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ABSTRACT

MENTAL HEALTH CARE AT THE MARGINS: A CRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICE IN AN INNER CITY COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SETTING

By

Katy A. Sampson

December 2009

Dissertation supervised by Leswin Laubscher

Within the past several decades, the field of psychology has attempted to improve psychological services for a greater diversity of people. However, despite these attempts, research continues to document a “gap” when it comes to mental health care services for marginalized populations. Various studies have addressed the issue of this “gap” in mental health care; however, most adhere to positivist assumptions regarding sociocultural aspects of experience, understanding culture and identity as immutable qualities existing within individuals, rather than as an interpersonal phenomenon that is negotiated between and among people and institutions. As a result of these assumptions, many past studies do not take into account this dynamic aspect of culture and the way in which it plays out within psychotherapeutic environments. In an effort to shed some light on the nuances and challenges of socioculturally sensitive practice, the current study utilized an ethnographic method in order to explore the practice of clinicians who were
attempting to offer psychological care to a marginalized population. Results
demonstrated that both psychologists and clients are caught up in a “web” of systems and
identifications which impact the provision of psychological services. These findings
support the notion that psychologists may benefit from expanding the traditional
scientific lens when it comes to exploring issues of culture in psychotherapy, particularly
when it comes to addressing the gap in services to marginalized groups.
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INTRODUCTION

Three years ago, I worked as a student clinician in an inner city community mental health center, located in a Northeastern city in a largely African American community. At this center I observed a distinctly community oriented model that was shaped by, and interwoven into, the local history, customs, values systems, and struggles of the community. At times psychologists at the center seemed to be consciously trying to incorporate these sociocultural concerns into their practice, at other times their attention to culture was more implicit as they worked, embodying what appeared to be contextualized understandings of clients’ experiences, relationships, and their own practice. I observed that this community model operated according to principles very much in line with traditional community psychology, such as an emphasis on the importance of contextualization, consideration of power and its effects, concern for social justice, and a particular interest in marginalized populations. These principles of course played out in ways specific to the particular geographic, historical, cultural and political context in which this community clinic was located (a lower income, urban, largely African American neighborhood). Given the complexity of the clinical work at this “Center”, my interest was piqued and I began to scour the community mental health literature to help me understand what was happening at the Center and to relate what others have found to practice at this particular Center.
After reviewing much of the current and extant literature around issues of culture and community in Western psychology, at least one thing was clear – the field is still struggling to find ways to understand and address the “social” workings of human experiences (Kitayama & Markus, 2000). Diversity and difference are often recognized as important considerations in contemporary psychological literature; however, the translation of such considerations to community-based clinical practice has not only been wrought with difficulty, but has been few and far between. Indeed, a paucity of research, especially qualitative empirical inquiries, offers little guidance. To compound matters, the few research studies and initiatives that do exist, are often so reductionistic and dismissive or ignorant of the complexity of culturally oriented community practices, as to offer little more than formulaic aphorisms incapable of any substantial praxis translation. That said, many (mostly quantitative) studies have documented a “gap” in psychological services when it comes to “diverse” groups (often “diverse” in these studies refers most broadly to people living in poverty in both rural and urban neighborhoods) (see Atkinson, Morten & Sue, 1998; Chow, Jafee, and Snowden, 2003; Snowden, 2005; Stevenson, 2001). Framing the problem or “gap” as resulting from practical “obstacles” such as lack of insurance coverage, inability to obtain affordable childcare, or transportation (Chow, Jafee, and Snowden 2003), many of these studies challenge psychologists to address this “gap.” Almost never, however, is this supposed “gap,” or the challenge of a response, understood or argued in terms of how psychological services may be set up and delivered in ways that do not address these concerns, or may in fact be complicit in its very existence.
A similar tension or paradox as suggested in the previous paragraph is also evident with respect to the importance of community and culture. On the one hand, within the field of psychology there is a hue and cry for sensitivity to issues of community and culture, but on the other hand, researchers have also suggested that when individuals rely on “cultural(ly) sanctioned explanations for illness” it creates an obstacle to their motivation to seek western medical/psychiatric treatment (Chow, Jafee, and Snowden 2003). According to conclusions based on these studies, local, spiritual, or cultural understandings of illness are constructed as being at odds with, and even “obstacles” to, traditional western medical/psychological understandings of illness.

Despite the call for improvement in culturally appropriate psychological practice based on findings from these past studies, such statements regarding a person’s reliance on “culturally sanctioned beliefs” imply that cultural norms are still seen as “obstacles” that impinge upon what would otherwise be helpful treatment. Prilleltensky (2002) has also commented on a similar issue, noting that, “if a client does not fit the [psychological] paradigm, the generalizability of the theory is not questioned, but rather the ability of the client to have a valid experience is contested” (p. 1149). Although most contemporary psychologists would probably not explicitly devalue culturally or religiously sanctioned beliefs, such a devaluing can happen in more covert and insidious ways; for example when a client is considered to be “concrete” or “not insightful” given their tendency to understand their experiences in non-psychological (e.g. culturally sanctioned or religious) terms (Prilleltensky, 2002).

The field of psychology has historically been concerned with the functioning of individuals (rather than groups) and this focus has made it difficult for the field to
understand and intervene with people in more socially contextualized ways. On the other hand, the subfield of community psychology offers a synthesis of psychological and social considerations, including issues of social position and power. Community psychology as described by Lewin (1951) (who has sometimes been identified as the originator of community psychology) represented a social psychology that could study the articulation of both the individual and the collective, or what Durkheim called the “socio-psychical” (Durkheim, 1933). Following from this history, community psychologists have continued to understand much subjectively felt and behavioral phenomena in social terms – as symptoms of systemic disarray. Over the years, community psychology has become a broad field and has found expression in very diverse contexts around the world. At times community psychology is closely aligned with sociopolitical movements and action research and activism; at other times, and commonly in the United States, community psychology finds expression in more clinical realms such as public psychology clinics (Orford, 2008). However, at least one commonality is threaded throughout the various forms of community psychology: a concern for what has been termed the “macro-social” level of experience and a critique of traditional psychology for neglecting this dimension (Prilleltensky, 1994). Prilleltensky (1994), a contemporary community psychology pioneer and advocate, suggests that clinical psychologists in particular have typically tended to “dissociate” their clients from “wider systems of society that share her or his behavior extensively, thus creating an ahistorical and asocial image of individuals” (p.102) On the other hand, although Prilleltensky (1994) argues for community psychology as a legitimate alternative to overly individualized psychological practice, he also observes that community
psychology has room for improvement when it comes to really applying their theories, understanding the experiential dimension of various social conditions/positions, and involving themselves in the political arena. As such, one of the first aims of this study is to examine psychological practice in one particular community clinic for the obstacles and innovations in culturally oriented community practice.

Outside of the field of community psychology, much has been written about diversity in general and the need to incorporate issues of difference in clinical practice (Atkison, Morten, & Sue, 1998; Kitayama & Markus, 2000; Sampson, 1993b; Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis, 1992). Some diversity considerations have arisen from traditional quantitative survey research and other considerations have arisen from personal narratives, qualitative studies, and philosophical/political theory. Much of the mainstream multicultural psychology literature has focused on defining social categories such as race, class, gender, ethnicity, etc. and critiquing past research, personality models, testing, and understandings of psychopathology for its’ Eurocentric, masculine bias (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998; Sue, 1998; ). Despite multicultural psychology’s emphasis on these important issues, most research tends to focus more on the quantitative study of social categories still defined according to positivistic and often individualistic standards rather than exploring their function, meaning, and construction (Cosgrove, 1995). Multicultural empirical research regarding culturally sensitive practice tends to focus on psychologists’ adherence to “cultural competency” models, and/or manipulating various variables, such as client and therapist ethnic or racial “matching” and measuring effectiveness of psychotherapy in those instances (this issue will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 1) (Gamst, Der-Karabedian, & Kramer, 2000; Maramba & Hall, 2002;
Sue, 1998; Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis, 1992). Although such studies may provide some insight into diversity issues in practice, they still do not address the larger systemic issues that permeate the practice of psychotherapy, nor do they typically take an interpersonal, dynamic approach when understanding culture/race/ethnicity in the first place.

Various psychologists who work within a multicultural or community framework have begun to adopt more critical ways of looking at diversity which has helped to shed some light on why it continues to be difficult for psychologists to effectively take culture and community into consideration in clinical practice (e.g. Altman, 1995; Javier, 1996; Prilleltensky, 1994; Smith, 2005; Sonn, 2004). Also, many academic theorists from fields such as anthropology, philosophy, feminism, and critical race theory have emphasized a more dynamic, intersubjective conceptualization of social identity that incorporates issues of diversity, difference and/or power (e.g. Butler, 1990, 1993, 1997; Foucault, 1978; hooks, 1990; Geertz, 1973, 1983; Shweder, 1991).

Despite all of the theory and research regarding diversity issues, very few texts and research actually look at what happens or how the question of diversity is answered at the level of actual clinical practice. Therefore, a second aim of the current study is to respond to the question of diversity by examining and staying close to the sphere of actual clinical practice. I will draw from a few qualitative studies such as the self-reflexive narratives of community psychologists included in Altman’s (1995) and Smith’s (2005) reflections on their clinical work in urban community clinics. I will also draw from qualitative studies conducted by James and Prilleltensky (2002) - research which sought to explore integrated community practice and constructions of community by
interviewing and observing practitioners – as well as research by Gubrium (1992) and Bloor, McKeeganey, and Fonkert (1988) whose ethnographic studies explored some of the systemic concerns related to residential psychiatric services, psychiatric hospital care, and family therapy respectively.

The current study seeks to broaden the scope of prior research by including a consideration of the system of care within which psychology is practiced as well as analyzing the way that issues of power, identity, and culture are integrated into practice in a specific clinical setting. More specifically, this research is an attempt to explore one clinic’s attempt at providing culturally informed, locally situated, community oriented psychological care at an inner city community mental health clinic (which I will refer to as “the Center”). In this account, I am concerned with how clinicians at the Center – who provide psychological care to a mostly African American community living in a lower-income urban neighborhood – have approached and articulated their work. Not only could it be argued that these clinicians “do” community psychology by virtue of the organization and aims of psychological practice at the Center, but the clinicians self-identify as community psychologists as well. I am also interested in articulating the larger social, cultural, and historical frame within which clinical work is situated as it assumes that cultural context and psychological practice shape and inform one another continually. In doing so, I hope to provide a glimpse into the workings of community psychologists at the level of everyday practice, and also show how community psychologists are already embodying many of the tenets of multiculturalism that traditional psychology is still struggling to translate into practice. Of course, the study
will also remain attuned to ways in which multiculturalism in practice – even in community psychology practice - may be obstructed, constrained, or otherwise limited.

This study is motivated by questions that arose for me during my own clinical work at “the Center,” by interests/concerns of staff at the Center, and by current debates in the field regarding issues of race, class and social inequality in psychotherapy. By conducting an ethnographic account of psychological practice that is tailored to a specific, typically “underserved” population, I hope to contribute to psychologists’ understandings of the integral role of race, class, and culture in clinical practice and the everyday challenges of addressing social issues in the psychotherapeutic endeavor.

Furthermore, I articulate and explore the dialectical relationship between the social and the psychological, practitioner and practice; self and other (such views are prevalent in Shweder’s (1991) theory of cultural psychology). I will pay particular attention to power from a Foucaultian perspective and incorporate some of Butler’s consideration of the issue of power.

As mentioned before, many theorists, several from outside of the field of psychology, have explored questions about culture, diversity and difference in psychology and as such I seek to draw upon them in this study. Given my interest in investigating the many facets/challenges of community psychology and its expression within a particular context, as well as my specific interest in diversity, qualitative research methods seemed a most well-suited vehicle towards achieving these aims. In addition, community psychology literature supports the use of qualitative methods as most appropriate to exploring the practice of community psychology and other topics within this field (Orford, 2008). I use interpretive ethnographic methods to explore
diversity and power issues as they are integrated into psychological practice as well as to explore the culture, systems of meaning, and social forces that shape the everyday practices of the Center. Much interpretive ethnography, which is influenced by interpretive and post-modern theory, draws from the works of Clifford Geertz (1973, 1983) and James Clifford (1986) and I, too, will draw from the works of these two theorists in my method. Interpretive ethnography embodies several characteristics that are compatible with aims of the current research, namely a critique of modernist/realist interpretations, a critique of the notion of a value-neutral observer, and an emphasis on self-reflection and incorporating the voices of participants in the written ethnographic. Although Geertz (1973) and Clifford (1986) differ on some points (which I will review in detail in my method section), they both view culture as existing in the intersubjective field of meaning between persons. In other words, culture does not exist independently “out there”; rather it is dialectically constituted between persons. I will use a contemporary interpretive approach drawn from hermeneutics, social constructionism, and ethnography to analyze my interview transcripts, participant-observations and field notes.

To summarize: this study is located at the place where my own personal and professional background, academic theory, and the actual community mental health center – in space, history and as a data source - come together around the research focus: a focus which itself arose from a joint relation between my experience there, the expressed needs of the staff, and the center as spacing (in time and experience). In providing this narrative, some constraints or qualifications are noted. For example, clients will be presented only as they were understood by staff in order to protect their right to
confidentiality and preserve the focus of the current study on clinician’s practice and understandings. I do not therefore claim to provide a voice for clients in this study, nor a portrayal of how they might view the system. In addition, I did not observe other clinicians individual psychotherapy sessions with clients for similar reasons. However, I did draw from my own experience working individually and in groups with clients, and I was privy to numerous interactions between staff and clients throughout my work/research at the Center.

Despite the constraints mentioned above, the current research has the potential to contribute new insights and understandings to the field of psychology. First, considering the current emphasis in the field on developing “culturally competent” care that incorporates considerations of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc., it seems important to analyze psychological practice in a setting in which diversity issues are explicitly recognized and incorporated into practice. It is imperative for psychologists to continue to be self-reflexive about how current trends are operating in the field and what it means to address sociocultural issues from a psychological perspective. Second, psychologists participating in the current study incorporate race and class into their understandings of clients’ situations, but most of them have also considered how their own cultural identifications, with particular respect to race, class, and gender, shape their own experiences both personally and professionally. This study hopes to highlight the various narratives in which such work is situated and within which diversity issues and struggles play out through psychological practice. Third, after completing a literature review, the number of studies that focus on clinical practice holistically in all of its complexity are few, and those that specifically focus on community orientated inner city
work are even fewer. The current research can thus add to this small but important and growing body of literature. Lastly, many studies regarding mental health care with marginalized populations have documented that social minorities (including people of color and the poor) often either “underutilize” psychological services or are provided with “inadequate” services that are not culturally appropriate. In this study, I focus on an exception to these findings in a clinic where typically “underserved” clients represent the majority and presumably, therapists are finding a way to meet their needs.

This dissertation is organized in the following way: first, a literature review is provided to situate the subject at hand within the larger socio-cultural and academic context and present the variety of points made within both theory and research regarding “underutilization” of psychological services among marginalized populations. Second, I provide an orientation to the field of community psychology and consider the implications of community interfacing with the clinic (as in the case with community mental health care). Third, multiculturalism and psychotherapy with marginalized populations will be considered. I will discuss a variety of quantitative and qualitative studies on the topic incorporating a critical discussion of issues presented and providing an argument for the use of critical/ethnographic methods to explore the topic at hand. Fourth, I outline an argument for my choice of methods which draws heavily from interpretive ethnographic methods, more specifically, critical ethnographic methods and hermeneutics. I also describe my stance when analyzing data which incorporates deconstructive, interpretive/hermeneutic, and more general critical theory. In keeping with these theoretical and methodological positions, I attempt to maintain a self-reflexive stance as researcher throughout my analysis. I will explain when and in what way I
incorporate each of these approaches. Last, I will provide some possible conclusions based on my interpretations of the data and offer some discussion of the research process and points for further research.

I take as my point of departure the idea that in order for psychotherapy theory to progress, insight into the real everyday clinical work of psychologists is necessary. I aim to examine the dynamic nature of psychological practice incorporating social, historical, and economic considerations. My account will inevitably be partial – bound to subjective telling of the story as well as to the particular socio-historical moment in an otherwise long history of the Center. Nevertheless, it is a story worth telling in the name of gaining deeper understanding of what psychologists face when attempting to provide ethical and appropriate care to marginalized populations in the United States.
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Clinical psychology has traditionally been concerned with the study of the individual psyche, conceptualized as an individualized phenomenon existing as separate from social context. This conceptualization is consistent with modern conceptions of the individual as a self-contained, unified entity that exists separately from others. Although there is nothing inherently problematic about this conceptualization of psyche and/or the individual (assuming, for the moment, an equivalence of sorts between those terms), Hall (2005) suggests that “in order to fully understand human behavior, individuals must be studied in context” (p.787). Others from outside of the field of psychology, such as Geertz (1979), observed that the idea of the self-contained individual, although dominant in Western cultures, is a peculiarity to many other cultures in the world where the self is understood in relation to others, as embedded within a social matrix. Geertz’ observation poses an obvious challenge to the applicability of traditional Western psychological understandings of experience in non-Western cultures and countries. Less obvious, however, is the fact that Geertz observation is as appropriate and challenging within a heterogeneous, multicultural society such as the United States.

Aside from the limitations of cultural applicability or generalizability, however, an overly individualized approach to clinical work may not only be limited with respect to questions of effectiveness, but may actually perpetuate an oppressive sociopolitical status quo. Sampson (1993) argues that when we venerate the self-contained self, particularly within a context of domination and unequal power relations, we often
celebrate it at the expense of a denigrated other; we not only honor the self but define it in terms of what it is not – the other. Several authors (e.g. Prilleltensky, 1994; Sampson, 1993; Sue 1998) have identified a dominant reference standard in Euro-America, namely that of the white, male, heterosexual, middle-class person. Against this dominant standard, marginal others include people of color, women, sexual minorities, and working class poor, constructed negatively in relation to the dominant group and in the service of that group’s particular needs, values, and points of view. Arguments presented by numerous theorists, including Hall (2005), Prilleltensky (1994); Sampson(1993) and Sonn (2004) (among others) imply and often clearly recommend that effective psychological care needs to address and incorporate a consideration of social identities and the power matrices in which they are embedded in order to improve psychological care and better serve society.

Whereas the conception of the self as self-in-community finds resonance in a number of traditions outside of psychology, such as sociology (and social work), feminism, contemporary anthropology, and cultural studies to name a few, it is also true that there are pockets of support for this notion within psychology itself (e.g. Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Clifford, 1986; Geertz, 1973; Hillery, 1955; Sarason, 1974; Swenson, 2006). The idea of “self-in-community” expands notions of “self-in-relation,” emphasized by object-relations and other relationally oriented psychologies (e.g. Fairbairn, 1952; Klein, 1964; Winnicott, 1965) which focus on connection and individuation in smaller units such as dyads or families. Such relational conceptualizations of self have implications for the clinical practice of psychology when considering cultural or social aspects of identity. Bruner (1990) argued that human
psychology based on the individual alone was an impossibility, and that psychologists must study shared meanings, discourse, and concepts in order to understand our culturally adapted way of life. But the question remains as to how such ideas might be incorporated into clinical practice and what issues might arise when clinicians attempt to integrate the social with the psychological.

As a field, community psychology has historically been concerned with issues of social position and power, more specifically, experiences of disempowerment, oppression, marginalization and the psychological impact that such experiences have on communities and individuals within communities (as opposed to individuals qua individuals). As such, community psychologists are oriented towards community: either in concrete and utilitarian terms when delivering psychological services to people who might otherwise find it difficult to access hospital or agency care, but also in terms of a fundamental shift in the conceptualization of the individual (Swenson, 2006). Based on my clinical and research work in a community mental health center, I observed that psychological practice which grounds itself in the experiences of a historically marginalized community and that seeks to address entrenched social issues (e.g. classism and racism) that heavily impact these individuals, required a distinct sensibility about psychological suffering and appropriate intervention. This sensibility is multifaceted, dynamic and requires an acute awareness of complex relational, political, and economic webs within which both helper and client operate.

In the following sections, I review the existing community psychological literature and core concepts, as it pertains to this study, and continue to argue that studying the practice of community psychologists may help to shed light on the
complexity of issues that both make a more contextualized and culturally grounded practice possible, but also the issues that make it challenging. I begin the literature review with a discussion of the core principles and values of community psychology, which includes a specific focus on marginalized populations. After that, I review some of the mainstream literature regarding clinical work with these populations, including the response of multicultural psychology. I consider this literature through the lens of post-modern interpretive theory and present the thoughts and observations of researchers/theorists/practitioners who represent this perspective. Lastly, I discuss the basis for an interpretive ethnographic study of community-based clinical practice.

