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Abstract

The purpose of this research was to gain a better understanding of the experience of being 'White' in British Columbia. 'White' 'racial' identity development (WRID) theory proposes that 'White' people may develop a positive 'racial' identity that is non-racist. Research has linked the multicultural counselling competencies of a counsellor to her positive 'racial' identity. The American Counselling Association has made it ethically incumbent upon 'White' counsellors to develop a positive, non-racist 'White' 'racial' identity. However, the relationship between 'racial' identity and psychological health is inconclusive and the use of 'race' as a construct in the social sciences is controversial and confounding. WRID research has occurred exclusively in the United States and has only been concerned with attitudes towards 'Blacks.' A qualitative methodology, semi-structured interviews and content analysis were used to explore the nature and existence of WRID in British Columbia. Participants who considered themselves to be 'White' and who have lived or worked in aboriginal communities were recruited. Two computerized programs were used to help in the analysis of the content of the interviews. Participants provided descriptions of "White" culture yet their 'White' 'racial' identities were tenuous. No definitive support was found for the existence of WRID in British Columbia, however support was found for parts of theories found in the "racial" identity literature. This information may help counsellors and educators engaged in cross-cultural work.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

We live in a world of mobility, pluralism and change. The human population is exploding, international migration and tourism are on the rise and worldwide communication and transportation are accelerating. These conditions have created a physical and symbolic environment of flux, full of possibilities for creativity and destruction, for connection and conflict. Eminent British scholar Stuart Hall predicted that the "...capacity to live with difference is the coming question of the twenty-first century" (Hall, 1993, p.361, italics in original). I interpret him to mean that our ability to live with and relate to new people and new ideas is crucial to our well being, to our survival as human beings.

Canada is a site where a multitude of differences congregate. United Nations statistics portray Canada as "...the most culturally and racially diverse nation in the world" (Brown & Brown, 1996, p.47). Canada is attractive to immigrants in part because it ranks as one of the best places on earth to live. It has a worldwide reputation as a peaceful, humanitarian, egalitarian and multicultural nation. This reputation is bolstered at home and abroad by the heroics of Canada's foreign peacekeepers, by popular stories such as Canada's collaboration in the 'Underground Railroad' (Brown & Brown, 1996) and by Canada's official policy of multiculturalism. We see ourselves as a cultural mosaic and thus (humbly) superior to the assimilationist melting pot of the United States (Carrington & Bonnett, 1997). We do not seem to have the same dramatic episodes of civil unrest such as the Los Angeles riots, the Rodney King incident and the O.J. Simpson trial in the United States. All of this makes it seem that Canadian society has a broad capacity to live with difference.

Many commentators hold that the notion of a non-racist Canada is a myth (Brown &
Brown, 1996; Pleasant-Jette, 1996; Brown & Brown, 1996; Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000; Khenti, 1996; Li, 1995). The Multiculturalism Act of 1971 has been roundly criticized for disguising, rather than confronting, racial and class hierarchies (Bagley, 1984). Its language, with phrases like ‘tolerance of difference’ rather than ‘acceptance’ or, better, ‘celebration’ of difference, lacks a true democratic spirit and promotes the idea that ‘true’ Canadians should put up with people who are different from ‘us.’ James (1996) states that...

We are all familiar with the statement, ‘We are multicultural; there isn’t a Canadian culture.’ This inability to acknowledge that we all share, contribute to, and participate in ‘a Canadian culture’ reflects the general lack of cultural self-awareness on the part of some Canadians - a deficiency that often leads to insensitivity to, and intolerance of, those who are ‘different’ (p.16-17).

The reality is that Canada has a long history of racism, discrimination and oppression, which, contrary to popular belief, persists to this day. The myth of a non-racist Canada “...serves as a down-filled comforter underneath which [we Canadians] can snuggle, hiding [our] heads and denying the reality...” (Brown & Brown, 1996, p.49).

There is overwhelming evidence of racism pervading our justice system, policing, education, arts, media and human services throughout our nation’s history (Henry, Tator, Mattis & Rees, 2000). In 1983, for example, the Special Committee on Participation of Visible Minorities in Canadian Society assembled “two volumes of evidence” documenting the racism and difficulties faced by “visible minorities” in the economic, educational, cultural and other sectors of Canadian society (Canada, House of Commons, 1983 cited in Li, 1995). Examples of institutionalized racism include the internment of Japanese Canadians during and after the Second World War until 1947, the exclusion of South Asian Canadians from voting privileges until 1947, the ‘head tax’ on Chinese immigrants and the segregation of Blacks from Whites in
Nova Scotia schools until the 1960s (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000). Recent surveys show that about 16 percent of Canadian adults have racist views, 35 percent have somewhat intolerant views, 30 percent tend to be tolerant and 20 percent are extremely tolerant (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000). Recent headlines in The Globe and Mail scream about “Canada’s apartheid” (Stackhouse, 2001, p. F1), referring to rampant racism towards aboriginals in Canada. Khenti (1996) concludes that “[t]he ideology of racism has deeply permeated the hearts and minds of Canadians” (p.72).

While many have suffered racism and oppression in Canada, it is arguable that the original people of this land have suffered the longest and the most (Henry, Mator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000; Simms, 1996; Carrington & Bonnett, 1997). Aboriginals have suffered the horrors of the residential schools (see Appendix 5), the outlawing of aboriginal cultural institutions (the potlatch, the sun dance), the suppression of traditional aboriginal methods of healing (McCormick, 1995, 1997, 1998) and the withholding of voting rights are but a few of the abuses suffered by aboriginal people. Aboriginal people were not allowed to vote in provincial elections until 1949 and in federal elections until 1960. It was not until 1951 that potlatch ceremonies were again legal. In 1985 Indian status was reinstated to those women who lost it. However, the new law is still offensive because the authority to determine who can be recognized as a status Indian still lies with the federal government (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 2000). The last of the residential schools was not closed until 1986.

A common misperception in Canada is that the government had the best of intentions implementing these policies and that any abuses that occurred were isolated incidents. The evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. European ideologies and attitudes of ‘racial’
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superiority bred policies of domination, exploitation and assimilation of aboriginals in the colonies. Early attitudes toward aboriginals which persist today were epitomized in 1887 by British Columbia premier William Smithe when he said: “When the Whites first came among you, you were little better than the wild beasts of the field” (Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, Province of British Columbia, 2000). Such attitudes were consistent with European ideologies of ‘racial’ superiority. There is strong evidence to suggest that governmental policies were part of an intentional effort at systematic genocide (Chrisjohn & Young, 1997; see Appendix 6).

Such treatment has been linked directly to the disproportionate suffering of aboriginal people in Canada from high rates of family violence, drug abuse, incarceration, suicide and school dropouts (Dolan, 1995; Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 2000). Problems for these people are exacerbated by tensions around such issues as land claims and fishing rights in places such as Burnt Church, Oka and Sun Peaks continue to erupt between aboriginals, government and other Canadians. Only recently, the Canadian government issued an official acknowledgement of the historical maltreatment of aboriginals thereby taking some responsibility for the dire state of affairs but avoids admissions of genocide (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 2000; see Appendix 1 for the text of this statement).

What is being done to help this situation and what role can counselling psychology play? The Canadian government currently channels funds through the Aboriginal Healing Foundation (AHF) for various social services programs for aboriginals across Canada. As of July 19, 2001 the AHF received just over $96 million dollars with which it funded 515 programs nationwide, 122 of which were situated in British Columbia. In the Vancouver area there are more than fifty programs and services for aboriginals (some AHF funded, some not; Information Services
Despite this, the needs of aboriginals are not being met (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 2000; McCormick, 1995, 1997; Dolan, 1995). Programs have been implemented in an unintegrated or 'piecemeal' fashion. Most are usually short-term or pilot projects and limited to a few aspects of life. Service delivery is impeded by inefficient funding mechanisms, (supposed) lack of funds and high costs of providing services to rural and remote areas (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 2000). Many programs have been imposed upon, rather than developed with, communities thereby contributing further to their disempowerment. Aboriginals, like other ‘minorities’ in North America, are generally mistrustful and avoidant of mainstream and government-sponsored mental health services (Corey, 1991).

There are several possible reasons for this avoidance of mainstream mental health services. One reason for the avoidance of mainstream mental-health services by aboriginals and ‘minorities’ in Canada may be due to “...the way social service workers are educated” (Christensen, 1996, p.140). To begin with, most social service workers, including counsellors, are trained in mainstream (traditional, modern) Western Psychology and Philosophy, which may be unpalatable to people from various cultures. Western Psychology and Philosophy are largely individualistic (Russell, 1946), ethnocentric and culturally encapsulated within ‘White’ middle-class, male standards of normality (Corey, 1991; Leach, 1997; Myers et al., 1991; Pedersen, 1988; Wrenn, 1962). Such standards purport the following ideas:

(a) individuals, rather than systems of individuals, are the basic building blocks of society,

(b) independence is desirable and dependence is undesirable,
(c) everyone depends on linear thinking to understand the world around them,

(d) mastery over nature is desirable,

(e) an orientation towards the future is desirable,

(f) humans are either good or evil (dualistic view of human nature),

(g) acquisition of material goods is desirable,

(h) males are naturally dominant,

(i) Christianity is the superior belief system (Sue, 1990; Pedersen, 1988).

These ideas, amongst others, are central components of the American cultural-ideological system (Katz, 1985; see Appendix 7), by which the majority of North American social service workers consciously or unconsciously operate. Social service workers likely carry conscious and/or unconscious biases with them that may impede their work with clients from other cultures. Traditional Western psychotherapeutic approaches can clash with the worldviews of clients from different cultures. For example, while Western approaches seek to change the consciousness of the ‘sick’ client to better fit into the ‘healthy’ system (Pedersen, 1988). However, Eastern Buddhist philosophy tries to expand the consciousness of supposed ‘normal’ socially adjusted people beyond the illusion of normalcy and questions the existence of self and of society (Watts, 1963). Similarly, Aboriginal culture celebrates the vision quest, a spiritual rite of passage involving the seeking of guidance from what Western science traditionally regards as hallucinatory experiences. The majority of social service workers are likely not comfortable with such worldviews which may limit their effectiveness with aboriginals and people from other cultures.

Another possible reason for the chasm between social services and non-Western clients is
that the multicultural education of the Canadian mainstream has been less than successful. Furthermore, the quality and amount of such education differs considerably from province to province (Carrington & Bonnett, 1997). In particular, the efforts of government and school boards in British Columbia to implement multicultural policies have been criticized as being 'assimilationist,' 'circumscribed,' 'parochial,' 'haphazard,' 'unsystematic,' 'minimalist and anachronistic' (Carrington & Bonnett, 1997). A case in point is the intolerance for First Nations education in the Vancouver School Board (VSB). In the VSB, many educators (teachers and administration) are opposed to a high school course about First Nations that covers the legacy of residential schools, discriminatory legislation, protracted negotiations over land claims and other issues. They are concerned that the course will "alter students' views" of their country's history and will "detract from a unifying, common history" (Steffenhagen, 2000, p. A2). A minority of teachers, however, support such a course and believe that overall the social studies curricula still perpetuate a Eurocentric view of Canada (Steffenhagen, 2000, p. A2). This is the climate of public education in the major cosmopolitan centre of the Lower Mainland, British Columbia, where the attitudes of many future counsellors are formed. As a result, social service workers are inculcated in the Western worldview long before their formal post secondary educations.

Another possible reason for the avoidance of mainstream social services by non-Western clients is racism. Many 'White' university students in the United States have some amount of racist attitudes and yet deny it (Scheurich, 1993 cited in Diaz-Rico, 1998). This information is concerning since seventy-nine percent of counselling psychology graduate students are categorized as 'White' (Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs Survey, 1998) and the majority of counsellors in North America are identified as 'White' (Pack-Brown, 1999;
Furthermore, many university counselling students perceive multicultural content in their studies to be “meaningless and unnecessary” (Steward et al., 1998). Regardless of the presence or absence of racism in the ‘White’ counsellor, clients who have been scarred by racism from ‘Whites’ may shy away from what may be perceived as ‘White’ institutions.

Another (related) reason for the chasm between social services and non-Western clients is that many may be looking to their own cultural enclaves for help. Some counselling psychologists support this. McCormick (1997), for example, suggests that the best way for aboriginals to overcome the effects of oppression and cultural loss is to determine and control their own services and to have an infrastructure that supports this. Training their own people as mental health professionals, renewing the tradition of elders and becoming more involved in and having more control over research is what is needed (McCormick, 1997; Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 2000). This makes sense given that traditional aboriginal culture and healing practices differ in very basic ways from traditional mainstream culture and healing practices.

Furthermore, Chrisjohn and Young (1997) say that the continuing genocide of aboriginals in Canada (and the world) negates any paternalistic healing efforts such as the AHF. Furthermore, they state “…there is no literature to suggest the efficacy of psychology in dealing with issues arising from Residential Schooling…” (p. 16, italics in original). Instead, they call for justice and encourage Canadian citizens to take a political stand.

Multicultural counselling, a branch of counselling psychology, has studied the complexities of counselling across cultures since the 1950s in an attempt to bridge the chasm. This work has shown such promise for opening up new vistas of understanding that some in the
field (Wrenn, 1962; Pedersen, 1991) have excitedly predicted that multicultural counselling will become the 'fourth force' in counselling (after psychodynamics, humanism and cognitive behaviourism). The availability of multicultural or cross-cultural counselling courses is growing (in the United States, forty-three of the forty-nine graduate level counselling programs offer a multicultural course and in 22 of these programs students can specialize in multicultural counselling; Robinson & Bradley, 1997). Thus far, the multicultural counselling movement has influenced the development of new professional and ethical standards that implore and require counsellors to acquire the necessary knowledge, awareness and skills to be multiculturally competent (Arredondo et al., 1996; Dulles Conference Task Force, 1978; Korman, 1974; Sue & Sue, 1990).

This research focuses on a specialized line of inquiry within multicultural counselling, called 'White racial identity development' (WRID; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1984, 1990, 1995; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovsky, 1991; Sue & Sue, 1990). WRID theory postulates a stage model in which a 'White' person who is initially naive and unaware of racism moves toward a positive non-racist 'White' 'racial' identity through a growing awareness of 'White' privilege accompanied by emotions of guilt, anger, anxiety and emotional disequilibrium. The guilt associated with 'White' privilege is often referred to as 'White guilt' in the literature (Steele, 1990; Swim & Miller, 1999).

WRID theory and research is still in its infancy and leaves many questions unanswered. For instance, current models and measures of 'White racial' identity have been developed and tested exclusively in the United States, have mainly been based on college student samples and focus chiefly on 'White' people's attitudes towards 'Blacks.' What is not known is how well
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WRID theory applies in other countries such as Canada, with other people other than college students and with regards to attitudes towards groups other than 'Blacks,' such as aboriginals.

A problem with WRID theories is that they seem to perpetuate the idea that 'race' is a real category. They reify 'racial' terminology. They do not seem to fully appreciate that the scientific community has debunked the idea of 'race' and that 'race' has no reality outside of how it is socially constructed. It seems that the authors of WRID theory and research have entirely ignored the cutting edge politically oriented analyses from the fields of critical 'race' theory and 'Whiteness' studies. These other lines of inquiry deal directly with the complex phenomenon of identity politics... a subject not dealt with sufficiently or explicitly in WRID theory and research.

In addition, WRID theories have not accounted for the social psychological findings that when people feel a strong sense of belonging to a group they also tend to dehumanize non-members. This challenges the notion put forth by WRID theorists that a sense of belonging to a 'racial' group or category ('racial identity') is healthy (see Helms, 1992, A race is a nice thing to have). Reviews of identity research (Phinney, 1990; Frable, 1997) find no certainties regarding the nature of the relationship between 'racial' identity and psychological health. Yet the Canadian government and medical institutions see identity (usually cultural, ethnic and 'racial' identities) as central to the 'healing' of aboriginals in Canada (RCAP, 2000; Canadian Medical Association, 1994). We need to know more before we implement a treatment plan based on 'racial' identity development theories.

While it is important to be critical of these points, it is also important to recognize that WRID theories are consistent with the admonitions of Chrisjohn and Young (1997) that the focus
of the social sciences be shifted from the study of the oppressed to the study of the oppressors. After all, minority communities have been under the social scientist’s microscope for so long that they are feeling exploited, objectified and morally ‘raped’ (Ponterotto, 1993) by ‘White’ researchers. Along this line, WRID theory and research has had a significant influence on a particular set of professional and ethical standards for counsellors. Namely, ‘White’ counsellors are now required to identify the culture to which they belong, to acknowledge any racist attitudes they may have and to understand how they may “...have directly or indirectly benefitted from individual, institutional, and cultural racism” (Arredondo et al., 1996, p. 59). According to these standards counsellors are not only required to try to understand the diverse cultural backgrounds of their clients but also to learn how their own “cultural/ethnic/racial identities” affect their “values and beliefs about the counseling process” (American Counselling Association, 1997). Professional regulatory bodies have adopted these standards to some extent (American Psychological Association, 1993; American Counselling Association, 1997).

It is in this spirit of self examination my research focuses on ‘Whiteness’ and ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity development in British Columbia, Canada. To do this I drew upon the experience of Canadians racialized as ‘White’ who have lived in community with aboriginal people. It is in this population that one would likely find, if they exist, instances of ‘White’ identity, ‘White’ guilt and ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity development. It is less likely that awareness of ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity will be found in the ‘White’ mainstream most ‘White’ people tend to think of themselves as ‘race’-less. As Katz and Ivey (1977) have noted, “White people do not see themselves as White” (p.486)
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Most 'White' 'racial' identity development (WRID) models are stage models that portray a person moving from racist to non-racist, from naive to knowing, from reactionary to proactive and so on toward the ultimate achievement of a positive 'White' 'racial' identity (Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1984, 1990; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Ponterotto, 1988; Sue & Sue, 1990; Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovsky, 1991). The study of 'White' 'racial' identity in counselling psychology did not emerge until the early 1990s and grew out of earlier 'racial' identity development models that focussed on 'minority' populations.

It is partly due to fear and ignorance that the study of 'White' 'racial' identity has been slow in coming. Not only do 'White' scholars seem to be afraid to study the area (Mio & Iwamasa, 1993) but 'White' people to not often think of themselves in 'racial' terms. As Katz and Ivey (1977) have noted, “White people do not see themselves as White” (p.486) because 'White' people are the 'norm.' As Terry (1981) stated, “[e]xcept for hard-core racial supremacists, the meaning of being White is having the choice of attending to or ignoring one's own Whiteness” (p.120). Roman (1993) stated that ‘Whites’ “…generally consider themselves as colourless and thus without racialized ‘subjectivities’” (p. 71). Not surprisingly, non-‘Whites’ have pioneered most of the research on ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity.

Of all the theories, Helms’ (1990) WRID theory has attracted the bulk of empirical investigation probably because she developed the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS; see Appendix 9). While other measures now exist, the WRIAS is the most researched instrument (Burkard & Ponterotto, 1999). It consists of 50 items designed to assess five types of
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White racial identity attitudes (i.e., Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy) as proposed by Helms' model (see Appendix 10). According to Helms (1999), it has been used in at least 38 studies including doctoral dissertations. Helms' work has stimulated theory and research in a previously neglected area.

'Racial' identity development models, including WRID models, generally fall under one of five streams or philosophies within the multicultural counselling field (Carter & Qureshi, 1995). 'Racial' identity development models are subsumed by the Race-Based stream that assumes that, within European and American culture, 'race' is the primary determinant of one's culture such that the "experience of belonging to a racial group transcends all other experiences" (Carter & Qureshi, 1995, p. 244). While there is some overlap, it is the primacy of 'race' and the exclusive North American focus that sets it apart from the other four streams.

An understanding of the other four streams helps delineate the philosophical stance of WRID. The Traditional (Anthropological) stream assumes that one's culture is synonymous with one's country and that culture supersedes and circumscribes one's unique circumstances and personality. In this view, 'race' is ignored in favour of understanding different cultures. The Universal stream assumes that all people are basically the same and that differences within groups of people are more significant than differences between groups of people. This view holds that counsellors should transcend the construct of 'race.' The Ubiquitous stream assumes that all 'loci of identity' (i.e., age, sex, ethnicity, ability, socio-economic status, 'race') constitute different cultures such that practically any interaction between people is cross-cultural. In this view, difference is acknowledged and celebrated. The Pan-National stream takes a historical perspective and accounts for imperialism, colonialism and the psychology of oppression. In
contrast with the Race-Based stream, it assumes that racial group membership determines culture regardless of geopolitical boundaries. It views European and American culture and psychology as suboptimal and "...antithetical to non-European culture" (p. 255) and clients of non-European origin.

2.1 'Race'

Many people see 'racial' differences as obvious and believe that real biological differences distinguish people according to 'race.' If you ask people how they know that they are 'White' and not 'Black' (or vice versa) they might say: "Well, its obvious!" However, as Miles and Torres (1999) explain...

The quality of obviousness is not inherent in a phenomenon but it is the outcome of a social process in the course of which meaning is attributed to the phenomena in a particular historical and social context. The meaning is learnt by those who are its subject and object. They therefore learn to habitually recognize it, and perhaps to pass on this signification and knowledge to others, with the result that the quality of obviousness attributed to the phenomena is reproduced through historical time and social space. But people do not see 'race': rather, they observe certain combinations of real and sometimes imagined somatic and cultural characteristics, to which they attribute meaning with the idea of 'race' (pp. 31-32, italics in original).

Just because we appear different does not prove the existence of 'race.' Rather, the way in which we interpret these differences has been created over time. As Ladson-Billings (2000) states, "...the process by which racial meanings arise is termed racial formation" (p. 259, italics in original).

The term 'race' and its corollaries have been with us for such a long time that it has become very difficult to interpret the world or communicate without them. 'Race' is so ingrained that even renowned researchers on the cutting edge of multicultural counselling have
difficulty getting around thinking in terms of it. For example, Ponterotto (1998), a major contributor to the multicultural counselling literature, relates his account of mistaking the 'racial' identity of W.E. Cross (Appendix 3).

The term 'race' first began its career innocently enough in the early 1500s in a poem by William Dunbar in which he meant 'race' as lineal descent or ancestry (Banton, 1998). In the 1700s, Carl Linnaeus divided Homo sapiens into four 'races' based primarily on colour: Europaeus albus ('White'), Americanus rubescens ('Red'), Asiatic fuscus ('Yellow') and Africanus niger ('Black') (Yee et al., 1993; Bonnett, 1998). Interestingly, in the mid 1800s, Count Arthur de Gobineau of France proposed a theory that only three 'races' ('Caucasoid,' 'Negroid' and 'Mongoloid') existed (Ladson-Billings, 2000). Later, came Darwin's natural selection, which, when combined with Linnaeus' work, 'explained' the 'natural, inherited superiority' of the 'White race' (Carter & Qureshi, 1995). Later still, Mantegazza developed the 'Taxonomy of Races' which rank ordered the 'races' with 'Whites' at the top (see Appendix 15).

In the 18th and 19th centuries, 'racial' interpretations of the Bible became popular. For example, the so-called 'Hamitic myth' emerged from a 'racial' interpretation of a story in Genesis 9, of Ham, son of Noah, as the first 'Black' man (see Appendix 18). To this day, the intertwining of Biblical stories and 'race' ideologies powerfully infuses many Western minds with an acceptance of 'race' as natural and essential (Gourevitch, 1998). Then in the early 1900s, intelligence testing was used to demonstrate the 'mental superiority' of the 'White race.' The 'natural superiority' of the 'White race' was accepted in the sciences up until about the 1920s (Duckitt, 1992).

Today, there is a general agreement among biologists, and the scientific community in
general, that there is no biological basis for ‘racial’ categorizations. ‘Race’ is generally seen as a social construct. As Henry, Tator, Mattis and Rees (2000) state, “...race is a socially constructed phenomenon based on the erroneous assumption that physical differences such as skin colour, hair colour and texture, and facial features are related to intellectual, moral, or cultural superiority” (p.5). It is a myth that people can be divided into discrete categories based on skin colour or other physical characteristics. More accurately, people vary along a colour continuum (Waller, 1998) and there are more differences within groups than between so-called ‘racial’ groups. Furthermore, the names of ‘racial’ categories really make little sense. For example, “no White person is truly white, nor is any Black individual truly black” (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000, p.4). Smedley (1999) argues that “...the myth of ‘race’ has been a barrier to true human identities” (p. 696). Reacting to the Holocaust, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1950 sought to condemn the idea of ‘race’ as biological fact so that it could never again be used to support aggression and genocide and recommended replacing ‘race’ with the term ‘ethnic group’ (Yee et al., 1993).

It is fifty years later and the terms ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ are still used in the social sciences, often inappropriately and interchangeably, indicating a great need for conceptual and methodological clarity (Phinney, 1990; Frable, 1997; Mattai, 1990; Yee et al., 1993). Both terms differentiate groups in plural or heterogeneous societies, however, the difference between the two is that the former is commonly associated with unchangeable, biological, permanent, genetic attributes while the latter is generally considered socially learned, fluid and flexible. Phinney (1996), echoing UNESCO, advocated that ‘race’ be subsumed under the construct of ‘ethnicity’ to avoid the confusing usage of ‘race’ in the social sciences.
There are strong arguments against subsuming 'race' under ethnicity. Pope-Davis and Liu (1998) note a contradiction in Phinney's argument which states that 'race' is not as relevant as ethnicity but also says that ethnicity may not be as salient for 'Whites' who have more of a choice about whether to assume or discard an ethnic identity. Phinney neglects the fact that African, Asian, Latino and Native Americans do not have a choice about being assigned to a 'racial' category. Mattai (1990) noted a tendency in the social sciences to refer to people in the African Diaspora as a homogeneous 'racial' group ('Blacks') and to refer to 'Whites' as a heterogeneous group with different ethnicities. This leads to the scrutiny of 'Blackness' without regard to ethnicity and of 'Whiteness' without regard to 'race.' Helms and Talleyrand (1997) think that subsuming 'race' under ethnicity merely adds confusion not clarity because ethnicity "...seemingly has no real meaning apart from its status as a proxy for racial classification or immigrant status" (p. 1246). By subsuming 'race' under ethnicity, the specific effects of racism are more easily obscured and neglected. The confusion in terminology in the social sciences led Banton (1998) to throw up his arms and say that "...the words 'race' and 'ethnicity' have so many strong associations in the practical language, it may never be possible to use them as names for theoretical concepts within social science" (p. 199).

Indeed, the debate over the reality and utility of the term 'race' in the social sciences rages (Frable, 1997). Helms (1990), for one, asserts that, even though 'race' is a social construction, its psychological effects are very real and so should be used as a construct in theory and research. She states that at the psychological level of analysis, people's beliefs, feelings and thoughts about 'race' can have significant implications for their intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning. Similarly, but at the socio-political level, Guillaumin (1999) contends that...
[w]hether race is or is not 'a fact of nature,' whether it is or is not a 'mental reality,' it is today, in the twentieth century, a legal, political and historical reality which plays a real and constraining role in a number of societies. It is not possible to argue that a category which organizes whole states (the Third Reich, the republic of South Africa, etc.), and which is incorporated into law, does not exist. It is not possible to claim that the category which is the direct cause, the primary means, of the murder of millions of human beings does not exist (p. 45).

Therefore, the consequences of the use of 'race' are very real at different levels of analysis. However, what remains is the danger that if we continue to use the word 'race' people will continue to use it without thinking, or worse, with thinking it is a valid biological category.

