want addressed. Only in this way can our interventions, research questions, and methodologies address the real needs of community members as they themselves characterize those needs (LaFromboise, 1988). In describing the importance of giving voice to poor, rural women in the context of a "social action intervention," Bond et al. (2000) noted that "if we begin our inquiries by trying to understand the subordinate group's experience, the limits of conceptual frameworks based on the dominant group's experience can be revealed" (p. 9). This cannot be achieved without spending real time with community members, as mutual trust is critical (LeCompte, 1995).

Second, counseling psychologists must find ways to amplify the voices of community members so that others can learn about their needs, wishes, strengths, and vision. This can involve a broad range of activities, including publishing qualitative studies with and about community members, bringing

their ideas to policy makers, or working with community members to disseminate their ideas to the media.

In reality, however, psychologists and other social scientists have at times exploited disenfranchised communities by doing what some call "drive-by data collection"—treating community members as data banks and then using the data in publications that promote the researchers' careers rather than the communities' well-being (Patai, 1991; Riger, 1999). Consequently, communities often receive psychologists with suspicion and anger, even if the psychologists' intentions seem worthy (LeCompte, 1995). In communities in which psychologists are not immediately welcomed, they must make special efforts to learn about and communicate respect for community members and their traditions.

Of course, the emphasis on privileging the voices of marginalized groups does not necessarily mean that social justice–oriented counseling psychologists do not have a perspective to bring to the table. Indeed, through their work, they may conclude that members of the target community do not recognize some of the ways that social conditions shape their individual experiences. In this case, consciousness raising may be a useful tool.

Consciousness Raising

The fourth principle emerges out of the feminist and multicultural counseling context; consciousness raising means helping clients understand the extent to which individual and private difficulties are rooted in larger historical, social, and political forces (Helms & Cook, 1999; Ivey et al., 2002). The personal is rendered political.

Thus, multicultural counseling theorists urge people of color and White people to become aware of the role that racism, discrimination, and White privilege play in the problems they do or do not face on a daily basis (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1997; Helms & Cook, 1999; Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 2001). For example, Atkinson et al. (1993) warn that recent immigrants, especially those not perceived as White, are often unaware that they have entered a racial hierarchy in this country and that they may well face forms of discrimination that they are poorly equipped to manage, given their often idealized views about immigration to the United States. Thus, immigrants need to be advised of the external sources of problems so as not to mistake their struggles as evidence of personal failings.

Similarly, feminist theories encourage women to become more consciously aware of issues of sexism and male privilege in our society and the ways in which this social context influences their problems (Ballou & Brown, 2002; Brabeck & Brown, 1997). This awareness, coupled with an emerging voice and the skills to resist dominant norms, allows clients to

locate the source of their distress in the social context. Feminist theorists argue that the distress that comes from the experience of being silenced is alleviated through awareness, but the distress that, in turn, arises from that very awareness is treated not through medication and psychotherapy but through social action (Brabeck & Brown, 1997; Brown, 1994, 2000; Perkins, 1991). As Brown (2000) noted, feminist psychotherapy differs radically from traditional psychotherapy in that the role of the therapist is "not to soothe, but to disrupt, not to adjust, but to empower" (p. 369).

Extending this principle to social justice work means acknowledging that although listening to the shared stories community members tell about their lives and asking them to identify relevant barriers as they perceive them are critical, their explanations may represent only part of the whole picture, as members themselves are likely to be shaped by themes prevalent in the dominant culture (Brown, 2000; Riger, 2000). Counseling psychologists doing social justice work can use consciousness-raising techniques for the purposes originally intended—not in an individual counseling context but with community groups that are then poised for social action. Paulo Freire (1975) originally described this method as conscientization, the process whereby people achieve an awareness of the socioeconomic and cultural circumstances that shape their lives and their capacity to transform that reality. When people share their own personal struggles with each other, especially those involving experiences of oppression, they often come to recognize they are not alone, they did not cause these inequities, and their experiences are not random. Instead, they are part of a pattern of oppression created by specific social institutions, structures, or norms. Making these kinds of connections represents the first step toward social change. As Prilleltensky (1989) wrote, "Although awareness does not necessarily guarantee constructive action, it is certainly a condition sine qua non. Psychology is probably the most appropriate science to develop that awareness" (p. 799).

It should be noted, however, that even well-intentioned psychologists need to guard against simply imposing their own group's values on another group in the name of consciousness raising. Moreover, we must be careful that in our attempts to use conscientization, we do not end up denigrating or silencing individuals within a group who may think differently. We must engage people with humility and pluralism, acknowledging that our views arise from our own sociocultural experiences and may not be true for the people with whom we are working.

Focus on Strengths

A chief goal of feminist and multicultural counselors, indeed of counseling psychologists generally, is to identify client's strengths, skills, and talents

and to help them recognize themselves as competent, powerful individuals with the capacity to enact solutions to problems (American Psychological Association, 1999; Brown, 1994; Comas-Diaz, 1991; D. W. Sue, 2001). The Education and Training Committee of Division 17 (Fitzgerald & Nutt, 1986) of the American Psychological Association includes this goal in the very definition of counseling psychology:

> Counseling psychologists enable and facilitate psychological growth and development by helping others better use existing resources and skills, or by guiding them in developing new ways to help themselves. (p. 1)

A prominent theme in feminist therapy, for example, is the notion of cognitive reframing as a tool to help clients view their apparently problematic behavior as "adaptive responses" in the face of oppressive social structures. This reframing allows clients to view themselves more positively and to recognize the strengths they already employ (Brown, 1994; Miller & Stiver, 1997). In a similar manner, multicultural counselors help clients to gain an understanding of how social oppressions (such as racism and discrimination) contribute to their emotional difficulties and to identify internal sources of strength and resilience with which to cope with these adversities (Atkinson et al., 1997; Comas-Diaz & Greene, 1994; Helms & Cook, 1999).

In the social justice context, we must translate this individual-based skill to working toward social change. Just as the individual client may have to make a cognitive shift in his or her understanding of a behavior from negative to positive, so might systems have to shift to accommodate the strengths already existing in the community. Currently, many organizations that work with marginalized communities fail to incorporate their strengths into the program designs. As a case in point, a few years ago, administrators and teachers from a set of local preschools invited Janet Helms (this article's third author) to give a keynote conference presentation on how they might help their African American and Latino/Latina preschoolers to obtain high enough scores on cognitive-ability tests to be admitted to private elementary schools. Janet encouraged these well-intentioned preschool staff members to think about whether they wanted their children to give up their culture in the ways that would be necessary for them to perform at the levels that admissions committees were requiring. For example, Latino/Latina parents were being encouraged not to speak Spanish to their children. Consequently, although the children could speak better English than their parents, they could no longer communicate with their grandparents and were distancing themselves from their own parents, whose English they found embarrassing. Janet pointed out literature that suggests that bilingualism is an asset rather

than a deficit in older children and encouraged the audience to think about ways that they could advocate for change in the cultures of the elementary schools so that students' linguistic assets and cultural socialization experiences could be more valued and integrated into the predominantly monolingual, White, privileged school environments they were seeking to enter.

Leaving Clients With Tools

The last principle returns full circle to our definition of social justice work as increasing access to the tools of self-determination among marginalized groups. Feminists have historically promoted the ideals of autonomy, self-determinism, personal effectiveness, and self-fulfillment. Even feminist theories that emphasize the importance of cooperation and working within ongoing relationships describe how most relationships must shift to a less dependent, more mutual type over time (e.g., Jordan, 1992).

Multicultural counseling theories reflect this principle in their emphasis on facilitating self-help and indigenous support systems (Atkinson et al., 1993). Counselors need to know what kinds of support systems are available in the indigenous culture, such as extended family, community elders, and religious support groups. By fostering the ongoing development of support systems that evolved in the client's own culture, a clinician may ensure that the client can continue to be supported after initial clinical crises and interventions have ended.

Translated to the community level, the aim of our collaboration is not to develop a one-sided or hierarchical dependency that may render the community or system helpless once we leave but rather to support strengths that will continue to thrive beyond our explicit involvement. Therefore, early in the collaborative process, psychologists must consult with community members about what tools they feel are necessary for sustainability. Collaborating with the community of interest in the development of interventions must include explicit plans for postcollaboration continuation and provide opportunities for the expansion of community resources that will permit communities to advance as far as their new abilities permit. This may mean, for example, training community members in grant writing to secure ongoing funding for their projects or working with them to develop peer-training models. To the extent possible, the counseling psychologist working from a social justice perspective should engage with the community in such a way that his or her presence becomes unnecessary for its continued growth and the empowerment of its members.

INTEGRATING SOCIAL JUSTICE WORK AND TRAINING:
THE BOSTON COLLEGE EXAMPLE

The counseling psychology program at Boston College (BC) is located in the Lynch School of Education (LSOE). The mission statements of the university at large, the school, and our graduate program all highlight a commitment to social justice (BC, 2003). In an attempt to train our students in roles that extend beyond the traditional, individually focused work of counseling and psychotherapy to work that addresses social justice issues more directly, in 1997, the Counseling Psychology Program at BC instituted a unique training requirement, called the "First Year Experience" (FYE).[1] As part of the FYE, 1st-year doctoral students spend approximately 6 hours each week working in urban, community sites including public schools, courts, detention centers, community-organizing agencies, and public health departments. Rather than working in traditional roles at these sites, students develop skills in prevention, interprofessional collaboration, and advocacy.