**Constructions of Community and Definition of Community Psychology**

The word “community” is of Indo-European origin, *kommein*, meaning “shared by all” and from the Latin word *communitas*, meaning “fellowship.” Over the years, however, “community” has been defined in a number of different ways (for example, Hillery (1955) identified at least 94 different definitions), as have the practical implications and applications of the varying definitions in community life and intervention. However, despite such differences, Hillery noted similar features that were included across almost all of the definitions of community, namely “geographic area,” “social interaction,” and “common ties”; that is there is a sense of commonality, or “fellowship,” in terms of geography or other social or historical organization. Various thinkers within the fields of sociology and even social psychology, have further refined the definition of community by differentiating between types of communities (Bell &
Newby, 1972; Sarason, 1974). For example, Bell & Newby (1972) distinguish between small versus large communities where, in the former type of community, there are high degrees of homogeneity, interaction, and commitment and low rates of change; and in the latter type of community, there is more diversity, less personal interaction, and higher rates of change. There is debate as to whether the characteristics of each of these are mutually exclusive because, of course, close personal ties may coexist with impersonal relationships within the same community and there are many communities in which these descriptions simply do not apply (for example, within a prison which is likely to be a small community, with high rates of interaction, but considerable diversity, and perhaps even high rates of change).

Despite these attempts at defining community, the concept remains rather vague and muddy. This vagueness bespeaks the complexity of interpersonal relationships and the difficulty with determining concrete definitions of such relationships. These previous definitions gloss over the many ways people form or are considered part of communities and concepts such as “social ties” and/or geographic commonality appear to be quite open to interpretation.

Perhaps, as some theorists/researchers have suggested, it may make more sense to ask about a person’s subjectively felt (psychological) sense of community instead of trying to reach some unifying “objective” definition. This subjective sense of community is of particular relevance to psychology for it speaks to a person’s sense of self-in-community (Swenson, 2006). Sarason (1974), one of the putative founders of community psychology, emphasized that people’s sense of well-being depends upon their subjective sense of community. He believed that a psychological sense of community was so
important that it served as the conceptual center for the psychology of community
because it is one of the “major bases of self-definition” (Sarason, 1974, p. 157). The
psychological sense of community involves “the perception of similarity to others, an
acknowledged interdependence with others, a willingness to maintain this
interdependence by giving to or doing for others what one expects from them, and the
feeling that one is part of a larger dependable and stable structure” (1974, p. 157).

Gusfield (1975) identified two important dimensions of community: relational
and territorial. Relational communities are bound by what Hutchinson (1995, p. 8)
referred to as “network links (webs of communication)” which are marked by common
ties or interests. Scholarly circles may be considered an example of a relational
community, given that scholars are tied through similar academic interests despite often
living in quite disparate geographic locations. Territorial communities, on the other hand,
are defined primarily by geographic location as in the case with neighborhoods.

Defining community psychology

As with defining community, so too with defining or circumscribing community
psychology: A number of competing and sometimes conflicting notions emerge as to
psychological models with which to theorize social aspects of experience. Among such
perspectives are community/ecological models as well as multicultural approaches.
Contemporary social constructionist and narrative approaches that overlap with, or are
often incorporated in, certain kinds of community and multicultural theory/practice have
also emphasized social meanings and self-in-community. Some of these ways that
psychology has interfaced with community, inclusive of the theoretical tensions and challenges that arise from it, are touched upon below.

Community psychologists are concerned both with people’s psychological sense of community and how this sense of community impacts their senses of self, life trajectory, understandings of the world, and relationships with others. Two prominent community psychologists, Frank and Keys (1987), suggest that there can be no individuals without groups, and no groups without individuals. As such, community psychologists tend to be concerned with non-individualized, socially oriented understandings of experience as well as the impact that social context has on individuals intrapsychically. Despite this overarching concern for social context, the practice of community psychology tends to vary widely depending upon the social and political context within which it is applied. For example, Orford (2008) notes that in Brazil the practice of community psychology has historically remained much more closely tied to political movements, resulting in even clinically oriented community psychologists becoming more involved in various forms of activism. Additionally, due to oppressive power regimes in Brazil, the practice of psychology at times (and especially during the 1960’s) had to be more covert, resulting in community-based clinical practice taking place in private offices, which rarely happens in the United States (where community-based clinical practice is largely housed in public clinics) (Orford, 2008). Regardless of where or how it is practiced, though, community psychologists share a general set of principles, values, and goals. These principles may or may not have any bearing on the clinical practice of community psychology, an issue I will address later on.

Where North American community psychology is concerned, some of the core
values and assumptions include, firstly, privileging context – including social, historical, political, and economic aspects of context – and how these social factors create and sustain human existence and experience. It follows then that community psychology focuses on analysis and intervention beyond the individual level, including a consideration of interpersonal settings and larger sociopolitical structures. Not only do community psychologists focus on analysis and intervention at a level beyond the individual, they also “bring attention to the way in which [traditional psychological] analyses and interventions may compound distress by blaming individual or family victims for problems that are the consequence of the way society is arranged” (Orford, 2008, p. xii). This last quotation speaks to what can be labeled the critical nature of community psychology, that is, a focus on examining and deconstructing common understandings and strategies commonly used by mainstream psychologists. Prilleltensky (1994), a key figure in the field of community psychology, is a strong proponent of the critical dimension of community psychology. He argues and cautions that all too often even community oriented psychologists have reverted to taken for granted psychological concepts and interventions without due consideration of the political and economic influences on their work. From a critical (as well as a social constructionist) viewpoint, people’s sense of self is constructed by social context and thus this view can be deemed to be compatible with community psychology principles. However, despite this recognition that persons are constrained and even constructed by social forces, community psychologists tend to also emphasize personal agency. Notions of agency and empowerment are actually quite important within community psychological theory and practice, although not much attention is paid to the interesting tension between
understanding or conceptualizing the self as both socially constructed and as empowered individuals, able to effect personal/social change.

Another important foundational principle of community psychology revolves around issues of power: how it operates in society and how people are impacted by and utilize systems of power. Within community psychology literature, it is generally recognized that “control or power is structured by societal arrangements including relative wealth, socio-occupational stratification, gender and dominant – especially ethnic-group membership” (Prilleltensky, 1994; Rappaport, 1977). One of community psychology’s goals is to take a critical view of power and to expose ways in which certain exercises of power are damaging to community and psychological wellbeing. In addition, community psychology aims not only to analyze power, but to find ways to help people resist inequality and injustice. Consistent with this social justice aim is a deep respect for diversity, difference and working towards an equitable and just redistribution of power. Consequently, it is often the case that an emphasis on prevention, intervention, and policy change at the institutional or structural level takes place and/or is preferred as opposed to treatment at the personal level. With reference to psychology as profession and institution, such a stance may for example include a stringent critique of the status quo when it comes to traditional medical/psychological models, as well as a self-reflexive look at how community psychology could improve in terms of promoting social change (e.g. venturing out more into the political arena) (Prilleltensky, 1994). Prilleltensky and Nelson (2002) interlace critical and community psychology and suggest that “unlike typical psychological research, in which power is regarded as a variable existing ‘out there,’ affecting the behavior of the people we study or treat, critical psychologists
contend that power suffuses our very own actions as psychologists” (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2002, p.5). As such, community and critical psychological research and practice involve a strong element of reflexivity and analysis of interpersonal aspects of clinical practice (including power as it is enacted in interpersonal relationships).

Another important and defining characterizing feature of community psychology is its emphasis on working collaboratively with others, especially others who are marginalized and/or disempowered. Community psychologists are interested in non-hierarchical, participatory methods when it comes to research and practice. There is an emphasis on the competence and expertise of community members vs. those of “professional” psychologists and/or researchers. In an effort to create these collaborative relationships with community members, psychologists may adopt a more transparent stance, sharing about themselves, adopting an attitude of not-knowing and curiosity, and trying to draw on both everyday and expert forms of psychological knowledge.

**Community Psychology and the Clinic**

The story of community psychology as it is practiced at the community site under investigation, “the Center,” must be situated against a broader narrative canvas for it to stand out in sharper hermeneutic relief. Internationally speaking, community psychology has found diverse expression and its trajectory remained quite closely connected to sociopolitical movements. In contrast, the development of community psychology in the United States has emerged alongside the community mental health movement which is also credited by some as serving as a kind of “launching pad” for community psychology (Levine, Perkins, & Perkins, 2005, p.5; Orford, 2008). As such, much community
psychology within the United States has been joined with social services, and has taken a distinctly clinical turn. Joining the clinical and the community had, and continue to have, important and far-reaching implications. The clinical practice of community psychology, for example, is often practiced in community-based clinics or community mental health centers which – especially so in contemporary times - have often been absorbed into or by larger psychiatric and/or medical institutions. Such is the case with the Center under investigation, which operates as a satellite of a larger psychiatric hospital. It therefore makes sense to examine the emergence of community mental health centers in the U.S., which has been such a formative force in the development of community psychology, in greater detail.

A brief history of community mental health centers

Because the Center is considered a “community mental health center” – one of the last of its kind in this large, Eastern state - it carries with it a particular history that reflects socio-historical trends/ideologies of the past fifty years or so. As such, the story of community mental health as a social/systemic movement in general, is in some measure also the story of this particular and singular clinic. It behooves the investigator who attempts to understand community mental health, to keep in mind that the story is not only that of practice, but also that of a social/systemic movement.

Community mental health centers were created, in part, as a result of the community mental health movement, which is well rooted within clinical psychology. This movement picked up momentum in the 1960’s after the government passed a Mental
Health Act (1963) intended to improve care for people with a variety of mental “disabilities” (Cooper & Lenter, 1992; Cutler, Bevilacqua, & McFarland, 2003; Smith, 2005). One of the main arguments of this act was that community care was superior to hospital care for individuals with severe mental illness and/or mental retardation (Vega & Murphy, 1990). The community mental health movement also embraced ideals of the civil rights movement, and saw as part of its goal the empowerment of people of color and the revision of exclusionary institutional practices (1990). Consequently, community clinics originally developed out of the two pronged conviction that a) individuals diagnosed with psychiatric disorders would thrive outside of hospitals and that b) the plight of historically oppressed communities, such as persons of color, deserve particular attention when it comes to deconstructing and reshaping systems of psychological care. A community model not only conceptualizes community as being the appropriate environment for treatment, but it is also more likely to take into account the ways in which someone’s distress, whether it be labeled depression or schizophrenia, represents the manifestation of larger social/community problems (Prilleltensky, 1994).

Unfortunately, government funding for community mental health centers fluctuated for many years, ending up dwindling to almost nothing by the 1980’s. As a result, many of the imagined and expected community centers remained an unrealized dream and were never actually built (Cooper & Lentner, 1992). Yet, even as the community movement was undercut by lack of federal funding from the start, it has still retained the spirit of promise and an alternative, at least in some clinics. This, too, in spite of the fact that many of the community centers that remain have been absorbed into larger institutions or have emerged as a satellite clinic of a larger institution. As a result it
is common for public clinics (including the Center) to operate at an intersection of the
discourse of a larger psychiatric institution (a medical model), and the discourse of a
community model (Vega & Murphy, 1990).

The ideals of the community mental health movement are implied within the
organization of many community mental health (CMH) centers, even though they may
not be outlined explicitly in treatment plan write-ups, mission statements, etc. Both the
community of the Center as well as the surrounding community are valued and integrated
into therapeutic practice. Social factors are considered a crucial element in understanding
psychological distress which is, at least in part, conceptualized as a manifestation/
reflection of the state of the community (Vega & Murphy, 1990). However, it should be
noted that the emergence of “community mental health,” although philosophically
grounded in community psychology, is also integrating notions of “mental health” that
are in turn infused with individualized, medical understandings of the experience.
Although community psychology is often practiced within clinical settings, there remain
inherent tensions between the clinic and the community. Some of the implications of the
interface between clinic and community are reviewed below.

**Community and Clinical Practice**

So what is meant by the term community when we talk about community mental
health or community psychology? And what does it mean to try to practice community
psychology in a clinical setting – or to be engaged in the task of community-based
clinical practice? Sessions and Lightburn (2006) suggest that:
Community-based practitioners seek an infusion into clinical mental health practice of the values and perspectives of ‘community,’ an integration of interventions that build on the healing power of the collective, of belonging to a group that contributes to a social identity and provides opportunities for meaningful, contributing social role. At the same time community-based clinicians recognize that the highly specialized knowledge base developed ‘in the clinic’ is extremely useful in ‘the community’ as well (p.4).

Lightburn and Sessions’ (2006) comment highlights the potential for mutual exchange and enrichment between the clinic and the community. For example, community, as they propose, focuses on shared experiences, collaboration, interdependence, mutual participation and perhaps even a feeling of “fellowship” (as is suggested by the definition of community in the American Heritage Dictionary, listed earlier). The term “clinic” on the other hand, evokes images of hospitals or other medical centers, where the emphasis is on science, objectivity, professionalism and pathology. Relatedly, “clinical” conjures up a long history of research, diagnosis, assessment, and intervention that sought to remove people from their social contexts in order to more objectively measure, study, observe, and treat them. As mentioned, Lightburn and Sessions (2006) believe that the clinic and the community can enhance one another: the clinic can offer psychological knowledge gleaned from its’ more “sterile” environment, such as knowledge about human development, about psychological trauma, family and group theory, and ideas about psychopathology; whereas the community can feasibly benefit from applying this knowledge to understanding their own lives and facilitating community growth. Clinical knowledge is only useful if it can be shared with and used by the community and
transformed as a result of feedback from the community. As such, the clinic needs the community to ensure its continued utility and the community can benefit from resources provided by clinical knowledge. Not all theorists are as optimistic as Lightburn and Sessions (2006), however; Swartz (1996) for example, argues that by attempting to practice clinical psychology in the community, psychologists risk the extension of the “medical gaze” – “a mechanism of the production of desire and hence social control – the pushing of the boundaries of psychology becomes at base an attempt to place boundaries and controls around people and to interfere with and police their lives in an elaborate form of surveillance masquerading as service” (Swartz, 1996, p.5) This risk seems particularly salient when psychological knowledge and interventions are assumed to be “neutral” and always “just and fair” (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2002, p. 6). Perhaps the recognition of the tension between clinic and community and the need for critical reflection when it comes to dissemination and application of psychological knowledge can assist in lessening the oppressive potential that such an interface might have.

For the current study, such a consideration of the interface between the clinic and the community, and the potential for perpetuating oppressive regimes of power is particularly important given some of the defining socio-economic features of the community in which the Center is located. The Center is located in a lower income, predominately African American, community that carries the scars of a particularly difficult and tumultuous history within the context of the larger city. Whereas I provide a fuller account of this history in Chapter 3, the purpose of its mention here is to argue, on the one hand, that community psychology and community clinics tend to be oriented towards working with marginalized populations, and to motivate, consequently and on
the other hand, for a review of some of the mainstream literature regarding psychotherapy with marginalized populations both within community centers and elsewhere, as in the section below.

**Psychological practice with marginalized populations**

Because “community” psychology is local, it makes reference to particular communities – communities that are often characterized according to common demographic characteristics such as, race, ethnicity, geographic location, and/or class. The Center happens to be located in a neighborhood often labeled as an African-American, low income community, and the particular mission, goals, challenges, and trajectory of psychological practice at this clinic relate directly to issues most salient for this community. If we were to utilize Gusfield’s (1975) ideas about community, this community might represent a “territorial” community – defined primarily by geographic location. However, the community is also unified by common ties, such as a shared history of oppression/marginalization which renders it a relational community as well. A significant body of literature exists regarding psychological practice with socially marginalized populations, ranging from mainstream experimental psychological studies to qualitative studies, including some post-modern critical reflections on race (e.g. Altman, 1995; Chow, Jafee, & Snowden, 2003; Clay, 2005; Javier, 1996; Mitchell, 2005; Paris et al., 2005; Smith, 2005; Wynaden et al., 2005). I will focus on some of the main themes from this diverse literature, and point out some areas that call for more critical reflection or further research. In this section, common identity terms such as “poor,”
“African American,” and “minority,” will be presented as they appeared in the literature with little critical reflection or discussion; however, a critical analysis of these terms will be included in later sections.

The mainstream, predominantly quantitative, psychological literature generally characterizes psychological services, when it comes to ethnic/racial minorities and the poor, as “inadequate” - especially in comparison to ostensibly increased rates of mental illness among these same populations (Snowden, 2005). Communities labeled as “minority” and “poor” are cast in terms of crisis, and as engaging in “troubling patterns of participation” in treatment (Chow, Jaffee, & Snowden, 2003). For example, in 1999 the Surgeon General’s Report on Mental Health stated that the needs of minority racial/ethnic groups remain largely unmet and that “premature termination” was an especially “problematic” issue in the provision of care (Chow et al., 2003, p.794). Others, such as Stevenson (2001), argued that the gap in mental health care for African American patients has persisted, partially due to the relatively small number of African American psychiatrists nationwide, resulting in few “minority” patients ever seeing a therapist who “looks like them” (Sept. 4, 2001, Stevenson, p. A.12). Stevenson is not alone in her argument; in fact, many culturally/community oriented psychologists would agree that the face of psychology is predominately white and that this can, and does, have a negative impact on the experiences of some clients of color (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998; Prilletensky, 1994; Sampson, 1993b; Smith, 2005; Sue, 1998).

Snowden’s (2005), the Surgeon General’s (1999), and Stevenson’s (2001) observations suggest that there is a disconnect between the clinic and the community – even as speculations as to how and why this situation came about are still unclear. Chow,
Jafee, and Snowden (2003) suggest that “lack of insurance coverage, a tendency to attribute mental health problems to religious and other culturally sanctioned belief systems, and lack of access to receptive culturally compatible providers” can account for the observed disparities in community members’ “service utilization” (p.2). Additionally, research has shown that the tendency among socially marginalized individuals to discontinue therapy “prematurely” is hardly a new phenomenon. Beginning in the 1960’s, researchers have been documenting the trend of “racial/ethnic minority” individuals and/or individuals of lower socioeconomic status to withdraw from therapy (Smith, 2005). Despite their usefulness, many explanations define the gap between helping professionals and clients as either the product of larger social/economic conditions, or as being caused by particular characteristics of the individual culture of clients, rather than focusing on how systems of care themselves are implicated.

The gap between psychological service providers/models and the needs, interests, and values of social minorities has been well-documented (for example, Atkinson, Morten & Sue, 1998; Stevenson, 2001; Chow, Jafee, and Snowden, 2003; Snowden, 2005); however, many of the studies cited by these authors used quantitative research methods, and were geared towards identifying problems and patterns, not necessarily towards investigating why these observed patterns were occurring, or what social forces produce and sustain problems. Moreover, despite over forty years of clinical research that has documented these difficulties, when it comes to clinical practice, not much has changed. For example, just a few years ago, the American Psychological Association (APA) issued a Resolution on Poverty and Socioeconomic Status in which they identified
poverty as “detrimental to psychological well-being” and charged psychologists with the responsibility to “treat and address the needs of low-income individuals and families” (APA, 2000, p. 23). The resolution points to an ongoing short-coming of psychology to communicate with diverse populations despite the current emphasis in the field on multicultural awareness and competence. The APA’s resolution represents a call to action for psychologists to take responsibility for looking more carefully and deeply at what it means to “address the needs” of not only low income families in general, but to address diversity and difference more broadly. Although the field has been slow in looking into the nature of psychotherapy with the poor and/or individuals of racial/ethnic minorities, some recent studies have sought to expand the exploration of this issue by using qualitative methods (Mitchell, 2005; Paris, Añez, Bedegral, André-Hyman, & Davidson, 2005; Rios, Palacios, Gonzalez, & Sandoval, 2003; Wynaden et al., 2005). Findings from these studies which are discussed below, elaborate on past quantitative studies by adding a richer, descriptive dimension.