Miles and Torres (1999) have proposed a way out of this by drawing a distinction between the idea of 'race' and the concept of 'race.' They say that just because people use the idea of 'race' to comprehend their social world, social scientists do not need a concept of 'race.' Besides, the concept of 'race' has never (can never) be rigourously defined further than basic "...lay stereotypes that do not go beyond self-identification" (Yee et al., 1993, pp. 1133-1134). Furthermore, the use of the idea of 'race' in scientific analysis has the effect of reifying the term (Miles & Torres, 1999). In other words, it makes 'race' real and concrete when it is in fact abstract and hypothetical. Reification "...is one of the more seductive ways in which social scientists distort and misrepresent the status of many of their hypothetical entities and constructs" (Reber, 1985, p.628). This then legitimates and reinforces everyday beliefs that 'races' are a biological phenomenon or essences) in a process called 'subjective essentialism' (Leyens et al., 2000). Young (2000) cites Wittgenstein’s (1958) observation that concepts, spurious or not, tend to compel people to seek out things which correspond to them. For Miles, 'race' is an 'ideological effect' (1984), a 'mask' hiding imbalanced economic relationships
Miles (1988) suggested that it may be possible to develop a vocabulary that acknowledges the use of the idea of ‘race’ in everyday life yet avoids reifying ‘race.’ For example, rather than saying a person is ‘White,’ ‘Black,’ ‘Red’ or ‘Yellow,’ the critical ‘race’ theorists say that it makes more sense to say a person is ‘racialized’ as ‘White,’ ‘Black,’ etc. The terms ‘racialized’ and ‘racialization’ refer to “...any process or situation wherein the idea of ‘race’ is introduced to define and give meaning to some particular population, its characteristics and actions” (Miles cited in Hatcher & Troyna, 1993). These terms avoid the myth of ‘race’ as biological fact and emphasize that it is socially created and historically and culturally contextual in nature. They also help describe a process of racialization in which ‘racial’ identities are ascribed to and/or achieved by a person. The terms emphasize “...how groups and individuals embrace the idea of ‘race’ and difference, in their efforts to compete and succeed” (Small, 1999, p.50). Other terms follow: ‘racialized groups,’ ‘racialized relations’ (Small, 1999), ‘racialized categories,’ ‘racialized formation’ (Miles & Torres, 1999) and ‘racialized subjectivities’ (Back & Solomos, 2000). Helms (1997) would agree with this line of thinking because a “...major advantage of relabeling race rather than attempting to name it out of existence is that cleaner operational definitions of race as a psychological construct should be possible because the basic constraints on the term(s) are specified in advance” (p. 1247).

Another option is to always put ‘racial’ terms in quotes, as in this paper, to emphasize and remind people of its socially constructed nature or at least to continually call into question its veracity.

However, ‘race’ or racialized interactions are inescapable features in counselling that
need to be addressed. It is important for the counsellor to remember that 'race' may have multiple meanings for clients and counsellors (Yee et al., 1993). As we have seen in the case of self and identity, language and meanings evolve and so terms and constructs must be considered in their specific contexts (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees).

2.2 Racism(s)

The study of racism comes from many different angles. The following are two definitions of racism:

Racism may be viewed as an ideology or attitude held of people of another race, which is based on the belief that races are distinct and can be regarded as 'superior' or 'inferior.' It is an uncritical acceptance of a negative social definition of a group identified by physical features such as skin colour (James, 1996, p.26).

Racism (more correctly, "social racism") refers to the assumptions, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours of individuals as well as to the institutional policies, processes, and practices that flow from those understandings. Racism as racialized language or discourse is manifested in the articulation of ideologies and policies through euphemisms, metaphors, omissions, and passive language. It is reflected in the collective belief systems of the dominant culture, and is woven into the laws, language, rules, and norms of Canadian society (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000, p.5).

These definitions seem to (unequally) convey that racism occurs at all levels: individual, institutional and cultural. Critical Race Theory (CRT) suggests that racism “...is so enmeshed in the fabric of the U.S. social order, it appears both normal and natural to people in this society” (Ladson-Billings, 2000, p. 264).

At the individual level racism is defined as personal negative prejudicial attitudes or discriminatory behaviours toward people of another ‘race’ and a belief in the superiority of one’s own ‘race.’ Institutional or structural racism can be defined as intentional and unintentional
institutional laws, policies, practices and structures that subordinate and exclude people of a
given ‘race’ and maintain the economic and social advantages of the dominant ‘race.’ Cultural
racism is rooted in societal beliefs and customs and promotes the assumption that the products
(religion, music, values) of one’s culture are inherently superior to those of other cultures and
that (Helms, 1990; Waller, 1998).

Racism is related to, yet distinct from, ethnocentrism, prejudice and social discrimination.
Ethnocentrism can be defined as the propensity to only take the point of view of one’s own
culture, to see it as superior to others or to think that what applies in one’s own culture holds for
all others (James, 1996). Prejudice from the Latin ‘praejudicium’ means, strictly, ‘precedent’ and
‘prejudgement’ and, more broadly, an invalid negative preconceived opinion, notion, assumption
or attitude (James, 1996). Allport defined social discrimination as “any conduct based on a
distinction made on grounds of natural or social categories, which have no relation either to
individual capacities or merits or to the concrete behavior of the individual person” (cited in
Mummendey, Otten, Berger, & Kessler, 2000, p. 1258). Social discrimination also includes
exclusion from certain social rights or privileges. Racism can be defined as different from
prejudice and ethnocentrism in that racism includes the element of power to enforce one’s
prejudices (Dobbins & Skillings, 1991).

Authors have related racism is to sexism, classism (Fontana & Frey, 2000) and capitalism
(Ignatiev, 2000b). An exploration of these relationships is beyond the scope of this literature
review, however, such relationships may surface in the data analysis.

Definitions of racism have not always included the micro and macro levels of analysis.
Since the social sciences began to study racism in the 1920s, the approach to the subject has
White' 'racial' identity development

shifted through several paradigms, some of which are still clung to by some people. In the 1920s, racism and prejudice were seen as irrational... a 'rotten apple' or disease theory of racism based on the assumption that the average, normal person is sane, rational, and unprejudiced (Rizvi, 1993). In the 1930s and 1940s, psychodynamic explanations of racism as "...normal psychological processes characteristic of all persons" (Duckitt, p. 1186) were popular. In the 1950s, an orientation to the study of individual differences in racism prevailed and studies of the 'authoritarian personality' were common.

In the 1960s, social science began to focus on broad social and cultural factors influencing racism and saw prejudice as being transmitted through socialization and conformity to a socially embedded norm. This 'normative' approach, however, did not account for unequal power relations and optimistically implied that 'race' relations could be harmonious if only 'Whites' could learn to accept 'Blacks' (Duckitt, 1992).

In the late 1960s and into the 1970s it became clear that racism and discrimination were more deeply entrenched in U.S. society than previously assumed. Sociological explanations for racism emerged such as 'internal colonialism,' 'institutionalized racism' and "...the socio-economic advantages for Whites of maintaining a stable Black underclass" (Duckitt, p. 1188). In the 1970s, two lines of inquiry evolved, the social psychological study of prejudice/social discrimination and the study of covert racism.

2.2.1 'Dehumanization': A social psychological construct

A line of experimental social psychological research into social discrimination diverged from sociological explanations of racism in the 1970s. Using the 'minimal intergroup paradigm' this research showed that even when people are randomly assigned to minimal groups and have
no interaction or conflict of interest between them, the people in the groups still exhibit bias, discrimination and a competitive orientation towards the other group. The ‘mere categorization effect,’ as this is called, is "...the finding that an arbitrary categorization into ‘us’ (the ingroup) and ‘them’ (the outgroup) can be sufficient to elicit social discrimination between groups [and] is broadly accepted as a robust phenomenon in intergroup research" (Mummendey, Otten, Berger, & Kessler, 2000, p. 1258). Social Identity Theory (SIT) (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986) explains the mere categorization effect as people trying to achieve and maintain a positive social identity by favourably comparing the ingroup over relevant outgroups. Thus, "...both ingroup favoritism and outgroup discrimination are tools to achieve positive distinctiveness of one’s own group" (Mummendey, Otten, Berger, & Kessler, 2000, p.1259).

Leyens et al. (2000), carrying this line of thinking to its ugly end, argue that people tend to view group members as sharing essential qualities, such that ingroup members are somehow fundamentally different from outgroup members. This is subjective essentialism; a reification of the psychological distance between ‘my’ group and the outgroup. Combining subjective essentialism with the mere categorization effect, Leyens et al. conclude that people tend to think of their group as somehow more human than the outgroup. People in the outgroup are seen to "...lack typically human characteristics and, therefore, are considered infrahumans" (Leyens et al., 2000, p. 188). This infrahumanization is similar to the concepts of ‘delegitimization’ (Bar-Tal cited in Leyens et al., 2000) and ‘moral exclusion’ (Opotow cited in Leyens et al., 2000).

Social psychologists, however, found a crucial exception to this rule. De Cremer and van Vugt (1998) noted the propensity for people who are focused on interpersonal issues to define themselves according to their personal identity and demonstrate low group identification.
"Consequently, people focused on personal identity will not display these positive in-group evaluations because they are motivated to distinguish themselves from other in-group members" (p.3). Thus, if you are personally oriented you are less likely to dehumanize those who are different from you.

The social psychological approach has limitations that may make it unsavoury to multicultural counselling psychologists. The approach is mainly cognitive and cognitive-motivational which focuses, respectively, on the concepts of ‘stereotype’ as a cognitive structure and ‘social categorization’ as a cognitive process. It therefore tends to neglect affective factors, which counselling psychologists are generally interested in.

Research on social identity is usually conducted in short-term laboratory situations based on artificially constructed social groups comprised of college students so it is not clear about how results generalize to natural social contexts (Cooper & Denner, 1998). Counselling psychologists, especially in the multicultural vein, are interested in a wide variety of people in natural social contexts.

Social psychologists do not focus on intrapersonal differences or ambiguities. Hatcher and Troyna (1993) noted "...the frequent practice of social psychologists, uncomfortable with notions of cognitive or attitudinal ambivalence [is to] impose a unitary model of consciousness by claiming that one attitude is more deeply held and therefore is the real attitude" (p. 119). Counselling psychologists deal with intrapersonal ambiguities and obfuscations as a matter of course.

While social psychology has offered a number of single-factor explanations of prejudice including socio-demographic (i.e., linking urbanism and tolerance), family socialization (i.e.,
influence of authoritarian parents), personal orientations (i.e., authoritarianism), and cognitive-motivational processes (i.e., social identity), some authors have found that single-factor theories or frameworks are inadequate (Agnew, Thompson, & Gaines, 2000; Duckitt, 1992). Duckitt (1992), therefore, proposed an integrated theory that incorporates universal psychological processes underlying an inherently human potential for prejudice, the intergroup conditions that trigger these potentialities, the transmission of normative prejudiced attitudes and individual differences in susceptibility to prejudice. Counselling psychologists, trained to approach problems from many levels, would be interested in such a model.

The SIT stream of social psychology, for example, generally views intergroup prejudice and discrimination as "...inevitable outcomes of a normal, natural and universal cognitive process that [functions] to simplify and make more manageable the complexity of the social world" (Duckitt, 1992, pp. 1188-1189). The emphasis on discrimination as an essentially normal universal intrapsychic process seems to be a throwback to the 1930s and 1940s. Hopefully, counselling psychologists would argue with the notion that categorizing and making generalizations about the world inevitably leads to prejudice and discrimination.

2.2.2 Covert racism: A Canadian problem

Racism in Canada is blatantly manifest in the significant presence of racial supremacist groups (Li, 1995). We tend to write these extreme groups off as minor aberrations in an otherwise non-racist society or as sick people in an otherwise healthy society. Extreme groups ease the burden of conscience for the majority by making everyday versions of racism appear more banal, reasonable and tolerable in comparison (Li, 1995). As Li states "...racial extremism provides the moral grounds for the majority to condemn what a democratic society is not, and at
the same time to accept what otherwise would be an unacceptable manifestation of racism under a democratic system” (Li, 1995, p. 9). Perhaps more harmful is that extreme forms of racism render other, more prolific forms less obvious and more insidious. ‘White’ supremacists are just the visible tip of the metaphorical iceberg.

By the 1970s the overt expression of racism was becoming socially inappropriate (aka. politically incorrect) and new, subtler or forms of racism were emerging. Today, even the Ku Klux Klan is becoming more covert by occasionally claiming to have rejected the ideology of ‘White’ supremacy or by claiming that love of the ‘White race’ means hatred of others (Roediger, 1999). These new covert forms have variously been called ‘symbolic’ racism, ‘low modern’ racism and ‘democratic’ racism. Symbolic racism involves using ‘codewords’ and double entendres in order to circumvent accusations of racism (Small, 1999). For example, words such as ‘difference’ and ‘culture’ often replace ‘race’ yet assume the same fixed, natural, pseudo-biological meanings as associated with ‘race.’ As Small (1999) says “...although no reference is made to ‘race,’ the words themselves are heavily saturated with such meanings and interests” (p. 57). Helms (1994) noted that “...race has been camouflaged by other similar group-classification constructs” (p. 163) such as ethnicity and culture. Discourses of multiculturalism and difference often have a metonymic relationship to racism that result in a ‘hidden racial narrative’ (Back & Solomos, 2000).

Similarly, ‘low modern’ racists try to behave in an egalitarian fashion (political correctness) yet still harbour racist attitudes (Beal, O’Neal, Ong, & Ruscher, 2000). Merton’s (1970) four-category typology of the interaction of attitudes and behaviours illustrates the possibility of a person holding racist attitudes behaving in a non-racist way and vice-versa (see
Table 1). ‘Low modern’ racists would fall in the quadrant reserved for ‘non-use of racist behaviour by people who have racist attitudes.’

Table 1. A model for locating racist behaviour (adapted from Hatcher & Troyna, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>Racist</th>
<th>Non-racist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of racist behaviour that expresses racist attitudes</td>
<td>Non-use of racist behaviour by people who have racist attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>Racist</td>
<td>Non-racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of racist behaviour by people who hold anti-racist attitudes</td>
<td>Non-use of racist behaviour by people who hold anti-racist attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-racist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democratic racism is the “...the most appropriate model for understanding how and why racism continues in Canada” (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000, p.19). Democratic racism justifies the inherent conflict between democratic ideals and racist ideologies. The following discourses are seen to support democratic racism in Canada: (a) denial, (b) colour blindness, (c) equal opportunity, (d) blaming the victim, (e) ‘White’ victimization, (f) reverse racism, (g) binary polarization, (h) immigrants, balkanization, and racism, (i) moral panic, (j) multiculturalism, (k) liberal values and (l) national identity (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000,
pp. 384-385, see Appendix 4 for a fuller explanation of these terms).

Diaz-Rico (1998) envisioned the possible ways that racism is expressed along a ‘continuum of involvement in transformative engagement’ (see Table 2). The individual expression of racial prejudice can vary according to tone of voice, respect of personal space, amount of eye contact, amount of verbal interaction, amount of friendliness, attributions of negative behaviour of outgroup members to their dispositions rather than to their situations (and vice versa for positive behaviour) (Duckitt, 1992/93), verbal expressions of antipathy, avoidance, discrimination, physical attack and finally, extermination (Allport, 1954).

| Continuum of involvement in transformative engagement (Diaz-Rico, 1998) |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| overt racism | covert racism | political correctness | speaking up in cultures | participating events | initiating leadership |

In summary, we can see a continuing tension, as in the literature on identity, between individual and societal perspectives of racism. While many believe that racism is due to idiosyncrasies like ignorance, irrationality and/or a pathological personality, others tend to consider victims of racism “... as relatively powerless in the face of the structural distribution of power...” (Rizvi, 1993, p. 129). Rizvi (1993), however, contends that theories, which emphasize one level over the other, are in error because...

...both perspectives naturalize the phenomenon they seek to describe. The [individual] perspective assumes a Cartesian view of subjectivity, while the [institutional perspective] assumes institutions to have a sui generis character, independent of the actual practices of actual individuals... What has become increasingly clear, then, is that the individual and institutional views of racism operate from opposite ends of the same dualism. However, if we reject such a dualism, both accounts can be shown to be equally problematic... because it is impossible to describe institutions that are not historically constructed through the actual
practices of individuals. Nor is it possible to imagine discourses and practices in which individuals engage as having any significance outside their institutional locations. What the rejection... suggests is that racism does not have some essential form. It is continually changing, being challenged, interrupted, and reconstructed (p. 129).

Thus, the critical ‘race’ theorists speak of racisms instead of a single, essential, monolithic racism (Back & Solomos, 2000).

2.3 Racial identity theory and research

From a counselling perspective racial identity theories seek to explain the psychological implications of membership and non-membership in a ‘racial’ group as well as to explain various dynamics in cross-cultural counselling (Helms, 1984). According to Janet Helms (1990), the term ‘racial identity’ refers to a quality of group or collective identity based on the perception of a shared racial heritage.

Early work on racial identity in the United States was epitomized by Kenneth and Mamie Clark’s (1952) famous study of ‘Black’ children’s preference for ‘White’ dolls. ‘Black’ children who were presented with differently coloured dolls most often selected ‘White’ dolls when asked how they identified themselves and what their preferred identity was.

Before the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s most studies addressed ‘Black’ American identity from a deficit perspective. The deficit perspective studied the problems associated with having a ‘different’ ethnic, racial and cultural heritage. It ignored such contextual factors as racism, socio-economic conditions and barriers to access to institutions including counselling services (Arredondo, 1998). W.E.B. DuBois (1903/1986), a ‘Black’ scholar, was one of the few who accounted for these contextual factors in his comments on issues of identity. An important scholar, he is rarely cited in counselling literature (Mio & Iwamasa, 1993). Parham (in Mio &
Iwamasa, 1993) noted that the pioneers of minority research, who were and are minorities themselves, are rarely cited in reviews of the literature. He stated that the tendency of today’s authors to mainly cite recent articles has systematically neglected the pioneering work of minority scholars.

Two reviews of the literature (Phinney, 1990; Frable, 1997) found a dearth of empirical research on racial/ethnic identity. While Phinney (1990) concludes “[e]thnic identity is central to the psychological functioning of members of ethnic and racial minority groups” (p. 499) neither reviews found consistent results as to how racial/ethnic identity relates to self-esteem and adjustment. According to the reviews, the three theoretical frameworks which dominate the psychological literature on ‘racial’ identity are acculturation theory, social identity theory (SIT) and identity development. It is not always clear in these reviews, however, which kind of identity is being referred to, ‘racial’ or ethnic.

Acculturation theory includes the linear and two-dimensional identity models. According to the linear or ‘melting pot’ model, as immigrants identify more strongly with the new culture, their original cultural identity weakens. The two-dimensional or ‘bicultural’ model proposes that immigrants’ original and new cultural identities are independent dimensions and therefore it is possible to have strong ties to both cultures. The bicultural model is currently more popular than the linear model but theory far outweighs empirical work (Frable, 1997).

SIT, a social psychological project similar to the bicultural model, views ethnicity as a social identity which is multidimensional in structure and content, influenced by social histories, supported by environmental structures such as cultural background, fluid across changing contexts (i.e., home to school) and negotiated in many ways depending on the importance of the
identity to the individual (Frable, 1997). There is some research that shows that people can have 'situational ethnicities' (Cooper & Denner, 1998) or bicultural identities.

The bicultural and SIT models resemble Lal's (1995) Symbolic Interactionist concept of 'optional situational' identity in which there is an element of conscious choice. The optional situational perspective sees identity as a creative process that is engaged as necessary depending on the social situation. This of course is not to neglect the constraints put upon identity options by the definitions and activities of powerful others. As Lal says "...powerful groups may try and may succeed in creating identities for a group not felt by its members, as was the case, for example, for those assimilated Jews who saw themselves as Germans and not as Jews during the Nazi era" (p. 433). Ethnic and 'racial' identities are subject to constraints yet both are changeable and self-interested to some extent. The similarities with the postmodern self are also apparent.

On the other hand, the primordialist approach sees 'racial'/ethnic identity as the primary influence on identity and behaviour. Similar to the modern concept of self and the Race-Based approach (Carter & Qureshi, 1995), the primordialist concept is concerned with the permanence and essentiality of 'racial'/ethnic identity. Despite any anti-racist intentions, the primordialist concept is a type of absolutism that has the potential for restricting the development of the individual because it lacks potential for choice.

2.4 ‘White studies’

The counselling psychology literature on 'White' 'racial' identity can be, but rarely is, situated within 'White studies,' a vast and growing literature from a diverse range of fields within the humanities and social sciences. 'White studies' (or 'Whiteness studies') distinguishes
itself from traditional studies of ‘White’ attitudes and behaviour within ‘race’ research by attempting to treat its object of study as a “...historically mutable social construction” (Bonnett, 1996, p. 153). The emergence of the study of Whiteness and ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity was, in part, a response to the criticism that the social science of ‘racial’ identity had exclusively focused on the victims rather than the perpetrators of racism (Back & Solomos, 2000). It attempted disrupt the ‘common sense’ equation of the study of racism with the study of ‘Black’ and other minority communities (Back & Solomos, 2000) and expose “...the operations of racial privilege and advantage that structure the lives, attitudes, and actions of White people” (Hartigan, 1999, p.184).

Also of note is how ‘White’ feminists began to study ‘White’ culture and ‘White’ identity in the early 1990s in an effort to understand why women ‘of colour’ were reluctant to put gender alliances above ‘racial’ ones (Hitchcock, 1995). This perhaps speaks to how ‘Whiteness’ is more of a problem to ‘Black’ feminists than maleness.

Rodriguez (2000) outlines three major streams in the ‘White studies’ literature. These include the original stream, which considers Whiteness and ‘race’ as a social construction and involves social and historical analyses, the abolitionists, who believe the best course of action is to abolish ‘race’ and racial categories, and the dialectical approach, which seeks to deconstruct and rearticulate Whiteness.

2.4.1 The original stream

The original stream of ‘White studies’ broke from tradition in social studies where ‘race’ was rarely used to signify people of the majority culture. ‘White’ culture was the hidden norm against which so-called ‘racially’ different groups were measured. The new ‘White studies’
equated Whiteness with power, oppression, domination and privilege. These equations were maintained, it was theorized, by the 'invisibility' of Whiteness. An example of Whiteness wishing to remain unmarked is Martin et al.'s (1999) study of preferred self-labels for 'Whites' in which they reported an unusually high number of nonresponses and unusable responses to their questionnaire. They postulated that this might have been because being asked to self-label was "an intrusion on choice" for 'Whites' (However, for those who did respond, the following labels were named in order from most to least preferred: White, Caucasian, White American, European American, Euro-American, Anglo then WASP). The original stream, then, sought to 'mark' or 'name' Whiteness and include it as a racial category.

Another thrust behind the original stream was exposing how 'White' identities are malleable through time and space. They showed how 'White' identities were not always exclusive to people of British or Northern European heritage. For example, when European colonizers first set eyes on North American aboriginals they did not see them as having significantly different coloured skin. It was not until about the middle of the eighteenth century when Europeans began to claim exclusive rights to Whiteness. Whiteness gradually became more central to the colonizers, aboriginals were increasingly cast as 'tawny', 'brown' and 'red' until the nineteenth century when red became the universally accepted colour label for aboriginal (Bonnett, 1998).

In pre-modern China, Whiteness was associated with purity, sensitivity, beauty and membership in the elite class. Peasants were described as 'black-headed' not because of heredity or 'race' but because of circumstance: peasants worked under the sun. When the 'White' Chinese first met Europeans, they did not immediately abdicate their 'White' identities. On the
contrary, rather than being viewed as ‘whiter,’ the Chinese thought Westerners’ skin had a “peculiar, ash-like, quality” (p. 1034). Similarly, in the Middle East, the ‘White’ identities of the ruling class were not disturbed by early encounters with Europeans. Gradually, over the last 250 years, Europeans have reinvented ‘White’ identity to claim it as their own and to convince themselves and others that White identities have never existed outside of Europe (Bonnett, 1998). However, as proof of the malleability of identity, aboriginals in Oklahoma were classified as ‘White’ from 1907-1967 (Wallenstein, 2000).

2.4.2 The abolitionist stream

The second is called the abolitionist stream in which Whiteness is equated with domination and oppression and calls for the dismantling and abolition of ‘race’ and Whiteness. Abolitionist Ignatiev (2000b) states, “...there is no such thing as white culture. Whiteness has nothing to do with culture and everything to do with social position. It is nothing but a reflection of privilege, and exists for no reason other than to defend it. Without the privileges attached to it, the white race would not exist, and the white skin would have no more social significance than big feet” (p. 1). Ignatiev holds that “...so-called whites must cease to exist as whites in order to...[become] fully developed human subjects” (p. 2). Ignatiev urges people racialized as ‘White’ to “...break the rules of whiteness” (p. 5) and ask those who racialized them: “What makes you think I’m white?” (p. 6).

Indeed, many ‘Whites’ are beginning to view their Whiteness negatively. Gallagher (1994) surveyed students attending a ‘racially’ and economically diverse inner-city university and found that they experienced their Whiteness as a mostly negative social category. The students felt handicapped because of affirmative action, thought they were being stereotyped as
racist and were uncertain how to behave around students of colour. The responses varied little across different areas, settings (cities, suburbs) and post-secondary institutions in the United States. However, all the respondents grew up in exclusively or predominantly ‘White’ neighbourhoods. Storrs (1999) reminds us, however, that the students in the Gallagher study represent a limited population of ‘White’ youth with socially disadvantaged ‘racial’ identities. There seems to be a consensus in all literatures that, for the majority, Whiteness is still advantageous.

Similar to the Gallagher study, the women in Storrs’ (1999) study viewed their ‘White’ identities negatively. However, the women in Storrs’ study self-identified as being of mixed ‘race’ and rejected their ‘White’ heritage in favour of their non-‘White’ heritage. These women reported that they could pass as ‘White’ or ‘Black’ depending on the situation. The women valued their non-‘White’ heritage because it made them feel interesting and distinct. They rejected Whiteness because of its associations not only with normalcy, emptiness and blandness but also with oppression, prejudice and discrimination. In a similar vein, Page’s (1999) lengthy definition of racism essentially equates Whiteness and racism (see Appendix 8).

The abolitionists want to avoid consolidating ‘White’ identity in any form because it has never and will never stand for something positive. As Ignatiev (2000a) writes,

...to promote Whiteness as a legitimate identity is to play a dangerous game. A few years back, a prominent American fascist said that what gave him the greatest encouragement was the development of a White ethnicity and White pride. He was right. But if Whiteness is a culture, as both he and many in the White studies industry claim, then what is wrong with ‘White pride’? I predict that before long the White-power camp will latch onto ‘White studies’ and use it to advance their own goals. If I now appear alarmist, wait and see: in fact, recently the organizers of a White-studies conference in Boston were confronted with a White-
power advocate who demanded he be allowed to attend, insisting that he was motivated only by the desire to foster White pride. The organizers debated it amongst themselves for weeks, because although they did not want him there, they had no principled basis on which to exclude him... The second danger of White studies is that it leads to 'racial sensitivity' workshops and 'diversity training' instead of political struggle (p. 3-4).

Ignatiev sees 'White' studies as leading us astray.

Rodriguez (2000), however, sees four problems with the abolitionist approach. First, it does not take seriously enough how embedded the social construction of 'race' is in culture. Second, it runs the risk of supporting the notion that 'race' does not matter. Third, it may push an already anxious and threatened 'White' population either into 'White' solidarity or immobilizing guilt. Fourth, it does not account for differences within Whiteness such as gender, age, sexual orientation, physical and mental challenges, socio-economic status (i.e., 'White trash,' a category that challenges the equation of Whiteness and power and invisibility), etc.

2.4.3 The dialectical stream

The third movement in Whiteness studies is a dialectical approach that calls for a deconstruction and rearticulation of Whiteness. Stuart Hall, on BBC Radio in 1989, called for such a rearticulation in Britain. He said...