The principles described above have guided the development of this program, the goals of which, beyond exposure to expanded professional roles, are to help students (a) gain an awareness of systemic factors impacting mental health, psychological growth, and career development; (b) experience collaboration across professions; (c) do collaborative work, advocacy, or indirect service with underserved populations; and (d) engage in the design, delivery, and/or evaluation of preventive interventions (BC, 2003). The FYE is designed to expose students to work at the meso (community, organizations) and macro (government, policy, social norms) levels instead of, or in addition to, the more traditional micro (individual) level (Moane, 2003). It is also meant to teach students that working for social justice can involve collaborating directly with those marginalized communities whose situations counseling psychologists are interested in improving or with those groups with the power to make changes happen—those who hold the purse strings, develop policies, or run programs. As Lewis and Vasquez (2000) have noted, social justice cannot be achieved without both the passionate push (from those with less power) and the compassionate pull (from those with more power).

Students engage in a wide variety of projects through the FYE, all of which are developed or discovered through faculty-community collaborations. It has taken years to shape these opportunities and requires a considerable time commitment on the part of all faculty members in the program to maintain them. Sometimes, specific projects do not go as planned, and students are disappointed. Other times, students are electrified by their projects and continue the work well beyond the required year. Often, their work during the FYE becomes the basis of a research project (see, e.g., Blustein et al.,

2001; Latta & Goodman, in press; Sparks & Prosper, 2001). Sometimes, it becomes the basis for long discussions about "broken" systems, but more often, it triggers interesting conversations about the core role of social context in peoples' emotional well-being. Over the past 3 years, students have worked as domestic-violence advocates in a court system, helped to develop a program for the children of new immigrants, collaborated with lawyers to develop the asylum cases of political refugees, helped to develop comprehensive social and health services in a local school system, worked in a grassroots political-action organization for the rights and empowerment of the Chinese community, conducted educational advocacy in a school system, developed a set of policy recommendations regarding domestic-violence services for a city's department of public health, designed and implemented a psychoeducational program on school-to-work issues for high school students, consulted with lawyers who work with girls in the juvenile justice system, and worked on a community-organizing project for low-income women with depression. While performing these activities, FYE students received individual supervision from a range of people, depending on the nature of the activity, even though their main supervisor is on-site. For some, the on-site supervisor is a BC faculty member. For others, it is an agency staff person or program developer.

Regardless of who does the primary supervision, all students take part in an FYE seminar that meets bimonthly at BC. In that seminar, students get a chance to discuss their experiences with each other; explore the ways in which their own gender, race, and class shape those experiences; and develop the connections between their own individual endeavors and the larger social justice mission in which they are all engaged. At the end of the year, students present their projects to the faculty and students of the counseling psychology program. In these presentations, they describe the work they have done, how they have incorporated social justice principles into their work, and the kinds of struggles and joys they have experienced.[2]

The regular seminar meetings and end-of-the-year presentations also serve as an informal method for ongoing evaluation of the FYE program. In the future, we plan to formalize the evaluation process by conducting focus groups and surveys with FYE student participants about their learning experiences, successes, failings, and findings. Findings from these evaluations will be used to further refine the FYE program.

Although the FYE does not continue formally into the students' 2nd year, many, if not most, of the courses students take over the next few years continue to engage them around issues of social justice research and practice. For example, research-methods courses teach students nontraditional methods for data collection (i.e., qualitative methodology, needs assessment, participatory research methods). Counseling theory and assessment courses go

beyond teaching traditional counseling and developmental theories and provide an opportunity for a critical analysis of these theories and assessment practices based on ecological and social justice perspectives. The ethics class helps students think about the limitations of traditional ethical decision-making frameworks for work with communities (see ethics section below). And the consultation course requires students to consult with a variety of community organizations seeking to make systemic changes.

In the next section, we describe four FYE activities in greater detail to illustrate the experiences students have in these placements and how they have engaged the principles described above in their work. We then explore a variety of ethical dilemmas that have arisen for students as they engage in social justice work. The first placement involves running an intervention in the Boston Public School System for ninth-grade students called Tools for Tomorrow (TFT). This program, developed by BC faculty members[3] in partnership with the School-to-Career Office of the Boston Public Schools (BPS), was designed to address the uncertainty and even despair that urban high school youth face in relation to career choices (Hartung & Blustein, 2002). The TFT curriculum underscores the nonacademic barriers to learning and career preparation confronting these students, many of whom are immigrants and live below the poverty line. These barriers include family problems, substance abuse, lack of financial resources, and aversive peer relationships. As part of the FYE, counseling psychology graduate students are paired with teachers from the BPS to teach this curriculum through weekly structured group activities (Hartung & Blustein, 2002; Solberg, Howard, Blustein, & Close, 2002).

Counseling psychology students working with TFT aim to intervene at both the micro and the meso levels. At the micro level, the curriculum seeks to change the poor expectations for success that urban youths have internalized regarding academic achievement and career prospects and to provide them with skills to maximize their chances for gaining access to resources and opportunities. The activities that constitute the TFT curriculum raise the students' awareness of both the challenges they face and the resources they possess as they reach toward their career goals. But changing these youths' beliefs makes little difference if the structures surrounding them are unsupportive or undermining. The TFT curriculum affects the meso level through its impact on teacher attitudes and perceptions of students. The activities and group discussions that are part of TFT expose teachers to a side of students' lives that is typically not addressed in school. Through TFT, teachers gain a broader, more comprehensive understanding of the lives of their students, which in turn enables them to have a more empathic understanding of the daily challenges that students face. Thus, at the meso level, TFT facilitators are working to change the school system itself by engaging Boston

Public School teachers in a process through which students' life experiences become more integrated into the classroom.

A second FYE placement is with the Juvenile Rights Advocacy Project (JRAP), based in BC's Law School (Sherman, 2001).[4] The project is interdisciplinary in nature, involving graduate students in law, social work, and counseling psychology. Law students enrolled in this program represent girls in the Massachusetts justice system and serve as guardians *ad litem* for girls in the status-offender system. Some law students may also become engaged in policy-level advocacy for these girls. Graduate students from counseling psychology provide consultation to JRAP on a range of topics from helping the law students listen to and communicate with the girls more effectively to working with judges and lawyers to develop alternative sentences that are more context sensitive and rehabilitation oriented.

JRAP involves counseling psychology graduate students in social justice work at all three levels—the micro, the meso, and the macro. At the micro level, the students conduct in-depth interviews with girls in the justice system to understand and then explain their psychological and social needs. At the meso level, they transform the law students' education by helping them think more contextually about their clients. Finally, at the macro level, they work to change the legal system by educating justice-system agents about the social and contextual dimensions of the girls' lives.

A third FYE project, called ROAD (Reaching Out About Depression), involves students with a peer-support and community-organizing project for low-income women struggling with depression.[5] Building on the belief that traditional mental health treatment may be too narrowly conceptualized to meet poor women's real needs, the ROAD model addresses not only the individual symptoms of depression but also the sociocultural conditions that influence or even create them. ROAD, which is based at a statewide advocacy organization and privately funded, emphasizes peer support and political action as mutually reinforcing contributors to low-income women's mental health and well-being. The development of a series of "supportive action groups," or workshops composed of low-income women with depression and led by women from the same community (who develop the groups themselves), is at the heart of the ROAD project. The counseling psychology student working with this project is involved in the ongoing evaluation of ROAD, as well as the ROAD "planning group" composed of community organizers, advocates, and academics (including Lisa Goodman, the first author of this article).

As is true of the other FYE projects, ROAD seeks to make an impact at multiple levels. At the micro level, ROAD aims to improve the emotional well-being of the individual women who participate in it directly. At the meso level, it helps develop avenues women can use to effect change in their local

communities. At the macro level, its ambitious agenda is to serve as a model for how women can heal from depression and, at the same time, collaborate with programs and policy makers to create social change for other women in their communities.

Although TFT, JRAP, and ROAD involve direct interventions with programs or communities, some FYE placements emphasize research. A fourth placement is with a local public health department's office on violence prevention. Rachel Latta (the fourth author of this article) and Lisa Goodman (the first author) worked with this office to conduct a citywide needs assessment to understand the strengths and limitations of the city's services for Haitian immigrant women who have experienced domestic violence.[6] This issue was examined from two perspectives. First, Haitian community leaders helped Rachel understand the cultural dimensions of violence for Haitian immigrants and the types of culture-specific programs that should be developed for Haitian victims of intimate-partner violence. Second, Rachel conducted interviews with mainstream domestic-violence service providers regarding the services currently offered and the extent to which these services are culturally competent, particularly with regard to Haitian women. After completing the study, Rachel presented the final report to a city official, who plans to implement some of the recommendations (Latta & Goodman, in press). This FYE represents intervention at both the meso and the macro levels. At the meso level, the report gave voice to the concerns of Haitian community leaders regarding traditional domestic-violence services and empowered them to state what type of change they wanted to see in service provision to their communities. At the macro level, the research was reported directly to the city government, allowing change to occur at the policy and governmental levels.