Findings from studies examining clients’ experiences or perceptions of mental health care systems overlap across a few main themes. This feedback may represent the kind of reciprocal communication that Sessions and Lightburn (2006) suggested would assist with reducing the tension between clinic and community and also reduce the potential for the imposition of psychological practice that is incongruent with the worldview/ethos of a community. The first theme from my review of this research revolves around alienation and social stigma. Many researchers, operating within both quantitative and qualitative research paradigms, have documented the ways that marginalized communities have often felt alienated by traditional systems of
psychological care and also reported concerns about a stigma related to seeking professional psychological help (Alvidrez, Azocar, & Miranda, 1996; Clay, 2005; Mitchell, 2005; Paris, et al., 2005; Rios, Palacios, Gonzalez, & Sandoval, 2003; Wynaden, et al., 2005). The second common theme relates to the positive relationship between client satisfaction with services and the degree to which staff take a collaborative approach to their interactions with clients. Researchers have found that when there was more collaboration between staff and clients, such as allowing clients in a community clinic to sit on a governing board of the site, clients generally felt less alienated and responded better to therapy (Newberry, 2005; Wynaden, et al., 2005). The contextual nature of community mental health care was a third common theme among researchers who observed that in a community clinic or community mental health center, what is therapeutic (or not) to clients happens on many levels across many individuals in the clinic (Newberry, 2005; Phillips, 2005; Wynaden et al., 2005). For example, when a client comes to a community clinic, he or she is likely to have contact with several people, such as other clients, administrative assistants, case managers, psychiatrists, nurses, and psychotherapists. A given client’s interface with a community clinic is, therefore, not limited to his or her contact with a therapist (Newberry, 2005; Phillips, 2005; Wynaden et al., 2005).

Most of these studies did acknowledge that myriad factors, such as economic, social, and religious considerations, play a role in the accessibility of mental health care outside of client/therapist interactions (Chow et al., 2003; Mitchell, 2005; Paris et al., 2005; Phillips, 2005; Rios et al., 2003; Snowden, 2005; Wynaden, 2005). At the same time, this research also presents the behavior, perceptions, and/or cultural beliefs of
marginalized populations as explanations for their disinterest in, and/or aversion to, seeking professional psychological help. For example, imagine a client who decides to withdraw prematurely from psychotherapy because her understanding of her distress is markedly different from that of her therapist. The client may make sense of her suffering in religious terms, believing in a more spiritual explanation of her experience. If we were to apply the line of reasoning presented in some of the aforementioned studies, we might say that because she attributed her distress to “religious and other culturally sanctioned belief systems” and not to the traditional medical model, this served as a barricade for “effective” treatment (Chow et al., 2005, p.2). It could be argued that to describe her beliefs as “different” to begin with sets up a situation in which the psychologist’s (or psychiatrist’s) model of understanding becomes the invisible standard against which the client’s “culturally sanctioned belief system” is compared, and subsequently labeled “different.” I use this example to highlight the way in which focusing only on the perceptions/experiences of marginalized groups to the exclusion of looking more self-reflexively at the field of psychology itself represents a blind spot for social science researchers. In other words, perhaps the existence of appropriate mental health care for individuals considered “other” (than white, middle class), says more about the practice, beliefs, values of psychology than it does about those receiving services. If the structure of psychological practice remains invisible, then it is difficult to fully consider the ways in which it is implicated in the reported dissatisfaction of marginalized communities.

These studies form a useful backdrop to the study of community-based psychological practice and are particularly relevant to the current research. Some of these past studies even point to potential challenges when it comes to addressing what have
been labeled more “social” issues as well as some effective interventions (e.g. collaboration) as it pertains to appropriately engaging communities who have been historically marginalized. However, there is little discussion in the literature regarding how psychologists conceptualize these issues (mental health, community, culture) in the first place. Labels such as “poor,” or “African American” are presented with little discussion, and as if unambiguous and neutral rather than socially constructed and political as emphasized in the guiding principles of community psychology. Most, if not all, of the studies reviewed thus far, take cultural, ethnic, or racial descriptors as the point of departure for investigation without asking what it means to use such labels to differentiate among peoples in the first place. Furthermore, as Sampson (1993a) inquired, is it really possible that differentiations based on skin color, cultural heritage, and/or level of income can be neutral when adopted within the context of white domination? Finding alternative ways to describe commonly used social categories is admittedly a formidable task; however, although I may not be able to avoid participating in this discourse entirely (for it also presents the platform for identity), I argue that social position, culture, identity are not straightforward and/or value neutral concepts and that there is a rather wide body of literature that has attempted to address these complex issues. I begin first with a review of how the field of multicultural psychology, which conceptually overlaps quite a bit with community psychology but emerged as a parallel field with little dialogue/collaboration existing between the two, has traditionally addressed the issue of difference within psychology. A variety of perspectives exist within this extremely broad field so I will stick to giving a general overview of mainstream approaches but also dialogue this
approach with some of the social constructionist/post-modern voices from both within and outside of psychology.

Psychology and multiculturalism

If one types in “multiculturalism” in any popular search engine on the internet, he or she is likely to find a variety of suggested definitions ranging from the general to the specific. Some definitions appear to avoid reference to any particular location or field: multiculturalism is about “stressing the importance of different culture, races, and ethnicities” or multiculturalism refers to “relating to or including several cultures.” Other definitions suggest how multiculturalism might be applied within a particular field: “in literature, multiculturalism is the belief that literary studies should include writings…from a number of different cultural groups” (Definitions of Multiculturalism on the web, Retrieved May 19, 2009). Despite considerable variability in meaning, two themes stand out as characterizing many of these definitions of multiculturalism: 1) the formerly popular conception of the United States as a “melting pot” of various ethnic/cultural groups has been replaced by an emphasis on celebrating several different cultures rather than one national culture and 2) there is an emphasis on the idea that disparate cultures should be equally respected and/or “tolerated” and live in “peaceful” or harmonious co-existence. This ideology of “cultural pluralism” heavily influences contemporary mainstream multicultural psychology and has been taken up in a variety of ways by multicultural theorists. In the Dictionary of Multicultural Psychology, Hall (2005) describes multiculturalism in the following way:
…an individual psychological and theoretical view that all cultures and national groups
are equal. Multiculturalism acknowledges that cultures and national groups vary in norms, values, worldviews, and traditions, but there is no superior versus inferior culture. Multiculturalism in psychology is an expression of the sociopolitical climate. As cultural issues, concepts, and values are explored, there is an underlying assumption of equality, irrespective of any implicit or explicit differences. (p. 121)

When it comes to defining multicultural psychology specifically, Hall and Barongan (2001) offer the following:

Multicultural psychology is the study of multiple cultural groups in the same context. Cultural groups influence one another when they are in the same sociocultural context; the strength of this influence is largely dependent on the power and status that cultural groups have in society…Thus; multicultural psychology is the study not only of culture, but also of the sociopolitical issues that ethnic minority persons face in the United States.

(p.10)

Hall (2005) differentiates between multicultural, cultural and cross-cultural psychologies by noting that while cultural psychology considers cultural influences on behavior within a single cultural context and cross-cultural psychology studies cultural differences across two or more cultural contexts, multicultural psychology is the only one that incorporates social and cultural influences together within a single social context.
In addition to a concern for the study of culture per se, multicultural psychology also developed in response to concerns regarding psychology’s exclusionary practices and neglect of cultural context. In fact, the call for a multicultural perspective in counseling was originally rooted in critiques of the Eurocentric basis of traditional psychology and the ways that research, theory, and practice in psychology have excluded the experiences of persons of color, women, sexual minorities, etc. (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2002; Smith, 2005; Sue, 1998). The multicultural movement in psychology has become so influential that in 2002, the American Psychological Association (APA) amended the Ethics Code for psychologists to add a statement regarding the importance of psychologists’ awareness of cultural, individual, and role differences including those related to age, gender, ethnicity, and national origin and role differences (APA as cited in APA, 2002, p. 14).

Psychologists have responded to this call to address “difference” in a range of ways. Some have emphasized the need for culturally specific clinical practices that address the particular needs of various cultural/racial/ethnic groups (see Atkinson, Morten & Sue, 1998). Others have suggested that if psychotherapy is practiced well, it should by its very nature be sensitive to difference and thus inherently multicultural and appropriate for diverse groups of people (and therefore there is no need for culturally specific models). Hall (2005) (borrowing from the language of anthropology) describes the tension between what seem to be specific versus generalized approaches as “emic” versus “etic” perspectives (p.787). He suggests that, for the most part, multicultural psychology has attempted emic understandings of culture that are based in specific cultural contexts, whereas community psychology has emphasized more etic approaches,
attempting to apply models developed in one context to other contexts (Hall, 2005). However, Hall points out, it is more often the case that aspects of both emic and etic perspectives appear together and that they may serve to complement each other. Other theorists would have taken this critique even further to say that the binary opposition presented between “emic” and “etic” is a false one in the first place and such terms still do not make proper reference to the extent that one can never fully claim full understanding of others’ subjectivities.

Regardless of these issues of etic versus emic understandings, identity or culture is not just about how an individual is labeled externally by society, it also about the specific way that people identify with a given social identity. As Helms (1994) observes, the centrality of various cultural identities/identifications is also key to consider when attempting to develop culturally sensitive practices: “It is by no means clear that the same competencies required to deliver effective services to clients for whom racial-group membership is central are equally appropriate for clients for whom other social identities (e.g. gender, age, or religion) are more central” (p.163). Furthermore, exactly what is meant by these various social categories is debatable. Historically racial indicators have been associated more with what are considered “biological” characteristics such as skin color, hair texture, and/or bone structure; whereas ethnicity is associated more with a shared cultural history and/or similar national origin (Atkinson, Morten, and Sue, 1998). However, it has become more common, in contemporary human science theory, to view race and ethnicity not as immutable qualities existing “out there,” but as being socially/culturally constructed. In other words, culture and identity are constructed between people through complex patterns of interpretation. There has been considerable
debate as to the precise meaning of social identity terms but despite this lack of consensus and confusion as to the exact criteria for inclusion in a given racial or ethnic group, labels such “race” and "ethnicity" continue to be used in the psychological literature as if they held some distinct meaning, and possess some essentialized quality.

Given the difficulty psychologists have had with defining culture, ethnicity, and/or a unified multicultural perspective, it is not surprising that translating such theory into practice has presented a challenge for psychologists. Historically, given the dominance of positivist approaches in psychology, researchers have attempted to operationalize difficult to define or “fuzzy” concepts so as to make them amenable to study through the scientific method. Kitayama and Markus (2000) note “cultural influences may be quite pervasive, widespread, and powerful in forming the basis of ‘being’ for ordinary people, and yet, remain elusive for those researchers who have sought to understand them” (p.123). Attempts to define culture and/or the social dimension have been relatively brief and insubstantial in most psychological literature, yet the strong push towards developing culturally sensitive clinical practices has continued – most prominently in the form of the development of cultural competency guidelines for counseling (APA and Division of Counseling Psychology, 2002)

According to Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis,(1992) the initial impetus to create competencies for the practice of cultural awareness was the desire to translate multicultural principles outlined by the APA and Division of Counseling Psychology into “meaningful statements for the profession” (p.481). The notion of cultural competency breaks down into three main domains: 1) psychologist’s awareness of his or her own biases, assumptions, and cultural heritage, 2) awareness of the worldview of the client; 3)
the practice of culturally appropriate, relevant and sensitive clinical interventions (Sue, Arredondo, McDavis, 1992; Wynaden, et al., 2005)). Cultural competence, as it is commonly understood in the United States can be defined as having the knowledge, awareness, and skills to provide psychological services that promote and advance cultural diversity (APA, 2002). Various cultural competency models have followed from these efforts and have become increasingly popular over the course of the past several years; some focus more on clinician’s awareness of their own cultural values, expectations, biases, assumptions, etc., while others suggest that activism and advocacy efforts are an important part of providing truly culturally sensitive care (Hwang & Schenck, 2004). In theory, according to Sue, Arredodo, and McDavis (1992) “becoming culturally skilled is an active process;” “it is ongoing,” and “a process that never reaches an end point” This definition recognizes the complexity and diversity of any human experience and also our limitations when it comes to becoming culturally skilled. Even still, it has been argued that cultural competency guidelines have at times been taken up by psychologists as prescriptive norms to be “achieved” rather than as a sensibility that could never be mastered, only used as a guiding framework for ethical practice. Perhaps taking a more critical perspective, one that draws from contemporary, post-modern psychology, anthropology, and philosophy can assist in deepening our understanding about diversity and difference. In the next section I will offer some alternative critical perspectives to the literature I have reviewed thus far.
Critique of Mainstream Research

Proponents of interpretive, critical, and/or post-modern approaches to culture argue that the cultural competency movement and traditional multiculturalism in psychology have done more to regulate taken-for-granted concepts and practices when it comes to culture than it has to deconstruct and transform them (Cosgrove, 2003; Prilleltensky, 1994; Sonn, 2004), for example, by taking for granted the terms “woman” and “man” or “black” and “white” as essential or natural identity categories rather than considering the social/political construction of such concepts. As such, cultural competency models in psychology have also been critiqued for overlooking complex issues of power and privilege (which are more evident when the socially constructed nature of identity categories is taken into consideration) (Sonn, 2004). Prilleltensky (1994) and Sonn (2004) have fervently argued that neglecting elements of power can lead to the imposition of various concepts, interventions, and measures developed with Western populations to those from non-Western cultures, therein perpetuating the (oppressive) sociopolitical status quo. Post-modern and cultural psychological understandings of social categories call for an analysis of the complex processes of power when it comes to diversity and identity, including the various historical, social, and political realities that accompany various social positions.

Still, we have not answered the question of why the issue of diversity and culture has been such a challenge for psychologists. Perhaps the philosophical basis of western psychology adheres to understandings of self that are fundamentally at odds with contextual understandings of self/experience. Maruyama (1992) argued that psychology has not yet generated the cognitive structures that allow us to think contextually when
approaching diversity, which is a foundational and perhaps cultural issue in and of itself. As such, the foundation of a psychology which is based on logical positivism and modernist conceptions of self may preclude psychologically contextualized understandings.

Rather than trying to develop alternative conceptualizations of self that would enable psychologists to think culturally, Sampson (1993b) purports that psychology has responded too hastily by using “add-on eclectic strategies” when it comes to understanding culture which has led to psychologists learning stereotypical characteristics of various cultures rather than looking at the broader understanding of the characteristics and function of culture. Furthermore, simply “adding on” a consideration of culture to the study of the individual psyche is a layering approach much like what Geertz (1973) has referred to as the “stratigraphic” concept of human being that dominate the social sciences. According to Geertz (1973), the stratigraphic model implies the following:

Strip off the motley forms of culture and one find the structural and functional regularities of social organization. Peel these off in turn and one finds the underlying psychological factors – ‘basic needs’ – or what-have-you – that support and make them possible. Peel off psychological factors and one is left with biological foundations – anatomical, physiological, and neurological – of the whole edifice of human life. (p.37)

One drawback of this approach is that culture is viewed as something extraneous to a pre-existing biological entity that would exist independently of the social environment. It implies that psychologists might be able to somehow address only the psychological
dimension or biological dimension of experience without considering the others. Geertz (1973) argues that it is impossible to understand the human being stripped of the “trappings” of culture and that to do so would provide distorted understandings of human nature.

To elaborate on Geertz’ (1973) ideas about culture just briefly, he describes three main elements that intersect to form what he calls “webs of significance” which permeate social existence and give meaning and coherence to our everyday lives. The main intersecting elements of “webs of significance” consist of worldview, ethos, and culture more generally. When Geertz refers to worldview, he is referring to the more cognitive aspect of culture that consists of assumptions (mostly unconscious) about what a person is, what motivates his or her behavior, and about what a person’s capabilities, resources and characteristics are. On the other hand, ethos is the more moral and affective component that outlines norms and standards for desirable ways of functioning and interacting – how a person ought to behave, develop, and feel. Culture consists of ethos and worldview and provides a broader framework which gives structure to the ideas about personhood and standards for behavior. Worldview, ethos and culture function together to form the webs of significance within which our behavior, interactions, constructions of reality have meaning.

Another way to conceptualize culture, from a more psychological perspective, in a way that leaves room for consideration of dynamism, power, and the dialogical dimension, is referenced in Shweder’s (1991) conception of cultural psychology, defined as:
Cultural psychology is the study of the ways subject and object, self, and other, psyche and culture, person and context, figure and ground, practitioner and practice, live together, require each other, and dynamically, dialectically, and jointly make each other up (p.73).

In essence, “culture” (including “race” “social class” etc.) makes reference to the complex way that human beings “seize meanings and resources out of a sociocultural environment that has been arranged to provide them with meanings and resources to seize and use” (p.74). And further, it refers to the way in which human beings and sociocultural environments “interpenetrate each other’s identity” and cannot be analyzed independent of one another. It is a view that sociocultural environments do not exist outside of the intentions of human beings (what Shweder refers to as “psyche”) and that likewise, individual psyches do not exist independently of a sociocultural environment (what Shweder refers to as the “intentional world.” Shweder (1991) writes:

Intentional persons and intentional worlds are interdependent things that get dialogically constituted and reconstituted through the intentional activities and practices that are their products, yet make them up (p.101).

From this perspective, understanding psychological practice in this particular setting necessitates also looking to the practitioner as they are inextricably intertwined. Understanding diversity, difference, and culture in such a way also opens up possibilities for analysis of how various culture identities/identifications are lived-through as a process rather than defined.

In summary, the main thrust of much of the community mental health, sociological, and even psychological research mentioned here is that services for various communities of
identity according to race, class, ethnicity, etc. need to better fit the needs, values, interests of these groups. However, the concept of these communities of identity is not understood in relational terms – there is a reversion to essentialized taken for granted understandings of these groups which has, one could argue, led to this difficulty to begin with. In other words, research and practice based on positivist, individualized notions of the self have a difficult time addressing the complex and dynamics needs of communities because the very definition does not allow for their existence. Such an oversight is likely to be more of an issue with vulnerable populations due to the effects of power and history of oppression.

Community/culturally oriented psychotherapy: Alternative perspectives

When it comes to diversity/multicultural theory and practice, there is an abundance of information to choose from. Theories ranging from modernist or essentialized conceptualizations of diversity to more post-modern approaches that focus on deconstructing social categories to begin with, grapple with the social dimension of human experience and even make recommendations as to how this should inform practice. Similarly, there exists a substantial body of scientific empirical research that has sought to study psychotherapy effectiveness when it comes to working with populations historically excluded by psychologists. Some studies, such as the ones already mentioned focus on the utilization rates of minority populations, some focus on psychotherapy outcome when using empirically supported treatments for certain cultural groups or on “match” of ethnicity and/or race between therapist and client (Sue, 1998). However, far
fewer studies consider the process that psychologists actually go through when attempting to translate multicultural, community, or critical concepts into practice; how the application of this theory changes along with their interaction over time with individuals and groups of clients and how their work then reciprocally informs their evolving understandings of their clients and how to effectively work with them. Studying individual therapy sessions or even sessions over time is an extremely useful way to get at the interactions between therapist and client; however it does not take a step back to observe the context in which this therapy is occurring and further the ongoing experience of therapists outside of those individuals’ sessions. Looking at the “in-between” times and getting a sense of therapists’ backgrounds, understandings, and how they continue to transform interventions may be particularly important and meaningful within a community mental health center where there are many opportunities for interaction beyond the consulting room and where the boundaries between professional and personal involvement are more permeable. Talking to psychologists and observing them work can help to answer the question (or at least tell one potential story) about what does actually happen when theory is translated to practice. Do the principles of community psychology previously mentioned pan out? How is theory changed? What does it mean to have a social justice orientation from the perspective of the psychologists? What does this really entail when it is embodied instead of remaining an ideal? What is the dynamic of practicing community psychology within a medical system?

James and Prilleltensky (2002) attempted to explicate what they referred to as an “integrative” approach to mental health care by providing a description of their approach to working with one Portuguese (Azorean) immigrant community. The study heavily
emphasized the importance of situating psychological practice within the philosophical, religious, moral and cultural understandings of the community. The researchers chose to conduct ethnographic interviews with 50 Azorean community members regarding their understandings and beliefs about their experience (including perceptions of suffering). James and Prilleltensky (2002) highlighted the multiple discrepancies between traditional psychotherapists’ interpretations of the community member’s experiences and their own explanations. For example, community members described a condition known as *agonias*, translated into English as the “agonies” (p.1148). Clinicians reported being confused as to the meaning of this term due to the multiple ways in which it is used by community members (to refer to anything from indigestion to feeling “on the brink of death”) (James & Prilleltensky, 2002, p.1148). When asked about how they chose to conceptualize the “agonies,” clinicians reported that they assumed it was similar to anxiety and depression. On the other hand, community members who were interviewed suggested that a person can experience *agonias* because of any number of socially or religiously oriented experiences such as spousal abuse or having a premonition that something bad will happen (2002). Although clinicians may accept this culturally based explanation for suffering, James and Prilleltensky found that the general trend in clinical psychology is to privilege internal experience and ignore the concomitant cultural and social dynamics. As a result, clinicians are likely to rely on treatments that focus on the internal world of the individual either through individually focused treatment or through suggesting medication; whereas in the Azores this type of distress is treated by community compassion. James and Prilleltensky also mentioned a tendency for clinicians working with the Azorean clients to view them as “concrete” or “not psychologically
minded” because these clients tend not to understand their experience in terms of psychological causal relationships. The researchers suggest that this practice is commonplace among practitioners and implicitly assumes that psychological theories apply to everyone equally and if the client does not fit that paradigm, the validity of their experience is questioned (rather than the applicability of that theory). Many psychotherapists practicing in urban settings would agree that certain biases, myths, and assumptions have the potential to powerfully shape interactions with clients, especially poor clients. Foster (1996) argues that clinicians generally rely upon various metapsychological frameworks as “templates through which we see our patients and evaluate their strengths, weaknesses, and ability to undergo our method of psychic inquiry” (p.6). These psychological frameworks are also powerfully shaped by normative cultural ideas and practices dominant at the time they are developed.