I think for black people who live in Britain this question of finding some way in which the White British can learn to live with us and the rest of the world is almost as important as discovering our own identity. I think they are in more trouble than we are. So we, in a curious way, have to rescue them from themselves - from their own past. We have to allow them to see that England is a quite interesting place with quite an interesting history that has bossed us around for 300 years [but] that is finished. Who are they now? (cited in Solomos & Back, 1999, p. 75).

This is what Kincheloe and Steinberg (2000) refer to as a “crisis of Whiteness.”
According to many thinkers, a new 'race' consciousness is taking hold in the West as 'Whites' realize that they are seen as oppressors by most of the rest of the world (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2000, p. 185).

However, for Rodriguez (2000) the dialectical approach does not equate Whiteness only with domination and oppression but also with hope that 'White' people "...can use their own whiteness to undermine and/or challenge [the] legacy [of oppression]" (p. 3). This approach views Whiteness as "...a viable, progressive, and contradictory category..." (Rodriguez, 2000, p. 16) and questions who 'Whites' are and what Whiteness is.

Part of what makes the category contradictory is the diversity among 'White' people "...which makes sweeping generalizations about them dangerous and highly counterproductive..." (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 2000, p. 182). Kincheloe and Steinberg (2000) note that while Whiteness is a marker of privilege, not all 'White' people are able to take advantage of that privilege. They state, there is a "...subtle but crucial distinction between Whiteness, with its power to signify, and White people" (p. 182). Garza (2000) agrees saying that Whiteness is a characteristic that anybody can have regardless of the colour of his or her skin. She states: "I've known White people who didn't ooze Whiteness as much as some Hispanic or African American people I know" (p. 60-61).

Whiteness, having been equated with normality for so long, has traditionally gone without definition (Back & Solomos, 2000). Garza (2000) says Whiteness "...is too complex to contain in a singular definition [but finds that Whiteness is] the way people respond to difference... [through] fear of the unknown, fear of the 'other'" (p. 65). She says "...Whiteness uses its own comfort [and safety] as the measuring stick for how other people should live, think,
work, play, feel and so on. Whiteness says ‘you’ are bad because ‘I’ am uncomfortable with you...” (p. 65). Kincheloe and Steinberg (2000) say “...there is no fixed essence of Whiteness... The dialectical approach seems most similar to WRID theory in that it proposes transforming one’s ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity. As Rodriguez (2000) says: “To rearticulate Whiteness entails a sustained effort at living out one’s Whiteness progressively...” (p. 17). However, it goes further than WRID in that it is beginning to actually define Whiteness.

2.5 ‘Racial’ Identity Development

It could be said that W. E. Cross was the grandfather of WRID theory. In 1971, Cross published a seminal article proposing a ‘Black’ racial identity development model which attempted to account for the varied responses of ‘Black’ individuals to the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. This article has since inspired similar models of identity development for females (Downing & Roush, 1985), homosexuals (Troiden, 1989), biracial persons (Poston, 1990), racial/ethnic groups in general (Ford, 1987; Sue & Sue, 1990), minority (oppressed) groups in general (Myers et al., 1991), and individuals who are members of multiple minority groups (Reynolds & Pope, 1991). It was not until the 1980s that the topic of ‘racial’/ethnic identity development received any appreciable attention from the counselling community. Helms’ (1984, 1990) work, which related ‘racial’ identity development to the process and outcome of counselling, sparked an explosion of research in this area to the extent that “[r]acial identity has emerged as a major issue within the counseling psychology literature” (Fischer, Tokar, & Serna, 1998, p. 212).

According to ‘racial’ identity development theory, a person’s ‘racial’ identity can potentially go through a developmental process (Helms, 1990). Racial identity development
Theories are concerned with the psychological implications of the belief systems that surround 'racial'-group membership. According to Pack-Brown (1999) most 'racial' identity development theories are characterized by the following five assumptions:

1. Everyone belongs to one or more social groups (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender).
2. Belonging to a social group influences a member's worldview and affects the way the world relates to the member.
3. The United States is a racist society.
4. A racist social environment influences the process of 'racial' identity development.
5. As one develops in social identity, one contends with 'racial' identity.

The racial and ethnic identity literature can be divided in two paradigms: 'V-REG' (visible racial ethnic group) models and 'salience' models. V-REG models assume that because 'race' is a visible marker it is the over-arching factor in the development of one's social identity. Salience models, on the other hand, assume that 'race,' ethnicity and/or other reference group memberships may all be equally important factors in the construction of sense of self (Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997).

According to Frable (1997), the most influential V-REG model continues to be Cross's (1971) 'Black' identity model which has inspired other similar models such as Katz and Ivey (1977), Atkinson, Morten and Sue (1989), Helms (1984, 1990), Poston (1990) and Sue, Arrendondo and McDavis (1992). The majority of research on racial identity development has focused on racial minorities; mostly 'Black' or African-American while some attention has been paid to Latino identity (e.g., Ruiz, 1990), Chicano identity (e.g., Arce, 1981) and Asian-
American identity (e.g., Yeh & Huang, 1996). 'Racial' identity theories derive mainly from Erikson's ego identity formation, except that they hypothesize a more conscious exploration and decision-making process (Phinney, 1990). Most follow a three-stage progression from an unexamined 'racial' identity to an exploration of one's own 'racial' identity to an achieved or committed 'racial' identity (Phinney, 1990). Exploration involves examining and questioning pre-existing attitudes and assumptions about 'race' as a necessary step toward identity achievement. An achieved 'racial' identity is a secure, positive sense of one's identity as a member of a 'racial' group together with an acceptance of other groups (Phinney, 1996). Theory on 'racial' identity development suggests that 'identity resolutions' directly affect the development of attitudes and interpersonal and social behaviours (Helms, 1995). It is a dynamic construct that changes over time and context and varies across individuals. Helms (1990) contends that 'racial' identity development is a 'normal' developmental process in the United States in that it "probably occurs in some form in all individuals" (p.8).

Helms' 'Black racial identity development' theory is the most researched and frequently cited within the V-REG orientation. In her theory, 'Black' people can evolve through four stages. These are (a) preencounter, in which a person maintains a Euro-American frame of reference, devalues or denies his or her 'race' and holds attitudes that are anti-'Black' and pro-'White'; (b) encounter, in which a person's anti-'Black' and pro-'White' worldview is confounded by some critical event or experience and causes that person to be receptive to new interpretations of his or her identity; (c) immersion-emersion, in which the person immerses him/herself in 'Black' cultural heritage and develops sense of 'Black pride' and anti-'White' attitudes; and (d) internalization, in which a person internalizes a positive, nonracist, secure
'White' 'racial' identity development

'Black' identity which allows for friendships with 'Whites'. Helms describes it as a process that is influenced by individual characteristics as well as situational or environmental factors (Helms, 1989). According to Helms (1990) 'racial' identity attitudes are significantly related to self-esteem, affective states and preference for therapist 'race' in a manner that is consistent with racial identity theory but they were not related to social class.

Helms (1996) has since expanded her model of 'racial' identity development to include all 'people of color.' Helms justifies this expansion with the idea that all 'people of color' share the experience of racism.

Helms (1989) criticizes 'racial' identity theories for not being clear about whether stages are cumulative or disjunctive "...such that each stage represents a unique restructuring of experiences" (p. 241). Frable (1997) criticized most models for not being systematically developed. This probably contributes to the lack of accurate measurement and empirical validation of the stages (Phinney, 1996; Frable, 1997).

The V-REG orientation resembles the Race-Based and primordialist orientations and is therefore subject to similar criticisms. Some models are sociohistorically encapsulated or Eurocentric. Most treat individuals as passively reacting to environmental events. They view identity in static, deterministic terms and do not account for the flexibility of identity across social contexts despite evidence from social psychology (Yeh & Huang, 1996). Many 'racial'/ethnic identity development theories can be criticized for being overly concerned with internal, intrapsychic processes that ignore collectivistic concepts of identity (Yeh & Huang, 1996).

The salience orientation (e.g. Smith, 1989), on the other hand, incorporates ideas from
social psychology and postmodernism. It holds that people search for social identities that have personal meaning or salience and may not include 'race.' It acknowledges racism but also focuses on how difference is processed in a pluralistic society. It assumes that all humans have the tendency to continually define the ingroup and the outgroup (us and them). We thus continually construct a social order with boundaries based on such classifications. Drawing such boundaries is seen as an internal process. While membership in the majority or minority group is seen as an influence on identity development, it is actual contact, positive or negative, with an outgroup member(s) which ultimately influences a person to broaden, narrow or crystallize their boundaries (Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997).

A unique theory of 'racial' identity development by Myers et al. (1991) proposes developmental stages that culminate in a sense of interconnectedness to all beings. Their Optimal Theory Applied to Identity Development (OTAID) model proposes that people are oppressed, regardless of 'race,' gender, age and so forth, by a reliance on 'external' rather than 'internal' sources of power. North Americans live in a 'suboptimal' social system (materialistic and oppressive) that promotes reliance on external power. People in a suboptimal society may go through a six phase developmental process in which spirituality and self-actualization increase. While the early stages of this theory are similar to Western psychodynamic (Mahler, 1968), psychosocial (Erikson, 1968) and 'racial' identity development models (e.g. Helms, 1990), the later stages offer something different. In the final phase a person achieves something not included in other models: a holistic sense of interconnectedness to all beings (including one's ancestors, future generations, nature, infinite spirit and community) and a worldview in social context (Myers et al., 1991). OTAID is an example of the Pan-National stream of counselling
'White' 'racial' identity development (Carter & Qureshi, 1995).

For a critical review of identity development theory see Appendix 17.

2.6 'White' 'racial' identity development (WRID)

'White' 'racial' identity development models do not seem to fit into V-REG or salience models. Helms (1990) describes 'White' 'racial' identity development as the changes that a member of the dominant 'White' majority goes through while becoming aware of the meaning and implications of being 'White' in America. A number of WRID models have been proposed (Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1984, 1990; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Ponterotto, 1988; Sue & Sue, 1990; Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovskey, 1991). Wehrly (1995) noted the following similarities between the models: (1) the first stage represents a naive perspective on racial identity and a limited awareness of racism, (2) subsequent stages represent a growing awareness that Whiteness is a privileged position, (3) before discovering and integrating a nonracist 'White' identity a person will (4) waffle between the 'old' familiar 'White' identity and the 'new' unfamiliar 'White' identity and (5) experience emotions of guilt, anger, anxiety and emotional disequilibrium. Most of the work in this area is theoretical and there is relatively little empirical research on this topic (Phinney, 1996).

Of all the models, Helms' has received most of the attention. A basic assumption of Helms' model is that 'White' people are born the "benefactors and beneficiaries" of racism whether they are aware of it or not. Racism is seen to benefit but also adversely affect 'White' people socially and psychologically. For 'Whites' to develop a healthy 'racial' identity in a racist society, she argues that 'Whites' must become aware of their privilege due to racism and attempt to abandon privilege and racist attitudes.
In her theory, the development of a positive ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity consists of six stages divided into two main cognitive processes: (1) the abandonment of racism and (2) the development of a positive, non-racist, nonoppressive ‘White’ identity. The stages represent increasingly sophisticated conceptualizations of ‘racial’ information. The stages are (a) contact, during which an individual is unaware of himself or herself as a racial being and benefits from diverse forms of racism without necessarily being aware of it; (b) disintegration, during which the person acknowledges her or his Whiteness and experiences confusion, guilt, and depression in the struggle to resolve the internal dilemmas posed by facing the advantages of being ‘White’ in a racist social system; (c) reintegration, during which feelings of guilt and anxiety are transformed into hostility and anger toward ‘Blacks’; (d) pseudo-independence, during which anger and hostility toward ‘Blacks’ dissipate and there is an intellectual acceptance and curiosity about both ‘Whites’ and ‘Blacks’; (e) immersion-emersion, during which the person actively searches for information about what it means to be a nonracist ‘White’; and (f) autonomy, which is characterized by a person's acceptance of her or his Whiteness, an appreciation of racial differences, and a commitment to end racism and other forms of oppression. For a fuller description of the stages see Appendix 10. The stages are hypothetical constructs that are theorized to be reflected by certain attitudes that, in turn, infer certain behaviours (Helms, 1990).

The stages are all present as potentials in the person, however, the particular stage, which dominates and directs the person’s behaviour depends on the person’s unique cognitive mediating processes and on the qualities of his/her environments which most consistently reinforce a certain ‘racial’ conceptualization (Helms, 1984). Progression through the stages is not smooth and there may be regressions and progressions on the way to the ultimate stage.
"Thus, what makes the model linear is the ultimate direction of change rather than the immediate pattern per se" (Helms, 1989, p. 240). Helms' developmental hypothesis is teleological as are the classic developmental theories. Helms theorizes that cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957), a dialectical concept, is the catalyst for change in WRID. WRID theory has its roots in Erikson's theory and is intuitively similar to Kohlberg's stages of moral development (Appendix 11).

Helms and Piper (1994) and Helms (1995) renamed Helms' (1990) stages as ego statuses. The change to statuses was meant to emphasize the permeable, interactive and thematic nature of the levels and to avoid the interpretation that they are "mutually exclusive categories" (Helms, 1995). Helms (1995) says

...statuses are defined as the dynamic cognitive, emotional, and behavioral processes that govern a person's interpretation of racial information in her or his interpersonal environments. Statuses give rise to schemata, which are behavioral manifestations of the underlying statuses. It is schemata rather than the statuses per se that paper-and-pencil racial identity attitude inventories presumably assess (p. 184).

Helms therefore has eased away from the stage-wise interpretation of WRID.

Supportive studies found WRI attitudes as measured by the WRIAS to be correlated with certain variables in a manner consistent with Helms' theory. These variables are racism (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994a), cultural values (Carter & Helms, 1990), working alliance formation (Burkard & Ponterotto, 1999), self-esteem (Lemon & Waehler, 1996), personal adjustment and self-actualization (Tokar & Swanson, 1991) and multicultural counselling competencies (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Richardson & Helms, 1994; Neville et al., 1996; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994b).

Steward et al. (1998) found a significant relationship between lower levels of cognitive
development and lower stages of ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity but found no significant relationship between higher levels of cognitive development and higher levels of ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity.

Carter (1990) found fewer racist attitudes at higher WRID stages for both men and women however ‘White’ men were more confused about ‘racial’ identity issues and less understanding of racial differences than ‘White’ women. Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994b) replicated Carter’s findings and found that men scored higher at levels of Disintegration and Reintegration while women were highest in Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy. Carter (1990) proposed that women might be better able to appreciate the effects of racism than men because of their experiences with sex discrimination. Also, as Gilligan (1982) has suggested, women may be more oriented towards interpersonal harmony than men. The conclusion that women score higher than men is not solid, however. For example, Brown and Parham (1996) found that ‘White’ female students averaged high Pseudoindependence scores while ‘White’ male students averaged high Autonomy scores.

Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994b) also noted that the younger participants had high levels of Disintegration and Reintegration attitudes while the older participants had high levels of Autonomy attitudes suggesting that WRID may also be a function of age and maturity.

Ottavi, Pope-Davis and Dings (1994) found strong positive correlations between levels of ‘White’ racial identity development and multicultural counselling competencies. Neville et al.’s (1996) self-report measures found that a multicultural counselling course improved multicultural competencies, increased the sophistication of ‘White’ identity attitudes in ‘White’ counsellor trainees and that these improvements were maintained after one year.

Personal narrative accounts of people’s struggle to achieve a positive ‘White’ identity
have recently been published (Brandyberry, 1999; Croteau, 1999; D’Andrea, 1999; Lark & Paul, 1998; Kiselica, 1998, 1999; Rooney, Flores, & Mercier, 1998). These narratives all describe a developmental process similar to that described by WRID models. The authors of these narratives, however, are students of counselling psychology and likely had prior knowledge of WRID models, thus colouring their accounts. Despite this, the inclusion of narratives in the counselling psychology literature is a new event. Ponterotto (1998) hailed this fresh approach as significantly helping to change the foci of multicultural training literature from content to process, from knowledge to experience and from quantification to personal narrative.

‘White’ ‘racial’ identity development models have offered much yet leave much unanswered. They have offered a way in which to interpret differences between people with regards to their ‘racial’ attitudes. They may encourage therapists and clients through a potentially painful process of change toward being non-racist. They have also spurred research and theory in an area previously reserved for minority populations. However, the counselling psychology research in this area could benefit from an integration of knowledge from other disciplines.

2.7 ‘White’ guilt

Waller (1998) believed that the costs of racism for racists could be psychological (feelings of hate, fear, guilt, self-deception and self-hate), social (sacrifice of meaningful relationships) and material (sacrifice of cultural benefits). Guilt is an important component of Helms’ WRID theory. It is known as ‘White’ guilt, stemming from the awareness of ‘ill-gotten’ advantage of being racialized as ‘White’ and of the pervasiveness of racism. Many prominent figures (C. S. Lewis, Martin Luther King, Jr.) have noted the existence of ‘White’ guilt
Throughout the 21st century (Swim & Miller, 1999). It is said to have become rampant in the 1960s when it "...became so palpable you could see it on people" (Steele, 1990, p. 497).

Guilt can be defined as an emotional state that results from the knowledge, conscious awareness and acceptance that one has breached an internalized moral, ethical or legal standard. It is based on the assumption that one is a free moral agent and is self-determined in relation to the standard in question. One may have violated the standard behaviourally (doing something one should not), cognitively (thinking something one should not) or emotionally (feeling something one should not). Guilt is not a pleasant feeling therefore in order to stop the feeling one desires to repent or make amends or reparations. Guilt is most similar to feelings of compunction, remorse and failure. It is related to regret and sorrow but differs in that these may be felt for things that have happened that one had nothing to do with.

Recently social psychologists have become interested in the relationship between prejudice and guilt (Devine et al., 1991; Doosje et al., 1998; Zuwerink et al., 1996; Swim & Miller, 1999). Though theories of emotion often imply that a person feels guilty only for their own actions, Doosje et al. (1998) showed empirically that a person can feel guilty as a result of the prejudiced actions of their group even if the person has not engaged in these particular actions. Social identity theory says that a person's identity consists of individual and group components and that emotions can result from awareness of one's own actions and from the actions of the group to which one belongs. Doosje et al. (1998) found that people who feel guilty are more likely to want to compensate the group that they or their group has treated unfairly. Doosje et al.'s (1998) research suggested that low prejudiced people are bound to feel more guilt than high prejudiced people when their group treats another group unfairly. High prejudiced
people may feel less guilt because they feel social support from their fellow transgressors ("OK, maybe I'm guilty, but so is everyone else in my group"). Devine et al. (1991) and Swim and Miller (1999) also found that guilt was more prevalent in low prejudice individuals. Doosje et al. (1998) found that when made aware of their group's ambiguous treatment of another group, people who identify highly with their group are more likely to challenge the negative treatments, perceive the positive treatments as more salient and experience less guilt as compared to low-identifiers.

Zuwerink et al.'s (1996) research suggests that low prejudiced individuals experience more guilt than high prejudiced individuals when their behaviour does not match their personal standards. This was interpreted as being because (1) their personal standards are better internalized and (2) they believe that they have a personal, moral obligation to respond consistently with their standards. High prejudiced persons, rather than feel guilt, direct their negative affect toward others. Interestingly, all participants, whether high, low or moderately prejudiced, perceived a fairly high degree of prejudice reflected in society's standards and all internalized these standards to the same degree. Most participants' actual responses were more prejudiced than their personal standards indicated was appropriate.

The feelings of guilt are similar to shame. Shame though is different in that it may be experienced when one perceives or feels that others know, or will know, about one's transgression. As Cheek and Hogan (1983) found, people with Personal identity orientations reported significantly more guilt feelings than shame, whereas people with Social identity orientations reported significantly more shame than guilt. Shame is more prevalent in collective than individual cultures likely because the self is experienced as part of the collective.
The existentialists would agree that feelings of guilt are important to development. They say that it is possible to avoid responsibility by making excuses for that which we are becoming. However, existential guilt results from the awareness of having evaded a commitment or having chosen not to choose. This is the guilt we experience when we do not live authentically. It results from allowing others to define us or to make choices for us. Recalling the quote from Athusser and Foucault, “[a] solid, centered identifiable self can be more easily controlled or punished, is more capable of feeling guilt” (Anderson, 1997, p. 43). Making a case for responsibility, Sartre said ‘We are our choices’” (Corey, 1990).

2.8 Criticisms of WRID and the WRIAS

In view of the wider scope of knowledge on the topic criticisms of the current WRID theory and research become apparent. These criticisms include little description of a ‘White’ identity per se, reification of ‘racial’ terms, lack of critical appraisal of stages of development, limited scope of WRIAS, controversial validity evidence, strong demand characteristics, inadequate consideration of consequential validity and limited generalizability.

2.8.1 Little description of a ‘White’ identity per se

WRID models seem to mainly describe how a ‘White’ person’s attitudes change toward other racial groups rather than how a ‘White’ person’s identity changes. This is reflected in the WRIAS, which focuses on ‘White’ attitudes towards ‘Blacks’ rather than a ‘White’ identity per se (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994). For instance, the term ‘Black’ is used almost twice as many times as the term ‘White’ in the WRIAS (see Table 3). Furthermore, the term ‘White’ is most often used in comparison with ‘Black’ and it is used on its own in only four items. WRID models and the WRIAS offer little description of a ‘White’ identity per se.
The WRIAS could be improved by including more items beginning with “I am,” “I was” or “I want to be.” WRID models could be improved by making reference to Katz’s (1985) ‘Components of White Culture’ (see Appendix 7).

Table 3. Analysis of items of the WRIAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>No. of items using certain term(s)</th>
<th>No. of items with certain focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘race’</td>
<td>‘White’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoindipendence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8.2 Reification of ‘racial’ terms

It is not entirely clear where Helms stands on the issue of the reification of ‘race.’ On the one hand, Helms (1994) acknowledges the social construction of ‘race,’ the “...irrationality of the racial classification system...” (p. 295) and how it is reified in the public consciousness. On the other hand, she (1992) entitles one of her publications *A Race Is a Nice Thing to Have*.

Some items in the WRIAS seem to reify the term ‘race.’ Items such as “I hardly think about what race I am” (Item 1) and “I was raised to believe that people are people regardless of their race” (Item 36) seem to implicate ‘race’ is a legitimate, essential quality. Simply reading these and other similar items may have the effect of solidifying the idea of ‘race’ as real in the minds of the respondents.
In view of the fact that 'race' is a social construction, it is ironic that by scoring high on items 1 and 36 the respondent is pegged in the lowly Contact stage. True, people who get high scores on these items may be naive about 'racial' issues and about their privileged positions in racist society. However, I believe that someone could be quite conscious of 'racial' issues, be staunchly antiracist and yet still score high on these items. Pope-Davis and Liu (1998) say it is an error to say that people who say that they 'belong to the human race' or 'don't want to separate themselves from others' can be categorized at low levels. They advocate for understanding how people construct their worldviews about 'race' and looking at the seemingly contradictory statements they make about 'race.' In this way, research and counselling can contribute to a creative collaboration rather than a corrective effort.

To illustrate this point, consider for a moment the hypothetical opposites of items 1 and 36, respectively: "I frequently think about what race I am" and "I was raised to believe that people are people depending on their race." Would it make sense that scoring high on these statements would reflect a higher level of development? For the former, why is it desirable to frequently view the world through a 'racial' lens? This item could very well speak to respondents who think of themselves as 'racial' because they are frequently faced with racism and discrimination. It could also speak to a 'racial' supremacist. The latter statement comments on the racism of the family but does not speak to the respondent's current outlook. People may think and act in ways that do not conform to the ways in which they were raised. But more than this, if you scored high on this item, you would believe that someone is a person depending on his or her 'race.'

The problem of reifying 'race' and 'racial' terms is endemic to WRID theories in general.
Roediger (1999) suggests that counsellors might do better to deconstruct 'White' 'racial' identity rather than to reinforce it.

Reynolds and Pope (1991) noted that 'racial' identity theory and research tend to simplify matters by treating 'race' and ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, class and religion as discrete categories. They issued a challenge to the field to seek out more complex understandings of identity development.

2.8.3 Does not account for social psychological findings

The social psychological finding of the mere categorization effect (dehumanization) seems to contradict the theory that 'racial' identity development can culminate in a positive 'racial' identity which is compatible with non-racist, non-prejudiced attitudes or behaviour. Such points of contrast between social psychological theory and multicultural counselling, however, are rarely explored by anyone (Speight & Vera, 1997). Despite the logical connection between the two fields, only a few counselling psychologists have attempted to integrate the two (i.e., Strong, 1968; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) and an adequate integration has yet to occur.

2.8.4 Lack of critical appraisal of stages of development

Aside from Neville et al.'s study, there have been no longitudinal studies to empirically test the developmental nature of the theory. Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson (1994) see it as erroneous to conceptualize the process of 'White racial' identity as stage developmental. They claim that...

[i]t is important to recognize that the directionality (culminating in a nonracist sense of White identity) is imposed. That is to say, there is nothing in nature, similar to the Piagetian stages of mental operations, that orders the stages of White identity development and nothing other than our imposed ethics that imbues the stages with ordered levels of desirability (p.132).
Indeed, Lemon and Waehler's (1996) test of the stability and construct validity of the WRIAS found a lack of constancy of the scores that may mean that the test represents differences in people's states (influenced by conditions or events) rather than traits (stable characteristics). They recommend that results of the WRIAS should be interpreted in view of contextual factors for that person.

Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson (1994) proposed their Model of White Racial Consciousness which is purported to be an environmental model in which a person's 'racial' identity, or consciousness as they prefer to use, is not developmental but changes as a result of changing life circumstances, experiences and socio-political climates. Similar to Erikson (Appendix 2), they conceptualize an unachieved and achieved 'racial' consciousness on the part of 'Whites.' A person with unachieved 'racial' consciousness is characterized by attitudes that are not internalized. They can be avoidant of racial/ethnic issues, dependent on others for their attitudes or dissonant and uncertain about their sense of 'White' racial consciousness. Achieved 'racial' consciousness is internalized and is dominative (racist), conflictive (racist in some situations), reactive (similar to Helms' disintegration status) or integrative (similar to Helms' autonomy status). The catalyst that propels a person from 'unachieved' to 'achieved' is dissonance (see Appendix 12). Although, Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson claim to not impose levels of desirability, it seems obvious that the 'achieved integrative' status would be the most desirable status for most people.

2.8.5 Limited scope of the WRIAS

According to Helms (1995) racial identity development involves cognitive, emotional and behavioural processes. In a similar vein, social psychologists say that "...prejudice is an
attitude comprising three components: an affective component, a cognitive component and a behavioral component” (Shelton, 2000, p. 378). These three components are evident in Helms’ WRID theory however they are not evenly represented in the WRIAS (see Table 2). Twenty-nine items measure cognitions while only ten items are behavioural and eleven are emotional. Cognitive items are evenly represented in all subscales however emotional items are skewed toward upper stage subscales and behavioural items appear more frequently in the lower stage subscales. Given that feelings of ‘guilt’ and ‘depression’ characterize the Disintegration stage it seems inadequate that there is only one item tapping into depression and none for guilt in this subscale. In the Pseudo-independence subscale, three items tap into feelings of ‘comfort’ and one explores ‘enjoyment.’ It does not make sense why three items are required to assess feelings of comfort in this subscale while only one item is required to assess depression in another. Uneven proportions of facets among the subscales threaten the representativeness of the WRIAS. A remodelling of the measure based on a table of specifications that more evenly distributes the facets amongst the subscales may be of benefit.

2.8.6 Controversial validity evidence

The validity of the WRIAS is not always supported. Behrens’ (1997) confirmatory factor analysis did not confirm the WRID constructs and Alexander (1993) failed to demonstrate correlations with personality traits. Swanson et al. (1994) suggested that the factor structure of the WRIAS may best be represented by the unidimensional bipolar factor (racist-antiracist) rather than the six dimensions proposed by Helms. They noted that the positively loaded items seem to equate with the ‘abandonment of racism’ phase, and the negatively loaded items seem to correspond to the ‘defining a nonracist White identity’ phase of ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity
development. Goodstein and Ponterotto (1997) found that none of the racial identity statuses related to self-esteem.