In the next sections, we describe some of the difficulties and successes our students have encountered as they faced the challenge of moving beyond individual- or group-focused interventions to effect change at a broader systemic level. Specifically, we discuss how they have struggled with the principles laid out above in their work with and for larger communities. We then describe specific ethical dilemmas that students have confronted as they engage in this work. The student examples come from interviews we conducted with students who participated in the FYE during the past 2 years.

Students' Experiences With
Self-Examination in Social Justice Work

Counseling psychology graduate students working in TFT vividly demonstrate the struggles and rewards of self-examination. These counseling students spend significant time in classrooms working with urban high school

students of color. The counseling psychology students, who often are not people of color themselves, must strive to become aware of their own biases, values, and conferred privileges in relation to their students. Through this self-examination, the counseling students are then able to enter into more collaborative relationships with the ninth graders.

One counseling psychology student, Kevin Henze, a White, middle-class man, described the shift in his thinking that occurred over the year that he was involved with TFT. He went into the program believing that TFT would provide the high school students with a clear model that could help them discover their career aspirations and define pathways toward traditional forms of success. In essence, TFT would have "answers" for them. After working with the students for some time, however, Kevin found that he had more questions than answers. Again and again, he heard them talk in concrete terms about the barriers they faced in defining and working toward careers—barriers that differed significantly from his own high school experience. The obstacles ranged from the seemingly mundane, such as students' having to spend an hour and a half commuting to school in the morning, sometimes leaving their homes at 5:30 a.m., to more abstract obstacles, such as racism or classism. For example, in one exercise, students were asked to think about their career goals and talk about who would be most surprised to see them succeed in this goal. One African American student said that he would like to be a lawyer. When asked who would be most surprised to see him succeed as a lawyer, the student responded "other lawyers. They wouldn't expect to see a Black kid like me." This highlighted for Kevin the conferred privileges he had received as a White man and how little he had considered the pervasive and tangible effects of racism and oppression for many of these students. Drawing from this and other similar interactions, Kevin was able to adjust his interaction with the high school students to reflect his growing recognition of the centrality of poverty, culture, and discrimination to their ideas about career.

More generally, because genuine and accurate self-evaluation is most effectively done in dialogue with others rather than in isolation, we ask students to engage in a certain level of self-disclosure. This request has led some FYE students to worry about the social and professional costs of doing so. They have worried that the academic setting does not represent a safe zone for open exploration of personal biases because of dual relationships between students, peers, and academic supervisors. Indeed, students have worried that admitting their vulnerabilities might open them up to negative evaluation and criticism in a setting where they hold unequal power. Interestingly, however, these students have felt increasingly comfortable about this kind of self-disclosure as faculty members have become clearer about their own sense of vulnerability as they engage in the same process. In one particu-

lar FYE meeting, a faculty member explained that even for faculty members, dual relationships make open personal exploration feel unsafe in academic and community contexts. Faculty, too, must risk appearing incompetent, ignorant, or offensive in the eyes of the various communities with which they interact both inside and outside the academy. Once faculty members and students acknowledged that both groups had much to learn, had many blind spots to remedy, and had something to lose and gain by taking risks with self-disclosure, more open discussion became possible.

Sharing Power

Power sharing can be conceptualized in numerous ways and across many different kinds of stakeholders. ROAD offers an interesting example of sharing power among professional and community participants. The value of collaboration has driven the conceptualization and evaluation of ROAD from the start. The program evaluation process itself, for example, aims to empower participants by giving them an opportunity to reflect on their own lives and situations and then make desired changes (Fetterman, 2000; Patton, 2000). As part of the evaluation process, ROAD participants are given the opportunity (via ongoing journals or tape recordings) to comment on their experience of each meeting. Sarah Weintraub, the sixth author of this article and a counseling psychology student working with the ROAD evaluation, codes and analyzes these narratives and then brings them back to the group for discussion of the themes that emerged. The evaluation is being conducted in this kind of ongoing way so that participants can hear and give feedback that can be put to use immediately to shape the program itself.

Even with the explicit goal of sharing power in the forefront, however, practice sometimes needs to catch up with rhetoric. For example, Sarah and the other evaluators developed a set of evaluation questions to ask participants after each meeting but soon heard from the ROAD participants that the questions seemed too focused on negative aspects of their experiences and, furthermore, that the nature of the questions made them feel like they were being "checked-up on" or measured against some outside standard. This revelation led to a new process in which the participants helped create the evaluation questions. Although this shift seems subtle, it proved to be a pivotal moment in moving beyond an ideological commitment to sharing power to actually shifting processes and methods to ensure that power was shared in a practical way.

Experiences like this, in which Sarah faced the real meaning of sharing power, led her to begin to grapple with her own role as a developing psychologist. As she describes it,

> Part of my socialization into psychology has been to think of myself as a skilled and competent expert. But with ROAD, I am being told that the women partici- pating are the experts of their own lives. They are teaching me more than I am teaching them. Even with the research (about which I am supposed to be the one in-the-know), they are deciding the methods to use at least as much as I am. This is sometimes confusing as it goes counter to the message I get in many other professional contexts.

TFT provides another useful example of sharing power, this time among collaborators. The idea for the program developed out of the mutual needs of the BPS and BC counseling psychology faculty. The BPS School-to-Work office wanted to find a way to infuse vocational-readiness skills into the high school curriculum, while BC faculty wanted to better understand the process of collaboration with the public schools. Each of the BPS and BC team mem- bers had been involved in other attempts at university/school collaborations where shared power had been a goal that was not fully realized. TFT proved to be a different experience. From the beginning of the collaboration, BC fac- ulty and BPS staff were equal partners in the process. Everyone's voice was carefully solicited and heard, and all areas of expertise equally contributed to the development of the TFT curriculum. The experience of shared power continued into the implementation phase, when the BC collaborators added graduate student facilitators to the TFT team. The students' ideas and opin- ions were included in the conversation, and their experiences working with the curriculum were influential in shaping the revisions to the curriculum. In an evaluation of the 1st-year implementation process, TFT team members who were interviewed commented on the ways that power was equally shared during the collaboration. This led to team members feeling a sense of ownership for the program, which in turn contributed to an ongoing commitment both from BC counseling psychology faculty and students and from BPS to continue the program.

Giving Voice to Oppressed Groups

As with sharing power, giving voice can mean many different things, depending on the nature of the project. In the case of the researchers assess- ing service provision to Haitian immigrant domestic-violence survivors, Rachel and Lisa worked to elicit and amplify the voices of Haitian commu- nity members through the use of a qualitative method of inquiry. By using open-ended interviews, we allowed participants to define their own subjec- tive experiences in context, as opposed to imposing a preformed framework through a questionnaire or closed interview (Creswell, 1998). Data analysis was content derived, indicating that preconceived categories were not super-

imposed on data. Rather, categories emerged from the data as coding proceeded. Also, data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously so that each could influence the other (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992; Sandelowski, 2000). Finally, to ensure the credibility and validity of the findings, we established a Haitian advisory board, which was made up of Haitian community leaders. The advisory board was given a detailed summary of the findings, interpretations, and conclusions of the research and encouraged to give feedback regarding the accuracy and credibility of the research (Latta & Goodman, in press).

As a result of this methodology, our view of the work was transformed following pilot interviews with community members and service providers. We expected to learn about the problems with existing services and how to make them more culturally competent. After speaking with community members, however, it became clear to us that providing adequate services for Haitian immigrant women would require more than "cleaning up" or adding to existing services. Instead, community members wanted to reflect on alternative strategies for addressing intimate-partner violence that did not even involve the mainstream system of service provision.

Given our use of qualitative methodology, we were able to shift our focus following these initial interviews, allowing the research participants to help define the research questions themselves. This shift, however, required more than just an appropriate methodology. It also required that we listen carefully enough to the voices of Haitian community leaders to hear their frustration with mainstream services, even when the frustration was not expressed loudly or directly; it demanded that we trust their ability to assess what services would and would not work for their community.

Sarah's experience with ROAD provides another example of giving voice. One of the project's components, built on the work of The Kitchen Table Project, an earlier community-organizing project in the same city, is the concept of the "invite-in." During an invite-in, ROAD participants invite a community leader to sit in on their group. ROAD women then share with these leaders their experiences with the particular set of services for which the leader is responsible, offering suggestions for improvement. The Kitchen Table Project, for example, invited to its group a high official in the city's health alliance to talk about structural difficulties for women moving from welfare to work. They expressed dismay to this official that the local pharmacy was not open after normal work hours. Given how frequently they and their children became sick (which is common in low-income communities), this was no small matter. As a result of this process, the pharmacy expanded its hours.

When Sarah heard about this success, she was struck by these women's collective power and the real impact this change would likely have on their

well-being. But it also caused her to question how she could spend her professional life concentrating the majority of her energy on the psychology of individuals given the obvious power of collective action to change life circumstances. This is a common response for students working on social justice projects.