James & Prilleltensky (2002) suggest an “integrative practice,” which consists of four complementary considerations: philosophical, contextual, experiential, and pragmatic which can help to address the shortcomings and mistreatment of diverse populations (p.1135). They describe these four considerations as representing a bridge between theory and action that is continually and reciprocally informed. Each of these four dimensions of practice call for different tasks and the involvement and/or consultation of different people. For example, when considering the philosophical dimension, clinician’s might ask about what a given community and clinician view as “the good life” in their respective communities and what values are dominant. Answers to these questions might be achieved by consulting philosophy, religious leaders, and/or social leaders in the community. As for the second dimension, psychologists would
consider the social, cultural and moral norms prevailing in the clients’ as well as the helper’s communities, and how these norms might impact the way that mental health is understood. Social scientists, researchers, and researchers involved in the study of sociocultural and economic trends that may have an impact on mental health may be useful when considering this dimension. The last two areas, experiential and pragmatic, are focused more on intervention. In considering the experiential level, a clinician may ask what is missing from the particular social context in order to improve the mental health of individuals and communities whereas, at the pragmatic level, clinicians ponder what can be done to improve the mental health of clients and the community more generally. Community members’ experiences as well as agents of social change both within and outside of the community can be called upon to address these latter two dimensions.

James and Prilleltensky’s (2002) approach is not only integrative in the sense that it brings together multiple considerations which have implications for both theory and practice, but it also highlights the importance of assessing the clinician’s understandings, contexts, experiences, and assumptions in a continual process. The authors do not suggest to “be aware of biases” etc. as a activity to be completed a priori to conducting psychotherapy, but rather as an ongoing process of considering the context of the client – as having an experience not only in their respective communities but also in relation to one another. A few psychotherapists who practice psychology in urban community mental health settings have written accounts of their practice in which they draw upon sociopolitical and/or critical theory and research when it comes to working with individuals from economically impoverished communities. Their reflections incorporate
and highlight the ways that cultural issues are manifested in clinical practice and are congruent with the self reflexive aspect of James and Prilleltensky’s (2002) integrative practice for diverse settings.

Other psychologists have also attempted to explicate the process of community-based clinical practice through writing biographical narratives about their work. Drawing on their own experience practicing psychology with low-income and/or low-income racial/ethnic minority clients, Smith (2005), Javier (1996), and Altman (1995) have written self-reflective analyses of their clinical work. Several themes surrounding the entrenched classism in psychological (especially psychoanalytic) theory and practice were prominent in their reflections. Smith (2005) tackles the realization of her own class biased attitudes while working in a predominately poor, African American/Hispanic community psychology clinic. She notes that her own attitudes reflect many common classist assumptions about doing psychotherapy with poor clients, such as the belief that: “poor people are forced to contend with so many overwhelming day-to-day problems that they either have no use for what a psychologist can offer,” or that “conventional psychological services are neither familiar to nor widely accepted in the cultures of many poor and working-class communities, so that even poor people who could benefit will not be likely to use them” (Smith, 2005, p.692-3). Smith admits that the latter assumption is in line with her own clinical experience with “poor” clients; however she encourages us to consider why this might be the case. She suggests that the culture of the psychologist’s office may be so unfamiliar or unaccepted among lower income clients because traditionally such spaces have also represented a culture of whiteness and class privilege (Smith, 2005). Smith’s point is an important one, because much of the mainstream
literature on diversity in practice often focuses on the experience, culture, and behavior of clients who are considered part of a marginalized group to the exclusion of more critically examining the culture and practices of the field itself. Arguably, much less attention has been paid to the ways in which the culture of “whiteness” and class privilege factors into the equation of psychological practice with the urban poor.

Javier (1996) also addresses some of these same themes but he does so from the perspective of psychoanalysis. He addresses the common belief that psychoanalytic and psychodynamic therapies would be impractical and/or inappropriate for poor clients by showing how this assumption is rooted in classist assumptions. Both Javier (1996) and Altman (1995) suggest that from a psychodynamic perspective, the influence of social systems and more specifically the conditions of living under oppression, can be incorporated into the interpretive process of therapy, instead of representing a stumbling block. These first-hand accounts of psychological practice provide a foundation for further empirical research by providing rich “stories” about the complexities psychological practice in settings where sociocultural marginalization is prevalent.

The Current Study

From this review, it becomes apparent that in general as psychologists, we have historically struggled to understand the social and its relationship to the psychological and furthermore to integrate this understanding into clinical practice. The current study attempts to illuminate the contextual nature of community care and highlight the various principles, values, conceptualizations, interventions as well as the larger community and
psychological context in which they occur. Systemic issues such as economics, location, and political aspects of psychological care will also be considered. Moreover, although qualitative studies that focus on more holistic and integrated accounts of community practice are becoming more popular, several major figures in the field have argued that there is still a paucity of research, especially *qualitative research* that focuses on contextualized experience, subjective meanings, systems of social power and social change (Luke, 2005; Orford, 2008; Rappaport, 2000; Wolff, 2000). The current study seeks to focus on the *clinical practice* of community psychology from a contextualized perspective, which, according to Wolff (2000), is even less well represented in the research literature. He writes:

> Community psychology is a field for both research and practice, yet the literature has been dominated by a focus on research and academically based practice. Many questions remain regarding what practitioners of community psychology really do, what kinds of settings they work out of, how amenable those settings are to their work, what levels of intervention they choose to become involved in, and how their practices relate to the research and theory base of the field. (Wolff, 2000, p.741).

The current study addresses this gap in the literature by investigating a setting where community psychology is practiced and by using qualitative, ethnographic research methods and asking the question: what does it mean to practice community psychology in this particular setting? By addressing practice at the local level, it is possible to illuminate some of the complexities that characterize the clinical practice of community psychology. This type of study entails addressing the issues, concerns, conflicts, ideals, values,
beliefs, struggles, challenges, history, and relationships, that come to bear on psychological practice in this particular place with this particular community.

A theoretical and conceptual revision or rethinking of issues and aspects of community implies and necessitates a parallel or concordant epistemological shift. The next chapter charts some of the epistemological and methodological dynamics attendant on this study and the topic in general.
CHAPTER 2: AN INTERPRETIVE ETHNOGRAPHIC METHOD

Debates regarding the nature of “knowledge” and appropriate means to access the social/psychological realities of people’s lives still abound in psychology in general, and perhaps even more so in community psychology in particular. Even so, however, Orford (2008) argues that many involved in contemporary community psychology support the use of qualitative research methods as a means to advance community psychology’s core values of empowering communities through understanding them in contextualized ways. To better achieve this aim, several community psychologists have seen the need for a paradigm shift from logical positivism, which supports the “reification of quantifiable data, use of reductionist methods, and neglect of context” to a method that allows for the situated nature of knowledge and the “thick” descriptions of people within contexts (Kelly, 2003; Luke, 2005; Orford, 2008, p.68; Prilletensky, 1994). On the other hand, given the diversity of qualitative methods available, not all qualitative approaches necessarily represent a shift from the positivist paradigm. In keeping with my understandings of sociocultural contexts as being dialectically constituted between psyche (intentional persons) and culture (intentional worlds) and also with the dynamic interrelationships apparent at the Center, it seemed important to find a research method that could account for this dimension and complexity. Clinical work conducted at the Center incorporates many people interacting with each other and clients in multiple forms; psychiatrists, nurses, social workers, administrative assistants, and of course, psychotherapists, interacting with clients across multiple levels of care. It thus seemed
appropriate when attempting to study the complex practices of a community mental health center, to incorporate the multiple (often informal) ways that staff come to provide psychological services to clients. After considering a number of approaches within “traditional” psychology, my insistence on methods and methodologies that kept an emphasis on context, power, and systems of meaning, increasingly drew me outside of the field of psychology. As becomes apparent later, this movement “out” of psychology is also a movement “in,” and not so much a betrayal of psychology in an extradisciplinary sense, as much as precisely fidelity in an interdisciplinary sense that enriches and enhances. For the moment, however, suffice it to say that I initially felt both hesitantly wary, and excitedly enthused to explore ethnography as methodological possibility. It seemed to offer a rich methodological literature and epistemology, well-suited to my research aims of maintaining a contextualized, reflexive, holistic account of psychological practice. Although – in the end - I cannot claim that I have conducted a “formal” or “traditional” ethnography, I was significantly influenced by ethnographic theory and method in conducting the present study. As such I review some of the key features of ethnography that influenced data collection and analysis.

Ethnography as a theory/method emerged from the fields of anthropology and sociology and has more recently been employed as a research method in psychology. Ethnographic practice has gone through several major transformations over the past century, so major in fact, that Lincoln and Denzin (1994) have labeled these transformations the “five moments” of ethnographic inquiry, which are: the traditional, modernist, blurred genres, crisis of representation, and the present or fifth moment. Denzin (1997) has since also designated a “sixth moment” which charts the future of
ethnography and focuses on writing that has been produced since James Clifford’s *Writing culture*, a collection of essays that was published in 1986. A full examination of the history of ethnography is beyond the scope of the dissertation, but the reader is directed to authors like Clifford, 1986; Denzin, 1997; Geertz, 1973, 183; Lincoln & Denzin, 1994; Madison, 2005; and Thomas, 1993 for a more in depth account.

For the current project, what has been termed the “new ethnography,” the kind of ethnography influenced by interpretive and post-modern theory and that follows from the works of Clifford Geertz (1973, 1983) and James Clifford (1986) provide an appropriate starting point. In a nutshell, and explored in greater depth below, the main features of Geertz and Clifford’s theories include a critique of realism in anthropology, a critique of the notion of a value-neutral observer, and an emphasis on self-reflection and incorporating the voices of participants in the written ethnographic report.

**Interpretive/Critical Ethnography**

Geertz, in his two canonical works, *The interpretation of cultures* (1973) and *Local knowledge* (1983), critiques the classic realist conception of anthropology in which ethnographers are charged with the task of “directly captur[ing] lived experience” of the other and the project of re-presenting culture as text (Denzin, 1997, p.3). Instead, Geertz (1983) emphasizes the interpretive nature of ethnographic practices and the way in which “the ethnographer does not, and … cannot, perceive what his informants perceive. What he [the ethnographer] perceives, and that uncertainly enough, is what they [informants] perceive ‘with’ – or ‘by means of,’ or ‘through’ … or whatever the word should be”
Geertz conceives of culture as existing in the intersubjective field of meaning between persons. In other words, culture does not exist independently “out there,” but is dialectically constituted between persons. According to Geertz, culture is not located within the perception of any one individual, but can be observed in the “webs of signification” formed between people, occurring as a dynamic force, evident through language, gestures, rituals, behaviors, and interactions (1973, p.5). According to Geertz, the task of the ethnographer is to provide as “thick” of a description as possible of the activities, relationships, structures, of an observed society, all the while gracefully tacking back and forth between “experience-near” and “experience-far” descriptors (Geertz, 1983, p.58). The goal of analysis for the ethnographer becomes a “search for meaning” within the observed “webs of significance” rather than a search for a general (scientific) “law” that can be generalized (Geertz, 1973, p.5).

James Clifford (1986) was influenced by Geertz, but presents a more radical critique of conventional ethnographic practices. His book *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography* (1986), is a collection of essays geared towards critiquing conventional anthropology and ethnographic practices and explicating alternative and innovative visions for ethnographic inquiry. Clifford, like Geertz, conceives of culture as intersubjective but also as being “composed of seriously contested codes and representations…[he] assumes that the poetic and the political are inseparable, that science is in, not above, historical and linguistic processes.” (1986, p.2). Clifford thus expands Geertz’ notion of culture by considering, more explicitly, the broader social and historical context that shape and produce textual representations of culture. In fact, Clifford would want to highlight the constructed nature of cultural accounts because to
him ethnography is “always caught up in the invention, not the representation of cultures” (p.2.)

For James Clifford (1986),

Ethnographic work has indeed been enmeshed in a world of enduring and changing power inequalities, and it continues to be implicated. It enacts power relations. But its function within these relations is complex, often ambivalent, potentially counter-hegemonic.” (p.9).

This quote forms the foundation for Clifford’s argument that ethnographers need to identify their position as one voice among many in the textual prefiguration of cultures in order to counter the tendency to slide into a position of the invisible authority writing as the voice of “Truth.” To Clifford, the voices of informants or “co-authors” of a cultural story should be equally weighted and all voices, including the ethnographer’s voices, should be positioned within a discursive field. In this way no one voice is granted authority of absolute truth, yet the “writer’s voice pervades and situates the analysis” (p.12). The once objectified “cultural” is turned into “a speaking subject who sees as well as is seen, who evades, argues, probes back” (Clifford, 1986, p.9).

“Self-reflexive” ethnographic accounts such as Clifford’s present culture as dialogical, polyphonic, power laden, negotiated realities that happen between people. The ethnographer includes his or her experience in an effort to make explicit the ways in which his or her position also forms and constructs the cultural story being crafted.

Norman Denzin (1997) has critiqued and added to the body of ethnographic theory that has been outlined thus far. As mentioned before, he picks up where Clifford’s Writing culture leaves off, looking critically at the new texts that have been written since the

Critical ethnography fits somewhere among this mass of descriptions pulling broadly from post-modern theory, (post) Marxist theory, and interpretive theory for its broad foundational influences – each respectively less or more so depending on the theorist or researcher doing the critical ethnography, and the phenomenon or location in question. It is perhaps already somewhat apparent that critical ethnography defies easy and categorical definition, unfortunately so for those who seek clear and present clarity, yet strangely appropriate for the goals and values of this type of method. Born of a melding of multiple theoretical models (some of which I have already alluded to), including critical theory (counting critical race theory), feminist studies, deconstruction (e.g. Derrida), cultural studies, and/or practices of urban sociology (stemming from the Chicago school), the extent to which each of these theories may inform a given critical inquiry depends upon the phenomenon to which it is being applied. For example, if the topic of investigation centers around women’s reproductive rights, the researcher may draw more heavily from feminist studies grounding an analysis in this history. However, for the current project, it seems more fitting to incorporate cultural psychology/studies, community theory, and critical/post-modern theorists who focus on systems of power, social identity, community, and mental health/psychology. Critical ethnography is thus a very flexible and very diverse type of qualitative inquiry.

Some of the characteristics that have been deemed essential to critical ethnography more broadly, include the distinction from conventional ethnography, firstly,
as “conventional ethnography with a political purpose” (Thomas, 1993, p. 4). Thomas further clarifies that “the difference between conventional and critical ethnography begins with a passion to investigate an injustice (e.g. racism); social control (language, norms, or cultural roles); power; stratification; or allocation of cultural rewards or resources to illustrate how cultural meanings constrain existence” (1993, p.36). Second, a major goal of any critical method includes investigating the taken for granted reality or that which presents itself as not requiring any further investigation (Thomas, 1993, p.3). Looking beneath surface appearances involves dialectical reasoning in which taken for granted assumptions about the world are problematized. A dialectical logic is considered an essential element of critical inquiry by some theorists who cite Marx as foundational to the practice of using dialectical logic to address materialist issues (Foley & Valenzuela, 2005; Madison, 2005; Wainwright, 1997). Marx purported a materialist conception of dialectics, emphasizing the socially constructed nature of both what we deem to be our subjective perception of the world and of phenomena as they occur in the real world (Wainwright, 1997). According to Wainwright, when we are able to use dialectics to challenge our representations, “we can recognize the historical specificity and social construction of prevailing phenomenal forms, in order that we can act to consciously transform them” (p.4). Thus the dialectical approach aims to problematize the relationship between “objective reality” and our attempts to represent it through knowledge and locates any knowledge within a particular historical moment (1997).

Examining the way that categorical representations are formed and placing them within a historical context is not only important because the world is constantly in flux, but because the categories through which we view the world also have a political
dimension, and concedes that some groups have privilege while others do not. From a Marxist perspective, certain groups have relative power over other groups, allowing them to exercise dominion, power, or control over those less powerful. Yet the exercise of power is not simply or straightforwardly a matter of one party having it, and wielding it over another but, as Foucault (1978) demonstrates, historical categories through which we view the world produce the conditions under which power can be enacted – no one actually has power in the sense that they possess it, such that those who maintain a privileged social position are conceptualized as having greater access to discourse and thus truth claims than those with relatively less power. Because power represents a matrix of relations which exists everywhere and “comes from everywhere,” the powerful and the powerless are always caught up in power relations that supersede their individual situation (Foucault, 1978, p.93). Both of these conceptions of power would support the closer examination of categories or as Foucault would say, the “discourse” through which we grasp the world in order to expose the way that they are constructed and “a product of a whole network of social and economic relations” (Wainwright, 1997, p.5).

It becomes clear that critical ethnography has been described in a variety of ways by a multitude of theorists, and that the practice of critical ethnography is equally as diverse, being applied to a range of topics ranging from campus date rape to the land rights struggles of Nicaraguan indigenous groups (Sanday & Hale as cited in Foley & Valenzuela, 2005) to an analysis of gender and power in heavy metal music subculture (Krenske & Mckay, 2002) and several analyses of poverty in the United States (Fein & Weis, 1998; MacLeod, 1995). Foley and Valenzuela (2005) point to the new, much more politically active focus of critical ethnographers who have aimed their cultural critique at
a range of topics such as corporate agriculture, environmental pollution, pharmaceutical dumping, transnational labor migration, the publishing industry, cyberspace hackers, criminalization of urban street life, and informal economies based on drugs, sex, and cultural rebellion.

Aside from examples of “critical ethnography” per se, I would like to highlight two ethnographic studies that focused on psychological practice, which of course is the topic of the current study. Gubrium’s (1992) ethnography of two family treatment facilities and Bloor, McKeganey, and Fonkert’s (1988) ethnographic study of various therapeutic communities represent two important projects in the history of ethnographic research into psychotherapy practices. Both studies relied heavily on participant-observation, a central technique in ethnographic methodology, and provided rich, detailed descriptions of the everyday workings of psychotherapy clinics/communities. Although each of the studies focused on different issues occurring across different settings, both set out to examine psychological practice more holistically.

Bloor et al. (1988) and Gubrium’s (1992) studies demonstrate the usefulness of applying ethnographic methods to understand how therapeutic communities and family therapy operate, respectively. McLeod (2001) has suggested that using an ethnographic approach to psychological research adds dimension to our knowledge of psychotherapy by presenting a “detailed, vivid and highly readable descriptive account of what happens in these therapy centers” and that “the reader gains a sense of what it would be like to be a staff member or patient” (2001, p.66). Rather than glossing over the details of what goes on in psychotherapy, these studies represent examples of how the ethnographic method can offer more concrete descriptions of those interactions, thus opening the
possibility of a different kind of analysis. Both Gubrium (1992) and Bloor et al.’s (1988) methods were based on an analysis of the use of language at clinics, routine interaction patterns, and physical surrounding as a way of demonstrating the way that the experience of being a therapist or client at a psychotherapy center is constructed.

More specifically, Bloor et al.’s 1988 study represented a comparative analysis of ethnographies of eight different therapeutic communities including hospital communities, foster family communities, halfway house communities, and concept houses, to name a few. Taking an ethnographic approach, the researchers kept copious notes of their participant-observations of the various therapeutic communities. They were attentive to the daily activities of each setting: including observing psychotherapy groups and individual sessions, spending time with patients during activities, interviewing staff, and attending staff meetings. Bloor, McKearney, & Fonkert (1988) also included self-reflections which included their reactions and experiences of the various communities as another source of data. The precise role of the researcher varied across research study and setting. For example, in most of the studies researchers adopted roles akin to a “junior staff member” whereas in one study the researcher actually participated in a concept house as a resident (Bloor et al., 1988). All of the studies relied upon field notes, although additional materials such as documents, audio recordings of conversations and groups, of interviews, and panel discussions were also used in some settings. The data was then analyzed and organized across themes which were agreed upon by the researchers. The implications of the findings were assumed to vary according to “audience” and therefore were written with three specific audiences in mind: therapeutic community practitioners, sociologists, and general readers (1988, p.72). As this
organizational framework suggests, the findings of the study are presented in the form of both concrete suggestions for clinical practice as well as a philosophical and sociological analysis (including Foucaultian notions of power) of the work being done in these therapeutic communities. In this way the researchers take a closer look at both the implications of specific everyday clinical practices and also at the meaning the therapeutic endeavor has for society in general. For example, the authors mention that the practice of “making fellow residents responsible for keeping residents in treatment” (Bloor et al., 1988) had evolved at one center as a way to address premature termination of a day treatment program.