Some studies critical of the validity of the WRIAS, however, are not without their own faults. For example, in their investigation of the validity of Helms’s WRID model and the WRIAS, Tokar and Swanson have interpreted their statistics to mean that some pairs of subscales may be measuring the same thing. They state...

...some of the subscale intercorrelations were so high as to suggest redundancy. For example, given the alpha coefficients for WRIAS Disintegration (.78), Reintegration (.84), Pseudo-Independence (.65), and Autonomy (.71) scales, the maximum validity coefficients obtainable between Disintegration and Reintegration scales and between Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy scales would be .81 and .68 respectively... The high intercorrelations...are a plausible explanation for the finding that only one variable (at most) from each of these variable pairs significantly contributed to the prediction of any of the three criteria® (pp.299-300).

However, Cortina (1993) says that “...although a set of items with a high alpha usually has a strong common factor, this is not necessarily the case” (p. 100). Cortina reminds us that alpha is an indication of internal consistency, which is merely one requirement for homogeneity: internal consistency and homogeneity are not the same thing. In this case, it would have been useful to examine or report on the standard error of item intercorrelations and thus the precision of alpha. As Cortina says, a large standard error, although it does not provide enough information by itself to prove multidimensionality, is a symptom of multidimensionality® (p. 100).

2.8.7 Who says participants are ‘White’ or not?

Related to the issue of validity is the way that social scientists have been selecting their subjects for ‘racial’ identity research. First of all, there is often a confusion between the terms
'White' 'racial' identity development

A category is a classification made by a supposed objective, outside observer. It is an arbitrary, static and abstract concept that is used, for example, in the census. In contrast, a social group can be defined as being "...constituted by the relations between its members [who] are conscious of belonging to it and identify with it in varying degrees" (Banton, 1998, p.196). A group is dynamic, concrete and contextual. The relationship between imposed 'racial' categories and the formation of 'racial' groups can be reflexive. In other words, those who begin to see themselves as members of a 'racial' group may appropriate the term for a 'racial' category.

In Phinney's (1990) review of the 'racial'/ethnic identity literature, the self-identification of research participants was not assessed in about half the studies. This begs the question: Did the subjects really consider themselves to be, for instance, 'White' or 'Black' or did the experimenters merely select those whom they saw as 'obviously' 'White' or 'Black'? Phinney comments that "[d]etermining ethnicity for research purposes is in itself a methodological problem that has often been ignored" (p. 504).

In her review of the 'racial'/ethnic identity literature, Frable (1997) avoids this conundrum by excluding studies which do not "...assess participants' subjective perceptions or internal representations of their racial or ethnic groups; [and by excluding] studies that use racial or ethnic group merely as a nominal classification scheme" (p. 170). However, even those that do include 'racial' self-identification leave questions unanswered. For example, in the methods section of Richardson and Helms (1994) it says...

Participants were 52 Black male undergraduate students, ages 18 to 26 years (M = 21.5, SD = 2.14), attending a large, eastern university with a majority of White students. The sample included 14 freshmen, 11 sophomores, 10 juniors, and 17 seniors.
Participants differed in how they described themselves racially: 32 preferred to be called Black, 11 preferred Afro-American, 4 preferred Negro, 1 preferred Colored, and the remaining 4 preferred not to use any racial terminology (p. 173).

Why do the researchers continue to label the participants as ‘Black’ when many chose different labels for themselves and four rejected any ‘racial’ terminology? Why and how does a researcher’s conception of a person’s ‘race’ hold sway? Do various labels (and non-labels) have different meanings for people and thus reflect different identities?

Research suggests that people prefer labels that originate from their ‘racial’/ethnic group and that are not imposed by others (Martin et al., 1999). It seems then that research participants should identify themselves. However, as the symbolic interactionists remind us, identity is negotiated. As Powell (1999) argues, while self-identification...

...has a great deal of intuitive value, it is probably not workable or desirable. Much of the appeal of this position stems from our ideology of individualism. In our dominant discourse, we embrace the rhetoric that each person is an individual. While this is a truism in what it says, it is false in what it implies. We all may be individuals, but none of us are just individuals.... This position again suffers from the failure to embrace the significance of race and identity as socially constructed. This does not mean that we cannot or do not participate in the constitution of our identity. But it is a false claim and a flawed hope that we can define who we are in isolation (p. 147).

Therefore, in selecting research participants it would be illuminating to know how they identify themselves and how others in their community define them.

2.8.8 Questionable item technical quality

Content validity studies have not addressed the representativeness and technical quality of the items in the WRIAS. For instance, Kishor (2000) commented that responses to items with the word ‘race’ in them would likely cluster together and confound the results. To further
complicate matters, four out of 10 items in the Contact subscale use the word >race= while other subscales use it only once or not at all (see Table 2). Also, it is unclear how the items of the WRIAS measure identity; they appear to simply measure attitudes.

2.8.9 Strong demand characteristics

College students are typically the population from which subjects are drawn for studies involving the WRIAS. Students may be more aware of ‘politically correct’ responses than the ‘average’ person and may respond in a more liberal, egalitarian fashion thereby belying their true attitudes. Duckitt (1992/93) noted that the use of college students as subjects may seriously threaten the validity of measures involving ‘race’ because the liberal and politically correct climate on most U.S. campuses creates significant pressures on students to appear non-racist. No studies have examined the validity of the WRIAS with regards to modern or covert racism.

2.8.10 Inadequate consideration of consequential validity

Messick (1995) noted the necessity of examining the actual and potential consequences of the administration and interpretation of test instruments. To some extent, the consequential aspect of construct validity has been discussed by Helms and Carter (1990) who contend that it is important to know the level of ‘racial’ identity development of a counsellor in relation to that of the client. If the counsellor’s level is lower than the counselling situation can be unproductive or harmful. However, the possible negative consequences for counsellors and clients who are rated incorrectly at low levels of development by the measure have not been addressed.

The WRIAS has been used primarily for research purposes and it is unlikely that test scores were revealed to respondents. Therefore, the consequences of erroneous categorization into a certain stage have likely been minimal in this respect. However counsellors, especially
impressionable counselling trainees, who are proactive in trying to satisfy ethical and professional standards for multicultural counselling skills and who use the WRIAS to this end may be affected. Erroneous categorization in lower stages of WRID can be confusing, misleading and ultimately damaging if the counsellors begin to think that there is something wrong if they do not think they have a 'race.' Equally as dangerous would be counsellors who score high on the test and solidify their beliefs in the notion of the biological reality of 'race.' Counsellors' beliefs are propagated through their practices and so clients are ultimately affected.

2.8.11 Limited generalizability:

The fact that Helms' WRID model was developed in terms of 'Whites' attitudes toward 'Blacks' is a serious limitation. Helms (1990) claims that 'White' 'racial' identity issues naturally focus on 'Blacks' "[b]ecause White racism in the United States seems to have developed as a means of justifying the enslavement of Black Americans" (p. 49-50). But what about other oppressed populations? In response to this, Helms (1994) reports on an unpublished masters thesis which "...found no essential differences in the psychometric properties of the 'White' racial identity measure when she substituted 'Asian' or 'Hispanic' for 'Black' in the original measure" (p. 164).

No studies have been done on WRID outside the United States.

2.9 Summary

WRID theory and research has been part of an initiative to counter racism in counselling and improve cross 'racial' counselling. Janet Helms and other WRID theorists and researchers have made invaluable contributions to this end by breaking open a previously ignored area. However, 'racial' identity development theory and research, including WRID, is still in its
infancy (Hill & Thomas, 2000) and there remain many areas of concern.

These various concerns are methodological, theoretical and philosophical. The traditional social scientific study of ‘race’ and racism, including WRID literature, suffers from a lack of empirical research and incongruous definitions. The content and consequential validity of the WRIAS are hampered by technical problems, poor representation of the theory, unqualified use of ‘racial’ terms and elusive definitions of Whiteness. WRID and the WRIAS are concerned with attitudes toward ‘Blacks’ and actually provide little description of ‘White’ identity per se. The cognitive, emotional and behavioural facets of identity development are covered in theory yet are unevenly represented in the different subscales of the WRIAS. Existing models and measures of WRID have only been developed and tested in the United States therefore they may not be appropriate in other areas of the world. There have been no longitudinal studies of WRID. Perhaps most importantly, rather than challenge or disrupt ‘racialized’ thinking, it seems to reify it. ‘Racial’ terms and categories go unquestioned. Researchers rarely explain how they determine the ‘race’ of a research participant. It is simply taken for granted. WRID theory and research seems to stick too closely to the tenets of Traditional Psychology and its individualized, essentialized, deterministic view of self and identity. Given these concerns it seems that the study of ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity needs to go in fresh directions.

WRID theory and research might benefit from a multidisciplinary approach. Other disciplines such as ‘White’ studies, postmodern psychology, critical ‘race’ theory and social psychology offer intriguing perspectives on ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity development. With regards to Whiteness, ‘White’ studies have seriously attempted to deconstruct Whiteness and reconstruct
it recognizing that many people racialized as ‘White’ are also oppressed. With regards to self and identity, postmodern psychology sees it as relational, constructed, process and multiple, which seems to be more appropriate given the fast changing world we live in. Postmodern psychology also rejects the notion of predetermined stages, preferring a less deterministic view. Critical ‘race’ theory offers an historical and power relations perspective that is important to the understanding of how ‘race’ has been used to divide and conquer. Social psychology suggests that, depending upon one’s identity orientation, simply identifying with a group leads one to dehumanize people outside the group. Perhaps WRID could benefit by integrating these other perspectives.

2.10 Research questions

Ideas from other disciplines might help shed light on how ‘White’ identities are constructed over time and place in people living in south-western British Columbia, Canada. How do ‘White’ guilt, gender, age, socio-economic status and ‘race’ figure in these constructions? What are the differences and similarities between people who currently see themselves as ‘White’ and people who used to see themselves as ‘White’? What other variables come into play? Does Helms’ WRID model fit with people racialized as ‘White’ living in south-western British Columbia, Canada? These “...vaguely formulated research questions” (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 8) are typical of exploratory and descriptive qualitative research at this stage.

2.11 Rationale for method

Within an overall narrative framework (Silverman, 2000) this study will use semi-structured interviews to gather data that will be analyzed using content analysis (Holsti, 1969; Weber, 1990; Carney, 1972; Krippendorf, 1980) supplemented by various other techniques.
borrowed from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Participants will be adults who self-identify as ‘White’ (or who used to self-identify as ‘White’) and who are (or were) involved in aboriginal communities or who are (were) allied in some way with an aboriginal in Canada. Ostensibly, these people will be more aware of their ‘Whiteness’ than people in the mainstream culture who rarely are confronted with their ‘Whiteness.’ It also responds to the limitations of normative research and research which has relied on college students for data.

The reasons for using such an approach are many. First, the study will be exploratory and descriptive because there is no known research on WRID with Canadians.

Second, the interview approach will be used because it is a good tool for capturing the emotions, subtleties and complexities in the participant’s message (Fulford, 1999).

Third, as Helms (1989) argues, positivistic, reductionistic and quantitative research has not lent itself to the study of the dynamic, cyclical and socio-political nature of ‘racial’ identity formation. Qualitative methodology can be sensitive to the complex interrelationships of social and individual contexts and can produce data that submits to a postmodern/social constructionist/narrative analysis.

Fourth, there is a call for a more human approach in multicultural counselling research (Helms, 1989; Sue & Sue, 1990; Hoshmund, 1998; Pope-Davis & Liu, 1998). As Lal (1995) says, “...the field of race and ethnic relations [must] redefine itself to give the actor [the participant] a greater voice” (p. 435), hence the interview is used for this study.

The implications of this research are manifold. First, an understanding of ‘White’ identity in a local Canadian context may inform and broaden ‘White’ racial identity theory. Second, counsellors racialized as ‘White’ who work with aboriginals may learn something new...
from the experiences of people racialized as 'White' who live or work with aboriginal communities. It is in this population that instances of 'White' guilt and 'White' 'racial' identity development may be found. Third, by focussing on how people racialized as 'White' can change, this research may shift the onus of change away from aboriginal people to people who ostensibly gain from being racialized as 'White.' In a small way, a better understanding of 'Whiteness' in a part of Canada may have a positive influence on relations between mainstream society and aboriginal communities, which is strained in many cases because of the history of oppression by 'Whites.' Perhaps most importantly, the research participants may learn something new, may be catalyzed to change any racist attitudes and/or may construct new, helpful meanings in their lives.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

3.1 Design

This study used in-depth individual semi-structured interviews with participants who lived or worked in aboriginal communities and who currently, or who used to, self categorize as ‘White.’ These interviews gathered rich descriptions of Whiteness and changes in racialized identity in participants’ own words.

The content of the interviews were analyzed using content analysis. Content analysis is a method of analyzing large amounts of unstructured symbolic communication material and demonstrating how characteristics of it are related to inferences made about it (Carney, 1972; Weber, 1990). While content analysis involves a series of structured operations, many of which are quantitative, it is not positivistic science. Content analysis is very much an art as it relies on the creativity and judgement of the analyst to formulate questions put to the data that achieve an optimal balance of rigour and significance (Carney, 1972).

This project falls under the qualitative research tradition, because it emphasizes processes that are inductive, generative, constructive, nonlinear, interrelated, holistic and subjective. It attempts to describe from the perspective of the participant first before referring to theory and research: There were no a priori hypotheses and the methodology was flexible but also systematic and accountable. While the methodology was planned out, it also allowed “…the researcher to improvise, to find out more about some critical event or moment in the lives of the participants” (Janesick, 2000, p. 382). Interviews were conducted in natural settings, the contexts of which will be made explicit below (Merchant & Dupuy, 1996).
3.2 Selection of a thesis advisor and committee

Helms (1993) noted that ‘White’ researchers, dissertation advisers and journal editors have traditionally been the “primary gatekeepers of cross-cultural research” thereby reducing the heterogeneity of perspectives in the study of multicultural issues. To avoid this I have assembled a committee made up of people from a variety of cultural backgrounds and genders. Also, my supervisor has expertise in multicultural counselling and racism issues.

3.3 Researcher’s background and biases

I briefly state my background and my theoretical orientations here to help the reader view the results of this research critically. I am a 39-year-old, middle-class, Canadian, able-bodied, English speaking, heterosexual male, with no religious affiliation and a secular upbringing. I was born in Canada, live in Vancouver and am currently pursuing my M.A. in counselling psychology. I have considered myself, and have been racialized as, ‘White.’ However, my ‘Whiteness’ did not occur to me very often until taking a multicultural course in counselling psychology a few years ago. Since then I am aware of it much more often but not necessarily because I am called ‘White’ by others. I have benefitted from being racialized as ‘White’ and feel responsible to do my part in combating racism. While I recognize that I am racialized as ‘White,’ I do not subscribe to the concept of ‘race’ per se.

My theoretical bias is towards the relational, constructed, process, multiple view of self. I have serious doubts about the relevance of stage theories to ‘racial’ identity in a postmodern world of flux. I see identities as being constantly shaped and reshaped by history and competing social interests. I believe that ‘race’ and ‘racial’ terms are divisive and dehumanizing. As a qualitative researcher I know that it is impossible to enter into research without my preconceived
ideas influencing the results. I also know that the credibility of qualitative research findings can be enhanced when the researcher explicitly states his or her theoretical and philosophical orientations and attempts to bracket them to limit their influence on the results, as I do here.

3.4 Participants

Ten participants (n = 10) were recruited. One participant cancelled 10 minutes before the interview was scheduled. This participant offered no other explanation than “I’m chickening out.” This cancellation is considered data.

A total of nine (9) participants were interviewed. Their participation was framed as an opportunity to tell their stories to me privately about what it is (was) like for them in an aboriginal community. Participants fit the following criteria: 1. They self-identified as ‘White’, or used to self-identify as ‘White’ and 2. They lived in, worked with and/or were adopted into an aboriginal community. Two of the participants grew up with ‘White’ identities but within the last 5 years discovered they had aboriginal ancestry and received official aboriginal status.

Participants ranged in age from 42 to 65 years. The average age was 53.6 years.

Three (3) participants were educators, two (2) were retired educators, two (2) were non-education school staff, one (1) was an architect and one (1) was an actor.

Five (5) participants were male and four (4) were female.

3.5 Access to participants

Participants were accessed initially through contacts at my workplace. Subsequently, participants were accessed through word of mouth and ‘snowball’ sampling techniques, where participants introduced me to new participants (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998).

I attempted to recruit participants via the CNPS listserv in order to access a wider variety
of participants (see Appendix 16) however this proved fruitless.

3.6 Researcher’s Notes on Recruitment

3.6.1 Reaction to Recruitment Poster: While the recruitment poster (Appendix 16) elicited no reaction on the Counselling Psychology department’s listserv, it elicited a heated reaction from the Vancouver School Board. The Board promptly complained to the Chair of the Department of Education, Counselling Psychology and Special Education at UBC. According to him, the School Board complained that the poster’s question “Do you consider yourself to be white?” was tantamount to asking “Are you a racist?”

3.6.2 Cancellation of interview by 10th participant: The 10th participant cancelled her interview 10 minutes before it was scheduled. It was to be a telephone interview as she was living in a remote aboriginal community on the coast of British Columbia. She was apologetic but would not elaborate on her reasons for withdrawing other than she was afraid to be interviewed (i.e., “I’m chickening out”).

3.7 Site selection

Participants were asked to suggest a quiet, private location where they would feel most comfortable being interviewed. If the participant had no suggestions, I suggested a selection of locations from which the participant chose. This element of choice was included to bolster the participant’s feelings of control over the situation and thus promote more freedom of expression due to relaxedness and confidence. Two (2) participants chose to be interviewed in their homes, five (5) in their places of work, one (1) over the phone and one (1) in a sports bar.

3.8 Informed consent

A consent form was discussed with each participant immediately prior to completing the
questionnaire and beginning the interview (see Appendix 19).

3.9 Confidentiality

Participants were told that their transcript, questionnaire and signed consent form would be kept confidential. They were told that their words may be quoted in the final paper but any personally identifying information (names, specific places, specific times) would be withheld. Participants were asked if they wanted to choose a pseudonym to represent them in the study. Two participants chose their own pseudonym.

3.10 Confirmation letter with interview questions

At least two weeks prior to each interview, participants were sent a package with a confirmation letter for the first interview (Appendix 13) thanking them in advance for agreeing to attend the interview. Included in the package were some questions for the participant to reflect upon prior to the interview. The questions were related in a general way to the interview questions. They were told to feel free to consult with friends and/or family to help build their thoughts on the matter. They were told to feel free to jot down their thoughts to bring to the interview if they so wished. They were also asked if they could refer to me anyone who might be interested in participating in the study. All letters briefly described issues of consent, confidentiality and anonymity. Each participant was phoned the night before the interview to confirm our appointment.

3.11 Apparatus

Interviews were recorded using a SONY digital recorder. Transcribers were hired to transcribe the texts of the seven (7) of the nine (9) interviews. Two (2) of the interviews were transcribed by me using “Dragon” voice recognition software.
Preliminary exploratory analysis of the textual data was done on a personal computer using Wordstat (Peladeau, 2003) followed by the main analysis using Codeminor (Peladeau, 2003). These computer programs facilitated text management, manual coding, intercoder agreement calculations and qualitative analysis. Analysis tools included tabulation of frequency of manually assigned codes and the relationship between those codes. This software aided in the systematization of the analysis and provided an "audit trail" of code and category development (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It also enabled the coordination and consistent application of coding procedures. Lebart, Salem, and Berry (1998) used Codeminor in their analysis of textual data.

3.12 Data Collection

Data collection was triangulated (Hill & Thomas, 2000) between field notes/memos, questionnaires and individual interviews.

3.12.1 Field notes/memos

Research field notes were taken throughout the research process and were included as data in the analysis. Notes were taken about what is noticed by me in the full range of research activities from gaining access to the setting, to initial contact with participants, to hunches about themes and patterns in the data (Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 1992) to any evolving changes to my philosophical, theoretical perspectives (Janesick, 2000). Notes include my thoughts, feelings and actions as well as the actions of the participants and the settings of the interviews.

3.12.2 Questionnaire

Each participant completed a short written demographic questionnaire (see Appendix 14).
3.12.3 Interviews

I tried to gain an empathic understanding of the participant’s frame of reference through a semi-structured interview. The interviews combined a structured set of open-ended and closed-ended questions in an effort to acquire data that will be comparable across participants. I used probes, paraphrasing and verbal and non-verbal encouragers to increase the depth of responses from the participants.

Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. Significant nonverbal behaviours (e.g., long pauses, crying, laughing) were included in the transcript.

Throughout each interview I used paraphrasing, empathic reflections, clarifying questions, probes and minimal encouragers.

3.12.4 Interview Questions

The interview questions were designed to assess participants’ perceptions of how identities have been created or co-constructed by ‘self’ and others. The interview questions fell into two general areas of interest, namely, (a) constructions of ‘White’ identities and (b) changes in constructions of ‘White’ identities over time and place.

Questions and probes were designed to open a space for the participant to consider actions, thoughts and feelings for each category. Specific questions were preceded by more general opening questions or invitations to talk on a topic.

The following questions served as a guiding structure for the interview:

1. Tell me about some of your experiences living/working with aboriginal people.

2. What is it like being ‘White?’

3. In your opinion, what does it mean to be ‘White?’
4. “What do you like about being ‘White?’”

5. “What do you dislike about being ‘White?’”

6. “How important is being ‘White’ in your life?”

7. “What kinds of things do you do that make you ‘White?’”

8. “What kinds of things do you not do that make you ‘White?’”

9. “Do other people see you as ‘White?’ How do you know?”

10. “What is it like being referred to as ‘White?’

11. “What does it mean to you to have been seen as ‘White’ by others?”

12. “Throughout your life has the meaning of being ‘White’ ever changed for you? How?”

13. “How might the meaning of being ‘White’ change for you in the future?”

Closing: The participant was asked if there was anything else they would like to say. Finally, they were asked if they could refer me to another person who they see as ‘White’ and who has spent a substantial amount of time with aboriginal people.

3.13 Pilot study

A pilot study of two interviews was conducted for the purpose of testing the quality of the interview procedure and questions. Only minor changes to the interview questions were needed so the pilot data are included in the data analysis.

3.14 Duration and density of interviews

Interviews ranged in duration from 55 minutes per interview to 124 minutes per interview with an approximate mean of 75 minutes per interview. Number of participant words per interview ranged from 5286 to 20731 with an approximate mean of 9891 words per interview.
Number of participant words per minute ranged from 94 to 256 with an approximate mean of 119 words per minute and a standard deviation of 49.94. As seen in Figure 1, Bob stands out as the fastest talker.

Given the high number of words by Bob, his interview might dominate analyses based on simple code or word totals. Therefore, analyses were done using the percentage of total words or percent of total codes by each participant, thereby comparing participants based on proportions of codes and words used within interviews.

Figure 1. Words per minute uttered by participants

Figure 2. Words per minute spoken by gender of participant
On average, males talked faster than females but varied more in their rates. Male participants averaged 138 words per minute with a standard deviation of 60.4 while female participants averaged 94.75 words per minute with a standard deviation of 3.7 (Figure 2).

3.15 Data analysis

The main task of this analysis was to classify meaningful units of text (themes) into content categories and to infer the significance of and relationships between these categories (Weber, 1990). Categories were developed inductively through, in part, constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in which “[d]ata collection, analysis, and theory are related reciprocally” (Janesick, 2000, p. 397). This was in aid of suggesting or elucidating a model or part of a model “…of causal and intervening conditions, phenomena, contexts, action/interactional strategies and consequences” (Brott & Myers, 1999).

3.15.1 Initial exploratory analysis using Wordstat

The search for themes began by entering the texts of the interviews (with the interviewer’s words extracted) into the Wordstat program. Wordstat facilitated the search for themes by tabulating occurrences and recurrences of words or short phrases. The functions of the Wordstat program include counting word frequencies, counting word frequencies across researcher defined variables, displaying researcher selected words in context and searching for recurrent phrases across and within interviews. I used these functions in an intuitive and recursive fashion to group words and phrases into emergent categories guided by an increasing familiarity with the data. Filler words and phrases such as “you know” and “that kind of thing” were manually excluded from the analysis. Wordstat automatically generated various kinds of
graphic representations of the co-occurrences of categories in the form of dendograms, 2-
dimensional graphs and 3-dimensional graphs. This facilitated further refinement of the
categories and suggested relationships between categories.

3.15.2 Content analysis using Codeminer

Next, in a much more laborious process, meaningful units of text, here called themes,
were manually coded using Codeminer. A theme is defined as "...a conceptual entity: an
incident, thought-process, or viewpoint which can be seen as a coherent whole" (Carney, 1972,
p. 159). According to Carney (1972), themes are units of text which fall somewhere between
individual words and entire texts. A theme will be further defined here as a unit of text that
contains at least one of each of the following: a subject, a verb and an object (Weber, 1990).
Initially, themes were coded using participants' own words. As the analysis developed,
however, terms from theories in the literature were also used to label codes and categories.

3.15.3 Intercoder reliability

Using Codeminer, a second coder independently coded randomly selected portions of
interview transcriptions. Codeminer calculated intercoder reliability based on the presence or
absence of a specific code and performed this on each code individually. 'Cohen's kappa
adjustment' was the statistical technique used to correct spuriously high values due to chance.
'Cohen's kappa' does not assume that all categories have equal probability of being observed. It
does not assume that the distribution of the various categories should be equal for all coders. In
the computation of the chance factor, 'Cohen's kappa' takes into account the differential
tendencies or preferences of coders (Peladeau, 2003).

On the first run through the data an agreement of 71.5% (Kappa=0.682) was reached.
After codes assignment was negotiated a second run through the data produced an agreement of 95.4% (Kappa=0.796).

### 3.15.4 Participant validation of themes

Each participant was shown a point form summary of themes (codes) in his or her interview. Summaries were based on occurrences of codes in his or her interview. Participants were asked to mark a 'X' beside any point they disagreed with and to mark a '?' beside any point they didn't understand or were not sure about. Initial agreement percentages were calculated. Points marked 'X' or '?' were either deleted from the analysis or brought back to the participant with accompanying quotes in order to get clarification on the meanings. The meanings of the points were revised accordingly and revised agreement percentages were calculated. Results are tabulated as follows (the following are pseudonyms):

- **Diane:** Initial agreement = 99%, revised agreement = 100%
- **Jim:** Initial agreement = 95%, revised agreement = 98%
- **Bob:** Initial agreement = 92%, revised agreement = 97%
- **Harlan:** Initial agreement = 97%, revised agreement = 100%
- **Jane:** Initial agreement = 98%, revised agreement = 98%
- **Iona:** Initial agreement = 94%, revised agreement = 96%
- **Wendy:** Initial agreement = 70%, revised agreement = 100%
- **Paul:** Initial agreement = 93%, revised agreement = 100%
- **Terry:** Initial agreement = 90%, revised agreement = 100%

Mean initial agreement: 92%

Mean revised agreement: 99.32%
3.15.5 Category development

The first step in category development involved classifying the codes into major areas of significance. This was an impressionistic, intuitive process that was guided by a unique and thorough familiarity with the data. It was also a recursive process as I constantly compared raw data, codes and emergent categories with each other (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Category names came from participants' own words and from the literature. As Holsti (1969) states "...categories should reflect the purposes of the research, be exhaustive, be mutually exclusive, independent and be derived from a single classification principle" (p. 95). Single count codes will be placed in an 'others' category, set aside for future research (Strauss, 1987).