Consciousness Raising

Although we traditionally think of consciousness raising as occurring among oppressed or less-privileged groups, raising awareness of power and the effects of the dominant race and culture among those with more power is equally important. JRAP provides one example of consciousness raising among those in power. The focus of the program is to help law students to see the gray areas between the polarized views of right and wrong so central to our criminal justice system. Consciousness raising occurs first with the law students themselves as they begin to understand the context of their clients' lives and the ways in which broader social issues play out at the individual level. But the awareness goes beyond the law students to the judges and district attorneys with whom they interact in court on behalf of their clients. For example, by suggesting alternative sentences that take into account their clients' complicated lives, JRAP participants do not simply reproduce the status quo. Instead, they help to raise the awareness of others in the legal system about the realities these girls face every day. Counseling psychology students involved with JRAP play a central role in this process by working with the law students in the clinic to reconceptualize the notion of "consequences" and to consider how the justice system may set up their clients for failure. One counseling psychology student, Julie Jackson, for example, challenged her law student peers to ask questions such as, "What is the background of a particular client?" "What is the nature of her crime and what meaning does it have for her?" "Is a young girl shoplifting out of necessity?" and "Why is she running away from her home?" Then, given this contextual understanding, Julie asked the law students to consider what a traditional sentence would mean to an individual client—that is, what does it mean to sentence a 15-year-old girl to 5 years probation with a 7:00 p.m. curfew? Is it a realistic expectation given the culture in which this girl lives? Does she have familial support to help her follow the terms of her probation? Or does the sentence just set her up to fail? By infusing psychosocial and contextual issues in this way, it is possible to help legal advocates have a more comprehensive, in-depth analysis of their clients' situations as they work through disposition planning (J. H. Jackson, personal communication, June 2003).

Focus on Strengths

Despite the values and orientation of counseling psychologists, we too often find ourselves emphasizing the vulnerabilities and failing to capitalize on the strengths of those with whom we work. The FYE project that involved a needs assessment of Haitian immigrant women in Cambridge who had been victimized by violence shows how community participants remind us to focus on strengths. Early interviews with Haitian community leaders quickly revealed that they were interested in creating alternative services and programs that built on the cultural and historical experiences of Haitian women. For example, although many of the Haitian participants noted that family loyalty and religious beliefs were contributors to the problem of domestic violence in the Haitian community, they were also quick to point out that these values were critical to the solution as well (Latta & Goodman, in press). These community leaders therefore advocated for services designed by and for Haitian community members that would draw on their own values, beliefs, and practices. We built on these findings in our report to the city by recommending several community-based violence-prevention interventions that were family and church focused.

One suggestion, for example, built on the Haitian cultural imperative to prioritize children and family. The intervention that we proposed is based on the work of the Action for Boston Community Development (2003), although their project emphasizes HIV prevention. Women host "parties" in their own homes that become the forum for thought-provoking discussions on safety for women and their families. In the report, we suggested that discussions on family difficulties and protecting children would be more accessible to Haitian women than an intervention that directly targeted the women themselves. Nevertheless, we hoped that conversations about the impact of violence and abuse on children would serve as a gateway to discussions of how intimate-partner violence affects adult relationships and women themselves.

Leaving Clients With Tools

From the beginning of our work with community members, we need to collaborate in ways that will create programs that are sustainable even without our involvement (McCroskey, 2003). The ultimate goal of TFT is to leave the students with the tools needed to re-engage in their schools and in planning their futures and to leave teachers and school administrators with the tools to more fully understand and promote the social-emotional development, career goals, and cultural identities of their students. In addition, the BC team members hope to make TFT sustainable without BC financial and/

or personnel resources. The ultimate goal of the students working with JRAP is to leave law students, lawyers, and judges with a better understanding of the sociocultural and psychosocial influences on their clients' lives. The aim of this collaboration is to establish a better link between psychology and law, allowing these future lawyers to have a clearer understanding of what psychologists can offer and to see the benefits of consulting with psychologists. Thus, the students hope to leave the lawyers with new tools and new abilities to work with their clients. From its inception, ROAD has attended to the importance of leaving participants with the resources to continue their work. Thus, the current group is focused on training participants, who will then go out into their communities and lead their own ROAD workshops. Participants in these workshops will, in turn, be given the opportunity to participate in new trainings so that they, in turn, can become ROAD leaders. As for the project with Haitian immigrant women, the ultimate goal is to help the community develop programs to serve victims of violence—programs that are in and of the Haitian community itself.

ETHICAL AND OTHER DILEMMAS
IN SOCIAL JUSTICE WORK

Feminist and multicultural psychology perspectives on ethics underlie each of the six tenets described above. These include the requirements that we commit to understanding ethnically, linguistically, and racially diverse individuals; strive to apply culturally appropriate skills; attend to the needs of oppressed groups; value peoples' subjective experiences; recognize our own biases; work to ensure political, economic, and social equality; and examine power in relationships (American Psychological Association, 2003; Brabeck & Latta, 2003; Brabeck & Ting, 2000).

Two broad and overlapping ethical mandates are implicit in these ethical guidelines, as well as in the six social justice tenets described above: First, the idea that values should and do shape our endeavors as researchers and practitioners is common to all. Feminist and multicultural theorists have long recognized that research is political, whether it uncritically reflects the status quo or explicitly challenges it (Brabeck & Ting, 2000; Mulvey, 1988). The same could be said of practice: The ways we relate to individuals, families, and communities necessarily reflect our personal values and the values of the organizations and systems in which we operate (Brown, 1994; Prilletensky, 1994). The second implicit ethical mandate in both feminist and multicultural perspectives is that the processes and outcomes of our work should entail empowerment and collaboration rather than exploitation and objectification. There are few, if any, psychologists today who knowingly

approach their work with the intention of exploiting or objectifying those they are trying to help. Yet research and practice can all too easily produce this undesired result. For example, when researchers distance themselves from the lived, subjective experience of the research participants—as is mandated by positivist research methods—the result can be a distorted depiction of reality, one that is then described as "objective" (Gaventa & Cornwall, 2001). Consistent with a social justice framework, the idea of empowerment must encompass not only a psychological sense of power but also actual control and influence in the social and political realms (Riger, 2002).

Within the context of these overarching mandates, however, the concrete practice of a social justice–oriented counseling psychology—one that is consistent with the tenets described in this article—raises a number of difficult ethical challenges. In the next section, we outline a series of ethical dilemmas that have arisen over the course of students' involvement in FYE. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to offer solutions for these dilemmas, the following examples provide a broad outline of some difficult questions that need to be addressed when engaging in this kind of work.

Ongoing Self-Evaluation

The tenet of ongoing self-evaluation in the context of social justice work gives rise to a fundamental ethical dilemma relevant to the other tenets as well: When honest introspection uncovers strongly held values (political, religious, or other) different from those of the community members with whom we are working, how do we navigate these differences? For example, several FYE students developed a series of "empowerment" groups for Asian American middle school girls who reported feeling marginalized in their school communities. Teachers also reported that the girls appeared distant and uninvolved in their classes. The goal of the groups was to help the girls fare better in the school context by teaching them first to articulate their own needs and second to assert themselves to get those needs met. It was only through a process of introspection and discussion that the FYE students realized that these values were culturally bound rather than universal goals. They also came to recognize that the girls did not share these individualistic goals. Many disclosed that they felt uncomfortable with the behaviors associated with "empowerment," such as speaking up in class. Instead, the girls wanted to hold onto their cultural values of modesty, respect, honor, and collectivism. Although these values cannot be reconciled easily, the students' recognition of their contrasting perspectives allowed for new and interesting conversations in the group about what is lost and gained within each value system. This example helps to illustrate the importance of checking our own values and being aware of how these may not be aligned with those of the communi-

ties with whom we are working. In the end, however, as counseling psychologists committed to social justice, we must acknowledge that to some extent, our work will remain grounded in our own viewpoints and will be both strengthened and limited by our own histories and experiences.

Sharing Power

Although shared power is appealing in principle, ethical dilemmas often arise concerning what processes and outcomes truly reflect the shared power among different constituents. The issue of monetary payment in social justice–oriented research raises one such dilemma. On one hand, when community members participate in research, it seems obvious that they should be compensated for their time, especially since the researchers themselves are likely compensated through salaries or other external rewards. On the other hand, financial compensation may have different meaning in different contexts. FYE students have questioned whether low-income participants can voluntarily give informed consent if they are offered payment for participation. When doing research with low-income communities, the students wondered whether researchers may inadvertently "coerce" or induce community members to participate if the financial incentive is significant enough. For some of the low-income women participating in ROAD, for example, the $20 incentive for research participation was too substantial to refuse, regardless of their real feelings about participation. This put the ROAD planning-committee members in a difficult situation. Should they pay less? Should they find an alternative to financial rewards? Several researchers working with homeless participants have dealt with this issue by offering rewards such as meal vouchers or bus tokens instead of cash (Unger, Kipke, Simon, Montgomery, & Johnson, 1997). Liebow (1993) ran errands for her homeless participants and helped them with needed transportation. This kind of compensation may place researcher and participant on more equal footing because the implicit message is that each constituent is doing something to help the other (Paradis, 2000).