Bloor et al.’s studies are an example of how ethnographic research can be used in the service of evaluating and learning more about the everyday practices of mental health/medical professionals. They point out that although many studies (psychological and medical) have focused on specific aspects of practitioners’ conduct (case conceptualization, examination processes, intervention) and on doctor-patient communication, patient satisfaction, and patient control, much less attention has been paid to practitioners work, that is, what practitioners themselves see as the core features of their everyday activities. Moreover, adopting an ethnographic approach – at least in the sociological and anthropological vein the authors subscribed to – left the precise question or exact topic to be investigated somewhat open, and for participants to lead researchers to important subject matter. Because their research adopted a post-modern epistemology, more specifically drawing upon Foucaultian notions of power, they incorporated a reflexive consideration into their research – turning the researchers gaze back upon themselves. In addition to being a useful way to explore the often overlooked
dimension of power in psychological practice this approach, I would argue that a critically informed ethnographic approach to studying practice at the Center also opens up a space for culture to be acknowledged and explored.

**Preliminary Observations, Assumptions and Questions**

Critical ethnography is more than a method; it is an epistemological stance and “begins with an ethical responsibility to address processes of unfairness or injustice within a particular lived domain” (Madison, 2005, p.5). At the same time, critical ethnographers such as Madison, claim that “politics alone are incomplete without self-reflection” and that “critical ethnography must further its goals from simply politics to the politics of positionality” (p.6). Proponents of reflexivity understand positionality as essential to the project of the new ethnography, which presented itself as an alternative to the supposed “value neutral” inquiries of past ethnographers and many other empirical methods (cf: Cosgrove; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Fine, 1998; Madison, 2005; Thomas, 1993; Wainwright, 1997).

Proponents of the new ethnography warn against the consequences of conducting research under the banner of objectivity, such that cultures become reinvented and remolded to fit the categorization and philosophical systems of the researcher without any acknowledgement of this happening. Self-reflexive research methods expose the way that a researcher is always first and foremost a human-being with intuitions, perceptions, biases, emotions with which he or she makes sense of the world. When the researcher’s position is covered over they run the risk of unwittingly forcing others into their
unexamined framework. From a self-reflexive position the researcher is considered a co-participant or as Conquergood might say, a “co-performer,” thus immediately acknowledging the roles of both the researcher and research participants (as cited by Madison, 2005, p. 168).

**The Current Study - Preconceptions**

It is probably not usual for the same heading as the one above, to be represented in two subsequent chapters. The reader will recall from the previous chapter that, given the literature review, this dissertation positioned itself to study and explore community psychological practice in a specific setting. This chapter argued that that exploration and examination had to be of a certain kind – that there needed to be a synergy between the theoretical and methodological, between the ontological, anthropological, epistemological, and methodological. Hence, given my argument to conceptualize culture in a complex and dynamic manner, my epistemology (and in the next chapter, my methodology and procedures) had to be able to manage, tolerate, and in fact celebrate such complexity. Critical ethnography at first glance seem able to do just that, and to that ethnographic end – almost as a first step of sorts, it bears emphatic mention that many of my experiences, reflections, and assumptions are interwoven throughout this dissertation (and especially highlighted in Chapters 3 and 4). Here, in line with the express demand for the researcher’s voice, I begin with a consideration of some of my preconceptions.

My main research interest and curiosity regarding community mental health was prompted by several personal experiences. Many of these experiences took place at the
community mental health center where I conducted the current research. As a practicum student I conducted intake assessments, provided individual counseling services, co-facilitated a psychotherapy group, and consulted with psychiatrists and psychiatric nurses regarding my clinical work. During my work there I noticed that it was different from work in university counseling centers in a variety of ways, but among the most striking, was that the clinic utilized a community psychological model. From my very first introduction to the Center I was faced with a clinical orientation with which I was not yet familiar. For instance, during my orientation as a practicum student at the Center, the director at the time (although he is no longer working there) guided myself and two other new practicum students into “the group room” which also resembled a conference room of sorts. A long, worn-looking cafeteria table served as our conference table in this relatively small room with narrow rectangular windows that hung horizontally at the upper most place of the wall. I recall expecting to receive some information about the Center and about what was expected of us. Instead we were presented with a barrage of questions regarding what we knew about the Center. I recall being unprepared for this line of questioning, as this meeting had been called an “orientation” session, during which I had imagined I might become more oriented about the center and the surrounding community which it served. Instead, I left feeling somewhat disoriented and perhaps this was purposeful. The director began by putting each of the new practicum students on the spot, one by one, asking questions like: What did we know about this community? And what did we assume working there would be like? Underlying these questions there seemed to me to be other implicit questions: Why do you want to work here? What kinds of prejudices and assumptions are you bringing with you? Most of all, who are you
and how will that impact your work here? This line of questioning was a surprise to all of us, who had not been prepared to have this discussion quite in this way. Perhaps if the meeting had been framed as an interview, I might have been more prepared for the questions. In hindsight, the issue of difference, that we happened to be three Caucasian clinicians coming to work at a predominately African American clinic, was probably present from the beginning of this line of questioning – however it was just never explicitly addressed. After questioning us, the director quickly realized that we were a bit dumbfounded trying to find our bearings in a new place that we did not know much about. He presented us with a large map and began describing the surrounding neighborhood, including a brief history of the surrounding community and the Center’s place within it. He told us about the neighborhood’s long history of being home to immigrants, first to a largely Jewish population and then, later, to a predominately African American population. I do not remember much of what he may have told us that day about our clinical responsibilities at the Center, however I do strongly remember the feeling of how important the center’s location in that particular community was.

This incident stands out in my mind, perhaps not only because it was my first interaction with this practicum site, but also because it represented the first among many moments of my acute awareness of difference as a white student therapist coming to work at a clinic where the majority of the staff and clients identified as African American. Maybe even my expectation of what an “orientation” should be like was based on a model of other sites at which I had worked and of course, my own cultural and class background as a middle-class, white woman.
As such, working at this site, I was confronted with a variety of challenges to the way I had previously been taught to conceptualize psychological practice. I recognized that the notion of “community” was a prominent discursive organizing figure in the daily practices and structure of the center as it had not been in other psychology clinics in which I had worked. “Community,” as the term was often used, and as I will use it here, referred to residents of the community surrounding the Center— but it also made reference to the turbulent history that this community had endured. Periods of great cultural and economic prosperity followed by destructive urban renewal efforts splintered communities by displacing families from homes and creating serious economic consequences. Within this clinic the meaning of the term “community” was over-determined, making reference to experiences of continuing conditions of economic and social oppression as well as tremendous community resilience and spirit. I noted that clinicians were engaged with clients on a variety of levels, sometimes as therapists, sometimes as advocates when involved in community action meetings, and sometimes in less formal ways as when client-therapist lunches were arranged. The fluidity of boundaries was something that was both exciting and challenging for me as I had been encouraged to keep a relatively strict “frame” with my clients which did not include having significant contact/relationships with clients outside of the session time. I wondered what the conceptual model behind such an approach might be.

I also noted that many clients seemed to experience the Center as somewhat of a home away from home. They would spend time there, socialize with other clients, and attend social action meetings, all outside of their regular psychotherapy and psychiatric appointments. I had the distinct sense that the Center must be providing them with
something if they chose to spend so much time there. Of course, some clients were living without a home-base of their own. Without the amenities of a home, they used the Center to assist with everyday needs like showers, clothes laundering and simply a place to find shelter during the day.

Initially I was interested in client’s perceptions: what made them want to come back? What was helpful or not about their experiences at the Center? However, aside from the ethical and practical issues of engaging vulnerable populations as research participants (i.e. those who are diagnosed with mental disorders and have a right to confidentiality and privacy) I decided against going in this direction for other reasons as well. When reviewing the literature it seemed that far more qualitative studies had focused on factors that would encourage or inhibit various marginalized groups from utilizing mental health services. As illustrated in my literature review, this heavy emphasis on the “underserved populations” seems to keep the focus on the clients as the main issue – often to exclusion of a thorough examination of the system providing care to those populations. Smith (2005), Altman (1995) and Javier (1996), commenting on their work with inner city populations, have all suggested the complex ways in which mental health care systems are seen as inaccessible to these communities. These observations made me wonder: Is there some way in which mental health systems are set up in a way that is experienced as unfriendly, inaccessible, or undesirable to those who choose not to use those services? And, alternatively, are there ways in which mental health care might be better arranged so as to be more relevant and helpful to those who might typically avoid such services? The literature suggests that people of color, especially people of color in the lower socioeconomic bracket, are among the least likely to utilize
psychological services (see Atkinson, Morten & Sue, 1998; Stevenson, 2001; Chow, Jafee, and Snowden (2003); Snowden, 2005). I am reminded of a casual conversation I had with one of the therapists at the Center who told me that she believed most of the “Black” clients prefer to come to the Center as opposed to the several other satellite clinics in the area because they felt the other clinics were more “white” clinics. This therapist’s anecdotal observation is supported by findings from Mitchell’s (2005) study regarding African American women’s perceptions of mental health care, suggesting that these women felt alienated by traditional psychological services. But then I wondered - what is it that makes the Center so different? Are there specific practices or a given orientation that might make psychological services seem more relevant or welcoming than other clinics? Certainly a comparison across various community mental health clinics would have been very interesting and important research – however for the sake of the current smaller-scale dissertation project, I decided to begin with an exploratory study; one that highlights some of the contextual factors of practice in this Center that are geared specifically towards engaging an inner city community.

I also noted that many systemic, economic, and clinical demands weighed on clinicians in their everyday work at the Center. They seemed to have tremendous caseloads, modest salaries, and limited external support for resources. The structure of the clinic itself was a testament to the lack of resources with which the clinicians had to work. I thus also became interested in how the clinicians managed this situation. I believe that systemic factors, beyond the individual practice of the clinician also played a role in the provision of those services. This systemic level is also often excluded from much psychologically oriented research. Attention is often paid to specific psychotherapy skills,
or “factors” without due regard to what the clinician has to go through personally and professionally to provide those psychotherapy services in different “delivery” systems or communities. As such, I felt it would be imperative in a space like a community clinic where those strains seemed to be felt on multiple levels to incorporate a contextual dimension into my research. My assumption here is that the economic, political, and professional context in which clinicians provide services has an impact on those services.

In addition, I would like to give attention to another concern of mine when embarking on this research project. In one of my research methods classes during my graduate program, a professor brought up the idea that conducting research with marginalized populations, especially when the researcher is positioned in a position of relative power as a member of a dominant group, in my case a white woman from the academy, has the potential to be “colonizing.” I took the possibility that my research had the potential to be colonizing seriously as I proceeded with my research design. bell hooks (1989) has suggested that “when we write about the experiences of a group to which we do not belong, we should think about the ethics of our action, considering whether or not our work will be used to reinforce and perpetuate domination” (p.43). She argues that so often dominant groups are seen as subjects whereas those in positions of relatively less power are viewed as objects. Thus, as a member of a dominant social class, doing research in a marginalized community, I risk perpetuating this dynamic. On the other hand, hooks (1989) also suggested that writers should not completely avoid writing about a group to which they do not belong simply because of the risk of further domination. However, she argues rather that the voices of the marginalized group should be heard and considered as valid, alongside voices from more dominant groups. Although
I recognize that there is no concrete way around this issue, I tried to find ways to increase the agency of my participants in the research process. One way I attempted to address my concern regarding power was to engage several of my participants in the planning stage of this research. I requested their input as to what kinds of research questions would be most interesting or useful to them and used some of their ideas to further guide my research questions (I will discuss this aspect of my research in greater detail in Chapter 3). A second way I addressed this issue was to pay close attention to my interactions with participants and how they might be experiencing me. The fact that our relationship had preceded the research and I had in fact been trained by several of my participants, complicated the way that power arranged itself in our relationships (for example, I had been evaluated by some of my participants in the past and thus was in a position of relatively less power). Of course, regardless of my attempts to be sensitive to power dynamics and potential for my participation in oppressive power dynamics, from a Foucaultian perspective, power is dynamic and constitutive of all human relationships and thus there would be no way for me to account for the multiple ways in which power would arise across my research project. Discussing the issue of power in an interview, Foucault (1997) stated that:

In human relationships, whether they involve verbal communication such as we are engaged in at the moment, or amours, institutional, or economic relationships power is always present: I mean a relationship in which one person tries to control the conduct of the other. So I am speaking of relations that exist at different levels, in different forms; these power relations are mobile, they can be modified, they are not fixed once and for all (291-292).
I therefore kept both Foucault and bell hook’s comments regarding the workings of power close at hand during the course of this research.

In conclusion, I take as my place of departure the question of what it means to practice psychological practice in this Center with specific emphasis on the psychologist’s situation, understandings, challenges, and the way that the community theory is translated into practice/action. And, moreover, that to respond to that question necessitates a particularly robust and complex method and procedure, part of which is already demonstrated in this very section. In the next chapter, Chapter 3, I will go into more details regarding the background of my research setting and the specific ways in which I implemented critical ethnography, including the modifications I made to this method, given the specific demands of place, theory, and the discipline of psychology.
CHAPTER 3: METHOD, PROCEDURE, AND BACKGROUND TO
THE CENTER

My review of the vast and diverse ethnographic landscape thus far has been
general in order to set up a conceptual framework within which I can now situate myself
more specifically. My stance as a researcher during every phase of this research,
including formal data analysis, drew from interpretive, constructionist, and ethnographic
theory. My own observations, interactions, and experiences while working as a student-
clinician at the Center prompted my interest in exploring, in greater depth, what it was
that was happening there and my particular interest in using an interpretive ethnographic
stance. During my practicum, I took note of the way that staff worked with limited
resources and often found themselves at the intersections of the urgent and sometimes
conflicting needs of the clients, clients’ families, the psychiatric institution, and the
city/community. More specifically, several aspects of the Center’s work were particularly
interesting to me: 1) the way in which psychological services were structured and molded
around the interests and needs of the community 2) the difficult position staff found
themselves in trying to address and meet the needs and interests of the community while
simultaneously adhering to the goals (sometimes business oriented goals) and vision of
the larger psychiatric institution (and field in general) 3) staff’s consciousness and
integration of contextual and specific knowledge that they had acquired through both
personal experience and their work, and 4) the way in which staff responded to
contradictions and tensions between their work and personal experience, and the
mandates and assumptions of clinical psychology in general.

I also noticed that both clients or “patients” and therapists at the Center took on
multiple roles beyond the consulting room. Given that this mental health clinical also
served as a community “drop-in” center, people spent time there socializing with each
other, even at times briefly with the therapist. What was considered therapeutic or
“therapy” seemed to extend beyond individual or even group psychotherapy sessions.

“Help” or assistance was offered in many forms, directed both at what are often
conceived of as the more “intrapsychic” struggles (say, depression or anxiety) and/or
examining these aspects of the Center’s work that has the potential to contribute to a
deeper understanding of many of the complexities embedded in systems of mental health
care today, particularly with regard to addressing the needs of socially liminal
populations such as inner city African American communities. Furthermore, it has the
potential to open up and help us question psychology’s taken for-granted understandings
of social positioning, for example such as race and class, and their meanings within a
psychotherapeutic context. In the next section I describe the Center and the community in
which it is embedded (I use pseudonyms throughout). I also describe the particulars of
my method both theoretically and procedurally, but I trust it is clear already, in so far as
my observations are presented from a particular vantage point and described from a
particular perspective, that data analysis has already begun. There is therefore much less
of a rigid demarcation of method, procedure, results, and discussion than is often the case
in research dissertations. Not only does ethnography “proper” or “traditional” follow a
wholly different kind of structural unfolding, but so too does my reworking or adaptation
of critical ethnography. Furthermore, the very structure of such mainstream and traditional psychological research studies are themselves wrought on a natural scientific or logical positivist anvil – one this very study resists. Hence, even as I – for the most part – keep the borders and appellations of such a traditional dissertation presentation, I sail on the borders and margins thereof. That is, this dissertation, as a written record, retains elements of both ethnographic tradition (e.g. first-person descriptions of data interwoven throughout various sections) as well as structural elements of a traditional psychology dissertation (e.g. separate section for analysis of narrative themes). This section on method therefore both elucidates the method in greater detail as well as marks the beginning of my presentation of results.

**Research Setting and Community History**

This study was conducted at a community mental health center where I worked as a practicum student for roughly 1 year in 2004-2005. This Center operates as one of several satellite clinics of a psychiatric hospital which runs under the auspices of a large university medical center. The Center is located in an inner city neighborhood in a moderate sized city in Pennsylvania, and emerged as a result of federal funding granted to its parent hospital in 1967 for the development of a community mental health center. The physical site of the Center, however, was itself was not in operation until 1972 (WPIC Annual Report, 1968-69; Freidman, 1999). Before the Center emerged as a centralized community location, the hospital relied on several ambulatory “teams” to bring mental health care to various “catchment” areas in the community. These mental
health care teams brought services directly into people’s homes, schools, and various community programs. The goal was that each team would eventually have a specific physical location in the community. An annual report from the hospital describes the team charged with the task of serving the 8th district community in the following way: “this team has been in existence since the Community Mental Health Center and has had a relatively intense relationship with the black community” (WPIC Annual Report 1970-71, p.63). There is talk in this report of merging with a rehabilitation center drug program and the emergence of a drug program in the form of a therapeutic community that was already accepting patients. Although the precise history of the Center is somewhat sparse, one can get a sense from these annual hospital reports that during the late 1960s and early 1970s there was an emphasis on community and community programs that served as the basis for the eventual development of actual physical community clinics. This emphasis on community care was motivated by a common issue experienced across the nation – namely, individuals who spent time in psychiatric hospitals were sent back into a community where they often had few resources or social networks for support (Vega, 1990). As a result, the conditions of newly discharged patients would often deteriorate rapidly and the former patient would wind up back in the hospital. Community services, both the ambulatory “team” approach described above as well as community clinics, such as the Center, were developed to help prevent relapses and rehospitalization for patients within given communities.

The Center officially opened its doors in 1972 as an “outreach facility”; it was at the time and remains today, housed within a larger community organization building. The building is located on a main road, close to a major intersection which leads directly into
the downtown area. Despite its relative proximity to the city’s major business district, the 8th district is geographically cut off from the surrounding area by a large public arena on one side and by naturally occurring slopes that exist along one edge of the neighborhood. According to demographic statistics there are approximately 17,000 people living in the area, most of them identified as African American and working class. The Center is juxtaposed to what appear to be housing projects and across the street from a small strip of stores.

The Center is located within a moderate sized building that is actually home to several other community organizations (e.g. a child care program, an employment assistance program, a community initiative program); together these organizations form “Phoenix House” (not the real name). The walnut brown structure stands only two-stories high and was built in a 1970s architectural style. Outside of the building there is a long pathway leading up to the entrance and a large window where I often noticed children playing in the daycare center. On one side of the building is a play area for the children in the daycare and on the other side there is a large court area that leads to another building that is often used for community events. Just inside the main doors of the building there are numerous plaques paying homage to those who have supported Phoenix House and other revered community members. The main doors lead directly into a large lobby area that is overseen by a receptionist who can assist in directing visitors to the appropriate office. Decorating almost every wall of the lobby are large plagues outlining the mission of Phoenix House and depicting historical photographs of the community. It is important to mention that Phoenix House and its many contingencies have been instrumental in bringing jobs, education, and support for families to many
community members. The house has been active politically speaking, getting local and national politicians to speak at the community event center in order to inspire political activism and empowerment in the community. Phoenix House operates according to a simple philosophy: “awaken each person’s power to reach their potential. Positive change in individuals strengthens families; and ultimately transforms communities.”

The Center is thus but one small, yet important branch of this House. As mentioned, it is also considered a satellite clinic of a psychiatric hospital and thus operates as both a part of a for profit medical institution and within a community-based not-for-profit organization which makes for an interesting dynamic to which I will return later. It is located in a relatively small suite on the second floor of the building and contains rooms for both community oriented activities as well as clinical “therapy” rooms. The setting of the clinic itself will be considered in further interpretive detail in the following Results and Discussion Chapters. I consequently turn now to a comment about the history of East city (not the real city name) and in particular the unique and troubled history of the 8th District. This history has significant bearing on the practice of psychology at the Center.