3.15.6 Item (Category or Code) Interrelationships

Codemin and Wordstat aided in the analysis of interrelationships by graphically displaying item co-occurrence patterns. To do this, the programs first computed proximity values of categories (in Wordstat) and codes (in Codemin). Proximity values were based on the likelihood of items occurring close together in the text. The programs then created a similarity matrix based on these proximity values. Based on this matrix, item co-occurrence patterns were displayed in the form of dendrograms (tree graphs) and two- and three-dimensional correspondence plots (Peladeau, 2003).

Dendrograms were created using an "average-linkage hierarchical clustering method" (Peladeau, 2003) to create clusters from the similarity matrix. In these graphs, the vertical axis represented the items and the horizontal axis represented the clusters formed at each step of the clustering procedure. Items that tended to be distributed similarly were combined at an early stage while those that had dissimilar distributions combined nearer the end of the agglomeration
process (Peladeau, 2003).

In the two- and three-dimensional correspondence plots, the distances between items indicated the likelihood that these items appeared together in the text. In other words, items that tended to occur together in the text appeared closer together on the plot, while items that were independent from one another in the text were located far from each other on the plot. Items plotted closer to the origin were more evenly distributed amongst interviews. Items plotted further from point of origin had singular distributions (occurred in fewer interviews).

3.15.7 Participant Interview Interrelationships

In the two- and three-dimensional correspondence plots, interviews with similar item co-occurrence patterns were plotted closer to each other, while dissimilar interviews were plotted further from each other. The more unique the item co-occurrence pattern of an interview was compared to the other interviews, the further it was plotted from the point of origin. The more similar the item co-occurrence pattern of an interview was compared to the other interviews, the closer it was plotted to the point of origin (Peladeau, 2003).

3.15.8 Item and Participant Interview Interrelationships

Participant interview interrelationships were plotted overtop the item interrelationships such that items that were more unique to a particular interview were plotted closer to that interview and vice-versa. Items that were distributed amongst a particular subset of interviews were plotted closer to that subset.

3.16 Limitations

Because participants were not selected randomly, it is possible that my biases influenced the selection of participants (Brott & Myers, 1999). To help counter this I was especially careful
to bracket my biases accordingly in the interview and analysis. I did this by recognizing my bias and the tendency toward it, by being flexible and open to constructive criticism from participants and advisors and by being sensitive to the words and actions of the participants.

Given that this study used volunteers the breadth of data may be limited. The attitudes of the participants may only reflect those of a certain section of society. This is similar to the limitation of snowball sampling, which can result in participants representative of a specific population. Compared to nonvolunteers, research volunteers tend to be better educated, more intelligent, more unconventional, more sociable, more in need of social approval, less authoritarian and tend to have higher social-class status (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1975). This will be taken into consideration when presenting the results. Helms (1989) also had concerns about using volunteers in 'racial' identity research, noting "...the possibility that research participants' level of racial identity may influence their decisions whether or not to participate in research" (p. 233).

Again, the participants may only be representative of a certain section of society. Indeed, the majority of the participants were educators and all were between 42 to 65 years old with an average age of 53.6 years old. However, this is not an overwhelming concern in qualitative research. Rather, qualitative research is concerned with situating the results in demographic, temporal, local context.

3.17 Sources of error

Fontana and Frey (2000) say that participant behaviour, interview method and interviewer effects are all potential sources of error. Participants can be affected by faulty memory, the social desirability effect and desires for privacy. The social desirability effect is
considered to have two dimensions: self-deception and impression management (Paulhus, 1993). To try to reduce the impression management part of the social desirability effect, at the beginning of the interview, I explicitly stated, “There are no right or wrong answers. I just want to get to know your views. Try to talk as honestly as you can. Your most honest responses will contribute to a greater understanding of people’s experiences.” To allay concerns about privacy and confidentiality the participants were reminded that their identities were to be kept completely confidential.

As far as interviewer effects are concerned, Fontana and Frey (2000) state that gender plays a role in how participant and interviewer interact. They also point to...

...evidence that student interviewers produce larger response effects than do non-students, higher-status interviewers produce larger response effects than do lower-status interviewers, and the race of an interviewer makes a difference only on questions specifically related to race... (p. 650).

Given this, ‘White’ middle class males may have responded to me differently than they would to, for example, a female or someone with a different socio-economic background than mine.

I am racialized as ‘White’ therefore I am embedded in the subject. As happened to Kanuha (2000) with her ‘racially’ similar participants, I may have mistakenly assumed to understand vague statements made by participants and not probed for more detail. By the same token, participants may have left out important information assuming that I already knew it. These sources of error are acknowledged. However, interview questions and probes are intended to prevent this.

As I will be both the researcher and the interviewer, it is possible that I will find what I
am looking for by selectively attending to and interpreting the pertinent data and selectively interpreting data (Brott & Myers, 1999).

Transcribing may have resulted in undetected typographical errors.
CHAPTER 4

Results

4.1 Results of Initial Exploratory Analysis using Wordstat

Initial exploratory analysis using Wordstat produced 112 categories of words and short phrases from a total of 89023 words uttered by the participants; see Appendix 20 for a dendrogram (tree graph) of these categories. The following clusters in the dendrogram suggested potential themes for further analysis using Codeminner:

- ABORIGINAL, GROUP, INVOLVEMENT, OCCUPATIONAL_WORK and WE (suggesting that participants spoke of their involvement with aboriginal people through their work)
- AWARENESS and SELF_PRESENT (suggesting that participants spoke of their personal awareness in the present)
- ACHIEVEMENT and WANT_PRESENT (suggesting that participants spoke of their own or others’ desire for achievement)
- EUROPEAN and ROOTS (suggesting that participants spoke of their own or others’ roots in Europe)
- MATERIALISM, MOBILITY and SOCIALIZATION (suggesting that participants spoke of materialism and freedom of movement as something they or others were socialized with)
- RELIGION and RESPONSIBILITY (suggesting that participants spoke of how they or others see the church as responsible for residential school abuses)
- OPEN_AND_ACCEPTING, SOCIAL_PROBLEMS and TRY_PRESENT (suggesting
that participants spoke of trying to be open and accepting of others despite social problems)

HELP_PRESENT and SPIRITUALITY (suggesting some link between help, helping and spirituality)

FELT, GUILT_SHAME_PRESENT and MISSIONARY_ZEAL (suggesting that participants spoke of own or others’ feelings of guilt and shame and that these are related to the desire to expiate the guilt by helping the unfortunate)

INTERPERSONAL_CONNECTEDNESS, DEEPER and RACE (suggesting that participants spoke of interpersonal connections going deeper than “racial” boundaries)

CANADIAN, PLURALISTIC and PRIVILEGE_NOT (suggesting that participants spoke of Canada’s increasingly pluralistic society resulting in a decrease in privilege for some)

AGAINST_PRESENT and RACISM (suggesting that participants spoke of own or others’ opposition to racism)

POWER, PRIVILEGE and MINORITY (suggesting that participants spoke of some relationship between power, privilege and minority groups)

COLOUR, SIMILAR and GROUP_MY (suggesting that participants spoke of people being similar to their own group in terms of colour)

HEALING, JOURNEY and IDENTITY (suggesting that participants spoke of some relationship between personal identity, personal healing and personal life journey)

As seen in Figure 3, Wordstat calculated an index of similarity amongst participant interviews with a score of 1.0 being the most similar and 0.0 being the least. There appears to be three groupings or clusters of similarity as follows:

Group 1 - Diane, Terry and Jim
Group 2 - Harlan, Wendy, Jane, Iona and Paul

Group 3 - Bob

**Figure 3.** Similarity of participant interviews in terms of word and phrases: Wordstat

As seen in Figure 4, Wordstat illustrated the locations of words/phrase categories and participant interviews in relation to each other in two-dimensional correspondence maps or plots. Interpretation of these plots followed the guidelines outlined in the Methodology section under Item (Category or Code) Interrelationships, Participant Interview Interrelationships and Item and Participant Interview Interrelationships.

Following these guidelines, one can see that Bob spoke more often about guilt and shame, victimization, government, racism, money, his group (‘Whites’) and non-‘White’ groups such as ‘Blacks’ and ‘Asians’ relative to other participants. Jane spoke more often about privilege, personal journey and interpersonal connectedness compared to other participants. Diane spoke more about social stereotypes, her family, achievement and her socialization relative to other participants. Jane and Harlan spoke more about their work with aboriginals and personal struggle than other participants. Iona, Terry and Diane spoke more about aboriginals,
nature, pluralism, differences and linearity than others.

Jane, Diane and Bob seem to be the most unique from each other and from the group as a whole. Bob seems to be the least similar to the rest of the participants. Meanwhile, Jim’s words position him fairly centrally in relation to other participants.

Figure 4. Two-dimensional correspondence plot: Words and phrases

As to be expected, the category WHITE is centrally located as this was the main topic of the interviews. Also, the category WE is centrally located, indicating a common tendency for the participants to express membership in the ‘White’ group. This also indicates a tendency for participants to speak indirectly about their associations with Whiteness. Bob, on the other hand,
spoke more directly about his membership in a "racial" group as illustrated by his proximity to the category GROUP_MY. Conversely, Bob is located at a distance from the category SELF_PRESENT, indicating his disinclination to discuss personal aspects of himself.

These Wordstat graphics not only suggested themes and relationships but also reinforced some of my initial impressions of the themes and relationships. These visuals were in aid of suggesting relationships between categories, between participants and between categories and participants. Because Wordstat only analyzes words and phrases, it does not handle larger chunks of meaning as does Codeminer and therefore may miss important themes. Codeminer enables coding and analysis of the themes suggested in the Wordstat analysis.

4.2 Results of Content Analysis of Codes and Themes using Codeminer

After a 3 month long recursive process of coding the texts, categorizing codes, recoding, recategorizing and so on, the data was reduced to a total of 143 codes, 45 categories and four metacategories (see Appendix 21). Since Codeminer only allows 2 levels of categorization and only analyzes at the code level, the metacategories were generated outside the program. The four metacategories are the following: 1) descriptions and meanings of Whiteness and Aboriginalness, 2) own and others relationships to Whiteness, Aboriginalness and otherness (including racism), 3) extent and process of personal change and 4) trying to effect positive social change.

A cursory glance at the Codeminer correspondence plots of codes (themes) in Figure 5 reveals a striking similarity to the Wordstat correspondence plot in Figure 4. Both show a similar, albeit inverted, spatial arrangement of participant interviews. This is an interesting result given that the units of analysis in Wordstat and Codeminer are qualitatively and quantitatively
different. The units of analysis in Wordstat, being words and short phrases, do not carry the same complexity of meaning as do the codes (themes) in Wordstat.

There are differences between the Wordstat and Codeminier analyses. In the Codeminier analysis (Figure 5), Terry clustered closer to Jane, Diane and Bob and occupied the outer edges of the spatial arrangement. Paul and Wendy clustered closer to the origin, indicating the similarity of their interview profiles to the rest of the sample.

**Figure 5.** Two-dimensional correspondence plot: Codes (Themes)
Another apparent difference between Figure 4 and 5 is that in the Codeminer analysis (Figure 5) the codes clustered more closely to the participant interviews than the words/phrases did in the Wordstat analysis (Figure 4). This indicates that larger chunks of meaning (codes) can be more representative of the uniqueness of a participant interview than mere words/phrases.

Figure 6 reveals that while the spatial arrangement of participant interviews may be similar across analyses, the absolute similarity between participant interviews is less in the Codeminer analysis than in the Wordstat analysis. This is consistent with an increase in complexity of units of analysis in Codeminer revealing greater differences between participant interviews.

Figure 6. Similarity of participant interviews in terms of codes (themes): Codeminer

As seen in the Codeminer similarity index in Figure 6, groupings are not as visually discernible as in the Wordstat index in Figure 3. However, looking at Figure 5, themes are clustered into three quadrants and the following participant interviews appear to be associated with these clusters:

Thematic Group 1 - Diane, Iona and Wendy occupied the upper right quadrant
Thematic Group 2 - Jim, Harlan, Terry, Paul and Jane occupied the lower right quadrant

Thematic Group 3 - Bob occupied the lower left quadrant

These clusters are not statistically significant.

4.2.1 Thematic Group 1

Lack of critical examination of relationships with Whiteness and otherness. Group 1 participants did not seem to critically examine their relationships with Whiteness and otherness to the same extent as other groups (Figure 7). Iona was quite clear about her lack of interest in examining her Whiteness. She said,

(pause) so, I mean, I think I was… I think I was just so much more interested in knowing about my Native ancestry that the White really wasn't all that important, you know, because, I mean, was, yeah, I'm White, so what? ...Yeah, so I... I don't think I (pause) I don't think I resented being White or anything like that, or just it was just kind of on the back burner. It wasn't really something on the top of my mind, whereas being Native was.

Wendy was similarly clear. She said, “It was interesting because I haven't thought in terms of myself being White... You know, you tend to think of, um, what other people are, but you don't tend to think of yourself, sort of, as that....” Both women express disinterest in exploring their Whiteness.

Diane, also in Group 1, seemed to express contradictory views about the relationship between Whiteness and privilege. At first she seemed to say that ‘Whites’ today no longer enjoy a privileged position in society. She said,

It used to be when I was growing up that wasn't the case. The White people got the opportunities and the aboriginals or other nationalities didn't... I think it's almost gone the reverse now... uh... for... partly for the Canadians... the White born Canadians... to actually have opportunities. Everything seems to be given more to the special interest groups... um... easier.
Later, however, she seemed to reverse herself. She said, "I think being White... you know... there's other opportunities out there and you don't have to live like that. I think you can see a bigger picture of things around you. There is a way out." This confusion suggests a lack of a considered viewpoint on the relationship between Whiteness and privilege and opportunity.

Figure 7. Percent of total words spoken by groups about exploring their Whiteness

Figure 7 illustrates the absence of exploration of Whiteness in Group 1 but also a desire to explore in the future. As Iona said, "You know, so, you know, in time, I think, I'm going to want to know more about my European ancestry as well." Wendy said,
Um, (pause) well, the only thing I think it might do is, uh, have me look a little bit more at my own traditions... uh, at my own traditions, uh, you know, this issue about, uh, Christmas over the holidays and... and, uh, and not using the word and... and sort of that thing.... Well, Christmas is a part of my culture, and, uh, so in a way, it probably strengthens, I guess, would be the short answer of my traditions and.... All right, so the only thing I see happening is that, uh, I because we are now... have a lot of different, uh, ethnic groups and racial groups, that I might look to my own culture... my own traditions and that kind of thing, uh, a bit more than I have.... So that's, um, huh, yeah, as well as the others, you know, where am I in all of this mosaic?

Consistent with the lack of examination of their own Whiteness, the participants in this group were very aware of racism and prejudice in others, yet mentioned little about their own racisms (Figure 8). Diane said, “My mother is very anti native... her view of native Indians is sort of drunken slobs, waiting for the liquor store to open and she was very vocal on... all my childhood of... how kind of useless she felt the native Indian society was.” Iona said, “I think that in my household it was because my mom (pause), um, because of... my mom tended to be somewhat racist because she and my dad ended up splitting up, and it wasn’t a good split up, and she blamed his Native... being Native for his flaws and his faults.” Wendy said, “I don’t know if you've had experience with IQ tests... they're terribly culturally biased, you know.”

4.2.2 Thematic Group 2

Critical examination of Whiteness. By contrast, Group 2 participant interviews were characterized by a more critical analysis of their relationships to Whiteness (Figure 7). Harlan, for instance, said,

I'm trying to think here, how that change, it's evolving... it's a steady progress of change, not like a watershed change or anything. I feel curious and interested in keeping doing this and I don't really want to change and do what I'm doing, but I do want to continue this, what I found very interesting, enquiries as a White
person to characterize it that way, I suppose it's getting into this whiteness thing and distinction from others thing, and see what that's about, and wanting to reconcile, I suppose, these differences...

Figure 8. Percent of total words spoken by group about racism/prejudice.

Jane said, "I had to sort of um...come to terms with the, you know, um...the fact that I wasn't aware of who I was in a privileged position and I hadn't come, you know, I wasn't aware before of um...that whole sense of institutionalized religion and institutionalized um...racism."

Jim and Jane commented about how interpersonal connectedness goes deeper than
“race.” Speaking about his close relationships with “Native” people, Jim said,

“...the stuff that’s beneath the color is what connected us... there was this deeper connection, the more human, the color blind... spiritual, deep or significant, you connect on that level that that which is holy in you connects with that which is holy in someone else, and you're forever changed.... You can have the superficial stuff, but you have this deep, deep connection that that supersedes race or economics or gender or anything else...”

Jane said,

Well, I guess, it's kind of cliché, but it is like a peeling of the onion, right? It is sort of like, um...I had such a... um...I had a good hmm... well... relatively, good childhood, like, kind of privileged, kind of thing, right? And so, and I worked from that outer area and then when I came up against these um...experiences of St. Georges' and Chicago and that, then, then that outer layer didn't work, right? So then I had to look deeper, okay, so what is it that I am basing my relationships on? Is it, so it's not people that you that are, sort of, similar to you. Okay, so then, um...what is it that you are basing your actions on and how do your beliefs fit in with that? And...and so it is, sort of, ... I can only sort of, experience, or say that when I experience a meeting of someone when I am moving from um...a sort of, like an interior place, it's, it feels and it is more authentic to me but I can't know, I can't do that – that's all I know. Those layers I have to unpack first of all, you know, and peel away and that's became um... they are part of me because of my history and my culture and the society and socializing that I have.

Jane continued, “I have learned something and that I can stop that outer thing and I can, sort of, put it into play. But I don't, I don't think I ever... like you know, I don't think I have reached the place where I am not doing that all the time, you know, act and do that all the time.”

Paul commented on the inextricable link between the personal and social aspects of identity. He said, “I just don't think any of the questions, or any of the misgivings, or any of the thoughts or reflections that you have of being White could possibly be excluded from what the perception is out there in the world. I don't think it's any different.”
Figure 9. Percent of total words spoken by group about selected aspects of Whiteness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whiteness associated with empirical/scientific model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More apt to associate with linear, rational, structured, compartmentalized and time-bound orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More discomfort with silence socially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites have negatively impacted environment and other cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whiteness associated with a linear, rational, structured, compartmentalized and time-bound orientation. Whereas all groups equally associated Whiteness with individualism, Group 2 participants were more apt to associate Whiteness with a linear, rational, structured, compartmentalized and time-bound orientation (Figure 9). Jim associated Whiteness with the scientific model. He said, “...if you would simply do this, then everything would be fine. That’s a White guy’s at least it’s a northern European solution thing empirical scientific model and always will be.” Harlan associated Whiteness with time-orientation. He said, “...we’re so conditioned to be part of an agenda, and you’re on at a specific time, and let’s get out....” Terry also associated Whiteness with time-orientation. He said,
I don't, ah... I don't throw away my clocks. Just that. So I still operate by... one of the things I do that makes me White is make time the most important thing that governs my actions. I guess I don't operate without the clock being more important than anything else.

Harlan associated Whiteness with technology and rationality. He said, “I'm in a technological and rational cocoon. I don't think we deal with things emotionally in the same way [as Natives].” Jane also spoke of Whiteness and rationality. She said, “I think sometimes a White person, educated and that kind of thing, sometimes they get really carried away with semantics and ideas and some things like that but kind of esoteric....”

Similarly, Paul associated Whiteness with having clear lines, boundaries, compartments and boxes. He said,

I think White people just generally try to compartmentalize, so it's everything... filing, people are trying to organize, and box it; that is associated with being White; the desire to do that ... the desire to live in a White manicured lawn and that's your house and my house is over here and this is the line going between it. I think... I think White means liking to have lines, liking to know what the boundaries are. I think... I think that's associated with being White.

Group 2 participants were not the only ones to make such observations. Iona, of Group 1, comments, "There's Indian time, and there's White time. You know, White time, they've got their 24 clock, and Indian time, they say, hmm, we'll get around to it (laughs).” The participants painted Whiteness as austere, cold, rigid, rational and sterile.

By contrast, “Nativeness” was portrayed as warmer, more flexible and emotional than ‘White’ culture by Harlan and Terry. Harlan, for instance, noted, “…a native person would feel much more within a community of people, family, extended family, and much more supported…” and “I think, a native person is probably located within an emotional cocoon....”
Terry recounted this story:

I recall one person telling me the difference would be in... the difference between a White doctor and a native doctor in a hosp... in the doctor's office... the White doctor would come out and say 'who's got the 2 o'clock appointment?' and take that person in. The Native doctor would go in the waiting room and say 'who's the sickest?' and take that person.

'Whites' uncomfortable with social silence. Group 2 participants spoke exclusively about 'Whites' being uncomfortable with social silence compared to 'Natives.' For instance, Jim said, “I learned that you don't have to talk all the time like us White guys do... We fill empty spaces with chatter.” Harlan said, “It's like you can say something and there'll be absolute silence for what I think is a normally long time, and the waiting and pacing of conversations is completely different. That's a very distinctive, um, characteristic of a meeting with a first nations people. It's really odd to be in that context.” Terry said,

I just... the one thing I can think of that I associate with being White is that I tend to be a talker rather than a listener... I think about people in my culture talk too much and listen too little... in a gathering of people in which I'm the only White person, to fill in the gap when there's silence for a long period of time.

He continues,

...in native cultures that doesn't happen... um... I can relate another story back then. I recall, um, my highschool students in the Nass River would often come and visit me in the evening and they'd come to our house and sit in our living room and I'd start talking to them and after a while I couldn't think of anything more to say and there'd be total silence and they would sit there for sometimes 2 and 3 hours without a word spoken. The natives wanted to be in our presence, in our house and they didn't need the words. They were getting something out of sitting there, in silence.
Only males mentioned anything about the differences between 'Whites' and 'Natives' in terms of rates of speech and comfort levels with social silence (see Figure 10).

**Figure 10.** Gender differences in concerns about social talk and social silence (5 males, 4 females)

![](image)

**Locating racism within self.** Group 2 participants tended to locate racism within self (Figure 8). The comments on this theme from Group 2 illustrate a high level of candour. Jim, for example, recounted the following story about his former workplace:

...and there was this... just this old... it was the old boys' changing room of the gym which they turned into a parent room. It had couches and simple things like an outside telephone, which many of them did not have at home. They'd come to school and make a phone call... but no one had a quarter, and the coffee pot was always on, and it was warm and friendly, and whenever the school was open, it was open. Well, I found myself just gravitating towards this room because it was so welcoming, and so it was in that room that I confronted my prejudices ... like there's this won-wonderful woman named Denise, uh, who's Musqueam but lives down there. She was there all the time. She's 27, or something,
with five kids. They're all in school and, uh, set of twins, and she was there all the time and very articulate woman... been through, you know, all the substance problems and, uh, and each of the kids had a different dad, and, uh, just... and her teeth are all missing and she was sort of grimy and her little babies were grimy too and it took me about a week to realize that she loved her kids every bit as much as I love mine and how dare I think anything other than that about her... you know... and she's one of my main teachers still is. Wonderful, wonderful woman, and... uh... so my Whiteness kind of darkened very, very quickly...

Jane and Jim spoke about their continuing struggle with their own racist tendencies. Jim admits that "It's all about learning, eh, and now, I have to... I have to work harder at it... I'm still a racist (laughs)." He elaborates: "Yeah, I guess, I still feel... this part about being cut off by Asian drivers and things like that... if... if there is something... vestigial reaction there. Well, that's hooked into my Whiteness, right, my non-Asianness whatever that might be." Jane said, "Then, then I think you... because of your upbringing and how you are socialized, you do have...inherent prejudice and racism and, and if you are not aware of them, it's more dangerous but if you are aware of them and can try to, sort of, be um...work from that." She continued:

But, I think um...in terms of myself and just my personal journey, it was, it was uncovering for myself what my racist attitudes were and... and being aware of them and then being able to sort of um...you know, deal with that and be able to um...um...grow as a human being, you know, because you are more aware of it and you can deal with...oh yeah, your first response is that. Well, why is that first response that way and what is, what is the basis for that?

Paul and Terry spoke more about their own racism in the past tense. Paul said,

Um... I think initially, probably to be honest, I was probably suspect ... because when I first starting fishing I ... when I first starting fishing with all Newfoundlanders, I thought they were strange, and then, my next experience was working with all White guys, and then, you know, a couple of years later I was working with native guys, and I think in many respects I was probably suspect of the fact that they were native. Like I was getting
something a little different, like who are these people, you know? What do they do, where do they... you know what I mean? What's their thing? And no matter what you can't tune out all the noise, you just can't tune out all the noise of, oh yeah, they're all drunk, they're all this, they're all that. You can't tune that out, so I think you're... you're...

Terry said,

I mean, when I was 20 years of age if I've been... uh... I would have to say my opinion of native peers was looked down upon [sic], you know. I always thought that native men, in their early 20s, were losers basically... uh... so for me being White was being superior. Then I think, probably from watching television, I think, um, I had to see my attitude towards blacks, that, you know, they were inferior people, in some respects... not in athletics maybe, uh, 'cause they're pretty good in sports, but as they lived in ghettos, and had inferior education, and had more crime, and... so I guess I viewed myself as a superior person, belonging to a superior race...

Extent and process of personal change. Group 2 members spoke more about shifts in their 'White' identities. Group 2 participants spoke more about having gone through a naïve period in their lives than other groups (Figure 11). Harlan, speaking of a shift in his awareness of "race," said,

I felt naïve and very silly at one point when somebody said to me... I must have been 18 or 19 years old... somebody said to me, "Well, that person was clearly Jewish," and I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "Like, duh, like, obviously." That really shocked me I remember, and I was 17 or 18. It really shocked me that I wasn't aware of that the same way that this person who was telling me...

Jane also spoke of her initial naïveté. She said,

I think that right up until I went to St. George's I had a sense as a student, no, as a teacher... I had a sense... that... (speaking slowly)...um...somehow that... it was a very naïve sense... that we were, you know, in this world together, but that somehow rather we um... worked equally together, you know?
Figure 11. Percent of total words spoken by group about a naïve period in their lives

Terry reported he was initially naïve and then became racist in his views. He said, "I mean initially I didn't pay much attention to the plight of native people..." Later he described how he changed,

when I first worked with native people I sort of found myself as... Amend... making amends for what our culture has done to the native people, feeling that somehow I had an obligation to, ah, to save these people... After a few years of realizing that I wasn't to be a saviour... that I was supposed to be there to, ah, participate in the community.

Terry alludes to "White guilt," "missionary zeal" and, finally, participating in the community.

Group 2 members spoke about changes within their selves more often than did other
groups. Jim, speaking of his experience working with aboriginals, said, “My Whiteness kind of darkened very, very quickly...” Harlan described his process of change as something steady rather than in spurts catalyzed by significant incidents:

I’m trying to think here, how that change, it’s evolving... it’s a steady progress of change, not like a watershed change or anything. I feel curious and interested in keeping doing this and I don’t really want to change and do what I’m doing, but I do want to continue this, what I found very interesting, enquiries as a White person to characterize it that way, I suppose it’s getting into this Whiteness thing and distinction from others thing, and see what that’s about, and wanting to reconcile, I suppose, these differences...

Terry began by denying any change within in his self. He said, “There’s not a change in me... but what there is, there is an acceptance of other people that do not operate that way.” However, later he seemed to change his mind. He said,

Well, I guess, ’cause I’m ...I... I’m... every year that you live amongst people of a different culture you gradually acquire more of their value system... ahm... and, become more like them perhaps.... I’m probably acquiring more of the attributes of first nations people as I get older, I would say, and... I don’t know how else to say it, I think other family members have noticed it in me that I’ve become... I’ve changed as the result of living on reserve.

Jim said,

You know feeling [for] the down trodden, the... those less fortunate than ourselves... that missionary kind of thing... the desire to elevate... Yeah, to bring them up to... to... so they, you know, so they can be as successful as we are... It's something that I... I felt was a solution. I no longer feel it is.... I don’t want... there's nothing in me that wants to make them like me... to... to be like me... not anymore.