When working with multiple community groups, as TFT and JRAP students did, informed consent can also become complicated. In these types of programs, there are many levels of participation. In JRAP, there are the girls receiving legal services, the law students providing legal services, the administrators of the program, and the counseling psychology students providing consultation to the law students. In TFT, there are the high school students receiving the curriculum, the counseling psychology students teaching the curriculum, classroom teachers bringing the TFT curriculum into their subject period, school administrators who have approved the TFT curriculum, and BC faculty and students who have developed and written the TFT curric-

ulum. When considering informed consent around the writing of this article, we struggled over whose consent was necessary to obtain. The counseling psychology students involved in the programs? The administrators of the programs? The clients and/or students receiving the services? We also wondered what we would do if some participants did not consent. What relative weight do we give our needs and wishes as collaborators in these programs? How do we balance our own needs with protecting the rights of participants? Demonstrating a commitment to the ethical principle of sharing power thus raises questions regarding whose power should be shared and what sharing actually entails.

Another ethical dilemma that falls within the category of sharing power involves tensions around who benefits from the publication of ideas arising from the project. Although conducting and publishing research often benefits researchers' professional lives and careers, the rewards for research participants are sometimes nonexistent because as Paradis (2000) pointed out, paying participants is no substitute for ensuring more intrinsic benefits to them. As a start, researchers committed to social justice should develop publications that can be used to advocate for the needs of the community that the research participants represent. Yet we have to acknowledge that only rarely does research produce changes that directly affect those particular individuals "being studied." Some participants may feel rewarded simply by the opportunity to express their views (through the publications) to policy makers and others who run the systems with which they engage. Another possibility is for researchers to commit a portion of their time to advocate for individual participants or to support participants' own efforts at activism (see, e.g., Kiselica, 1999, 2000; Rosenthal, 1991).

Giving Voice

Difficult ethical dilemmas also arise when social justice agents engage with individuals and communities to amplify their voices. To begin, which communities' voices should be amplified? On what basis should choices be made to direct limited resources toward one community over another?

Even within a single community, it may prove daunting to reconcile dissonant voices. One of the goals of TFT, for example, is to encourage students to explore their individual interests, hopes, and goals. But this kind of individualistic goal may be inconsistent with the collectivist orientations of students' parents, families, or communities, who expect the students to follow pathways that are clearly delineated for them. This may include continuing a family business, joining the armed services, or focusing on starting a family. So when perspectives are not consistent with each other, whose are privileged? By encouraging personal exploration in the classroom, TFT may be ignoring

the voices and wishes of students' family members and the larger community. Although TFT coordinators were aware of this dilemma, they chose nevertheless to amplify the voices of their students who had been systematically silenced throughout much of their education. Yet they continued to struggle with doubts about the wisdom of this approach. As noted above, it is important that we continually question our value-based decisions and strive for open dialogue with all of our collaborators.

Giving voice may be further complicated by a researcher's limited ability to speak for the target population. For instance, while conducting needs assessment for Haitian immigrant women who experienced domestic violence, Rachel questioned how language might affect her research. She did not speak Haitian Creole, which limited her interviews with Haitian community members to those who spoke English. Moreover, she was not fully cognizant of the nuances and intricacies of their culture. What is lost when the researcher neither speaks the native language nor deeply understands the culture of the research participants? What does it mean to give voice only in the dominant language? Is there a way that we are already muting voices when they are represented in their second or third language? When we represent the voices of a particular community, what are the pros and cons of framing those voices in professional language that the community members themselves often do not understand? Does it simultaneously disempower them and teach others about them (Paradis, 2000)?

Given her inability to speak Haitian Creole, Rachel's project involved speaking with service providers rather than with service recipients. This led to another dilemma around voice: How could she remain accountable to the different constituencies within the Haitian community? How could she be certain that she was best representing the voice of the community? In her effort to ensure that the experiences of Haitian women would be authentically represented in the research, she augmented her understanding of the context surrounding the women's experiences by talking with Haitian friends and acquaintances and by reading published accounts of the experiences and strengths of Haitian Americans and of the political and historical situation in Haiti. Nevertheless, she fully recognized that in the end, her representations could only approximate the real experiences of Haitian women. Research with marginalized communities almost always involves crossing boundaries—that is, differing racial, ethnic, gender, language, citizenship, educational, or age backgrounds. This requires social justice agents to be keenly aware of the issues involved in representing the voices of people so different from the agents.

Finally, should a social justice agent support community members' voices even when they seem self-destructive? FYE students involved with JRAP, for example, struggled with the often-contradictory goals of pursuing what they

believed to be the best interests of the girls involved in the juvenile justice system and the girls' actual wishes. A student working with JRAP described a case in which a girl wanted to leave a supervised program to move in with her boyfriend. The boyfriend had used violence against this girl numerous times in the past. In his interactions with the girl, the attorney, and the judge, the FYE student struggled with whether to support the girl's wish to move in with her boyfriend—a situation that had proven to be dangerous in the past— or to recommend that she remain in the program and continue to receive its supervision, safety, and support. While the FYE student wanted to validate his client's voice and wishes, including her ability to advocate for herself and determine her own needs, he also felt professionally obligated to ensure that supports were in place to help her access her voice in an ongoing way. While there are no clear rules to guide this kind of deliberation, the act of reflecting on the multiple issues involved and discussing them with the relevant parties inevitably leads to a more equitable balance of power and voice within relationships.

Consciousness Raising

In social justice work, the process of consciousness raising may also present ethical dilemmas. First, by identifying consciousness raising as a fundamental ethical and professional responsibility, practitioners, researchers, and students are implicitly characterizing themselves as having achieved some level of critical consciousness. This may place some in an awkward position that feels presumptuous, particularly for those who feel less "enlightened" than their professional role suggests. This delicate balancing act between our roles as educators and as learners is central to all social justice work. A crucial part of this work entails learning to occupy our areas of expertise with humility and a willingness to admit to areas in which we are lacking.

FYE students working with the TFT program have expressed a related concern around issues of educating or consciousness raising about something they have not experienced directly. In TFT, urban high school students engage in a dialogue on racism as part of the curriculum. In preparation for these dialogues, White facilitators questioned whether it was ethical for them, as members of the dominant culture, to "raise the consciousness" of their students of color, especially when some of these students denied the existence of racism or insisted no barrier related to discrimination would deter their success. While the facilitators had experienced oppression in other domains of their lives, such as gender or sexual orientation, they did not share a lived experience of racism. Did this, then, ethically exclude them from the role of educator about racism? In general, should individuals be taught about the ways in which they are oppressed by those who do not experience similar

oppression or cannot intimately understand such experiences of oppression? While there are no obvious answers to this question, reflecting on it helped the FYE students navigate the issue of race with more empathy and humility.

Building on Strengths

Ethical dilemmas may also emerge in the context of emphasizing clients' strengths in an effort to create change at the individual and community levels. Although building on existing strengths highlights the power of individuals and communities, it may also conflict with the notion that the source of a particular problem resides outside of individuals. FYE students often grappled with the limits of their clients' power in the context of flawed, unchanging social systems. Does it do more harm than good, they wondered, to help individuals feel empowered when in fact they remained reliant on unresponsive and oppressive systems and relationships for their very survival?

For instance, FYE students involved with ROAD have described certain contradictions inherent in encouraging community advocacy work among low-income women who struggle with depression. ROAD supports women's use of collective action as a way to heal from depression while creating community change. Although collective action may provide women with real and perceived power, it also places the responsibility for change on individuals and groups rather than on systems. Is this their responsibility? Is it fair to impose some of the onus for changing social circumstances on those who lack power and who control relatively few resources? In the case of ROAD, students tried to balance two beliefs—on one hand, collective action can truly lead to changed institutional systems and policies, and on the other, collective action puts an enormous strain on the personal resources of those involved. Although there is no easy way to reconcile these truths, counseling psychologists who do this kind of work can at least remain mindful of striking a balance whenever possible.

Leaving Clients With Tools

Last, although leaving clients with the tools of self-determination is useful and important, we must also consider what tools are most relevant to clients and whether it is possible to deliver these tools, considering limitations of time, funding, and the capacity of researchers, practitioners, and students. While many FYE students acknowledge the importance of sustained contact with individuals and communities, they also must contend with the time-limited nature of their roles. Students working with high school students in the TFT program have struggled with the recognition that although research

points to the need for stable, consistent adult figures in the lives of young people, the FYE does not extend beyond 1 school year.

Students involved in ROAD have voiced similar ethical concerns relating to leaving clients with tools. ROAD was created with the goal of continuing services beyond the initial funding period by transferring responsibilities for program governance away from the founders of ROAD to the ROAD women themselves. Yet even with the women's tremendous potential, motivation, and skills, students grappled with whether the women of ROAD would be able to sustain the project given the reality of their overwhelmed lives and the realities of specific institutional structures. For example, grant writing can be taught, but securing funding often requires professional connections to which the women cannot gain access given the hierarchical nature of most funding sources. So how can we expect underresourced communities to be able to continue our work even if we teach community members a specific set of skills? In some circumstances, it may not be possible to pass on all the skills and tools necessary for continued growth. In some cases, our own ongoing involvement may be critical. As rabbinic scholars of the Mishnah have taught, "You are not obligated to complete the task, but neither are you free to desist from it" (Pirke Avot 2:21).