Community history: A beginning point of ethnographic access

I first visited East city because I had been invited to interview for acceptance into a graduate psychology program there. On the day of my interview, I caught a cab to the university and had a brief yet memorable conversation with the taxi driver. As we turned around a bend and approached the university, he motioned to his left and stated that I
should “never” go in “that direction”— that is, “unless I had a gun.” Being completely new to the city, I was perplexed and curious and really had no sense of the context of his comment. From his description, I imagined it must be a very dangerous place, yet at the same time I wondered to myself what this person’s idea of dangerous was. Somewhat ironically, the very same area that this taxi driver had warned me about came to be the place where I would complete a practicum and develop as a researcher over the next few years. Although I did not “need a gun” to go to my practicum, I did often hear stories from community members about shootings occurring, 8-year-olds being sent out to deliver narcotics, and the fear of going outside because of chronic violence. I was often caught, both in my clinical work and as a researcher, between balancing what I heard about the realities of people’s lives with the way in which this community had been constructed as a dangerous and violent place. To say that this area is “constructed” as dangerous is not to invalidate the subjective experiences of those who live there, but rather to point out the reciprocal way in which social communications, via media and word of mouth (and via taxi driver) shape what we experience as reality. It is likely that this neighborhood was not the only area in which there was violence and drug running, but it had become the city’s scapegoat. In constructing an area in such a way one could feel more in control of avoiding the issues that this area came to represent. My very first interaction with anyone in the city was a testament to this construction.

The 8th district went through several transformations before it came to be what it is today. At the turn of the 20th century, the community was home to many European immigrants, mostly Irish and German-Jewish families, and later it was also populated by Italian, Russian, Polish, Romanian, and Slovakian immigrants (Goldman, 1968). Later in
the century even more diverse groups came to settle in the area, including Syrian, Armenian, and Lebanese immigrants and finally a large influx of African Americans from the southern United States. M.R. Goldman (1968) writes in his memoir of growing up in the area that during this time it was truly a “human cauldron or an American melting pot” mixture of a very diverse group of people. Cultural and economic shifts occurring during World War I, including the cessation of European immigration, led to the opening of East city’s job market to African Americans. This prompted a migratory wave from the South which increased the northern black population by more than 500,000 between the years of 1910 and 1930 (Trotter & Smith, 1997).

During this period, the 8th District, located just outside of downtown East city, was a virtual Mecca of culture, art, music, and entertainment. Many of the nation’s finest jazz musicians were drawn to the area and the 8th district was also home to many talented writers and artists, an area that "was thriving, bustling, and safe--a center for music, art and literature"(Pittsburgh Department of City Planning, Retrieved on July 19, 2007). The 8th District community was home to many activist groups, Black run businesses, and even a baseball team. A newspaper was founded during this period and became the nation’s largest and most influential black paper. The paper was committed to creating a sense of community and promoting black interests by chronicling issues such as housing, education, job opportunities, and political awareness.

Despite the 8th District’s cultural prosperity during this time, the community was still struggling economically and politically. African Americans were prohibited from securing jobs because of segregation and discrimination laws, and with the decline of industry in the area fewer jobs were available. As deindustrialization ensued, after World
War II, a splitting of black experience among class lines ensued due to deindustrialization of the region. The consequences of the loss of industry were devastating for working-class African Americans, economically speaking. To complicate and perhaps aggravate these difficulties, movements to begin an “urban renewal” project began as part of the city’s preparation for soldiers returning after WWII. Interestingly, the 8th district’s contribution, culturally speaking to the city, in terms of music, literature, sports, and politics, did not prevent prominent community figures from claiming that the 8th District was “a slum not worth saving (as cited in Trotter & Smith, 1997, p. 425). Admittedly, this dissertation does not intend to present a complete history of the 8th District, and therefore an exhaustive literature on the topic was not reviewed. However, after reviewing several articles on the subject, I was hard pressed to find any articles that contested this view of the 8th district. For example, one member of City Council wrote the following in a newspaper article in 1943: “Approximately 90 per cent of the buildings in the area are substandard and have long outlived their usefulness, and so there would be no social loss if they were all destroyed” (Evans, 1943). He goes on to say that because the renewal of this area would not involve displacing any major manufacturing plants or “important industries,” only residential housing, that the area is “well adapted” for redevelopment. Quite coincidentally, as I wrote this section, I happened upon a report of archaeological excavations in Indianapolis (where a similar African American community was razed to make way for the University of Indiana) uncovering that the argument of the day, of a community of decay and blight, was not altogether the case, and that in fact there was a thriving, middle class community in place (“Dig finds a thriving Mecca,” National Public Radio, July 23, 2009).
The argument of “urban renewal,” made by members of City Council, and in the submissions for building a large sports arena in the area, hardly makes mention of, or considers, the residents of the 8th District, the majority of whom were African Americans. The residents and small businesses of this area seemed invisible in these stories of reconstruction, as if they did not even exist. According to my interpretation of these articles the implication is that the residents of this neighborhood did not matter as much as the displacement of any “important industries” when it came to plans for demolition and reconstruction of this area. In the 1940s, legislation was passed permitting condemnation of the area and its consequent “renewal”. Demolition was authorized in the early 1950s, which uprooted 1500 black families in order to make way for a domed Civic Arena and luxury apartments. Uprooting was sudden and no provision was made for resettlement – housing conditions did not improve but these people were crowded into nearby neighborhoods, forcing the middle class out of those areas. A second setback for the local black poor was the inability to get governmental agencies to respond effectively to their needs. The federal war on poverty failed, as did the activism of local community agencies, largely because of the geographic dispersal of community members into 7 neighborhoods, making unity difficult because of competing interests and priorities. This failure of the War on Poverty clearly contributed to the riots of the late 1960s, which some saw as a “political” statement by the poor to call attention to their continuing plight of African American residents. Others suggest that the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. prompted the riots at this time. Regardless, the cumulative effect of a deracinated community, an infrastructure ravaged by riots, and a city government that seemingly had very little concern for, or interest in, the needs or demands of the
remaining residents of this district was an increasing volatility and desperation in the area, accompanied by a population decline from more than 50,000 in 1950 to as little as 15000 by 1990, most of whom lived in public housing then.

As the cab driver’s comment to me, referenced earlier, suggests, the 8th district still has not fully recovered. The community reports some of the lowest median incomes in the city, while public housing projects seemed to concentrate poverty. It remains unclear how the recent destruction of public housing projects and construction of market-rate housing will impact the community. Community members and staff members at the Center continue to be concerned regarding some of the plans for urban renewal in the area. Most recently a plan to build a casino on the perimeter of the 8th district has prompted protests from those concerned about the negative impact such an industry could have on the surrounding community. I attended a local community meeting in which this was the topic of discussion and several attendees raised concerns about the rise of drug abuse, gambling addiction, and crime that often occurs because of casino activities. It is unclear whether or not the 8th district community has more of a voice politically speaking than it once did, but there is certainly a push to invigorate the community from the inside out – to get community members engaged in determining the future of the neighborhood and attracting the attention of major politicians (John Edwards recently spoke at the community center connected to the Phoenix House during the 2008 campaign).

As mentioned before, my analysis of the Center includes a consideration of local context and thus my analysis has already begun with this description of the setting and community history. In the next section, however, I delineate more concretely the methods/procedures I used to formally obtain and record this data.
Data Collection: Participant-Observations and Interviews

Material for this study was drawn from two main data points. First, I conducted participant-observations of psychological practice at this clinic, drawing on my own experience working as a student therapist and my observations of the workings of the clinic itself. These observations included descriptions of the material condition of the clinic itself as well as everyday practices and conversations regarding treatment and diagnostic decisions, common interactions/rituals among staff, etc. Material gained through these observations does not include specific clinical information about any clients, even as some descriptions make reference to staff’s interactions with clients. I also took into account various important forms/documents utilized at the Center as a way to illuminate the more formal and inscribed story of what it means to provide psychological service through this institution.

Semi-structured interviews with four staff members formed a second major data point in this study. Although going into the project I had anticipated drawing equally from participant-observations and interviews, in some ways the detailed narratives I received in the interviews provided me with a wealth of information that felt like it overshadowed other data points. At the same time, I found that participant-observations and interviews were reciprocally informed. My experience as a practicum student and observations as a researcher led me to particular participants and particular interview questions, and participants’ answers to these in turn pointed back to, and further illustrated, many of my observations. Using multiple sources of data is consistent with
ethnographic methods because it lends itself to a “thick” description of the studied phenomena from several perspectives.

Before even beginning to collect formal data, I had a number of casual discussions with staff members at the Center regarding how they felt about research being conducted at the Center and what kinds of research might be interesting or beneficial to their work. All of the staff members I approached expressed enthusiasm for research being conducted at the Center. Many of their research concerns revolved around how to continue to improve services for clients. Interestingly, sometimes staff’s concerns at first were presented in psychiatric terms. For example, one staff member stated that he would be interested in patient “compliance” with medication and how to improve patient compliance. However, he quickly began wondering aloud about the social, political, and economic factors that might be contributing to what was typically understood as “non-compliance.” He mused about the possibility that sometimes clients do not follow-up with medication or appointments because they are afraid to leave their homes due to violence in the person’s building or neighborhood, or because they could not find child care, or afford to pay for the medications. This staff member presented several practical examples from his experience in which this had occurred with his clients. These early conversations, coupled with my own experiences as a clinician at the Center, helped to inform my research focus and interview questions. I eventually became most interested in how psychologists at the Center managed and navigated competing demands of the psychiatric system, clients’ needs, community needs, as well as their own needs.

After completing and having my dissertation proposal approved by my committee, I moved to the next phase of obtaining approval from the university’s
Institutional Review Board (IRB). Because I was conducting research in a clinic associated with another university, I had to obtain consent not only from Duquesne but also from the university medical center of which the Center was a satellite. In order to obtain IRB approval from this university medical center, I had to first find a faculty member at this university to “sponsor” my research. Eventually a psychiatrist agreed to sponsor my research and I began the rather lengthy process of preparing an IRB proposal that would be suitable for this institution’s purposes. Approval for the study was eventually granted by the review boards of both the medical center and Duquesne university. Staff at the Center were presented with informed consent (located in Appendix A) on an individual basis so as to guard against the potential for feeling coerced into participating in the study that might happen more readily in a group setting.

**Participant-observation**

I spent about 6 months in the Center recording my participant-observations. My role in the Center at the time was both as a clinician and as a researcher. I kept a detailed journal of my reflections, observations, emotional reactions, thoughts, and even my own embodied sense of what was happening in the Center. These journal entries typically took the form of little “snippets” of interactions or experiences that stood out to me although I also described the physical space and location of the Center quite a bit. I paid particular attention to the use of the term “community” in this context which made reference to certain shared sociohistorical experiences as well as geographical “territorial” context. Both at the level of data collection as well as interpretation I tried to remain sensitive to
the way that I was positioned and positioned myself as a researcher-clinician with a different sociohistorical background in many senses. I paid close attention to the interactions I had with clients and staff alike, placing myself in locations where I could become a participant-observer of what was meant by the terms “community” and “community-based clinical practice,” as well as the dynamic interplay of race and class within the context of the Center and perhaps how, if at all, I could be included within this context as a member of the “community.” Clinically speaking, I took particular note of the everyday struggles that the therapists faced in their practice as they wondered how to address the manifestation of psychiatric/biological symptoms that were expressed by an individual while simultaneously understanding such distress as symptomatic of larger social (community) issues. I followed many of the suggestions outlined by Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) in recording these field notes – suggestions such as writing in the first person to emphasize my presence as the researcher and reactions, paying close attention to interactions and discourse, and describing the characteristics of those around me, important events, and various conversations. At the same time, because I was often engaged at the time of the event or conversation I typically took time to reflect and transcribe what I had experienced after the event rather than writing notes at the time. I believe, as Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) point out, that as a “newcomer” clinician, I was in a prime position to access some of the more covert clinical understandings and practices at the Center; they write: “[the newcomer’s] struggles, mistakes, and questions” during training, has the potential to reveal the “implicit knowledge and skills most long time staff members take for granted” (p. 47). Although it was difficult to decide how these notes should be presented, I have chosen to integrate some of them throughout the
dissertation. Some of my participant-observations are highlighted in specific quotes in my results section and others took more of a background role in helping me to determine questions to ask during interviews or are present in my description of the clinic space and my research participants.

**Interviews**

I chose to use interviews as a means to access how staff might describe their clinical work at the Center. The structure of these interviews was heavily guided by my prior clinical work at the Center and my participant-observations. As Coffey and Atkinson (1996) suggest, I engaged in ongoing analysis of my participant-observation data in order to inform subsequent interview discussions. I recognize that there are pros and cons, so to speak, of using interviews as a primary research method, especially with a project that is attempting to examine the more dynamic and practical concerns of clinical work. For example, I was concerned that interviews would get at the intellectualized understandings of clinical work and might neglect the social dimension of how therapists talk to each other about their work. I originally thought that a focus group or a discussion group would be more in keeping with a community spirit and get at a spontaneous discussion of clinical work. However, I was aware, based on my own clinical work at the Center, that staff barely had time to convene for one staff meeting per week, let alone get together for my research. Given the arrangements of the clinic and relatively small staff I thought bringing the majority of clinicians in the Center together for a focus group might prove to be a difficult task that might be also be disruptive to the activities of the clinic.
Furthermore, being in a focus group with fellow coworkers and their director could potentially have inhibited staff members from speaking freely. I imagine, based on some of what participants shared with me, that they may not have been so candid had a fellow employee been present. I understood my interviews with participants as more like continued conversations from our earlier discussions and work together. In fact, although I did arrange for formal interviews with each of my participants, I also understood interviewing in a broader sense as merely “talking with people” in a more casual sense (as suggested by Devault & McCoy, 2002). My semi-structured interview guide included questions informed by experiences and observations in the field and thus continued to change in light of my observations (a copy of this interview guide can be found in Appendix B). In addition, my interview questions changed slightly with each interview in light of participants’ responses. As I learned which kinds of questions might elicit more interesting or in-depth responses I could adapt my interviews accordingly. I believe that an iterative approach to interviewing (rather than a pre-planned structured interview) is in keeping with a constructionist perspective and an emphasis on the dynamism of culture and also the general dynamic spirit of the Center.

Interviewees were chosen based on their knowledge and involvement in the Center. Each participant was contacted separately, some more formally than others. All interviews took place in the participant’s office and ranged in length from 30 – 90 minutes. Before beginning the interview I presented the participant with informed consent forms from both Institutional Review Boards and offered to respond to any questions about my research. Each participant signed a consent form allowing me to utilize data from our conversations in my study. Participants were also offered a $20 gift-
card to a local supermarket in exchange for their participation in this study. Interestingly, every one of my participants stated that they intended to either use the card to purchase necessities for the clinic or to donate it to local charitable organizations. Signed consent forms were stored in a lock file cabinet in my house. All interviews were digitally recorded using recording software on my laptop computer. Audio-files were then compressed and stored in password protected files on my computer. Written transcripts of these interviews can be found in Appendices D-G.

Research participants

I aspired to have the kinds of relationships with my participants that Conquergood (1989; 1992) recommends and in this spirit, I built relationships with most of my potential participants over the course of a few years – first as a practicum student and then as a researcher. I had the most contact with a few of the main therapists at the clinic and worked in various capacities with each of them as a student therapist before beginning this research. Each of them has played a role in guiding my clinical and professional development. I have had relatively less contact with other potential participants, such as psychiatrists, social workers, medical residents, and administrators; however, to many of them I believe that I was a familiar presence. I chose to return to work part-time as a practicum student in August of 2006 so that I could continue to build relationships with participants and gradually get a sense for the kinds of issues that are most salient to them. I chose participants based on their involvement in providing the majority of services at the Center and their interest in reflecting on their work. The
following is a brief preliminary description of each of the participants. Additional details about the participants are also integrated into my results section (Chapter 4). I used pseudonyms for each of the participants to conceal their identities.

*Tom*

Tom(P1), a 60-year-old African American therapist, agreed to participate in a formal interview after several conversations about my research. By the time of interview, I had known him for approximately 2 years and had worked under his supervision for a 1 year practicum at the Center. He expressed interest in my research and also contributed to the initial focus of my research project. Tom had many potential research questions about the work the Center was doing, especially with regard to how they could better serve their clientele. He displayed passionate interest in the meaning of his clinical work with the community, particularly with respect to “community trauma”. Tom had worked in the field of psychology for 30+ years, the majority of which he had spent as an administrator and clinician in a hospital substance abuse unit. When this hospital closed, he came to the Center and by the time I interviewed him, he had served as the Center’s director for approximately 3 years and was preparing for retirement. Tom shared with me that he had completed all coursework for a Ph.D. in clinical psychology, except for his dissertation.

On interview day, Tom was dressed in his typical business casual attire – khakis and a blue buttoned down collared shirt. The door to his office was open that day and as I approached the doorway he greeted me in his usual friendly style. Tom looked up from his work and said, “Hey, how ya doin?’” He was eating lunch while working (a common practice at the Center because there often was little to no time for extended lunch breaks.
away from the centre) and motioned as if he would stop when I came in. I encouraged him to keep eating and he continued to eat as I set up and we chatted about the many changes that the Center was going through. Most notably, the Center had finally been awarded money for renovations – money that, according to Tom, the Center had been requesting for several years. I surveyed Tom’s office and noted that it had been freshly painted just before the interview but in most other respects his office looked pretty much the same as it did before the renovations. There were the same African masks on the wall, a painting of a little Black boy playing and a large potted tree near his desk. Tom’s office was also cluttered with stacks of papers on just about every surface and items that had been donated to the Center, such as toys and clothing, were piled in the corner. Once we were both ready to begin the interview, Tom slid his desk chair closer to the table where I had set up the microphone for recording. He stretched out his legs in front of him, leaned back in his chair looking comfortable and relaxed and signaled that he was ready to begin.

Throughout the interview I had the impression that Tom had thought a lot about his work and had a lot to say, given the rapid pace of his speech. He also spoke with considerable emotion, emphasizing points with voice inflection and presenting examples from his own clinical work. I discovered that he had been very active in the civil rights movement during his college years in California and how he felt this social consciousness continued to shape his clinical work. Throughout the interview, Tom and I often referred back to our previous conversations giving this interview the feeling of being more of a continuation of previous discussions than some of my other interviews. At the end of the
interview Tom offered to continue our conversation if there was anything I wanted to follow-up on after the interview.

**Theresa**

Theresa, an African American woman in her 50s, started working at the Center relatively recently, and had only been there for a few months when I interviewed her. I therefore did not meet her while I was completing my practicum at the Center. She seemed enthusiastic about participating in my research study when I first asked her, and was friendly and casual as she welcomed me to her office on interview day. She was eating lunch when I arrived, and after greeting me, she asked me to review what my research was about. I shared with her my interest in documenting the multifaceted nature of practice at the Center including an analysis of how social/contextual issues were integrated into clinical work.

Most of what I know about Theresa I learned from my interview with her, including that she had grown up in the 8th district as a child and thus had a sense of the community transition that had taken place over the course of the past few decades. I also learned that she had worked in another clinic associated with the hospital over 25 years ago when, as she explained, psychiatry was still more closely aligned with psychoanalysis. She, too, had completed all coursework for a Ph.D. in psychology but had stopped before completing her dissertation after being offered opportunities to travel and do refugee work with the ministry. She also had experience working with anti-gang movement in the United States.
In terms of our interaction on interview day, Theresa seemed relatively friendly and open up until the point that I turned the recording device on. I can only speculate as to what Theresa may have been feeling, but I had informed her that I would be recording the interview and she had watched me fumble with the recording device for the first 5 minutes of our conversation. Theresa’s tone changed considerably and she had the sense that she rejected many of my attempts to paraphrase what she was telling me. Later in the interview process she seemed to relax more and I was able to join into the conversation more, however I believe the specific content of our interaction warrants further analysis and thus will be included in my results chapter.

Michael

Michael identifies as African American and is in his 30’s. He shared with me that he had grown up in East city and had attended college there as well. He holds a masters degree in social work and was raised in a family where he was taught to “give back” to the community and that everyone has a “responsibility” to make a positive difference in others’ lives. Michael shared that this type of philosophy also fits well with his Christian upbringing.

During the initial phases of the interview, I had the distinct sense of a cautiousness or distance between Michael and I. For example, Michael responded to my interview questions with only short answers at first and it almost seemed as though Michael might be trying to give “correct” answers, using more professional jargon than I had heard him use in casual conversations. As a result of this style, this interview
followed a more structured format than the previous two interviews (with Tom and Theresa). However, as the interview progressed, Michael appeared more relaxed. He began to spontaneously offer information about himself and at the end of the interview he actually stated that he had “enjoyed” the process and was “surprised” that he did. Michael admitted that he had “not known what to expect” but that it “felt good” to have half an hour of undivided attention to process/talk about his experiences as a clinician. He alluded to the fact that the primary task of most clinician’s doing psychotherapy is to listen but that they are often not given significant time to process those experiences. This is especially true at community mental health centers where the influx of patients often exceeds the time and resources available to treat them.