*Associations of own Whiteness with personal privilege.* Group 2 participants spoke more about an awareness of their ‘White’ privilege. Jane said,
I had to sort of um...come to terms with the, you know, um...the fact that I wasn't aware of who I was in a privileged position and I hadn't come... you know... I wasn't aware before of um...that whole sense of institutionalized religion and institutionalized um...racism...

Harlan said, “...the flip side of that is that I'm enormously privileged...” and continued,

I feel like I can fix stuff if stuff went wrong. I don't, I'm... maybe confusing myself, but, um, I feel, I know the word maybe is control, I feel I'm in control. I don't think a native person feels in control, of that in the same way that I do. There's more, um, actually issues of lack of control, lack of influence over the system, lack of access to the system, that I have access with a phone call, like I can just do it and make it work. That's what I'm... it's control.

Later Harlan added,

Well the other side is being privileged, like I said earlier, to be privileged to be part of a social construct because there's so many privileges and access to where you want to go, like I literally feel like I could do anything, like literally that's how I grew up I could do anything, and I don't that's true for, I don't think a lot of people perceive the world in that way. That's probably because of this whole infrastructure I have behind me.

Jane said, “...the fact remains is that, you know, the White, English-speaking society is privileged, you know.”

Paul said,

What does it mean to be White? I think it ... White means... it certainly means to be privileged, it means to have a Go card in the world, I don't think there's any denying that... White, male... I think... you know... there's... not... any... sort of... any guarantee of it being easy, but it certainly makes it, certainly a lot easier ... then, not having that ability to... I mean... I think that's the defining element about being White...

Terry said,

...being White has afforded me the opportunities I have to go to
school, to acquire an education, to raise a family, to live in a... to live in a community of my choice, and... to have freedoms, and ... I don't know... I mean not everybody who's White has the opportunity as a Canadian White male, but, certainly, I think most people in the world will look at it and say White male in North America has probably the easiest go of anybody, in respect...

Growing awareness of different worldviews. Harlan and Terry of Group 2 mentioned a growing personal awareness of different worldviews. Terry said, “I did go and teach in Northern BC, and in the years that I was there, I... I guess my eyes opened wider as to there are other ways of living and other ways of viewing the world.” Harlan said, “Well, yeah... the, that was very much a part of my growing up that I needed to get out of that White middleclassness to see what something else was... was like....” He added that his journey of discovery is far from over. He said,

I thought at first that I would achieve some kind of deeper understanding of what it would be like to be a first nations person, or understand better ... our relationship with them in those communities. I find in fact that the more people I know the more diverging opinions that are out there and I've just managed after 10 years to kind of... understand people better, but I don't think I have any more clarity around (interviewer chuckles) you know around... kind of ... I thought I'd achieve more clarity but I certainly haven't. I struggle all the time with issues of whether it's a good thing to build schools in native communities for example, or whether it's better to have all kids in an area have access to one school whether it be a White community or a native community. So those sort of issues are... remain to me confusing and I just find myself taking each circumstance and relating to it the best way I can. So I don't have any kind of vision or clarity around it, and I thought I would but I don't.

It was not exclusively Group 2 participants who spoke about becoming more aware. Wendy, of Group 1, speaking of a result of her experience teaching in a residential school, said,

I think what it's done is it has allowed me to not only use my own frame of reference, but, uh, to also, uh, be able to... to some
degree, uh, look at it from a Native point of view or Asian point of view or... or whatever that particular issue is, so I think that's what the main thing that experience did... It just shifted this ability, so, in a way, it gets you out of that narrow kind of focus... Um, I think you, uh, broaden your sort of values as well... you don't... you're not as narrow in values. You know, there's more scope in things... To a degree as much as one can, yeah, so when I'm reading, for instance, about the land claims issues, I can look at it from, um, the Native perspective, and I can also look at it from the, you know, the so-called non-Native, White perspective.

4.2.3 Thematic Group 3

Bob's extreme position in the arrangement can be related to his views on 'White' self-victimization, 'White' guilt, racism, and multiculturalism. Figure 12 shows how large a proportion of his words were related to these topics compared to other groups.

'White' guilt as unjustified. He sees 'White' guilt as being based on widespread inaccurate and biased views of history, one being that residential schools were not the "evil" they are made out to be. In fact, they were necessary step in preparing them for the future. He said,

Who are they going after? They're going after the Anglican Church. Talking about all those abuses that went on you know? I mean what was the option? The Anglican Church was hired by the federal government to educate people and for the most part they were honest... you know ... it was done. What was the option? To have people illiterate? You know? To live in a Stone Age society? I mean you can't have it both ways... you can't have it both ways. We're living in the 21st century. Where communities get really messed around is not being prepared for the 21st century... not by going back to some centuries old traditions. That's not going to save your ass in the 21st century (laughs). You know? That isn't going to work. It doesn't matter... I mean everybody was like that at one time. It's not like they have something special happening. White people lived like that, Chinese people, East Indians... everybody went through stages of development that were very similar... so it's not as if one group is special in what they've got now. They just happen to be at this time in their stage of development. Just like when the Romans when they went there... the ones they went up against were
bunch of savages. You know? Part of my relatives (laughs). You know? Living in swamps... bog people... primitive... human sacrifice... I mean Jesus... pretty bloody grim. But I would never want them to stay in that state or anywhere near that. The best thing that ever happened to us was the Romans you know what I mean?

Figure 12. Percent of total words by group about selected themes

It sounded as if Bob espoused a unilinear theory of the evolution of civilizations. Following this hunch, I asked him, “...so all cultures go through similar stages of development?” He said,

In a way. Yeah. Sure they do. For the most part they do. They've got their tribal this... I mean like the native community. One thing that is not talked about is slavery on the West Coast here. When there was first contact made from a third to a quarter of all natives were slaves... can you imagine? 1/4 to one-third... the women and the kids and they were slaves forever unless they could escape and their children were slaves and they could be killed... if you were rich guy you could just out and out kill them just to show that
you could afford to kill your slaves... you know? They don't talk about that. They don't want to talk about that. I mean they had slaves... everybody had slaves basically you know? The Romans had slaves... every culture had slaves... continue to have slaves. But if you were to mention that... you don't read about that. They like to make out like they were some utopian... like there was some big... nice little... before White guys came along and messed up the whole...

Investigating a possible link I asked, “You feel like White people are getting a bad rap for slavery when in fact it's been practiced in all cultures?” He responded,

...absolutely. Like in Africa... Do you think White guys could come over from Europe and go into the darkest part of Africa and haul guys out (laughs). I don't think so. Black guys sold them. One tribe would go to another... capture a bunch of other guys, haul them out to the coast and sell them. Why not? Perfect. You get money for guys you want to kill anyway. To think that White guys could actually go into Africa and take black guys against their will is just madness (laughs). That just never happened. I mean they didn't go in and get the guys. They were brought to them and then they were sold. And that is what happened. It wasn't White guys going into the darkest Africa and grabbing... can you imagine? How improbable...

Bob seemed to be saying that ‘Whites’ should not feel guilty for slavery because the groups enslaved and oppressed by ‘Whites’ also practiced slavery and oppression.

_Whiteness associated with disconnectedness._ Bob drew a very strong link between Whiteness and disconnectedness. When asked, “How might the meaning of being ‘White’ change for you personally in the future?” he responded...

I think what I see is I become less... what I see is happening is happening in the States too when I was down there... people are becoming less of a community in the big cities... they almost see themselves as a separate entity with their family and their friends and that's it... they have become really isolated... they don't want to have anything to do with ... not that they don't want to but they don't feel attached to the schools were to the community... they
just feel... I've got to lookout for myself... that's why you hear the stories about somebody lying on the road and people just drive by them... people have become so detached from society... its everyman for themselves... and you kind of get that selfishness... if you want to get on a bus you better push this guy out of the way because they'll push you... from personal experience I know that...

In the post-interview session, I asked Bob if he saw a link between the disconnectedness experienced by 'Whites' and "White individualism." He said that disconnectedness does not equate to individualism and that 'Whites' are not individualistic compared to aboriginal people.

No real barriers to opportunity. Bob firmly believes that there are no real barriers to opportunity for minorities in Canada or the United States. He states:

...you cannot get a more liberal country on earth than this country and North America. There is plenty of opportunity. You don't see the Chinese complaining about it, saying "Hey we got no opportunity." And a lot of people die to get into the states or Canada. For what? For the opportunity, you know. I mean people... understand... most people go about their business. Even in the States people think there's all this racial divide. It's a bunch of nonsense. Every guy basically, whatever race or colour, just goes about his business. He's got a job and a family to look after.

He continues: "...if the U.S. was such an intolerant place people wouldn't go there. America is very tolerant. As I say most Americans just want go about their own god damn business... make a living (laughs) you know... get your kids in school just like most people want to do..."

Bob thought that Canada's policy of multiculturalism is seriously misguided. He said,

Multiculturalism. What a pack of hooey that is. What a pack of hooey. Give them hundreds of millions of dollars which is what amounts to certain ethnic groups... as if China... yeah, to the Chinese community. There's only 1.3 billion Chinese. As if their culture is in danger of extinction (laughs). It's laughable.

Conflicting views. In his interview, Bob seemed to present conflicting views on where
power and privilege lay. He talked about "tyranny of the minority" and the absence of barriers to opportunity but he also saw 'Whites' as being more privileged. He said,

I mean it's certainly advantageous to be a White person there's no question about it... you can travel... just where you can go... you know... just where you can go... because there's White people everywhere... Australia, New Zealand, Europe, all of America, South Africa or any parts of Africa... you can go there and there's always White communities there... and if they're there that means that they're probably established there and they're not like poor... you know... if you go to a White community in say Asia there is probably... why are they there? They're not there digging ditches. They're there for business or teaching...

He continued, "Yeah it's definitely much easier being White in... I mean it's just... you can go about and be anonymous..." and "I can go live anywhere I want. I can go live in the States you know... White... you know... no problem."

Avoidance of speaking in personal terms. In his quotes, Bob often began to talk about himself then quickly shifted to a less personal tone. I probed him further. I asked, "So for you personally [with emphasis] how are you going to change?" He responded, "...probably by being a little bit more... uh... isolated you know... looking out for yourself... it sounds selfish to say that but... I think money is a problem too... people are feeling that squeeze...." It sounds like he is talking about himself but he again shifts quickly from the personal to the general. I probed him further, "...so it sounds like in the future you see yourself as doing less for the community and doing more for yourself and your family." He responds affirmatively then again quickly shifts,

"...that's right... I think that's what a lot of people... I talk to other guys who say they can't afford the time or the energy... money has become an issue... everybody is squeezed... but it's often more of a city thing... people in outlying communities often feel more attached to the community...."
Lack of exploration of the process of personal change. With regards to his identity development, Bob did not see himself changing internally. When asked how he has changed personally... He said

It wasn't like a shift... it wasn't a change... it was just a gradual kind of (pause) a gradual kind of (pause) a gradual change yeah... and not so much me... a lot of it was a reaction to what was imposed on me... it wasn't something that was internalized... it was often in reaction to some story, some government policy...

He continued, “Well what I'm saying is clearly my thoughts have changed but it has been outside forces that have made me kind of more conscious of being White... I was never really conscious of being White until you were sort of attacked... your group....”

4.2.4 Themes Across Groups

Lack of pride being associated with Whiteness. All participants made negative associations with Whiteness. Only one participant, Diane, mentions being proud of being ‘White.’ She said, “Yeah, definitely proud to be White. Proud... uh... White Canadian.” Yet she also saw Whiteness as associated with a lack of compassion, spitefulness. Recalling the way other ‘White’ children treated non-‘White’ children in her childhood, Diane said, “For me personally just... I mean... my observation of growing up in a White environment with other White kids I tend to find them not as compassionate to other people in general. There were some that were but I think on average they were very self-centered.”

Harlan, Jim, Wendy and Paul were not proud of their Whiteness. Harlan said, “...well in my context... That's a... that's a... hm... I don't feel particularly proud of being White, or North American, or European.” Jim said, “That's a very good question (laughs) I never thought about that. I... I don't know. I have no answer. I don't know what I like about being White.” Wendy
said, “About being White, hm, that's interesting. Um... I can almost think what I don't like about it, but, um, I can't, uh, think what I do like about it...” Paul said, “I just think it's harder to really own the negative association of being White, I think it's still more bullet proof than being called another racist name...” and later added, “I don't think, not that I actually ever thought about what I like about being White. I don't know... confusing question... Interesting question...”

Many participants expressed discomfort with being labeled 'White.' Wendy said, “I'm not thrilled with that the label White.... White I think comes with a lot of those connotations, and they're not nice connotations... so, um, my preference is not to be (laughs) too closely associated with that.” Jim said,

I feel self-conscious whenever I use the term White... Like it's we have to fill up one of those little reports about some weirdo being in the woods. I'd be I'd never I would never write down the word White even though everyone would understand what I meant. I would always put Caucasian.

Paul, quite definitely expressing his displeasure at being referred to as ‘White,’ said, “Ah... I think basically, you know... depending on the, you know, depending on the level of how it was said it was probably a variation of... different levels of fuck you....” He explained,

Yeah, I think, I probably think in the big picture it is; I probably do think it... in terms of helpfulness... do any of these things... how helpful are they? And then you go well, yeah they are helpful and then we can identify everything, and then, we can figure everything out because we got White over here, we got black over here, we got Aboriginal people here, we got Asian, we got Muslims, we got Jews, we got... now if we can get everybody told and spelled out and defined, then you got something to work with. I'm not so sure that necessarily is the way to work through things; I think there's been... I think overdefining things sometimes, I mean, it's just a personal level is not necessarily constructive.

He continued, “Ultimately White is a racist comment, a racist view.”
Feeling ‘White’ in unpleasant circumstances. Participants from different groups mentioned that they felt ‘White’ in unpleasant circumstances. Jim said, “I felt White when I when the injustices surfaced.” Bob said, “Well sometimes here... Yeah you can get some bad ugly looks from some groups... some ethnic groups... makes me aware that they don't like White guys... you know... they make no bones about it...” and “I was never really conscious of being White until you were sort of attacked... your group....” Jane said, “I feel very White when I am um...um...not talked to in certain situations. So when I am in an aboriginal community and um...there is a lot of anger, I feel really White.” She continued, when I am in an aboriginal community, in a group of aboriginal people, it's, it's very much there because I think that there is an identity and a journey of um...healing that's happening for that community that doesn't quite know what to do with my Whiteness and I, you know, like, I in the community don't know quite what to do with it, so there is quite a bit of feeling out and seeing what perspective I might be coming from or, or anger and not wanting to know what my perspective is and where I am coming from, and so um...I am, I am very much aware of that.

Whiteness associated with materialism. Diane, Jim, Paul and Terry associated Whiteness with materialism. Diane said, “I guess in a sense in that White thinking... it's more materialistic. That you have to achieve in order to make money... to get all the things they want... it's more... and to travel and... in order to get... to have the house... to do all that it's definitely a more materialistic type of thinking. It’s a materialistic upbringing.” Jim said, “…the White stuff... the dominant, cultural, business ethic, consumer, acquire, destroy the environment.” Paul said, “I think that sense of materialism is White. I don't know if that's necessarily true, ah, because, I just, ah, I think that a driving force that seems to be White.” Terry, referring to “White” culture, said, “...the importance of money in our culture. How we judge people by their wealth.”
Whiteness associated with power, privilege and opportunity at the expense of others.

Participants across groups associated Whiteness with power, privilege and opportunity at the expense of others. Diane said,

No I mean you got ... (pause) no I think just because I was always... given the opportunities to do anything I wanted to do or pursue that uh... that was... that was probably the good thing about... I think in our culture at the time when I was growing up... that was a benefit living in Canada being White... uh... because there was lots of opportunities for you. Where I think when I was growing up there weren't as many opportunities for people of other nationalities or even the aboriginals. It wasn't... uh... they had to work harder and struggle for more. And I was aware of that too that was harder for other nationalities.

Harlan said,

...being White I think being part of a big system of infrastructure that supports you, which we take that for granted. I think if you are minority, like a native person, you don't have access to that. It's very alienating. You just don't have access to it, and we take that stuff for granted.

He continued,

I feel... I know the word maybe is control. I feel I'm in control. I don't think a native person feels in control of that in the same way that I do. There's more, um, actually issues of lack of control, lack of influence over the system, lack of access to the system, that I have access with a phone call... like I can just do it and make it work. That's what I'm... it's control.

Paul said,

What does it mean to be White? I think it ... White means... it certainly means to be privileged, it means to have a Go card in the world, I don't think there's any denying that... White, male... I think... you know... there's... not... any... sort of... any guarantee of it being easy, but it certainly makes it, certainly a lot easier ... then, not having that ability to... I mean... I think that's the defining element about being White...
Whiteness associated with blandness. Three participants associated Whiteness with blandness. In Group 2, Harlan and Paul talked about it in the present tense. Harlan said, “...bland, like white slice bread, I mean no individuality, very, um, yeah... bland and not remarkable in any kind of way... I come from this, it's almost sterility.” Paul said, “Yeah, I think, yeah, absolutely. I think not wanting to... not wanting to... the lack of spice in things....” Wendy, of Group 1, referred to it in the past tense. She said, “I remember going through a spell at the time thinking that, uh, ‘Gosh, we don't have any real food or cultural events or, um, you know, dances like you can say Ukrainian people do” She continues, “I used to sort of contrast with other cultures... seemed so much more colourful than my culture...”

‘White’ guilt. All the participants associated shame and/or guilt with Whiteness except Iona and Wendy. Jim said, “I felt, um, the business of being White; there was a certain amount of shame attached to that... This expiating the Whiteness, yeah, I wanted to apologize for everything that we have done since we stepped off the boat from Europe, right... the... the White man's burden.” Bob said, “Yeah, I grew up with that [‘White’ guilt]. Yeah I grew up with that you know... I'm sure I was like most of the White people guilt-ridden....” Harlan said, “I used to be embarrassed for fear of being White... I've let that one go.” Jane said, “I think the big one for ...for people being White is guilt.” Terry said, “...when I first worked with native people I sort of found myself as... amend... making amends for what our culture has done to the native people... this missionary zeal thing, to make amends and save the people...to some extent I still feel a lot of the shame.”

Bob saw ‘White’ guilt as the source of many problems: “The White guilt has become a bit of a problem particularly here in Canada. You don't see that in Europe, you know. People
just go about their business. But in Canada here there's... I think that's a real problem. This White guilt has become almost a handicap to people you know...” He adds, “…a lot of Canadians are prisoners of their own guilt.” He sees that it has created a “…tyranny of the minority...” and White self-victimization: “…but again what it is... is these stupid White chump Canadians going after our own kind...”

Bob expressed the belief that ‘White’ guilt is more of a problem in Canada than in the United States. I asked, “So, when you say that in Canada people are feeling more White guilt than in the United States....” He responded “Yeah. Absolutely. Absolutely. It's like... yeah no question about it... I think so. For the most part they do yeah....”

Bob saw ‘Whites’ as being socialized into feeling guilt. He said, “…even out of high school... just bombarded... even now. Brainwashed I call it in a sense ... look at the books they would give us: Black Like Me, To Kill A Mockingbird... these are... these are racially... you know... where the White guy is the bad guy.”

Some participants expressed the view that while ‘White’ guilt is understandable, it can be unhelpful. Jane said,

So, good guilt is understandable and you should feel it right? But because of what we have in the name of, you know, ...society and what we've done in terms of aboriginal people, but bad guilt is like taking it all on yourself personally and not being able to do any kind of um... um... effective work.

Wendy said, “You don't get anywhere really with guilt. I don't think guilt is a very useful thing.” Jim said, “Well, I think, I've learned that it's... there's no point. It doesn't actually solve the problem. ... apologizing is all about me, not about them.” Harlan said, “…but feeling responsible for a whole society, it's an enormous burden you can't ... you can't do stuff like
Paul’s view was that while ‘Whites’ may be responsible for the exploitation of the natural world, in different circumstances it could well have been another group. He said:

The earth has been constantly under attack from ... the natural world is under attack, constantly being exploited, constantly somebody's trying to move forward, trying to develop, trying to extract, trying to do something out of every corner of the earth, and, ah... that's... I think, I don't know, I don't hold myself responsible for that when I say I'm White, I just think that's, ah, I think that's a bigger problem than just the White problem, the... I think that's classically a problem that everybody has, disguised in the fact that some people are being more exploited than others, but I think, I think ultimately, there's another flaw underneath...that we all possess, and that's that we're all human beings, so... some may have a leg up because of the situation but that's all very temporary, that all could change.

Paul seemed to be saying that because we are all human, we are all capable of doing bad things, therefore White guilt is erroneous.

Whiteness associated with achievement. Jim, Diane, Iona, Paul and Terry associated Whiteness with achievement. Jim said, “...that kind of upward mobility is probably a White guy's trait.” Diane said, “...we have different work ethics that we've developed that sort of... uh...we've been brought up to think that the work ethics of native Canadians are not as high as the White world is basically.” Describing the ‘White’ work ethic Diane said,

...it's being able to... (pause) stick with the job and... and do the best you possibly can do and do it every day... uh... and... and want to do better. Constantly want to do better in your life. Constantly striving to learn and... and progress and do better. Not sit back and say "oh, you know, I can't do this or won't do this"

Relating how she was socialized with a ‘White’ work ethic Diane said,

In a way I think it's probably more the White side of the work ethic... that's come out. Its basically that's just how we were
brought up as well. My mom was very much like that too. She's very... always moving even though she's in her 60s she's constantly taking courses and doing new things and learning new things and always was very... does everything to perfection in her work and everything she's done in life... been very focused.

Diane and Terry associated Whiteness with achievement pressure. Diane said,

To me it's an expectation... um.. being a White person. I guess it's an expectation that I probably put on myself that... that's what I should do and... and I like to do. But ...something that I think as a White person we're supposed to do. It's funny where all comes from. Geez, Glen (laughs). Yeah! Why? (laughs) Hmm... never thought of it before like that! Yeah! And I guess it's probably as you grow up all these little things... come out...

Terry said, “I felt in my culture there was too much pressure on me, and too much, ahm, push to get ahead, too much... to have a job... to, ah... to be industrious...”

Iona said, “...for me, there was no way that I was expected to grow up and collect welfare checks (laughs). I mean, I was expected to, you know, succeed at something, so I would say there was definitely higher expectations.”

Paul said,

I think there's a certain sense of what value is... I think the value of it is White. I think the value that there's something, that that's the Holy Grail somewhere in there. I think that, you know, we can find ourselves through that somehow, that's where success lies, that's where success is. I think those kinds of values, I think, ah, are there, tied up... that's what it is to be White, that's what it is to be successful...

Diane felt that aboriginal students should be put under the same pressure to achieve. She said,

I guess I kind of view what happens in my work environment here and the expectations of the kids I work with is... if the native Indian kids here don't want to stay in class or don't want to do things in class it's OK. They're allowed to roam the hallways
basically. It's... it bothers me that it's accepted... that it's OK that they don't have to achieve... that they're not expected to.

It really bothers me because I'm thinking that's not right because they'll never achieve if they don't expect them to. I know they tend to... you know... the... the... uh... what I observe is the feeling is that they learn in a different way and they don't learn by sitting in class and that's OK. The rest... everybody else here has to but they don't. They get like a little different priority status that they don't have to follow the rest of the world. They can beat... you know to their own beat to their own drum... work to their own... you know...

*Nativeness associated with “here and now” orientation.* Diane, Terry and Iona associated Nativeness with a “here and now” orientation. Diane said, “Whereas I think that the native kids they are not brought up with materialistic ideas. I think probably... making enough to get by and happy and family sort of more the focus which isn't necessarily a bad thing. It's just a different focus.” Terry said, “Native people's time goes by what's most important...” and continued,

I don't know how to describe it exactly, but in our culture we will plan something and follow through for several weeks of intense energy to reach a goal; whereas native people, if something happens today, um, they get involved. I recall one person telling me the difference would be in... the difference between a White doctor and a native doctor in a hosp... in the doctor's office, the White doctor would come out and say 'who's got the 2 o'clock appointment?' and take that person in, the native doctor would go in the waiting room and say 'who's the sickest?' and take that person.

Iona said,

...with my dad's family. Um, they... they don't look very far down the road. It's kind of next week, next month. There's not a lot of long term thinking there (laughs), and, um, and I don't know, maybe that's just because that's the way they were raised. I don't, you know, again, I don't know if its the Native way or just the family way...

*Unexamined essentialist notions of “race.”* All participants expressed essentialist notions
of “race.” Jane, expressing a sentiment typical of other participants, said, “I guess it’s pretty important because I can’t separate it from who I am, right? So, I mean, it’s part of who I am, so I can’t separate that, and so it’s pretty important.” Jane expresses her identity as essential and inextricable. She said,

Well... what did I learn? I learned, I mean, I learned that I need to be comfortable with who I am in the culture that I grew up in... I can only be in the aboriginal commu...community as who I am, which is a White person that is... um... from a White culture. So... and...as long as I accept that and know that that’s where I am moving from then I can be quite comfortable in the aboriginal community.

Diane, Iona and Jane, however, seemed perplexed by questions designed to challenge participants to investigate their assumptions about race (i.e., “What kinds of things do you do that make you ‘White?’”) Diane, for example, said, “Hmm... (pause). You come up with all kinds of things that you really have to think about (laughs) at the drop of a hat.” Iona said, “Uhuh. (long pause) I don’t know. You know, these are really tough questions...” Similarly, at the end of her interview, Jane was asked if she had anything else to share. After a long pause she said,

I don’t think so. I think that (pause). I guess what I... what I wanted to say is that those... some of those questions are really, um, difficult questions for me. So I would need to look at, like, why are they? Like, I can’t sometimes even understand the question. So I have to understand what it is that I can’t understand about it and... and then what, you know, like... what haven’t I looked at yet, and what haven’t I, um, explored yet about that?

Paul seemed to have accepted that he had been racialized as ‘White’ but did not see it as something essential to himself. He said, “Well, yeah, sure... I guess... I am White...I think in an abstract way I know that I am White...”
Lack of awareness of personal formations of 'White' identity. Jane, Terry, Iona and Diane did not recall actually being called 'White.' Asked if she had ever been referred to as 'White' Jane said,

Not that I'm aware of. I can't remember. No, I can't remember, actually, no. It didn't stand out. No. ... No, I think it's mostly my interpretation, probably.... (pause) ... I've had lots of instances where I've felt that and I've interpreted that way, but I can't remember if they've definitely said "White person", right?

Similarly Terry said, “I don't know if anybody has ever had to refer to me as White.”

Iona was asked how she knew others perceive her as ‘White.’ She said,

Well, they do assume that I'm White. They assume that I'm Italian or something because I've got, um, different, um, a different appearance, so they assume that it's some European which I guess it possibly could be because I've got so much European background as well, but, I think, it's just, uh, the cross between the Native and the European, so they assume I'm White simply because of the way I look, um.... Uh, because quite often they'll ask me my background, and when I tell them that I've got Native ancestry, they'll go, "Oh, I thought you were Italian," because of my features and my skin colouring and such...

But when asked if people actually referred to her as White she said, “No.” When asked at what point in her life she realized she was 'White' Diane answered,

Yeah. I don't know how... I mean... yeah (laughs)... I... I honestly can't say how I came to that determination but I mean there probably was something said at home that you just accepted it. That's just who you were. Yeah. I can think of any definitive moment that I would've decided that.

Being raised in a 'White' world. All participants except Paul expressed having been raised in a predominantly 'White' environment. For example, Diane said, “We've grown up...I guess... more in a White world... having grown up in a White family.” Bob said,

Where I grew up everybody was White... everyone... I mean even
if you were Italian you were considered White basically... not consciously. Everybody was White... like real White (laughs). I never met a Black guy until I was 18 years old. I used to play baseball with a couple of guys but that was it. I'd never met anybody but a White guy.