Given the complexity of social justice work, there will necessarily be ongoing ethical tangles for us to work through. As a group, we have struggled with how to think about or engage with these tangles; we have learned over time that many traditional ethical decision-making frameworks do not fit well with the kinds of situations that arise in our work with communities. First, many existing models seem to frame the decision-making process as an individual or intrapsychic process, with the decision maker as a single entity making the decision alone or within a social context (Cottone, 2001; Cottone & Claus, 2000). This individualistic perspective does not fit with the collaborative approach for which we argue. Second, existing ethical decision-making frameworks in counseling psychology were developed to address ethical conflicts that arise within specific structured relationships, the classic being that between therapist and client. But social justice work in counseling psychology takes us into bumpy terrain in which structured and clearly bounded relationships are the exception not the rule. Ethical dilemmas are therefore difficult to anticipate and cannot be solved easily.

We do not have an alternative framework to offer at this point, although we continue to discuss various possibilities. In the meantime, we encourage students to hold onto ethical tensions rather than solve them quickly. Only by asking difficult questions will we be able critically and ethically engage in social justice work in all of its complexity, frustrations, and fulfillment.

PROFESSIONAL OBSTACLES
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Obstacles

Of course, it will not be easy for counseling psychologists to move toward a more systematic approach to doing social justice work, even if they have become persuaded of its importance. Indeed, a wide range of obstacles must be addressed as we struggle to incorporate such work into our curricula, research, and practice. In what follows, we describe briefly some of the obstacles that counseling psychologists (particularly students and faculty) face most immediately when they attempt social justice work and provide some recommendations for addressing those obstacles.

Perhaps the most powerful roadblock in doing social justice work is simply its emotional costs (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). For students (and often faculty as well), a tremendous amount of time and energy is spent on activities that often go unnoticed and unrewarded. They hit many brick walls put up by suspicious community members, unresponsive social institutions, or the absence of resources necessary to make a difference on an issue. Many, if not most, go through periods of feeling as if the work is not making a difference, that systems are unchangeable, or that no one is listening. They often feel despair about the relatively small effects of their work relative to the overwhelming nature of the problems they are addressing, or a sense that they are just not doing enough (Wade, 2000). And many have asked at one time or another whether the costs outweigh the rewards.

Although perhaps obvious, it is important to note that at least in our experience, the rewards are greater than the costs. Faculty and students in BC's Counseling Psychology Program have learned a lot, formed fascinating and productive collaborations with community members, and enriched our thinking about counseling psychology immeasurably. We have had the privilege of participating in interesting, complex, challenging, meaningful, and valuable work that embodies values about which we care deeply. We have developed skills and knowledge that allow us to address problems in clients' lives that psychotherapy can never fix. And, most important, we are doing work that we believe can make a difference in the social and political structures that shape people's well-being. As Kiselica and Robinson (2001) noted, "Although social activism can be taxing work, . . . counselors who are successful advocates report a high degree of personal satisfaction . . . and personal growth" (p. 396). Still, it is critical to acknowledge the emotional toll that social justice work can take and to develop methods for dealing with it (see below).

In addition to emotional obstacles, there are structural obstacles to engaging in social justice work. First, researchers and practitioners trained in traditional methods may lack the skills required to mobilize community involvement (Serrano-Garcia, 1990). Second, faculty members and other counseling psychologists may find that engaging in such work has professional costs. The planning, process, and reporting of social justice–oriented research and practice is certainly more time and resource intensive than traditional methods (Serrano-Garcia, 1990). Community service is not generally weighed heavily when a faculty member is being considered for tenure or promotion (McCroskey, 2003). Promotion and tenure standards often fail to recognize the longer time period required to do research in and with members of the larger community, and only some universities give the same credit to rigorous qualitative research as they do to quantitative investigations. Moreover, research that stays true to feminist and multicultural psychology values may not be competitive for funding (Grossman et al., 1997; Helms, 2003). Granting agencies are far more likely to fund large-scale quantitative, epidemiological research on the "deficits" of marginalized people than to fund research that empowers communities or examines political and economic policies responsible for specific vulnerabilities (Shin & Weitzman, 1990). Therefore, social justice work must often be provided pro bono and "on the side" (Helms, 2003).

Third, licensing and accreditation requirements compel counseling psychology programs to focus course work on traditional, individual psychotherapy models for the most part. And given the plethora of these course and practica requirements, students have little opportunity for electives (much less required courses) in community organizing, program development, policy analysis, and other social justice–oriented curricula. Even when programs integrate these models into their curricula, they are generally add-ons to existing curricula rather than central elements of the program. Moreover, cross-departmental collaborations to create and support programs such as JRAP are often prohibited or made extremely difficult by university bureaucracies (McCroskey, 2003). These obstacles make it challenging and time-consuming to integrate social justice–oriented components into counseling psychology training.

Recommendations

Given the inevitable personal costs, it becomes critical for faculty members, in their roles as advisers, supervisors, and teachers, to provide emotional and practical support to students. The historical perspective that faculty members provide can serve as a critical antidote to students' hopeles-

sness around the seemingly immeasurable changes that result from their efforts. For example, faculty members must be prepared to help students establish realistic goals, prepare for inevitable failures, and work through their potential sense of hopelessness and anger as they come face to face with the staggering difficulties faced by oppressed and disadvantaged groups. They need to be prepared to teach students to have realistic goals and to recognize that their work represents just one small brick in an edifice that must be built by many, many people.

Of course, practical support of students is important as well. For example, faculty members cannot expect students to develop their own community projects. They should be prepared to do the legwork necessary to pave the way for students entering communities. This is not always because students lack the interpersonal skills to do this for themselves but simply because they lack the status and power. For universities in rural settings, where social oppression is often less visible and more challenging to access, students may need help recognizing oppression in surrounding communities, although it is important to remember that there are also oppressed groups on our own university campuses. It is not always necessary to go elsewhere to deal with social oppression at a systemic level. Finally, faculty members need to prioritize social justice work, making it integral to the curriculum and not just an appendage to traditional academic programs. If faculty members do not value social justice work enough to make space for it within the curriculum, they run the risk of replicating broader academic norms that exact costs for participating in community-based research and intervention.

To address some of the issues related to the academy's lack of recognition of the importance of social justice work, we recommend that the field consider increasing the number of publication outlets dedicated to theoretical and empirical work by counseling psychologists on social justice issues. The field also needs to pay more explicit attention to championing social justice values in the promotion and tenure process, perhaps by challenging academic departments to reconsider the relative weight given to various forms of scholarship and community work. A potential avenue for recognizing social justice work might be in instituting awards. Without necessarily expending any additional funds, Division 17 (counseling psychology) of the American Psychological Association could potentially create a significant award that formally and publicly recognizes not only postdoctoral and early-career contributions to social justice work but also senior counseling psychologists who have devoted their professional lives to this work. It will also be critical to continue to hold meetings, symposia, and other forums at counseling psychology conferences and other venues where like-minded people can meet and continue to brainstorm (Blustein et al., 2002).

To address some of the programmatic obstacles, we recommend that programs begin to integrate a social justice perspective into existing courses. Just as the field has called for the integration of a multicultural perspective into all courses, so should we integrate the study of major social problems and incorporate meso- and macro-level analyses of clients' difficulties. Attempting such an integration clearly requires a considered commitment on the part of the entire (or most of the) faculty in any given program. It means a wholesale reorientation to the work, a pervasive program shift involving new student requirements, new ways of teaching classes, innovative research approaches, and new collaborations in the community. Such a transformation cannot be accomplished by only a small subgroup of faculty. Furthermore, the sense of isolation and hopelessness that often accompanies this type of work can be countered most effectively when an entire program shares the same orientation and belief system. Social justice–oriented work requires both a personal emotional investment and an institutional political commitment to working toward social change.

CONCLUSION

Despite many calls to do so, counseling psychology as a discipline has not yet begun to struggle with the "how" of social justice work. This article has attempted to address this gap in a small way by highlighting a set of principles common to feminist and multicultural psychology that can serve as a bridge between the micro-level work with which we are so familiar and the meso- and macro-level work that a social justice orientation mandates. Faculty members and students at BC have used and struggled with these principles as part of the FYE and found them helpful in orienting us as we engage in efforts to help shift the social contexts of oppressed individuals.

Clearly, for counseling psychologists interested in social justice work, the opportunities to break new ground are vast. Of course, we recognize that change does not come easily. It is not enough for individual counseling psychologists to make individual commitments to engage in social justice work. Shifting our standards to reflect a commitment to understanding and intervening in the systems and structures that shape individual lives will require numerous personal and structural transformations. However, we must consider equally the costs of not making these changes. As feminist and multicultural theorists have underscored for decades, individual mental health cannot be fully achieved until we eradicate the multiple forms of oppression faced by so many.