Sam

Sam (P4) a European American man in his 50s told me that he had been a psychiatrist at the Center for several years. He has a background in psychiatry, which is different from all of the other participants, however he made it clear that his first love was psychotherapy/psychoanalysis and he sees psychotherapy as something that is integrated into his otherwise more medically oriented treatment of clients. I had relatively little contact with Sam during the time that I worked at the Center, partially because of my limited time there, but also because he was more involved in the training of medical residents than he was in the training of clinical psychology practicum students. However on occasion I had consulted with Sam regarding medication issue or when his permission
was required to get certain resources for clients. He shared with me that he was the child of Jewish immigrant parents and that this heritage had been an important part of his identity growing up. Furthermore, being aware of his Jewish heritage sensitized him to issues of oppression and the abuses of power in other communities as well, which had drawn him to doing work in the 8th district. Sam talked about his strong commitment to the public psychiatry movement and how he works hard to bring information about this branch of psychiatry to more professionals who he recognizes are often struggling to do this work with little support.

In terms of his interview, Sam’s style was more direct and factual at first but as the interview progressed he seemed to become more comfortable, asking me more questions about my research and bringing the interview to topics that were most interesting to him. I remember thinking that my interview with Sam would be brief, but to the contrary it ended up being one of my longest interviews, rich with content and thought provoking material.

**Data Interpretation**

Although I will begin an explicit discussion of data analysis in this section, analysis was incorporated into every phase of my research process. I approached this study guided by the question of what it means to practice community-based clinical psychology, and I used the content of early observations and interviews to further shape more specific research questions, including: How are the ideas of community and diversity understood and lived through in this setting? What are the systemic
circumstances that shape this practice? How do psychologists navigate this system and what are the tensions/challenges, disruptions to this work? Reflecting upon preliminary data content helped to further shape my research questions which in turn informed my analytic method. I found, as Maxwell (2005) suggested, that data analysis begins way before formal data analysis commences. I began to reflect upon and interpret what I observed and heard during interviews as they were occurring. Furthermore, the process of listening to recordings, transcribing, and taking preliminary notes was also an interpretive process.

Data transcription

I was surprised by the degree of interpretation that was involved in the process of data transcription. Each time I listened to the audiotapes I heard more nuances; sometimes I heard words differently or noticed a subtle pause or intonation that seemed to change the meaning of the content of what was said. I probably could have listened to the audiotapes indefinitely and heard the conversation differently each time. However, I chose to listen to each audiotape several times in an effort to consider as many different “listenings” as I possibly could within a reasonable time frame. Transcription of the 5 interviews took place over the course of several months. In the end, however, I chose to eliminate one of the interviews in my formal interview analysis, mainly given its brevity, and the fact that, in the main, it reiterated the themes and concerns of the others. This does not mean, though, that the information gleaned from this interview did not inform my understanding of the data more generally. I am convinced that the interview is present
in the data interpretation in a sedimented sense, even though it was not subjected to as explicit/extensive analysis as the other interviews. I am pleased at the time I spent with the audio recordings and spent carefully recording the words, inflections, etc. because I believe it helped to give me that initial interpretive sense of basic themes and interactional content to which I would return later. A description of my transcription coding system can be found in Appendix B.

**Constructing narrative themes**

In trying to make sense of interview transcripts based on my discussions with participants as well as my own notes about my experience working as a student clinician, I read a variety of accounts of data analysis. Reading this material broadened my understanding of a variety of analytic methods, however at the same time this broad and varied literature in some ways, complicated the process as much as it provided me with direction. I was left with the question: What method will help me to explore my research questions and data in a manner that also respects and gives agency to my participants? Ultimately, I found that there really isn’t a pre-existing single method in qualitative methods that could serve this purpose. Instead of trying to limit myself to one single perspective, I chose to draw from various methods when it came to data analysis, incorporating what seemed to “fit” my particular topic. My first step in determining my specific procedures for data analysis involved getting a better sense of how I conceptualized the data I had collected.
After listening to the interview recordings, and reading over my transcripts multiple times, I was left with the sense that although I set out to investigate a topic – community mental health, or more specifically how community psychology is storied in one particular clinic – I had ended up with (and perhaps not surprisingly) stories about people’s lives. More specifically (but not exclusively) I had been offered glimpses into the life-stories of my participants. As they shared their personal stories with me, how they arrived at the Center, what their past experiences were growing up, their values, dreams, disappointments, and struggles, I discovered a dynamic landscape of autobiographies that were interwoven and in many ways inseparable from their descriptions of community mental health care. Their stories markedly enriched the topic at hand in ways that I had not anticipated. As their stories became more personal, I noticed myself, as the interviewer, becoming more personal - telling more about myself or my experiences and perhaps in a way that would be avoided by some in interview research. I felt compelled to participate, to reciprocate in the dialogue, to bring my “self” to the table in a way that was actually quite characteristic of the culture of this clinic. Interpersonal boundaries described (and observed during my participant-observations) between and among staff and clients were also being lived-out between myself and interviewees during interviews. Therapists at this Center were perhaps more primed to bring their “selves” to their work because of the personal investment they reported they felt in the types of struggles experienced by clients. Many of them shared the experience of being marginalized and had many personal experiences of what it meant to be a minority in the U.S. As such, their own experiences of discrimination, marginalization, and resistance to subjugation
were interwoven with stories about their clients (many of whom share this racial identification as well as other subjugated identities) about their work, and relationships.

Staff’s personal stories, interests, beliefs, values, and dreams could not be separated from their work, and the important relationships they had with others at the Center. Understanding “personal” stories as revealing something social or even political, much can be revealed regarding sociopolitical issues through analysis of staff members’ narratives. It is because of the way my participants appeared to be telling stories, even when my questions were not always geared to elicit a full narrative, that I kept returning to the conceptualization of my data as a collection of narratives. Perhaps even my own participant-observation notes were like stories – ways for me to make meaning of my experiences at the Center. I originally aimed to retain as much of the context of the interview as possible – keeping the narrative structure and incorporating my participation in the interview process, however when trying to integrate these rather lengthy narratives with other data points, the presentation seemed to become unfocused and unwieldy. As a result though, I really did end up analyzing my data in several different ways in order to arrive at a final analysis. Looking at interview transcripts as both whole stories as well as looking to parts of each narrative as they related to particular themes seems congruent with the kind of interpretive circle suggested by Dilthey (1900/1976):

> The whole of a work must be understood from individual words and their combination but full understanding of an individual part presupposes understanding of the whole…[Thus] the whole must be understood in terms of its individual parts, individual parts in terms of the whole. (p.259)
Thus my specific procedure of data analysis took this circular form, tacking back and forth between the whole narratives, breaking them down into parts and then seeking to understand those parts in terms of the context of the whole. This circular reflective process also took place when interpreting one interview in the context of others. In the next section I will try to describe the specific procedures that I followed in conducting this initial phase of analysis.

After reading all four interview transcripts as a whole, I began to make some initial notes regarding the content. Although I did not use a systemic coding scheme, I began marking ideas that stood out to me, seemed significant in the scheme of the narrative, or related to my main research questions. I drew suggestions from Miles and Huberman (1994) and Coffey and Atkinson (1996) who give thorough descriptions of the various stages of “coding” in their work. Miles and Huberman (1994) state that “codes usually are attached to ‘chunks’ of varying size – words, phrases, sentence or whole paragraphs, connected or unconnected to a specific setting. They can take the form of a straightforward category label or a more complex one (e.g. metaphor)” (p.28). As suggested, I went through and identified sections of data that seemed to revolve around a given narrative theme or topic. I did this to get a sense of the “what” that was being discussed. I looked for repeating ideas that seemed to relate to larger themes across interviews but also paid attention to differences or points of contention. I chose particular cases in the interviews to illustrate general patterns and demonstrate range and variation on a theme. I also subjected my field notes to a similar kind of thematic analysis and compared how these observations seemed to reflect or contradict narrative themes from my interviews.
Although this preliminary “coding” process is often thought of as a way to make data more manageable, I used this preliminary analytic process to “complicate” the data as well (Strauss, 1987). Strauss (1987) describes a process of interrogating data through coding as a means to expand the conceptual frameworks and dimensions for analysis. He argues that this process can be about going beyond the data, thinking creatively with the data and asking the data questions and generating theories and frameworks. Given the sheer amount of data I collected based on interview transcripts alone, not to mention participant-observations, I spent a considerable amount of time “questioning” the data and recording preliminary insights and connections. The data was taken apart and put back together in multiple ways, each of which helped me to form new interpretations and frameworks for understanding the clinical practice of psychologists at the Center. Final “themes” for each interview were determined using guidelines for selecting themes presented by Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) which include: giving priority to topics with substantial data which reflect underlying patterns in the field, giving priority to what seems significant to participants, what they think is key, and what looks practically important and/or engages a lot of their time and energy.

**Across interview analysis and intertextual reading**

After identifying the main themes in each interview I conducted an across interview analysis to better organize and simplify the data. I interpreted a framework for practice based on these themes that included central community issues to which staff oriented themselves, the way they conceptualized community issues, and how they acted
or intervened according to those understandings. I listed main themes that related to each of these dimensions and included quotes from participants that I believe to support each claim.

I also conducted what can be considered an intertextual reading of interview narratives, participant-observation notes, and my observation of the physical space of the clinic and surrounding community. I explored how these multiple data points reflected, contrasted, and overlapped with one another and wrote up more fluid analytic “stories” that incorporate all three of these dimensions. These narratives are included in Chapter 4 alongside my thematic analysis.

In addition to exploring the content of “what” was said or observed during the research processes and how different data points related to each other, I also felt it was important to consider a dialogical or interpersonal level of analysis. This meant paying closer attention to my interactions with research participants and how I was involved in co-constituting the stories that emerged (both during interviews and participant-observations). Furthermore, during this level of analysis, I also considered what was left unsaid by participants, going beyond what seemed to be immediately revealed by the data to consider what my data might be concealing. In the next section I will discuss some of the theory behind dialogical analysis and deconstruction and how I went about this step of the process.
Dialogic analysis and deconstruction

After organizing and getting a better sense of the content of my data, I turned to focus more explicitly on the context of this data (although this level of analysis was present throughout the study, I gave it particular attention during this phase of analysis). I understood the stories my participants told me as jointly constructed – dialogically produced between myself and participants, and community context. As Reissman (2008) suggests: “stories don’t fall from the sky (or emerge from the innermost ‘self’); they are composed and received in contexts – interactions, historical, and discursive – to name a few” (p.105). Therefore I felt it important to go back to my data and highlight the social/interpersonal context in which data was collected and subsequently analyzed. Shweder (1991) calls this step in the interpretive process a “witnessing in the context of engagement with the other” and implies the process of representing the other is inextricable from the process of acknowledging one’s own self as part of the process (p.110) Examples of this type of analysis are present in many of my participant-observations which are written in the first person and include some of my reactions, imaginings, and reflections. Notes from my participant-observations are interwoven throughout this report and thus this level of analysis is not limited to one particular section or chapter.

With regard to the broader context of the data – I understood participants’ stories as “social artifacts” telling me something about “culture and society as well as the person” and the clinic (Riessman, 2008, p. 106). Shweder (1991) too has suggested that context or culture and psyche are intertwined – as he put it: “you cannot take the stuff out of the psyche and you cannot take the psyche out of the stuff” (p.97). For example, I
understood the material space of the clinic as an important source of information about
the political, social, and economic context of psychological practice in this setting. By
analyzing what the physical “space” of the clinic seems to say, I give a voice (from my
perspective) to the context in a way that is central to understanding the practice of
community psychology at the Center. Conceptualizing social and the psyche as
interweaving in this way, the interview narratives of individual participants could be seen
as “social artifacts” that revealed the working of social mechanisms or institutional
practices. Various discourses or narratives spoke through each of my participants,
creating a multivoiced story that was inseparable from context.

The dialogical dimension of analysis also contains within it an element of
destruction, or as Shweder (1991) suggests, “going beyond the other” (p.109). To the
extent that I assume participants’ narratives as well as other data sources made reference
to complex and at times contradictory meanings, I take a destructionist approach. I
sought to go beyond participants’ narratives and my participant-observations to look at
the “unsaid” dimension. The issue of power if often to be traced through the analysis of
certain utterances: “an utterance carries the traces of other utterances, past and present, as
words carry history on their backs” (Riessman, 2008, p.107). I therefore sought to
highlight some of the tensions I saw as underlying the foundation of practice at the
Center as well as complex issues of power in my discussion in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The following presentation of results represents an integrated analysis of my participant-observations of the material/physical space of the community and the Center, the general activities of the Center, as well as formal semi-structured interviews with staff members. It should be borne in mind, again, that the ethnographic enterprise militates against the neatly ordered, almost dispassionate, presentation of results “without interpretation” that is so often the standard. While reading through my data I kept in mind my broad research focus, that is, what does it mean to practice psychology at this inner city clinic? More specific questions emerged during all phases of the research, from collecting data to organizing and interpreting it, and included: What discursive practices shape this clinical work? What are the central issues to which practitioners orient themselves? How do they conceptualize these issues and choose to intervene? How does this practice speak to the larger social, economic, and political context? What does this context have to “say” back to this work? I understood “the results” I obtained from analyzing these data sets as representing metaphorical conversations between myself, my field notes, and participant responses during interviews. Although I had multiple conversations with the data sets which could have been represented here in a variety of forms, I have selected particular aspects of that data in an effort to provide the broader picture of practice at the Center.

In asking the question of what constitutes practice at the Center, I was struck by the important ways in which the broader material and geographic/historical context
within which this work was situated and the specific clinical concerns were intertwined. I begin the following analysis looking at the broader context and then analyzing the more specific ways in which clinicians at the Center took this context into account. The first part of this results section is thus focused more on the geographic context and material space of the Center, as well as the professional context within which the work was situated. The second part of this results section focuses more on specific issues clinicians saw as central to their clinical work, how they conceptualized these issues, and then how, based on these conceptualizations, they chose to intervene, clinically speaking. This part of the process involves an across interview aggregate which focuses on the similarities across interviews. In the last part of the results section, I attend to some of the differences across interviews by highlighting a specific topic that was discussed in more detail by only one of the participants.

**Returning to the Setting: A Story About Space and Location**

Before beginning this analysis it is important to get a “lay of the land,” both literally and metaphorically, of the physical and social landscape of the Center. I thus begin with this orientation to the “land” and some of my personal experiences.

On one hot July day I decided to take a walk around the Center to get a better sense of the surrounding neighborhood. Leaving the Center, I walked down the stairs, past the front reception area and out onto the street. When I got outside I noticed three men standing and sitting clustered around a small ice cream stand adorned with a sign reading “Soul Ice” on the front. They look up at me momentarily as I took pictures of
the outside of the Center and down the long avenue, but then quickly went back to their
conversation. There was no one else on the street directly in front of the Center aside
from the men at the ice cream stand. On a typical day, there aren’t many people out on
the street in the area directly in front of the Center, unless they are waiting for a bus, that
is. The area immediately around the Center is clean and relatively modern. The
landscaping in front of the Center is kept neatly and suggests that someone (or a number
of someone’s) are taking care of this place. Even the housing projects next door
appeared well-attended to. Walking down the street, away from the Center, however, the
scene changes a bit. I notice small clusters of people on the sidewalk socializing or
sitting on stoops outside of run-down apartment buildings and stores. I notice that every
few store fronts or apartment buildings are boarded up, appearing abandoned and
dilapidated. Small businesses characterize much of the area – barber shops and family
owned supply stores. The signs and buildings are aging and bear the mark of a different
decade, another generation. I have the distinct sense of a place that has been frozen in
time. In between an abandoned building and a small store I see a sign that reads: “8th
district community development corporation: for hope of the community,” reminiscent
of local community rejuvenation efforts. I noted that churches of various shapes and
sizes pepper the avenue in between abandoned buildings. I pass a YMCA where a
teenage boy with headphones strapped over his ear sits with his legs dangling over a low
wall. But other than him, this part of the street seems deserted. As I walk back towards
the Center, I notice that the landscaping there stands out from a distance compared to the
surrounding buildings. The flowers marking the exterior of the Center seem especially
bright, boasting various colors of the rainbow – yellow, pink, red, and white in stark contrast to the conditions just a few blocks down the road.

I begin with this story here to set the frame for the way that the surrounding geography and the space of the Center itself tells a story, a story which speaks to a certain political, economic, and social reality that strongly shapes the practice at the Center. It bears reminding, again, that this framing departure story, as it is told here, is the ethnographer’s story, which – even as it takes the data of the space as its departure point – shapes the data through omission, inclusions, narrative style, my own assumptions, what I adjudicated as important, and incorporative of influences I may not even be completely conscious of. As an example, my experience of the community is filtered through a particular class, gender, and racial lens, so that the description above, including as it does the suggestion that buildings are “modern” or “run down,” may reflect a middle-class position. Yet, writing from the perspective of an outsider not only separates the researcher from the material and the space, but carries with it the possibility that important distinctions will be missed, or events and experiences misrepresented in some way. Hence, I used my discussions with clinicians and observations of activities at the Center as a way to “check” and challenge my perceptions and found that often my understandings were shared. The story, therefore, has intertextual resonance, valence, and echoes which now makes it both mine, and not mine.

My observations, historical texts regarding the 8th district, as well as discussions with staff and my own previous clinical work with clients were closely aligned. My
sense that large sections of the 8th district had been left behind or even forgotten was confirmed by newspaper articles suggesting that the 8th district was a “slum that was not worth saving” (Trotter & Smith, 1997). Clients often struggled with poor housing conditions and lack of available jobs in the area. Tom (P1) pointed out that the neighborhood did not even have a grocery store (aside from convenience stores) which suggested the degree to which the 8th district was viewed as a dead economy. A lack of new industry coming into the area made it difficult to spark the economy by providing people with jobs, and/or even begin to focus attention on developing the area. Theresa (P2) was also sensitive to the physical conditions of the community in her interview, and discussed driving to work in the wintertime and getting to a distinct point in the road after which the roads were not plowed or salted. At one point in the interview she described a boundary around the perimeter of the 8th district after which it is “no man’s land” – she says, “When I come to work usually I cross all the way across town and the worst roads, the ice, the snow, salt and everything stops at the top of the hill…And it must say so much to the people who live here. I keep saying what is there – is there some kind of city ordinance, ‘don’t salt the 8th district?’ Just that one thing has just made such an impression on me!” (Lines 160-168). As Theresa stated, the physical state of the community – the feeling of neglect one gets when walking through the neighborhood – must “speak volumes” to the residents. Theresa interprets the neglect of the 8th district as reflecting attitudes of the city towards the 8th district community. Broadly speaking, she suggests that undesirable traits (violence, crime, etc.) are projected onto this particular area of the city, which serves to keep non-residents feeling safe that they do not live in one of “those” communities. I, myself, had various
interactions with others throughout the course of my research (not to mention my
interaction with my taxi driver) during which they expressed concern that I was working
in the 8th district or otherwise wondered why I would bother. However, before
continuing with an analysis of important ways in which constructions of the 8th district
are shaped through discourse (the way people talk, write, sign about it), I now provide
more of a detailed sketch of the landscape of the Center itself, perhaps even in the
concentric focusing manner of a “classic” ethnography.

The Center

The Center, as a material structure and a space for certain kinds of social
interaction, represents a liminal space. It has strong roots in the community and
community not-for-profit organizations while also remaining dependent upon the funding
of the university medical center. The Center is located within the Phoenix House which
is home to a variety of community organizations and is supported by local charities and
individuals who have donated to the organization’s efforts. The Phoenix House thus
stands as a figure of resilience and community support, while at the same time its very
existence speaks to the destitution of the community. The Center itself could be described
in a similar way - however, as a mental health clinic, its efforts are focused mainly on
psychological difficulties.