Iona said, "...being raised White, or growing up White is all I knew."

Awareness of residential school abuses. Most participants stated an awareness of the abuses suffered by aboriginals at the hands of colonial 'Whites.' Iona said, "Um, well, they the way, uh, the Whites or Europeans treated the Indians. You know, they like fooled them into giving them everything, and in return they would be allowed to live in, you know, in this one little enclosed space for the rest of their lives...." Wendy said, "Well, I think, uh, Whites were the ones that, uh, you know, pillaged and raped and did all those things (chuckles) when they came to the country, and, uh, took away the land, and assumed the patriarchal stances, and, uh, uh, did ugly things, like, um, introduce, um, smallpox to, uh, native villages and all those kinds of things...." Paul said: "...there's no denying that White people came over here and did an incredible disservice to the Aboriginal community, I don't think there's any ... it's a very difficult time defending that...."

Trying to effect positive social change. Two participants, Diane and Jane, spoke extensively about trying to effect positive social change. Diane spoke about being an active member of her community. She said,

...contributing to society. That was my role in society is to be a participating person to make my community better. Uh... and I have always been involved in volunteer work and that sort of thing. That's been important in my life... It was just something I have always felt I had to...wanted to do and continued to do and contributing to my community and having a voice and an input because if I didn't do that then I couldn't complain if I wasn't helping to change things and make it better... rather than sitting
back and letting other people do it.

Jane spoke about trying to fight for better treatment of the students in the residential school where she worked as a teacher. She said,

A strong image for me that year is me um...being in the principal's office, which, I just seem to have this image that I was there a lot, in the principal's office, trying to say what I believed and felt, and coming out of the office crying all the time. Crying probably out of frustration because I could not articulate what I thought should be happening... So, there was not much I could do about what was happening. I couldn't...um... I couldn't be part of it, sort of, in a way that would make it any different...

Compare the two preceding quotes with the following from Bob: “...if you don't like it do something about it kind of thing that I think it's a really good attitude to have... not that I do anything about it... I mean if I did I'd be a lot of better off....” Bob admits that he has not done anything to effect a desired change.
5.1 Descriptions of Whiteness

Ignatiev (2000b) claimed that, “...there is no such thing as White culture... Without the privileges attached to it, the White race would not exist, and the White skin would have no more social significance than big feet” (p. 1). Contrary to this, participants in this study collectively painted a picture of ‘White’ culture very similar to Katz’s (1985) “Components of White Culture” (Table 4). Participants touched on all but two aspects of Katz’s “components,” aesthetics and history. Participants often expressed these “components” in contrast to aboriginal culture. For example, individualism versus family-orientation, direct eye contact versus “shyness,” clock time-orientation versus context-orientation, future versus present orientation, rational versus contextual and nuclear versus extended family structure. On the surface, these findings seem to repudiate Ignatiev’s claim.

5.2 Relationship to Whiteness and Otherness

Katz and Ivey (1977) also claimed that, “White people do not see themselves as White” (p.486). In this research, all participants necessarily saw themselves as ‘White.’ However, the interviews revealed that this identity was tenuous for most participants. Jim and Wendy preferred to distance themselves from the term ‘White’ because of its negative connotations. Indeed, similar to the participants in Gallagher (1994) and Storrs (1999), participants in the present study rejected their ‘White’ identities because of its associations with sterility, blandness, oppression, prejudice and discrimination. Paul’s comment that “ultimately White is a racist comment” recalls the link that the Vancouver School Board made between Whiteness and
Table 4. Katz’s (1985) Components of White Culture: Values and Beliefs. Items marked by an asterix (*) were mentioned by participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rugged Individualism:*</th>
<th>Protestant Work Ethic:*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual is primary unit*</td>
<td>Working hard brings success*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual has primary responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence and autonomy highly valued and rewarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual can control environment*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Progress &amp; Future Orientation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning is everything</td>
<td>Plan for future*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win/lose dichotomy</td>
<td>Delayed gratification*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Orientation:</strong></td>
<td>Value continual improvement and progress*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must master and control nature*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must always do something about a situation*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic/utilitarian view of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emphasis on Scientific Method:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard English</td>
<td>Objective, rational, linear thinking*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written tradition</td>
<td>Cause and effect relationships*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct eye contact*</td>
<td>Quantitative emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited physical contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control emotions*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status and Power:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to rigid time*</td>
<td>Measured by economic possessions*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time is viewed as a commodity</td>
<td>Credentials, titles, and positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holidays:</strong></td>
<td>Believe &quot;own&quot; system*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Christian religion*</td>
<td>Believe better than other systems*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on White history and male leaders</td>
<td>Owning goods, space, property*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family Structure:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on European immigrants’ experience in the United States</td>
<td>Nuclear family is the ideal social unit*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanticize war</td>
<td>Male is breadwinner and the head of the household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female is homemaker and subordinate to the husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patriarchal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Religion:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and art based on European cultures</td>
<td>Belief in Christianity*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's beauty based on blonde, blue-eyed, thin, young</td>
<td>No tolerance for deviation from single god concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's attractiveness based on athletic ability, power, economic status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to these associations, participants in this research made associations between Whiteness and disconnectedness, a lack of compassion, naivété and self-victimization.

Paul saw his 'White' identity as an abstraction and an arbitrary imposition. He clearly rejected being labelled “White” because he disagreed with the principle of “racial” categorization. Paul seemed to be speaking from a postmodern perspective, rejecting the fixation of people’s identities into arbitrary “racial” categories (Savickas, 1993; Hoskins & Leseho, 1996; Hoskins & Arvay, 1998; Lal, 1995; Anderson, 1997). In this postmodern vein, Paul seems to reject the notion of identity as a unit unto itself in favour of a more relational, interdependent and sociocentric view. What Paul seemed to be inferring is the same as has been expressed in the literature: that the self is socially constructed and that realities are shared via prevailing cultural discourses in society (Hill & Thomas, 2000).

At the same time, Paul saw his Whiteness as an unavoidable part of himself. This shows a complexity similar to what participants reported in Weis and Fine’s (2000) research. They found that their participants conceived “…of race as both a floating, unstable fiction and also a fundamental, unerasable aspect of biography and social experience. Indeed, some of [their] informants…suggest that ‘race’ constitutes inherently undefinable territory, offering narratives not so much of denial as complexity” (p. 39). Participants in the present research, however, were not so conscious of the socially constructed nature of “race.” Participants expressed essentialist notions about Whiteness along the lines of “I can’t separate it from who I am.” However, the tenuousness of their essentialist notions about “race” were perhaps revealed by their perplexity when asked questions such as “What kinds of things do you do that make you
"White?" which were designed to examine the assumptions behind Whiteness and "race." Ignatiev (2000b), who urged 'Whites' to "break the rules of Whiteness" (p. 5) and deconstruct Whiteness by asking, "What makes you think I'm White?" (p. 6), was the inspiration for such questions in this research.

Bob seemed to be expressing views consistent with some of the discourses supporting democratic racism in Canada as outlined by Henry, Tator, Mattis and Rees (2000; Appendix 4). He denied the existence of racism Canada, believed that equal opportunity existed for all, did not support programs that supported minorities and believed that "certain groups" exploited the system. However, at the same time, he expressed the view that, of all groups, "Natives" have been treated the worst in Canada. He also believed that 'Whites' suffered from the "tyranny of the minority" but also believed that 'Whites,' particularly Canadian 'Whites,' have brought victimization upon themselves. Therefore, Bob's views appear to be clearly racist but must be considered in terms of their complexity.

The results suggest that Bob does have racist views and does not feel 'White' guilt as much as other participants. These results seem to support Zuwerink et al.'s (1996) research, which found more guilt in low prejudiced individuals than in high prejudiced individuals. Bob's expressions of anger towards "certain groups" is consistent with Zuwerink et al.'s findings that, instead of feeling guilt, high prejudiced people directed negative affect toward others. Where the results of the present research differ from Zuwerink et al.'s findings is that in their study, all participants, whether high, low or moderately prejudiced, perceived a fairly high degree of prejudice reflected in society's standards. Bob did not seem to perceive such prejudice in North American society.
Bob expressed the belief that ‘White’ guilt is more of a problem in Canada than in the United States. Granted, Bob was the only participant to express these views but they are interesting nonetheless. If more people have these views then it would be prudent to investigate further how WRID (researched exclusively in the United States) applies in Canada.

5.3 Extent and process of personal change

No overwhelming support was found for ‘White’ ‘Racial’ Identity Development theory as proposed by Helms. Some support for aspects of this and other theories and research related to ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity and racism was found. Results of this research did not validate or refute Helms’ (1995) model of ‘White’ ‘Racial’ Identity Ego Statuses (Appendix 10) or Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson’s (1994) model of ‘White’ ‘Racial’ Consciousness (Appendix 12). The most that might be said is that Group 1 roughly fits in the early stages of Helms’ model or the unachieved statuses of Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson’s model, that Group 2 might be categorized in Helms’ later stages or Rowe et al.’s integrative status and that Group 3 (Bob) might fit Helms’ Pseudo-independence stage (status) or Rowe et al.’s dominative status. The possible relationships of the groupings to the models warrant further investigation.

The participants expressed aspects of the developmental models. Group 2 participants and Iona from Group 1 mentioned initial stages of naïveté in the first 10 to 20 years of their lives with regard to “racial” issues. Jim, Jane and Terry of Group 2 expressed going from being more to less prejudiced/racist and described going through phases of idealizing “Natives” or wanting to help them in a paternalistic way. Jim, Jane and Terry also expressed having “moved on” from feelings of ‘White’ guilt while others did not.

Terry’s statement about once being overtly racist then becoming a participant in “Native”
culture is also reminiscent of Diaz-Rico’s (1998) “continuum of involvement in transformative engagement” (Table 2) in which he has moved from overtly racist to participating in cultures.

‘White’ ‘Racial’ Identity Development models propose a process culminating in the development of a positive non-racist ‘White ‘racial’ identity. Some participants expressed views that seemed consistent with this, the most concise being Jane’s “I can only be in the aboriginal... community as who I am, which is a White person.” Jane seems to be saying that she needs to be accepting and ever mindful of her Whiteness in order to function in the aboriginal community. This is consistent with a “higher level” of ‘White ‘racial’ identity such as Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson’s integrative status and Helms’ autonomy status.

On Diaz-Rico’s (1998) “continuum” this statement might put her at number 5, “participating in cultures.” However, another of Jane’s comments seems to put her at number 3, “political correctness.” She said,

Well, I’ve been trying to be very careful with my (laughing) with my talk, so um... I, you know, I try not to say with "your people" or you know, try to sort of be respectful of and aware of the terms that I use and...the part that makes me very White because I am, you know, I am trying to be politically correct – that could be a very White thing to be...

The two statements reflect a complexity of identity, seemingly higher on one scale and lower on another.

While not rejecting “race” as an idea, Jane and Jim commented about how interpersonal connectedness goes deeper than “race.” This is reminiscent of Myers et al.’s (1991) Optimal Theory Applied to Identity Development (OTAID) model, which proposes developmental stages that culminate in a sense of interconnectedness to all beings.

Interestingly, Bob drew a very strong link between Whiteness and disconnectedness,
where people are indifferent to people “lying in the street” and are becoming more selfish because of hard economic times. He seems to be describing what Myers et al. call a “suboptimal social system” where people rely on ‘external’ sources of power (money). Jim foresaw a bleak future where he as a ‘White’ person and his ‘White’ “group” were becoming more self-centred and isolated. Also, consistent with OTAID are Jane’s comments, which acknowledge the suboptimal society yet offer a way to improve it. She said, “Oppressor and the oppressed are as both as in much need of liberation, both... you know, so... In that process of empowerment, it doesn’t work unless all part...parties are liberated in some way from that stereotype, from the, you know, the oppression, from everything, right?”

5.4 Trying to effect positive social change

While both Jane and Diane commented on trying to effect positive social change, in the context of their interviews a difference in their motivations can be inferred. The difference is that Jane wanted to challenge a dysfunctional system, whereas Diane wanted to contribute to an already functioning society. Jane’s efforts to make a positive change in the residential school where she worked (“trying to say what I believed and felt”) might be placed on Diaz-Rico’s (1998) “continuum” (Table 2) somewhere between “speaking up” and “initiating events.”

5.5 Summary

Generally speaking, Diane, Iona and Wendy were characterized by little critical examination of their Whiteness, little experienced ‘White’ guilt, lack of personal change in their ‘White’ identities and non-racist views. Paul, Jim, Terry, Jane and Harlan were characterized by the experience of ‘White’ guilt, non-racist views, a critical examination of Whiteness, more self-examination and experienced personal change in their ‘White’ identities. Bob was characterized
by a lack of personal change in 'White' identity, little self-examination, racist views, experienced 'White' guilt and a critical examination of Whiteness.

Figure 13. Graphic representation of participants and selected themes

This summary is represented in Figure 13. It corresponds with the arrangement of participants in the two-dimensional plot in Figure 5. This is merely a rough approximation of the views expressed which distinguished participants or clusters of participants from each other. It is
meant as a general guide to the relationships among participants, among themes and between participants and themes. It represents a rudimentary model that explains some of the findings in this research. It is similar to the “model for locating racist behaviour” (Hatcher & Troyna, 1993) in Table 1.

5.6 Strengths of this Research

This research addressed and/or avoided five of the limitations of current WRID theory and research as described in Chapter 2.

WRID theory and research does not adequately describe a ‘White’ identity per se but rather describes attitudes held by ‘Whites’ toward ‘Blacks’ and other racialized groups. The participants in this research provided rich, subjective descriptions of how they experienced their Whiteness.

WRID theory and research seems to reify “race” by not acknowledging its socially constructed nature. This research asked participants questions designed to prompt thinking about Whiteness at a deeper level and comments were elicited from one participant in particular that questioned the wisdom of the use of “racial” terminology.

The WRIAS gives more weight to the cognitions than to the behaviours and emotions of respondents. The interview questions in this research were designed to give equal weight to cognitions, behaviours and emotions related to Whiteness.

WRID researchers have not explained their criteria for selecting ‘White’ participants. This research avoided this limitation by clearly stating the criteria for participation. Only participants who considered themselves to be ‘White’ or used to consider themselves to be ‘White’ were recruited.
Research using the WRIAS has typically recruited college students in the United States as respondents. This research recruited from a non-university population, thereby researching an untapped population.

This research critically analyzed WRID theory and looked to other related areas of scholarship including Whiteness studies, critical ‘race’ theory, identity development and theories of racism to create a fuller understanding of the complexities of the field.

5.7 Limitations of this research

The sample of the population of British Columbians who have been racialized as ‘White’ and who have lived or worked with Aboriginal people was small. Limited research resources prevented the recruitment of more participants. The clustering of codes into three quadrants (most apparent in the two-dimensional plot in Figure 6) raises the question about whether a more representative sample would have created a more rounded spatial arrangement (distribution) of codes and interview participants.

The methodology of this research is very time consuming and labour intensive. The coding process in particular was very time consuming. This methodology is only recommended for research projects with larger resources than afforded by the typical Masters student.

This methodology was not longitudinal and therefore not as able to discern changes in ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity.

5.8 Implications

5.8.1 Theoretical Implications

To my knowledge, this is the first inquiry into ‘White’ ‘Racial’ Identity Development in Canada and the first in relation to aboriginals. While minimal support for ‘White’ ‘Racial’
Identity Development was found, the fact that the descriptions of Whiteness were decidedly negative makes the attainment of a “positive non-racist White racial identity” seem unlikely. One participant’s postmodernist views on identity reflected the confounding and controversial use of ‘race’ as a construct in the social sciences, or all the sciences. This of course requires further research but the implications strike at the American Counselling Association’s ethical guidelines requiring ‘White’ counsellors to develop a positive, non-racist ‘White’ ‘racial’ identity.

Although definitive support for a unique Canadian ‘White’ identity was not found, one participant suggested that Canadians are more in the throes of ‘White’ guilt than are people in the United States. This deserves further investigation.

5.8.2 Methodological Implications

The methodology used in this research is unique to the study of WRID. Codeminer and Wordstat are useful tools in creating and organizing large sets of codes and displaying descriptive statistics and interrelationships amongst codes. This methodology can be a useful complement to existing methodologies in the study of WRID. Taken further, this research can be a precursor to the development of a test similar to yet more complex than the WRIAS.

There is an advantage to using both programs as a means of checking the strength of the relationships between interviews. In this research, the similarity of the spatial arrangement of the participant interviews in the two-dimensional plots across analytical methods indicated the strength of the relationships between participant interviews.

5.8.3 Practical Implications

This research may help counsellors and educators better understand the implications of
adhering to ‘White’ ‘Racial’ Identity Development theory. The results of this research suggest a complexity that is not accounted for in the present theories.

Beyond this, counsellors and educators need to be aware that not all people subscribe to the notion of “race” and that this does not necessarily mean they are in a naïve stage of “racial” identity. Instead, it may mean they are in an advanced stage of identity, if the stage hypothesis is to be honoured. Also, clients who are suffering from ‘White’ guilt may benefit from a narrative counselling approach that deconstructs the meaning of Whiteness rather from the perspective of WRID theory which subscribes to the notion of “race.” Such an approach may help the client to reposition herself in relation to the forces that racialize her.

The results of the present research showing lower tolerance in ‘Whites’ for social silence is instructive for the counsellor engaging “Native” clients. The lesson here for the ‘White’ counsellor is to be patient. What was interesting in the results of the present research was the fact that only males mentioned anything about the differences between ‘Whites’ and ‘Natives’ in terms of rates of speech and comfort levels with social silence. It was also noted that the males in the present study spoke more and faster than the females. The possible relationships between gender, rates of speech and comfort with social silence are intriguing and warrant further investigation.
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Appendix 1

Official Government Statement

Sadly, our history with respect to the treatment of Aboriginal people is not something in which we can take pride. Attitudes of racial and cultural superiority led to a suppression of Aboriginal culture and values. As a country, we are burdened by past actions that resulted in weakening the identity of Aboriginal peoples, suppressing their languages and cultures, and outlawing spiritual practices. We must recognize the impact of these actions on the once self-sustaining nations that were disaggregated, disrupted, limited or even destroyed by the dispossession of traditional territory, by the relocation of Aboriginal people, and by some provisions of the Indian Act. We must acknowledge that the result of these actions was the erosion of the political, economic and social systems of Aboriginal people and nations.

(Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 2000, p. 3)
### Appendix 2

Marcia’s (1980) operationalizations of Erikson’s (1968) ego identity statuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego identity statuses (Erikson, 1968)</th>
<th>Operationalization (Marcia, 1980)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity diffusion</td>
<td>Exploration absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity foreclosure</td>
<td>Exploration absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>Exploration present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity achievement</td>
<td>Exploration present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ponterotto’s mistake

Haresh Sabnani and I had just finished an extensive citation count of the most frequently cited authors, conceptual articles, and empirical studies in the multicultural counseling literature (Ponterotto & Sabnani, 1989). In that review, Dr. William E. Cross Jr.'s article on the "Negro to Black conversion experience" (Cross, 1971) was one of the most frequently cited conceptual articles. In the article, we also listed the racial/ethnic background of the most frequently cited authors. Given the focus of his writing, I assumed that Cross was African American, although at that point I had never met him.

Roughly 2 years later, Cross was giving the keynote address at the Winter Roundtable on Cross-Cultural Counseling held each year at Teachers College, Columbia University. I remember the time well, as Cross's (1991) classic book, Shades of Black: Diversity in African American Identity, had just been published. As I sat in the audience, I was struck by his stature—tall, thin, and very light-skinned—"Caucasian looking." I remember thinking, "Wow, I should not have assumed he was African American—I guess White people can write great stuff on the African American experience." Some months later, a colleague in one of our multicultural network groups wrote to ask the group about the racial background of Cross and other leading scholars. I wrote back saying that Cross was White. A day or two later, Dr. Janet Helms, who was part of the network group, left a message on my voice mail letting me know that Cross was indeed African American, and she did not know how he would feel about me calling him White. Needless to say, as I listened to the message I cringed in embarrassment. I chided myself: "You idiot; some people may already be questioning your place as a White man in multicultural research, and now you have given credence to their doubts. How could you forget that African Americans vary widely in their skin shade or tone!"

I ran into Helms at the next Winter Roundtable and sheepishly thanked her for taking the time to enlighten me and save me from further embarrassment. She smiled and said, "you're welcome." As I think back on that faux pas and others, I am still embarrassed, but not on the level that I once was. As I get older (and I am not that old), I find it a little easier to laugh at myself and forgive myself for my "cultural mistakes."

Two important lessons I learned from this story and others of a similar nature were as follows. First, I well realize, as highlighted in the preceding articles, that racial identity development and the pursuit of a multicultural identity is a lifelong process. I will continue to make mistakes and embarrass myself, though hopefully less frequently, and I will continue to take responsibility for and learn from these mistakes. Second, I do not and never will consider myself an "expert" in multicultural counseling. When, on occasion, a graduate student or new professional says to me, "Oh, you are the coauthor or co-editor of this or that book—you are an expert on multicultural counseling research," I quickly and politely respond, "Yes, I am the coauthor of that book, but no, I am not an expert but a student of multicultural counseling, and working on that book with my colleagues of color was a very valuable learning experience for me." Students are often surprised by this response, but I sense it also puts them at ease.

-from Ponterotto (1998, pp.46-47)
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Discourses supporting democratic racism in Canada
(Henry, Tator, Mattis & Rees, 2000, pp. 384-385)

Denial: “Canada is not a racist society; this is not a racist institution; he or she is not a racist.”

Colour Blindness: “I never notice skin colour.”

Equal Opportunity: “All we need to do is treat everyone the same and fairness will be ensured.”

Blaming the Victim: “They lack the motivation to succeed”; “They don’t really try to adapt their cultural values to ‘our’ society.”

White Victimization: “White European immigrants have also experienced prejudice and discrimination”; “All immigrant groups must expect to start at the bottom of the social and economic ladder.”

Reverse Racism: “Programs like employment equity and anti-racism policies incorporate authoritarian principles and methods that are antithetical to liberal democratic society.”

Binary Polarization: “We are ‘Canadian-Canadians’; “they are the ‘others.’”

Immigrants, Balkanization, and Racism: “Immigrants take jobs away from Canadians; immigrants are a drain on the economy; immigrants exploit the welfare system.”

Moral Panic: “We are in a state of crisis and disorder and are under seige; we have lost control; there is a serious threat to our ‘civilized’ society.”

Multiculturalism: “In a multicultural society we should try to be sensitive, to tolerate and accommodate different cultural values; but there are limits to our tolerance.”

Liberal Values: Individualism, truth, tradition, universalism, and freedom of expression: “The rights of the individual should override collective rights; there is a noble Euro-American tradition; there is a universal form of expression that includes and transcends all cultural and racial boundaries; there is an ‘authentic’ history that we are obliged to learn and share; we must establish what is the truth; freedom of expression is one of the most cherished of all our values; it cannot be compromised because some minority group is unhappy with the position taken by a journalist, politician, curator, or educator.”

National Identity: “Real Canadians are willing to put their other cultural identities behind them; Canada should define itself on the basis of a single, unifying Canadian-Canadian culture.”
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List of Abuses in Residential Schools
(from Chrisjohn & Young, 1997, pp. 31-33)

Physical Abuses

Sexual assault, including forced sexual intercourse between men or women in authority and girls and/or boys in their charge;

Forced oral-genital or masturbatory contact between men or women in authority and girls and/or boys in their charge;

Sexual touching by men or women in authority of girls and/or boys in their charge;

Performing private pseudo-official inspections of genitalia of girls and boys;

Arranging or inducing abortions in female children impregnated by men in authority;

Sticking needles through the tongues of children, often leaving them in place for extended periods of time;

Inserting needles into other regions of children’s anatomy;

Burning or scalding children;

Beating children into unconsciousness;

Beating children to the point of drawing blood;

Beating children to the point of inflicting serious permanent or semi-permanent injuries, including broken arms, broken legs, broken ribs, fractured skulls, shattered eardrums, and the like;

Using electrical shock devices on physically restrained children;

Forcing sick children to eat their own vomit;

Unprotected exposure (as punishment) to the natural elements (snow, rain, and darkness), occasionally prolonged to the point of inducing life-threatening conditions (e.g., frostbite, pneumonia);

Withholding medical attention from individuals suffering the effects of physical abuse;

Shaving children’s heads (as punishment);
Psychological/Emotional Abuses

Administration of beatings to naked or partially naked children before their fellow students and/or institutional officials;

Public, individually directed verbal abuse, belittling, and threatening;

Public, race-based vilification of all aspects of Aboriginal forms of life;

Racism;

Performing public strip searches and genital inspections of children;

Removal of children from their homes, families, and people;

Cutting children's hair or shaving their heads (as policy);

Withholding presents, letters, and other personal property of children;

Locking children in closets (as punishment);

Segregation of the sexes;

Proscription of the use of Aboriginal languages;

Proscription of the following of Aboriginal religious or spiritual practices;

Eliminating any avenue by which to bring grievances, inform parents, or notify external authorities of abuses;

Forced labour;

Enforcing Unsuitable Living Conditions

Starvation (as punishment);

Inadequate nutrition (e.g., nutrition levels below that of needed for normal growth and subsistence);

Providing food unfit for human consumption;

Exploiting child labour;

Forced labour under unsafe working conditions;

Inadequate medical services, sometimes leading to children's deaths;

Omissions of Action
Church Inaction

Failure to bring local incidents of abuse to the attention of higher church authorities;

Failure to bring local incidents of abuse to the attention of federal and appropriate provincial governmental authorities;

Failure to protect children under their care from the sexual predations of older children also attending Residential School;

Failure to remove known sex offenders from positions of supervision and control of children;

Acquiescence to federal funding levels below those the churches themselves believed necessary for operation;

Starvation (as a cost-cutting measure);

Neglect of their educational mandate;

Governmental Inaction

Failure to adequately inspect or otherwise maintain effective supervision of institutions into which their legal wards had been placed;

Failure to fund churches schools at levels sufficient for maintaining the physical health of their legal wards;

Failure to live up to the spirit of treaties signed promising education for Aboriginal Peoples;

Collaboration with church officials in covering up the criminal behaviour of officials, both governmental and ecclesiastical;

Removal or relocation of internal personnel critical of Residential School conditions.
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The Standard Account
(from Chrisjohn & Young, 1997, pp. 1-2)

Residential Schools were created out of the largess of the federal government and the missionary imperatives of the major churches as a means of bringing the advantages of Christian civilisation to Aboriginal populations. With the benefit of late-20th century hindsight, some of the means with which this task was undertaken may be seen to have been unfortunate, but it is important to understand that this work was undertaken with the best of humanitarian intentions. Now, in any large organisation, isolated incidents of abuse may occur, and such abuses may have occurred in some Indian Residential Schools. In any event, individuals who attended Residential Schools now appear to be suffering low self-esteem, alcoholism, somatic disorders, violent tendencies, and other symptoms of psychological distress (called "Residential School Syndrome"). While these symptoms seem endemic to Aboriginal Peoples in general (and not limited to those who attended Residential School), this is likely to have come about because successive generations of attendees passed along, as it were, their personal psychological problems to their home communities and, through factors such as inadequacy of parenting skills, perpetuated the symptomology, if not the syndrome. In order to heal the rift the Residential School experience may have created between Aboriginal Peoples and Canadian society at large, and in order to heal those individuals who still suffer the consequences of their school experiences, it is necessary and appropriate to establish formally the nature of Residential School Syndrome, causally link the condition to Residential School abuses (physical, sexual, or emotional), determine the extent of its influence in Aboriginal populations, and suggest appropriate individual and community interventions that will bring about psychological and social health.