NOTES

1. Only the fifth author was a faculty member at Boston College in 1997, although the first author now oversees the program. Faculty members at Boston College who sparked the development of the First Year Experience include Drs. Etiony Aldorando, Maureen Kenny, James Mahalik, Elizabeth Sparks, and Mary Walsh.

2. Two anonymous reviewers of this manuscript asked whether students keep journals. Although they haven't so far, we thought this was a terrific idea and plan to require it next year

3. This project was developed by Drs. David Blustein, Maureen Kenny, and Elizabeth Sparks, faculty members in the counseling psychology program, and Janice Jackson, a faculty member in the teacher education department.

4. This project was developed by Francine Sherman, a clinical professor at Boston College Law School.

5. This project was developed by Angie Littwin, a Harvard Law School graduate and staff member at Health Care for All in Boston.

6. This project represents a collaboration between the fourth author, a counseling doctoral student at Boston College; the first author, a counseling psychology faculty member; and Susan Marine, former director of the Violence Prevention Office within the Department of Public Health in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

REFERENCES

Action for Boston Community Development. (2003). *Women's safety net parties*. Retrieved July 10, 2003, from http://www.bostonabcd.org/publicinfo/pubs/safety-net.htm

ADMI, & Lykes, M. B. (2000). *Voices and images: Mayan Ixil women of Chajul*. Chajul, El Quiché, Guatemala: ADMI.

Albee, G. W. (1986). Toward a just society: Lessons from observations on the primary prevention of psychopathology. *American Psychologist*, *41*(8), 891-898.

Albee, G. W. (1996). Revolutions and counterrevolutions in prevention. *American Psychologist*, *51*(11), 1130-1133.

American Psychological Association. (1999). Archival description of counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *27*(4), 589-592.

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist*, *58*, (5), 377-402.

Arredondo, P., & Arciniega, G. M. (2001). Strategies and techniques for counselor training based on the multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *29*, 263-273.

Atkinson, D. R., & Hackett, G. (1995). *Counseling diverse populations* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Atkinson, D. R., Jennings, R. G., & Liongson, L. (1990). Minority students' reasons for not seeking counseling and suggestions for improving services. *Journal of College Student Development*, *31*(4), 342-350.

Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1997). *Counseling American minorities* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Atkinson, D. R., Thompson, C. E., & Grant, S. K. (1993). A three-dimensional model for counseling racial/ethnic minorities. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *21*(2), 257-277.

Ballou, M., & Brown, L. S. (Eds.). (2002). *Rethinking mental health and disorder: Feminist perspectives*. New York: Guilford.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.

Blustein, D., Elman, N., & Gerstein, L. (2002). *Executive report on social action groups. National Counseling Psychology Conference, Houston, March 28-April 1, 2001*. Presented to the Executive Boards of Division 17 and CCPTP.

Blustein, D., Jackson, J., Kenny, M. E., Sparks, E., Chaves, A. P., Diemer, M. A., et al. (2001). Social action within an urban school context: The Tools for Tomorrow Project. In D. P. Schultheiss (Chair), *Social action and prevention: Counseling psychology in schools*. Fourth National Counseling Psychology conference, Houston, TX, March 2001.

Bond, L. A., Belenky, M. F., & Weinstock, J. S. (2000). The listening partners program: An initiative toward feminist community psychology in action. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(5), 697-730.

Boston College. (2003). *Counseling psychology doctoral student handbook*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College.

Brabeck, M. M. (Ed.). (2000). *Practicing feminist ethics in psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brabeck, M., & Brown, L. (1997). Feminist theory and psychological practice. In J. Worell & N.G. Johnson (Eds.), *Shaping the future of feminist psychology: Education, research, and practice* (pp. 15-35). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Brabeck, M. M., & Latta, R. E. (2003). Feminist ethics. In J. R. Miller, R. M. Lerner, L. B. Schiamberg, & P. M. Anderson (Eds.), *Human ecology: An encyclopedia of children, families, communities, and environments*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio.

Brabeck, M. M., & Ting, K. (2000). Feminist ethics: Lenses for examining psychological practice. In M. M. Brabeck (Ed.), *Practicing feminist ethics in psychology* (pp. 17-36). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brabeck, M. M., Walsh, M. E., & Latta, R. E. (Eds.). (2003). *Meeting at the hyphen: Schools-universities-communities-professions in collaboration for student achievement and well being*. The 102nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, L. S. (1994). *Subversive dialogues: Theory in feminist therapy*. New York: Basic Books.

Brown, L. S. (2000). Feminist therapy. In C. R. Snyder & R. E. Ingram (Eds.), *Handbook of psychological change: Psychotherapy processes and practices for the 21st century* (pp. 358-380). New York: John Wiley.

Chambless, D. M. (1976). *Race and sex, 1972: Collisions or comradeship?* Seattle, WA: Radical Women.

Comas-Diaz, L. (1991). Feminism and diversity in psychology: The case of women of color. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*(4), 597-609.

Comas-Diaz, L., & Greene, B. (Eds.). (1994). *Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford.

Cottone, R. R. (2001). A social constructivism model of ethical decision making in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79*(1), 39-45.

Cottone, R. R., & Claus, R. E. (2000). Ethical decision making models: A review of the literature. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78*, 275-283.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, H. V. (1969). *Frank Parsons: Prophet, innovator, counselor*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dill, B. T. (1983). Race, class, and gender: Prospects for an all-inclusive sisterhood. *Feminist Studies*, *9*(1), 131-149.

Downe-Wamboldt, B. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and issues. *Health Care for Women International*, *13*, 313-321.

Egharevba, I. (2001). Researching an-'other' minority ethnic community: Reflections of a black female researcher on the intersections of race, gender and other power positions in the research process. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory and Practice*, *4*(3), 225-241.

Enns, C. Z. (1997). *Feminist theories and feminist psychotherapies*. New York: Harrington Park.

Espin, O. M. (1994). *Feminist approaches*. In L. Comas-Diaz & B. Greene (Eds.), *Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy* (pp. 265-286). New York: Guilford.

Fetterman, D. M. (2000). *Foundations of empowerment evaluation: Step by step*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fine, M. (1992). Passions, politics, and power: Feminist research possibilities. In M. Fine (Ed.), *Disruptive voices: The possibilities of feminist research*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Nutt, R. (1986). The Division 17 principles concerning the counseling/psychotherapy of women: Rationale and implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *14*, 180-216.

Fouad, N. A. (2001). 2001 Division 17 presidential address: Dreams for 2010: Making a difference. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *30*(1), 158-166.

Fouad, N. A., McPherson, R. H., Gerstein, L., Blustein, D. L., Elman, N. S., Ihle Helledy, K., et al. (2004). Houston 2001: Context and legacy. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*(1), 15-77.

Fox, D. R. (2003). Awareness is good, but action is better. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(3), 299-304.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *The social construction of Whiteness: White women, race matters*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (1975). Cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Educational Review Monograph*, 1.

Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1970)

Friedman, S.S. (1995). Beyond White and other: Relationality and narratives of race in feminist discourse. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *21*(1), 1-49.

Gaventa, P., & Cornwall, A. (2001). Power and knowledge. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 70-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilbert, L. A., & Scher, M. (1999). *Gender and sex in counseling and psychotherapy*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grossman, F. K., Gilbert, L. A., Genero, N. P., Hawes, S. E., Hyde, J. S., Merecek, J., et al. (1997). Feminist research: Practice and problems. Feminist theory and psychological practice. In J. Worell & N. G. Johnson (Eds.), *Shaping the future of feminist psychology: Education, research, and practice* (pp. 73-91). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Grove McCrea, L., Bromley, J. L., McNally, C. J., Koketting O'Byrne, K., & Wade, K. A. (2004). Houston 2001: A student perspective on issues of identity, training, social advocacy, and the future of counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*(1), 78-88.

Gunnings, T. (1976). *A systemic approach to counseling*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Gunnings, T. S., & Lipscomb, W. D. (1986). Psychotherapy for men: A systemic approach. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *14*(1), 17-24.

Gunnings, T., & Tucker, R. (1977). Counseling and urban Americans: A search for new forms. *Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance*, *5*(4), 153-162.

Hartung, P. J., & Blustein, D. L. (2002). Reason, intuition, and social justice: Elaborating Parsons's career decision making model. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *80*, 41-47.

Helms, J. E. (2003). A pragmatic view of social justice. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(3), 305-313.

Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

hooks, b. (1993). Black women: Shaping feminist theory. In M. Pearsall (Ed.), *Women and values: Readings in recent feminist philosophy* (pp. 165-174). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ivey, A. E., & Collins, N.M. (2003). Social justice: A long-term challenge for counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(3), 290-298.

Ivey, A. E., D'Andrea, M., Bradford Ivey, M., & Simek-Morgan, L. (2002). *Theories of counseling and psychotherapy: A multicultural perspective* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Jordan, J. V. (1986). *The meaning of mutuality* (Work in Progress no. 23, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley Centers for Women.

Jordan, J. V. (1992). The relational self: A new perspective for understanding women's development. *Contemporary Psychotherapy Review*, *7*, 56-71.

Joseph, S. (1996). Relationality and ethnographic subjectivity: Key informants and the construction of personhood in fieldwork. In D. L. Wolf (Ed.), *Feminist dilemmas in fieldwork*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Kiselica, M. S. (1999). Culturally sensitive interventions with African American teenage fathers. In L. E. Davis (Ed.), *Working with African American males* (pp. 205-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kiselica, M. S. (2000, April). *Keynote address: The mental health professional as advocate: Matters of the heart, matters of the mind*. Great Lakes Regional Conference of Division 17 of the American Psychological Association, Muncie, IN.

Kiselica, M. S., & Robinson, M. (2001). Bringing advocacy counseling to life: The history, issues, and human dramas of social justice work in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *79*(4), 387-398.

LaFromboise, T. D. (1988). American Indian mental health policy. *American Psychologist*, *43*(5), 388-397.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. London: Routledge.

Latta, R. E., & Goodman, L. A. (in press). Considering the interplay of cultural context and service provision in intimate partner violence: The case of Haitian women. *Violence Against Women*.

Law, M. (1997). Changing disabling environments through participatory action research: A Canadian experience. In S. E. Smith, D. G. Willms, & N. A. Johnson (Eds.), *Nurtured by knowledge: Learning to do participatory action-research*. New York: Apex.

LeCompte, M. D. (1995). Some notes on power, agenda, and voice: A researcher's personal evolution toward critical collaborative research. In P. L. McLaren & J. M. Giarelli (Eds.), *Critical theory and educational research* (pp. 91-112). Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Lerman, H., & Porter, N. (Eds.). (1990). *Feminist ethics in psychotherapy*. New York: Springer.

Lewis, V., & Vasquez, H. (2000, March). *Beyond the color of fear: Dismantling racism*. Workshop presented at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA.

Liebow, E. (1993). *Tell them who I am: The lives of homeless women*. New York: Free Press.

Lykes, M. B. (2001). Creative arts and photography in participatory action research in Guatemala. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 363-371). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin-Baro, I. (1994). *Writings for a liberation psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Maton, K. (2000). Making a difference: The social ecology of social transformation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *28*(1), 25-57.

McCroskey, J. (2003). Challenges and opportunities for higher education. In M. M. Brabeck, M. E. Walsh, & R. E. Latta (Eds.), *Meeting at the hyphen: Schools-universities-communities-professions in collaboration for student achievement and well being* (pp.117-139). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In M. L. Andersen & P. Hill Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McWhirter, E. H. (1998). An empowerment model of counsellor education. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, *32*(1), 12-26.

Miller, J. B., & Stiver, I. P. (1997). *The healing connection: How women form relationships in therapy and in life*. Boston: Beacon.

Moane, G. (2003). Bridging the personal and the political: Practices for a liberation psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *31*(1/2), 91-101.

Morrow, S. L., & Hawxhurst, D. M. (1998). Feminist therapy: Integrating political analysis in counseling and psychotherapy. *Women & Therapy*, *21*(2), 37-50.

Mulvey, A. (1988). Community psychology and feminism: Tensions and commonalities. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *16*, 70-83.

Paradis, E. K. (2000). Feminist and community psychology ethics in research with homeless women. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *28*(6), 839-858.

Patai, D. (1991). U.S. academics and third world women: Is ethical research possible? In S. B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 137-153). New York: Routledge.

Patton, M. Q. (2000). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Perkins, R. (1991). Therapy for lesbians? The case against. *Feminism and Psychology*, *1*, 325-338.

Pirke Avot, Mishnah. Ethics of the Fathers 2:21. First Century.

Ponterotto, J., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (2001). *Handbook of multicultural counseling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Prilleltensky, I. (1989). Psychology and the status quo. *American Psychologist*, *44*(5), 795-802.

Prilleltensky, I. (1994). *The morals and politics of psychology: Psychological discourse and the status quo*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Prilleltensky, I. (1997). Values, assumptions, and practices: Assessing the moral implications of psychological discourse and action. *American Psychologist*, *52*(5), 517-535

Prilleltensky, I. (1999). Critical psychology foundations for the promotion of mental health. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, *1*, 95-112.

Prilleltensky, I. (2001). Value-based praxis in community psychology: Moving toward social justice and social action. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *29*(5), 747-778.

Prilleltensky, I., & Nelson, G. (2002). *Doing psychology critically: Making a difference in diverse settings*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Rappaport, J. (1995). Empowerment meets narrative: Listening to stories and crating settings. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *23*, 795-807.

Rappaport, J. (2000). Community narratives: Tales of terror and joy. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(1), 1-24.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reinharz, S. (1994). Toward an ethnography of "voice" and "silence." In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 178-200). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reinharz, S. (1997). Who am I? The need for a variety of selves in the field. In R. Hertz (Ed.), *Reflexivity and voice* (pp. 3-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riger, S. (1993). What's wrong with empowerment? *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *21*(3), 279-283.

Riger, S. (1999). Working together: Challenges in collaborative research on violence against women. *Violence Against Women*, *5*, 1099-1117.

Riger, S. (2000). *Transforming psychology: Gender in theory and practice*. London: Oxford University Press.

Rosenthal, R. (1991). Straighter from the source: Alternative methods of researching homelessness. *Urban Anthropology*, *20*(2), 109-123.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, *23*, 334-340.

Sarason, S. B. (1996). *Barometers of change: Individual, educational, and social transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Serrano-Garcia, I. (1990). Implementing research: Putting our values to work. In P. Tolan, C. Keys, F. Chertok, & L. Jason (Eds.), *Researching community psychology* (pp. 171-182). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sherman, F. (2001). Effective advocacy systems for girls: Promoting justice in an unjust system. *Children's Law Institute: Legal & social welfare issues of girls & adolescents* (pp. 151-182). New York: Practicing Law Institute.

Shin, M., & Weitzman, B. (1990). Research on homelessness: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, *46*(4), 1-11.

Smith, J. M. (2003). *A potent spell: Mother love and the power of fear.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Solberg, V. S., Howard, K. A., Blustein, D. L., &, Close, W. (2002). Career development in the schools: Connecting school-to-work-to life. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *30*, 705-725.

Sparks, E., & Park, A. (2000). The integration of feminism and multiculturalism: Ethical dilemmas at the border. In M. M. Brabeck (Ed.). *Practicing feminist ethics in psychology* (pp. 203-224). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sparks, E., & Prosper, V. (2001, October). *Facilitating multicultural training of counseling psychology graduate students: Experiential learning in a diverse setting*. Paper presented at the First Annual Diversity Challenge Conference, Institute for the Study and Promotion of Race and Culture, Boston College, Boston.

Speight, S. L., & Vera, E. M. (2004). A social justice agenda: Ready or not? *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*(1), 109-118.

Spittal, P., Nakuti, J., Sewankambo, N., & Willms, D. G. (1997). "We are dying. It is finished!": Linking an ethnographic research design to an HIV/AIDS participatory approach in Uganda. In S. E. Smith, D. G. Willms, & N. A. Johnson (Eds.), *Nurtured by knowledge: Learning to do participatory action research* (pp. 86-110). New York: Apex.

Steiner-Adair, C. (1994). The politics of prevention. In P. Fallon, M. A. Katzman, & S. C. Wooley (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on eating disorders*. New York: Guilford.

Sue, D. W. (2001). Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *29*(6), 790-821.

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *70*, 477-483.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. New York: John Wiley.

Sue, S., & Zane, N. (1987). The role of culture and cultural techniques in psychotherapy: A critique and reformulation. *American Psychologist*, *42*(1), 37-45.

Surrey, J., Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A., Miller, J. B., & Stiver, I. P. (1991). *Women's growth in connection*. New York: Guilford.

Trickett, E. J. (1996). A future for community psychology: The contexts of diversity and the diversity of contexts. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *24*, 209-235.

Tseng, V., Chesir-Teran, D., Becker-Klein, R., Chan, M. L., Duran, V., Roberts, N., et al. (2002). Promotion of social change: A conceptual framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*(3), 401-427.

Unger, J., Kipke, M., Simon, T., Montgomery, S., & Johnson, C. (1997). Homeless youths and young adults in Los Angeles: Prevalence of mental health problems and the relationship between mental health and substance use disorders. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *25*(3), 371-394.

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(3), 253-272.

Wade, R. C. (2000). From a distance: Service-learning and social justice. In C. R. O'Grady (Ed.), *Integrating service learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities* (pp. 93-112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Worell, J., & Johnson, N. (1997). *Shaping the future of feminist psychology: Education, research, and practice*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Worell, J., & Remer, P. (1992). *Feminist perspectives in therapy*. New York: John Wiley.

Wyche, K. F., & Rice, J. K. (1997). Feminist therapy: From dialogue to tenets. In J. Worell & N. G. Johnson (Eds.), *Shaping the future of feminist psychology: Education, research, and practice* (pp. 57-72). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zajicek, A. M. (2002). Race discourses and antiracist practices in a local women's movement. *Gender and Society*, *16*, 155-174.