The "Irregular" Account
(from Chrisjohn & Young, 1997, p. 3-4)

Residential Schools were one of many attempts at the genocide of the Aboriginal Peoples inhabiting the area now commonly called Canada. Initially, the goal of obliterating these peoples was connected with stealing what they owned (the land, the sky, the waters, and their lives, and all that these encompassed); and although this connection persists, present-day acts and policies of genocide are also connected with the hypocritical, legal, and self-delusional need on the part of the perpetrators to conceal what they did and what they continue to do. A variety of rationalisations (social, legal, religious, political, and economic) arose to engage (in one way or another) all segments of Euro-Canadian society in the task of genocide. For example, some were told (and told themselves) that their actions arose out of a Missionary Imperative to bring the benefits of the One True Belief to savage pagans; others considered themselves justified in land theft by declaring that the Aboriginal Peoples were not putting the land to "proper" use; and so on. The creation of Indian Residential Schools followed a time-tested method of obliterating indigenous cultures, and the psychosocial consequences these schools would have on Aboriginal Peoples were well understood at the time of their formation. Present-day symptomology found in Aboriginal Peoples and societies does not constitute a distinct psychological condition, but is the well known and long-studied response of human beings living under conditions of severe and prolonged oppression. Although there is no doubt that individuals who attended Residential Schools suffered, and continue to suffer, from the effects of their experiences, the tactic of pathologising these individuals, studying their condition, and offering "therapy" to them and their communities must be seen as another rhetorical maneuver designed to obscure (to the world at large, to Aboriginal Peoples, and to Canadians themselves) the moral and financial accountability of Euro-Canadian society in a continuing record of Crimes Against Humanity.
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The Components of White Culture: Values and Beliefs


Rugged Individualism:
Individual is primary unit
Individual has primary responsibility
Independence and autonomy highly valued and rewarded
Individual can control environment

Competition:
Winning is everything
Win/lose dichotomy

Action Orientation:
Must master and control nature
Must always do something about a situation
Pragmatic/utilitarian view of life

Communication:
Standard English
Written tradition
Direct eye contact
Limited physical contact
Control emotions

Time:
Adherence to rigid time
Time is viewed as a commodity

Holidays:
Based on Christian religion
Based on White history and male leaders

History:
Based on European immigrants' experience in the United States

Romanticize war

Protestant Work Ethic:
Working hard brings success

Progress & Future Orientation:
Plan for future
Delayed gratification
Value continual improvement and progress

Emphasis on Scientific Method:
Objective, rational, linear thinking
Cause and effect relationships
Quantitative emphasis

Status and Power:
Measured by economic possessions
Credentials, titles, and positions
Believe "own" system
Believe better than other systems

Owning goods, space, property

Family Structure:
Nuclear family is the ideal social unit
Male is breadwinner and the head of the household
Female is homemaker and subordinate to the husband

Patriarchal structure

Aesthetics:
Music and art based on European cultures
Women's beauty based on blonde, blue-eyed, thin, young
Men's attractiveness based on athletic ability, power, economic status

Religion:
Belief in Christianity
No tolerance for deviation from single god concept
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A definition of racism submitted by Dr. Helan Enoch Page

Racism is a global system of material and symbolic resource distribution management more comprehensively defined, in accordance with each of the following principles:

**Principle I.** Racism is an ideological, structural and historic stratification process by which the population of European descent, through its individual and institutional distress patterns, intentionally has been able to sustain, to its own best advantage, the dynamic mechanics of upward or downward mobility (of fluid status assignment) to the general disadvantage of the population designated as non-White (on a global scale), using skin color, gender, class, ethnicity or nonwestern nationality as the main indexical criteria used for enforcing differential resource allocation decisions that contribute to decisive changes in relative racial standing in ways most favoring the populations designated as 'White.'

**Principle II.** The aim of this peculiar post-1492 stratification process has been to aggregate an upwardly mobile and putatively 'White' racial group that is stratified internally and that strives to validate its own ascendency using a shifting range of 'White' cultural practices which are defined as 'White' not on any presumed biological basis, but on the basis of "ideological Whiteness"—a field of racial discourse and representation.

**Principle III.** The conceptual content of this historic and politically-charged discursive field is sustained by racial agents who in many ways articulate and justify the suppression of "ideological blackness" (and every form of non-Whiteness this may entail) which may be accomplished by many formal and informal means of institutional domination, routinized interpersonal interactions, cultural imperialism, or by any other racialized means of information control.

**Principle IV.** As a generative principle of racism, "ideological Whiteness" refers to a dual behavioral process entailing enactments of identify formation and resource access legitimation, both of which were practices once overtly recognized as aspects of "White supremacy", but which now may be more subtly and covertly reproduced as an observable and routine set of implicitly prescriptive, but explicitly disavowed White supremacist beliefs and practices to which all who identify as 'White' (or who behave as 'Whitened') are expected to adhere—especially White males—if they wish to maintain their own racial standing as members of these two privileged 'White' groups and assert their negotiable right to privileged resource access.

**Principle V.** Collectively, the 'White' and/or 'Whitened' members of this racially privileged global population tend to bolster their shared political intent to impose patterns of restricted resource access on racially subordinate populations, and aim to preserve their presumably non-negotiable right to prescribe, and even dictate, lessor resource access rights for certain upwardly mobile members of the 'non-White' population whose internalized racism, reliable complicity, and carefully scrutinized willingness to cooperate with racial dominates is always required and rewarded.

[This is an updated and extended 1999 version of a detailed definition of racism developed by Dr. Helan Enoch Page (Associate Professor, Anthropology Department, UMASS-Amherst) and distributed at the American Anthropological Association in 1993. This short manuscript has been cited in several publications including books, dissertations and will be cited soon in a forthcoming book by Pern Buck (1999 or 2000), called: "Work Your Fingers to the Bone: An Anthropological History of Whiteness and the Elite in Kentucky": Temple University Press. Anyone is free to use this definition as long as Dr. Page is credited for its development and for its influence on any analyses or practical program stemming from its use.]
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WRIAS Social Attitudes Scale
Janet E. Helms and Robert T. Carter

Instruction: This questionnaire is designed to measure people's attitudes about social and political issues. There are no right or wrong answers. Different people have different viewpoints. So try to be as honest as you can. Beside each statement circle the number that best describes how you feel. Use the scale below to respond to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(circle here)

1 2 3 4 5 1. I hardly think about what race I am.
1 2 3 4 5 2. I do not understand what Blacks want from Whites.
1 2 3 4 5 3. I get angry when I think about how Whites have been treated by Blacks.
1 2 3 4 5 4. I feel as comfortable around Blacks as I do around Whites.
1 2 3 4 5 5. I involve myself in causes regardless of the race of the people involved in them.
1 2 3 4 5 6. I find myself watching Black people to see what they are like.
1 2 3 4 5 7. I feel depressed after I have been around Black people.
1 2 3 4 5 8. There is nothing that I want to learn from Blacks.
1 2 3 4 5 9. I seek out new experiences even if I know a large number of Blacks will be involved in them.
1 2 3 4 5 10. I enjoy watching the different ways that Blacks and Whites approach life.
1 2 3 4 5 11. I wish I had a Black friend.
1 2 3 4 5 12. I do not feel that I have the social skills to interact with Black people effectively.
1 2 3 4 5 13. A Black person who tries to get close to you is usually after something.
1 2 3 4 5 14. When a Black person holds an opinion with which I disagree, I am not afraid to express my viewpoint.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>15. Sometimes jokes based on Black people's experiences are funny.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>16. I think it is exciting to discover the little ways in which Black people and White people are different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>17. I used to believe in racial integration, but now I have my doubts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>18. I'd rather socialize with Whites only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>19. In many ways Blacks and Whites are similar, but they are also different in some important ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>20. Blacks and Whites have much to learn from each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>21. For most of my life, I did not think about racial issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>22. I have come to believe that Black people and White people are very different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>23. White people have bent over backwards trying to make up for their ancestors' mistreatment of Blacks, now it is time to stop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>24. It is possible for Blacks and Whites to have meaningful social relationships with each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>25. I understand that White women and men must end racism in this country because White people created it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>26. I am curious to learn in what ways Black people and White people differ from each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>27. I limit myself to White activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>28. Society may have been unjust to Blacks, but it has also been unjust to Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>29. I am knowledgeable about which values Blacks and Whites share.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>30. I am comfortable wherever I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 31. In my family, we never talked about racial issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 32. When I must interact with a Black person, I usually let him or her make the first move.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 33. I feel hostile when I am around Blacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 34. I think I understand Black people's values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 35. Blacks and Whites can have successful intimate relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 36. I was raised to believe that people are people regardless of their race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 37. Nowadays, I go out of my way to avoid associating with Blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 38. I believe that Blacks are inferior to Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 39. I believe I know a lot about Black people's customs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 40. There are some valuable things that White people can learn from Blacks that they can't learn from other Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 41. I think that it's okay for Black people and White people to date each other as long as they don't marry each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 42. Sometimes I'm not sure what I think or feel about Black people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 43. When I am the only White in a group of Blacks, I feel anxious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 44. Blacks and Whites differ from each other in some ways, but neither race is superior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 45. I am not embarrassed to admit that I am White.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 46. I think White people should become more involved in socializing with Blacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 47. I don't understand why Black people blame all White people for their social misfortune.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel comfortable talking to Blacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I value the relationships that I have with my Black friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Pack-Brown, 1999, pp. 89-90)

1. Contact stage (status). They are aware of and naively curious about whether racial differences actually exist. They superficially recognize their personal Whiteness, yet more often than not, fail to perceive themselves as "racial beings." Thus, students in the contact stage are limited in ability to recognize their participation in racism.

IPS for White counseling students--obliviousness--is as follows:
I'm White, and Whites have experienced discrimination too. If we work hard and do what we need to do to succeed, we get ahead. Others should do the same and stop complaining. If Whites complained as much as Blacks, for example, we'd be called whiners. To get ahead, Blacks should ignore things they can't control and take control of things they can. If they did this, they'd get ahead too, I did.

2. Disintegration stage (status). They see themselves as White and acknowledge the existence of discrimination and prejudice. However, as White persons belonging to a racial group known as the "oppressor," they often feel (a) guilty when racial differences emerge and (b) disoriented and anxious when seemingly unresolvable moral dilemmas force them to choose between loyalty to the White race and humanism. Subsequent consequences include the fear of alienation by other Whites. This fear navigates personal beliefs about fighting or not fighting racism.

IPS for White counseling students--suppression and ambivalence--is as follows:
I am torn between speaking up against racism when my White friends make racial jokes or slurs. I think things such as, they may not understand what I'm doing if I speak up; they may laugh at me (as if my speaking up is a joke or something) while I'm seriously sharing my discomfort with their racial jokes; or they may call me names, such as "nigger," which makes me angry and even more uncomfortable in their presence. So I just shut up or try to change the subject. It's even more difficult to tell my parents that I don't want them to continue to make racist remarks about a particular racial group, when in fact, on campus my best friend is of another racial group.

3. Reintegration stage (status). They idealize their socio-racial group and believe that Whites are superior and other racial groups are inferior. However, a significant life experience (e.g., falling in love with a person from another racial group) could promote a redefinition of this superior/inferior mentality and move a White student into the pseudo-independent stage (status).

IPS for White counseling students--elective perception and negative out-group distortion--is as follows:
I can't be held responsible for the history of White people! I never discriminated against non-Whites, and I get angry when people won't see me for the person that I am; instead, they see me as a White person who historically discriminated against people of color.

4. Pseudo-independence stage (status). They intellectualize their commitments to the White race and deceptively tolerate other racial groups. Underlying their intellectual commitment lies strong negative feelings around racial issues (e.g., fear of Blacks). Their primary goal is to rid
themselves of racism and move toward a positive White identity. During this movement, the
decision to counsel and help other racial groups may be made with a different commitment than
in other stages. This decision may be cathartic for White student counselors because they engage
in behaviours that allow the release of intense and pent-up feelings around racial issues.

**IPS for White counseling students--reshaping reality and selective perception--**is as follows:
I believe Black men are just as trustworthy as White men. But the other day I was in the elevator
and a Black man got on the elevator and stood beside me. Before I knew it, I had grabbed my
purse and gently put it under my arm. This surprised me! When I thought about it I became so
angry at myself. After all, I thought I was a culturally sensitive person. I found out that I was not
as advanced in cultural sensitivity as I thought, behind my words lies some strong feelings that
will influence my work, particularly with Black men.

5. **Immersion/emersion stage (status).** They search for increased understanding of their
meaning of racism and inherent personal benefits. These students attempt to redefine their
Whiteness. In doing so, they may become racial advocates in their personal life choices and in
counseling.

**IPS for White counseling students--hypervigilance and reshaping--**is as follows:
I know that because I am White I have specific privileges that other races do not have. It is
important for me to consider the life experiences and opportunities of other races and how I, as a
White person and White counselor, may interpret these experiences. When I hear or see
injustices, I recognize the importance of my becoming an advocate for my clients of color. I also
have to identify ways to assist these clients in coping more effectively with their experiences of
racism.

6. **Autonomy stage (status).** They are motivated to educate themselves about their personal
Whiteness and they do so by revising their internal definition of what it means to be White. In
addition, they are motivated to develop a new capacity to let go of the privileges of racism. For
them, oppression of non-Whites is defunct, and they avoid life choices that require racial
oppression. They have a newfound commitment to informed positive socioracial groups.

**IPS for White counseling students--flexibility and complexity--**is as follows:
Although I grew up in a predominantly White community, I have learned, as a result of my
formal and informal education and educational experiences, to value and appreciate participation
in integrated social functions and living situations. It's become important for me to gather
accurate information about racially different clients by interacting with positive and natural
support systems within the communities of the racial clients I may serve--systems such as
churches, Greek organizations, and community centers. I believe that ethical and professional
White counselors who are sincere about sensitively and competently serving all clients must do
the same. More important, I will do all that I can to encourage such behaviour.
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Kohlberg’s Stages of Moral Development
(from Crain, 1992)

Level 1. Preconventional Morality

Stage 1. Obedience and punishment orientation- people at this stage unquestioningly obey authority and see morality as external to the self.

Stage 2. Individualism and exchange- people at this stage see the world in relative terms, that people have different viewpoints and that people are free to pursue their individual interests. They believe in the notion of fair exchange. Family and community are not priorities.

Level 2. Conventional Morality

Stage 3. Good interpersonal relationships- people at this stage believe that all people should value family and community, have good motives and have interpersonal feelings such as love, empathy, trust and concern for others.

Stage 4. Maintaining the social order- concerned with society as a whole, people at this stage believe in maintaining the status quo. They value obeying laws, respecting authority, and performing one’s duties so that the social order is maintained.

Level 3. Postconventional Morality

Stage 5. Social contract and individual rights- people at this stage have a philosophical and intellectual view of society. They question and think independently about the rights and values of a ‘good society.’ They belief that a good society is a ‘social contract.’ They recognize that people have different values but all want basic rights and democratic process.

Stage 6. Universal principles- people at this stage believe that democratic processes are not a panacea and may conflict with one’s intuitive sense of justice. They see that the underlying principles of justice require us to treat the claims of all parties impartially and respect the basic dignity of all people. Ghandi and Martin Luther King are examples of people at this stage. Kohlberg called this a theoretical stage because he found very few who consistently reasoned at this stage.
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Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson’s (1994) Model of White Racial Consciousness

Unachieved

Avoidant: lack of consideration of one’s own White identity as well as avoidance of concern for racial/ethnic issues (similar to Erikson’s diffuse identity status).

Dependent: appear to have committed to a set of attitudes, they have not considered possible alternative perspectives (similar to Erikson’s foreclosed identity status).

Dissonant: uncertain about their sense of White racial consciousness and racial/ethnic minority issues, commonly the result of dissonance generated by the conflict between previously held attitudes and recent experiential incidents.

Achieved

Dominative: strong ethnocentric perspective, which justifies the dominance of racial/ethnic minority peoples by the majority culture, anger, fear, hostility toward minorities

Conflictive: opposed to obvious, clearly discriminatory practices, yet are usually opposed to any program or procedure that has been designed to reduce or eliminate discrimination, fear, indignation, disgust

Reactive: aware of and sensitive to racial/ethnic discrimination, feel they have much in common with racial/ethnic minorities, have a romantic idea of the minority group they identify with, anger at Whites, guilt and shame

Integrative: pragmatic view of racial/ethnic minority issues, based on moral responsibility, do not oppress or idealize, do not react out of anger, are not held hostage by guilt, have a more complex or sophisticated understanding of the sociopolitical factors affecting racial/ethnic minority issues, comfortable with their whiteness, comfortable interacting with racial/ethnic minority people.
Your story will contribute to the knowledge and education of counsellors who work with aboriginal people.

Our private and confidential interview is scheduled for (date & time) at (place). It will take about an hour depending on how much you wish to share. You will be asked to fill out a brief questionnaire and participate in an interview. I will be making an audio recording of our interview. You should only share what you are comfortable with.

Please take a few moments prior to our interview to reflect upon the following questions:

*What was it like being ‘White’ in an aboriginal community?*

*How has your identity as a ‘White’ person changed over time?*

Again, thank you for participating in this project with me. I am looking forward to listening to your story.

Yours truly,

Glen Manery.
Describe your ancestral origins including parents and grandparents:

Briefly describe your involvement with a native community. Include your role in the community, how long you spent there, what kinds of relationships you had, etc.

By completing this questionnaire you have given your consent to use this information in this research project. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire. Your identity will be kept completely confidential. The master list linking your identity to the information you provide will be kept under lock and key in the Department of Counselling Psychology at UBC.
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Mantegazza’s Taxonomy of Races

(McClintock, 1995)
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Identity development

Erik Erikson (1968) is commonly credited as being the major influence on the field of human development (Anderson, 1997) and his theories are a cornerstone of the developmental aspect of WRID. His influence is so great that The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology (Reber, 1985) has no definition for identity development per se but instead defines Erikson’s ‘identity formation.’ Erikson conceived ‘identity formation’ to be the major psychological task of life involving the rejection of previous “…more primitive identifications and influences…”(Reber, 1985, p. 341) and the integration of identity fragments into a flexible, complex, integrated, interactive system (Wurgaft, 1995).

Erikson’s theory of development depicts the following four potential ego identity statuses: (a) diffuse: neither engaged in exploration nor made a commitment, (b) foreclosed: commitment without exploration, (c) moratorium: in process of exploration and (d) achieved identity: firm commitment after period of exploration (Crain, 1992). The moratorium or crisis phase of development is a time when individuals re-examine and evaluate their childhood identifications and explore their own interests, abilities, and options. A secure identity is achieved after one has thought through for oneself and made commitments in a variety of areas (e.g., ideology, occupation, lifestyle); these commitments then serve as guides for future decisions.

The classic developmental theories of Gesell (sensory-motor), Piaget (cognitive), Kohlberg (moral), Freud (psychosexual) and Erikson (psychosocial) are stage theories. Stage theories can be classified as either maturational (biological, no interaction with environment) or interactionist (Reber, 1985). A stage developmental theory must meet the following criteria in order to be considered scientifically adequate:

1. **Temporality:** it must predict qualitative differences in behaviour over time and experience (Green, 1989; Reber, 1985).

2. **Directionality or sequence:** stages must be progressive, relatively durable and irreversible, they must be experienced in the same order by each individual even though individuals may progress at different rates at different times (Crain, 1992; Green, 1989; Reber, 1985).

3. **Structural cohesiveness:** the phenomena, properties or behaviours at each stage must be conceptually linked and organized into a mode that is qualitatively different from previous stages (Green, 1989; Reber, 1985).
4. **Hierarchical integration or cumulativity**: each stage must incorporate a new feature (or features) and expand upon earlier stages (Crain, 1992; Green, 1989; Reber, 1985).

5. **Increased capacity for self-control**: people at higher stages must become more proactive and less reactive, increasing their capacity for self-control (Green, 1989).

6. **Dialectics**: the process of change must be one in which new conflicting information (antithesis) competes with existing knowledge (thesis) and results in a new perspective (synthesis). Piaget called this process 'equilibration' and Kohlberg called it 'cognitive conflict'. Kohlberg claimed that developmental stages were neither genetically nor socially determined but rather emerged from critical thinking about moral problems (Crain, 1992).

Sue and Sue (1990) believe that developmental theories are helpful to psychotherapists in working with their clients. However, on what grounds, other than clinical experience, do we trust the validity of developmental theories? The sequential aspect of stages is, in general, empirically supported in the case of Piaget’s cognitive theory and somewhat supported Kohlberg’s moral stages (Crain, 1992). Marcia (1966), who operationalized and constructed measures of Erikson’s identity statuses (see Appendix 2), found relationships between the Erikson’s statuses and Kohlberg’s stages of moral development. There is some empirical evidence for Kohlberg’s theory that moral developmental stages are hierarchically integrated. There is also some empirical support for the claim that moral behaviour is more consistent, predictable and responsible at the higher stages because the stages themselves increasingly employ more stable and general standards (Crain, 1992).

The stage developmental hypothesis, however, has its weaknesses. First, hierarchic integration does not seem to characterize development at all of Erikson’s stages. The requirements of biological maturation and social expectations force the person to face the issues of a new stage regardless of the outcome of each previous stage. Second, Kohlberg’s stages have been criticized for being gender and culturally biased (Gilligan, 1982; Crain, 1992) and therefore limited in their predictive powers. Kohlberg’s work was based on research done with young males in the United States and has an individualistic, absolutist and justice-oriented slant on moral development. Gilligan’s work, on the other hand, is seen as more feminine and emphasizes a relational, relativistic and care-oriented view of moral development. Gilligan’s model is more similar to the moral structures and processes of African (Verhoef & Michel, 1997) and aboriginal communities.
Another criticism of classical developmental theories is that they are linear. Wehrly (1995), observing that change seems to occur in cycles of small increments and regressions, suggested that spiral models of development are perhaps more realistic.

Postmodernists have criticized theories of identity formation like Erikson's for portraying a fixed notion of identity and a process more pat and cohesive than the actual complexity of psychic experience. Wurgaft (1995), however, rebuts this by noting how Erikson's work recognizes the ideal of the wholeness of identity and the 'centrifugal forces' that threaten its cohesion.

Robert Kegan (1994) proposed a developmental theory in which the five levels of development culminate in a postmodern worldview. The first two levels have to do with childhood and adolescence. The next three levels he calls traditionalist, modern and postmodern. The traditionalist and modern levels are similar to the two highest levels in Kohlberg's system. People at the traditionalist level rely on an unambiguous measure of morality provided by authorities such as lawmakers. At the modern level, people reorganize their worldviews by questioning their assumptions and recognizing they have some choice and responsibility in matters. At the postmodern level, people realize that values and beliefs are constructed and fictive. People become more accepting of conflict "...as an ever-present opportunity for growth and change rather than as a deviation from some 'normal' situation in which it is a problem to be solved" (Anderson, 1997, p. 169). Kegan's model may give the false impression that postmodernists value their view over others. On the contrary, postmodernists value open consideration of all views. As Gergen (1994) states,

Postmodernist thought does not operate as another totalitarian discourse, ruling out certain ways of speaking or acting in favour of others. Rather, it operates as an invitation to reflexivity, encouraging one to consider all propositional realities and dictates as local, provisional, and political (p. 414).

Despite Kegan's model, postmodernists do not generally subscribe to stage models of development. Rather than fitting people into predetermined stages, they see people engaging in "identity work" (Storrs, 1999), rearticulating meanings in negotiation with larger social influences using narratives, symbols and processes to inform themselves and others of their identity(s).
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Interpretation of the Biblical story of Ham

The story tells how Noah after the flood got drunk and passed out naked in his tent. "On emerging from his oblivion, Noah learned that his youngest son, Ham, had seen him naked.... Noah responded by cursing the progeny of Ham's son, Canaan, saying, 'A slave of slaves shall he be to his brothers'" (Gourevitch, 1998, p. 51) and banished him to Africa. The story has been interpreted to mean that, of the three sons who founded the three branches of mankind, Ham was the original 'Black' man. This interpretation was used by colonial powers as a justification for slavery.
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Wordstat dendrogram of co-occurrences of word categories across all participants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacategory</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions and meanings of whiteness and aboriginalness</td>
<td>WHITE IS...</td>
<td>whites have more power privilege opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites had more power privilege opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more passive powerless naive and self-victimized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more direct and assertive than natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more achievement/education/career oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites linear rational structured compartmentalized time-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites future-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means constant activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites nuclear families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more materialistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means capitalism/socioeconomic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>western culture white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites talk more and faster than natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more uncomfortable with silence socially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white is Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic is white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means urban living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other whites had noble savage notions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites gender-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white society means freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prejudice and racism inherent in white culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means being oblivious to racial injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means nerdy and uptight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means less compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means spiteful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites more smug/arrogant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites missing something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means bland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites lack moral depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white means evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites less comfortable with themselves than non-whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>honky means thick-headed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites higher anxiety level than natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites erratic temperament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadians (whites) satirize own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you're not white if you have non-white ancestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spirituality not part of conversations with whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites not accepted by native community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whites not as eloquent as natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>native eloquence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>natives grounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>natives many successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>natives located in emotional cocoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHITE IS NOT...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITE IS NOT...</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you're not white if you have non-white ancestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spirituality not part of conversations with whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whites not accepted by native community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whites not as eloquent as natives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE ABORIGINAL ATTRIBUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE ABORIGINAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>native eloquence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natives grounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natives many successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natives located in emotional cocoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own and others' relationships to whiteness, aboriginalness and otherness</td>
<td>SOME WHITES THINK THEY ARE SUPERIOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native students get special treatment</td>
<td>natives dispirited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent and process of personal change</td>
<td>I WAS NAIVE ABOUT RACIAL ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLORING MY WHITENESS</td>
<td>I explored my whiteness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>I disagree with multiculturalism policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I value diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL IDENTITY IS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>cultural identity important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I REJECT RACIAL CATEGORIZATION OF PEOPLE</td>
<td>I do not like being categorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I TRY TO BE OPEN TO OTHERNESS</td>
<td>I try to be open to otherness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I DID NOT OVERIDENTIFY WITH NATIVES</td>
<td>I didn’t overidentify with Nativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>residential schools not all bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential school maltreated natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I VALUE FITTING IN WITH MAJORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>its easier if you look similar to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it is natural to be socially attracted to one's own race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we all have to learn to get along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I HAVE EGALITARIAN VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I RESPECT NATIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I WISH(ED) I WAS NATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY RACE/CULTURE IS NOT MY TRUE IDENTITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE PERSONAL RELATIONS WITH NATIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLOSE PERSONAL RELATIONS WITH NATIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I WAS ACCEPTED BY NATIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE GUILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white guilt is necessary, important yet uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white guilt is unhelpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't feel white guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt white guilt/embarrassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel white guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white guilt described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt egalitarian values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I VALUE FITTING IN WITH MAJORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>its easier if you look similar to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it is natural to be socially attracted to one's own race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we all have to learn to get along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I WAS SIMILAR TO MOST WHITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I AM NOT LIKE MOST WHITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I AM SEEN AS WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I AM AWARE OF OTHERS' RACISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RACISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OWN RACISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I COME FROM A PREDOMINANTLY WHITE WORLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I AM SIMILAR TO OTHER WHITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am exploring my whiteness</td>
<td>I want to explore my whiteness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know what I do that makes me white</td>
<td>I haven’t changed internally as a white person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE IDENTITY UNCHANGED</td>
<td>it's difficult to escape your original identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ONCE WANTED TO HELP NATIVES ACHIEVE</td>
<td>I once wanted to help natives achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEING IN NATIVE COMMUNITY CHANGED THINGS FOR ME</td>
<td>being in native community changed things for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to effect positive social change</td>
<td>I TRY TO EFFECT POSITIVE SOCIAL CHANGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>