The Center is located on the second floor of the Phoenix House which is a rather
non-descript institutional looking building boasting a 1960s architectural style. Walking
up the stairs of the Phoenix House, from the main lobby and rounding the corner, the
Center’s suite is identified by a rather small sign next to the door that bears the name of
the Center along with the name of the university medical center it is affiliated with. Once
inside the heavy institutional door to the Center lies a modest size lobby with a
receptionist window directly across from the doorway. The room contains little furniture
for its size: two tattered looking blue vinyl couches are positioned against the adjacent
and distant wall, which also contains a window to the receptionist area. Slightly further
down the distant wall, a half-door marks the entrance to a long hallway. The farthest part
of the room to the right opens onto another smaller room that contains a table with
various clothing items piled on top, or hung on, a nearby rack. The clothing reminds me
of the informal donation program that the director had started (or rekindled) to collect
necessities such as clothing for community members who may be in need of them. The
paint on the walls is an institutional beige color and is dull, smudged, and cracked in
some places. The walls are checkered with a smattering of flyers and framed posters that
convey inspirational messages about “achievement” and “integrity.” The posters are off
center within the frames which seem to be struggling to contain their contents. The look
of such inspirational messages within such decrepit looking frames is a bit ironic, and in
some ways bespeaks the very paradox within which therapists find themselves working
on a daily basis. That is, working towards great empowerment for the community with
relatively few resources. Aside from the posters, a laminated notice listing “patient
rights” is tacked in the corner by the entrance to the long clinical hallway. The floor is a
worn laminate material that bears the marks and cracks of many years of foot traffic. A
small table in the corner holds a large thermos with coffee, creamer and sugar. I am
reminded of the issues surrounding clients taking all of the sugar and creamer because
they were hungry. This type of behavior reflects the kind of poverty that many of the clients were living in.

The entryway to a long hallway containing the clinical offices is marked by a “half-door,” which is literally a Dutch style door which can be opened horizontally in two parts. This door serves as a gate of sorts, guarding the entryway to the interior of the clinic. During business hours the top part of the door is propped open while the bottom part remains closed. In order for anyone to get through they must be identified and “buzzed” through by the receptionist who unlocks the door through an electronic system that makes a buzzing noise. During busy times the perpetual “buzzing” sound of the door being locked and unlocked marks the flow of people going into and out of the Center, giving it a distinctly institutional feeling. I often wondered about how clients experienced this door. In many clinics, people are simply asked to wait in a lobby area until they are called, the assumption I presume, is that they will not get up and wander through the clinic uninvited. However, at the Center, this door represented a strong boundary, one that at first glance seemed anomalous to the otherwise open and familial atmosphere at the Center. When I spoke with Tom (P1) regarding the door he suggested that the clients appreciated this door, even though it made them dependent upon a designated authority figure to let them in and out. Tom claimed that clients “never complained” although they might get impatient at times and adamantly demand to be let out. Tom suggested that the relatively permeable boundary between the Center and the community created a vulnerability which, according to Tom, needed to be managed. He suggested that it was possible that the locking door served a protective function for both staff and clients alike. From my perspective, the half-door was an ambiguous structure. As Tom mentioned,
perhaps it kept people inside safe, but it also kept them confined, dependent upon the actions of an authority figure to determine when and how they would come into or leave the Center. Given that this Center was originally created by the university medical center in the 1970s to act as a step-down between hospitalization and the community, perhaps the door represents a remnant of mechanisms of control used on an inpatient psychiatric unit. The fact that the door remains half-way open, may symbolize the way that clients at the Center were, historically speaking, often “half-way” between living the restricted life of psychiatric hospitalization and living autonomously in the community. It should be noted however, that although the Center was initially set up mostly to address the needs of the “severely mentally ill,” it has since expanded its function to clients with less severe psychiatric issues and many clients have actually never been hospitalized. Another interpretation of this half-door (which may be more in line with Tom’s view) is that perhaps because the clinic is open to anyone as a “drop-in” center, the door is helpful in distinguishing between community members who are there for “official” psychiatric treatment and those who are there to “hang out” in the front areas but were not involved in counseling. According to this interpretation, the door marked the end of the “public” community space and the inside “private” space where clinical services were conducted.

Beyond the half-door, the interior or “clinical” area of the Center is comprised of a long hall-way with clinical offices lining either side. This narrow hallway opens into another smaller waiting area and rather large crescent shaped reception desk containing a computer, printer and phone. When I first began my practicum work at the Center, a second administrative assistant sat there but since she left several years ago, this second reception was, for the most part, abandoned. There were eleven clinical offices during my
practicum (although over the course of my research, construction was underway to build more office space), seven of which were used for counselors, psychiatrists, social workers, psychiatric residents and psychology practicum students; one was used by the psychiatric nurse, another one was used by the administrative assistant’s office and the remaining two rooms were used mostly as group rooms/conference rooms. Each of the therapy offices used by full-time staff were decorated differently depending upon the therapist’s taste, however the paint, furniture, and electronic equipment had not been updated in some time and the offices were all uniformly small. Offices used by trainees or part-time staff were shared and thus decorations were fairly minimal. One of the group rooms contained a long conference table and a white dry-erase board and was well lit by small windows around the perimeter of the room. The other group room looked as though it had been a kitchen at one time because it contained a sink and counter top in one corner but had been effectively transformed into a meeting space, equipped with several metal and vinyl chairs and a white dry-erase board on one wall. Various self-help workbooks and markers were stacked along the window sill.

The walls in the clinic were extremely thin, representing yet another semi-permeable boundary in the Center and as such, when walking from room to room in the Center, one could often over hear voices from other rooms. The material space of the Center, all of which I just mentioned, the cracked tiles, the worn decrepit couches, outdated office furniture, the chipped paint, and thin walls, reflected the clinic’s position within the professional and social hierarchies. To Tom (P1), the director of the Center, these conditions were deplorable and offensive. He felt that the conditions of the clinic represented physical evidence of the medical center’s dismissive attitude towards the
Center. He railed against the hypocrisy of a medical institution that touted “community values” but chose every year to ignore his requests for funding. During my interview with Tom, he questions “where’s the commitment?” when it comes to funding. He compares the funding that the Center received to those of other satellite clinics in the medical institution and raises concern about how the deteriorating conditions at the Center may impact clients experience as well. He states: “[clients] see, they go to [other clinics associated with university medical center] and then they come here and they look, it’s got a floor that’s all tore up, we got furniture’s a throw-back, it’s 60s stuff, and they’re going’ ‘whoa!’ some of ‘em even mentioned it, it was like…people even homeless people, it’s real interesting, um come in here and they still there is a sense about ‘em looking to see whether or not they’re welcome here” (Lines 329-337). In this particular excerpt, Tom suggests that part of the clients experience of mental health services or psychotherapy may be impacted by the very material space of a clinic as well as the experiences they have with people therein. He even goes so far to say that clients may not feel “welcome” in a space that appears to be neglected, as this type of neglect may be taken personally by those seeking services (feeling that they are not valued).

Despite Tom’s frustration regarding his sense of marginalization within the medical center, he as well as other clinicians could be seen finding ways to resist this marginalization, each from his or her own social and professional position. For example, Tom as director of the Center, reported “yelling” about the material conditions of the Center for “three years” and that he finally got the university medical center to agree to renovate. He also resisted what he felt was unfair distribution of funding through more covert actions. During one of our conversations Tom recounted an incident in which he
had helped a homeless client get a copy of his birth certificate so that he could apply for housing. He used the clinic’s credit card to obtain the birth certificate and was reprimanded by the administration for using the card in this way. Tom said that he told them it was an emergency situation for the client but that they reprimanded him anyway and took it out of his pay check. In this instance, instead of appealing to change on an administrative level, Tom decided to take matters into his own hands, using his authority as director to redistribute resources.

Michael (P3) similarly agreed that the Center struggled with funding and “resources,” but he emphasized that these material issues seemed much less salient to him than they were to Tom (which is likely at least partially a function of Tom’s position as director of the Center and Michael’s relative distance from these issues as a non-administrator). Michael focused more on the metaphorical space of the clinic. He believed that the space took on a social function of being like a “home” to clients, many of whom felt they had a stake in the space as their own. He told me a story regarding his first experience at the Center whereby clients reminded him that this was “their clinic” and that as a new therapist there, he would have to integrate into their clinic. During the interview Michael explained: “When I first started here… and there was a woman that said,… ‘you know, this was our clinic long before you got here and it’ll be our clinic long after you’re gone’ and I said ‘okay.’ And then she said to me ‘it’s nice to have you.’ Now what I took from that was, we’re happy that you’re here, but understand this is our house and right now you’re a guest you know and 7 years later, I’d like to think that I’m a little bit more than a guest but I understood it. I wasn’t offended by it. I completely understood it, I’m a stranger to them initially.” (Lines 213-224). In this excerpt, Michael
brings to life how some clients have an investment in the Center as a home-base and may even feel protective of this space. After recounting this narrative, he also shares that he credits the clinical staff’s explicit efforts in creating a welcoming atmosphere of caring and acknowledgement for some clients’ apparent investment in the Center.

The fact that some clients felt such a sense of investment in the Center bespeaks a collaborative rather than authoritative administrative style where clients also have a sense of shared responsibility for the functioning of the Center. Interestingly, I too experienced this feeling of being at home after only a short period of time working at the Center. Despite the rundown conditions, there was a sense of the staff and clients inhabiting the space in such a way so that it created a certain atmosphere of familiarity, of togetherness, and of safety. Tom struggled to describe this element of acknowledgement and welcoming in the Center and settled on the word “ambiance,” although he did not seem quite satisfied with this description. The general ambiance of the Center, the psychological sense of home created therein, represents one of the ineffable qualities of therapy or healing provided by the Center. It also demonstrates how what is healing or therapeutic extends beyond the consulting room or specific therapy skills.

*Discourse and practice*

The landscape of the Center and the community is constituted not only by the physical space of the Center and surrounding community, but also by the way that people talk about the community, how staff and clients view themselves within this context, as well what is written about this community. I have so far alluded to the ways that staff and
clients talk about their community and the physical space of the Center, however, I have not yet addressed the larger sociocultural discourse regarding the Center and the multiple discourses - professional, economic, and personal - that shape practice at the Center. In this section I discuss how the way that people in general talk about the 8th district as well as the Center constructs them as particular kinds of places. I also discuss in more detail the process clients go through when coming to the Center, not only as a community center but as a mental health center, and the ways in which community, psychiatric, and business discourse interweave in the everyday practices at the Center.

Arriving at the Center one day early on in my research project I was greeted by one of the therapists at the reception area. This type of situation was not uncommon and one could often find everyone at the Center, including the director, putting in their time to fill in at the front desk for short staffing. Once I was “buzzed” through the door, I stopped by the front reception office and introduced myself to this therapist and explained my role as a researcher at the Center. We discussed what she perceived to be the clients’ experience of the clinic. She shared that she had worked at multiple sites throughout the medical university system and felt that clients from the 8th district preferred to come to the Center, not only because of its location, but because it was seen as a “Black clinic.” The therapist drew a distinction between “Black” and “White” clinics, stating that the working class African American families in the area felt more comfortable in “Black” clinics. The therapist was vague about what she meant by the term “Black clinic” and unfortunately I did not have a chance to talk in depth with her about her comments, given the many distractions present at the reception area. I was left to speculate as to what made this clinic a “black” space. My first thought was that the Center, unlike many psychology
clinics in which I had worked, was predominately staffed by self-identified African American therapists, which creates an environment within which, even just on the surface, clients of color may not immediately encounter the sense of difference that they might at majority “White clinics.” Secondly, the Center is set up in such a way that communicates an interest in and valuing of the local culture and community. By incorporating community interests into practice, the Center provides recognition and valuing of community identity and the impact of this specific location on residents lives. For example, staff involve themselves and clients in community organization meetings/events, including voting registration and city development planning. They also travel outside of the Center with clients to lunches and educational activities.

The Center’s association with the surrounding community and informal designation as “a Black clinic” may have significant implications in terms of its’ perceived accessibility to the community. For example, as the therapist I spoke with pointed out, some clients preferred to be seen at the Center versus other clinics within the same medical system because they felt more comfortable there. The Center’s alignment with the plight of the community and integration of local knowledge into healing practices creates a space where the social dimension of experience is recognized as important. On the other hand, the Center’s association with the 8th district and with public mental health also made it subject to the same type of social and economic marginalization that the community faced. For instance, Tom received a phone call one day from someone inquiring about services at the Center. When the woman discovered where the Center was located, she expressed apprehensions seeking services at the Center. Tom explained to her that she would be no less safe than she might be in any
other area of the city; however, the woman apparently did not believe him and declined to initiate services. Virtually all of the participants in this study commented on negative perceptions, such as those expressed by this woman, of the community and the Center. The 8th district is often perceived as an undesirable, poor, and/or dangerous place that ought to be avoided by many city residents. Sam (P4) suggested not only is the community viewed in such a way but community members are deemed to be the cause of such “urban problems,” rather than the victims of systematic racism and oppression. Michael (P3) touched upon this issue of the attribution of social problems by distinguishing between the “deserving” versus the “un-deserving” poor. According to Michael, “poor impoverished communities of color” are perceived as “undeserving” of assistance or “compassion” whereas more socially dominant communities receive more compassion. Michael clarifies that this type of thinking also applies to other groups such as gay men – for example, when HIV was “just a gay” problem, people remained relatively unconcerned, until the issues began to touch the lives of dominant groups, such as those of a heterosexual sexual orientation. The analogy here is important in that it reflects an important process that each participant highlighted, that is, the parallel process of marginalization that both the community and Center experienced. Tom described feeling like the 8th district as well as the Center were “outta sight, outta mind” when it came to the medical center’s attention. He went even further to say that “for lack of a better term, it’s like the scapegoat of the system” with administration brushing the needs of the Center off by saying “oh that’s just the 8th district” (Lines 356-357). The feeling of being “outta sight, outta mind” was echoed in my impressions of the surrounding landscape of the community as well as Theresa’s experience of having to travel through
the “worst roads in the city” to get to work. It is interesting that the Center’s strong
alignment with community concerns may have served to build stronger community ties
and improve cultural sensitivity, however, such practices may have also in some ways
alienated the Center from the rest of the medical center.

As I have begun to demonstrate, the Center is situated within a particular
constellation of discourses, some of which are more explicitly related to social position,
context, and community and others which are more specifically related to clinical
practice at the Center. It is where these discourses intersect to produce what I understand
to constitute practice at the Center. One particular aspect of the discursive framework of
the Center involves the physical space of the Center, the landscape of the community, as
well as how people talk, write, and otherwise communicate regarding the Center and the
community. We have so far seen how staff are situated within and take up various ways
of describing the social dimension of their practice, however, we have not yet discussed
the professional and clinical discourses which are also threaded throughout practice at the
Center.

Various threads of psychological/psychiatric/sociopolitical discourse are
interwoven into practice at the Center however, because the Center continues to be
financially sustained by a university medical center, traditional psychiatric thinking and
discourse have a dominant presence in many of the practices at the Center. To begin with,
despite the predominant community orientation at the Center, certain clinical practices
demonstrate the equally strong presence of psychiatric traditions within the Center. For
instance, when initiating services, a client (or patient as they are sometimes called) would
be scheduled for what is called a “psychiatric evaluation.” When the client comes in for
this scheduled appointment the evaluating clinician would fill out a series of forms with him or her, which includes the following information: demographics, referral source, other members of the client’s household, emergency contact, insurance, level of income, history of state hospitalization, and “type of income” which includes government aid. Clients also have to sign an affidavit verifying their level of and source of income (e.g. SSI, welfare). At this first appointment the client would be interviewed regarding their reason for referral to the Center or their own personal interest in seeking psychological/psychiatric services. In addition a psychosocial history including psychopathological symptoms, family history, experiences of trauma, medical conditions, and past treatment would be assessed. Similar intake interviews take place across most clinical settings, but it is noteworthy that this same fairly traditional psychiatric interviewing process would still appear at the Center. Clinicians utilize interviewing templates created by the medical center and that rely on the language of Diagnostic and Statistic Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). The forms provide a space to describe clients’ “presenting illness” and to code this illness according to DSM codes. The use of formal documents created by the medical center bespeaks the Center’s continued dependence on this structure and at least partial participation in medicalized (individualized) understandings of distress. However, although I clearly perceived an interesting tension between psychiatric and community oriented language and interventions, this tension did not seem to be as salient to clinicians, at least on a theoretical level. For instance, although I had intended to elicit conversation regarding what I perceived to be the use of multiple theoretical models (e.g. medical vs. contextual) and how staff reconciled those differences in practice, when I asked participants to
comment on this issue, most focused more upon the material/political relationship with
the medical institution. During my interview with Michael, he mentioned the ways in
which he strongly believed that the Center must not conceptualize the person coming in
“as a problem” but rather see them as a person who is struggling “with problems” and
within a social context that in some ways creates those problems. At other points during
our conversation he also spoke in the language of symptom management and medication
compliance which communicates a different understanding of client’s distress. Michael’s
ability to switch rather seamlessly between psychiatric and community/social discourses
suggests that perhaps staff were often not explicitly concerned with the philosophical or
conceptual roots of their treatment model but rather approached their work more
pragmatically, from a social justice orientation. According to this social justice model, it
is possible that a biological or illness model of distress could be utilized without issue
because it would enable the client a certain recognition (via diagnosis) and access to
services (e.g. via insurance reimbursement).

In addition to more explicitly medicalized or psychiatric models of care, the
Center staff also drew from a number of other discourses, including the
addiction/recovery movement and humanistic traditions. Sam (P4) spoke most about the
recovery movement which actually is associated with a current trend in psychiatry. The
recovery movement focuses on the person’s strengths and ability for resilience in the face
of psychological disorder and life adversities. The movement represents an important
shift from conceptualizing the individual as a patient who is sick, to an agentic individual
who has some choice as to the future direction of his or her life. On the other hand,
because the movement is still couched within the field of psychiatry, biological models of
understanding are still dominant and medication is still the default treatment of choice (even if psychiatrists who are involved in the recovery movement might be more likely to intervene in more socially oriented ways as well). Michael highlighted the ways in which humanism infiltrates his clinic work when he talked extensively about “respect” and treating a person “with dignity” and the kind mutually collaborative relationship that he sets out to have with his clients.

The various discourses that shape clinical practice at the Center underlie the multiple treatment modalities available at the Center - individual psychotherapy, group counseling, advocacy/community groups, not to mention, of course, psychiatric treatment. For example, from a community perspective it is important to offer various groups, including both psychotherapy groups and community advocacy groups and thus a variety of such groups are offered at the Center (e.g. anger management, drug and alcohol, women’s wellness, client advocacy, community improvement). To the extent that clinicians still relied on biological/illness models of distress, the prescription of psychiatric medications was also offered.

Last, clinical practice at the Center is always operating within a particular economic climate influenced by both the culture of insurance companies as well as the concern for productivity. Clinicians felt pressure to assign formal DSM diagnoses to clients, even when none were appropriate in order to assure that clients could have their care taken care of through insurance companies. The discourse of market theory was evident in conversations with the director who concerned himself with “productivity” – a business term that has infiltrated mental health services. Gradually, over the past several decades, human service organizations such as mental health centers have been impacted.
by pressure to be “productive” in business terms in order to maintain reimbursement. Tom’s comment about his “outrageous” caseload of over one-hundred people, and his slight embarrassment when recounting this number suggests some conflict between “productivity” up (which translates to providing services to as many people as possible within a given business day) and his value on high levels of client care (which to Tom included significant engagement with clients and taking the time to get to know them).

**Across Interview Analysis**

In order to zero in more on how staff described their clinical work during interviews and distill their comments to a more concise format, I conducted an across interview analysis of the narrative themes that emerged with regularity across all interviews. In so far as my participant-observations helped to guide interview questions they are included implicitly in this section, however they will not be explicitly highlighted.

Reflecting upon what it means to practice psychology at the Center, various issues arose with regularity. Clinicians were concerned with what they saw as needs, interests, concerns, of the surrounding community which included issues of: social marginalization, social class, race, community trauma, emotional/psychological distress, and cultural identity/identifications. I analyzed the interviews to highlight how these issues were understood by clinicians and found that clinicians often understood these problems in contextualized ways, with particular attention to local understandings, and they also understood these issues in relational terms (both including the “self” of therapist and others in the client’s life). Clinicians also included an awareness of power and privilege
and the intrapsychic impact of oppression on clients. By virtue of these understandings, clinicians strove to enact this understanding through particular interventions such as: working collaboratively with clients, awareness of self in relationship to the client and use of self, acknowledgment and recognition, and fostering agency/empowerment. The main clinical issues, conceptual understanding of these issues, and interventions are presented below according to how much they were emphasized across interviews. In this section I focus much more heavily on interview analysis, how participants described their work with minimal reference to my participant-observations, however, I did integrate these observations more in the next chapter (chapter 5).

**Community trauma**

When looking across interviews, one theme that particularly stood out revolved around the idea of “community trauma.” All of the participants mentioned trauma as a prevalent issue which staff spent much time considering and attempting to address through their practice. The issue of trauma, whether conceptualized in the traditional sense or according to a community conceptualization was the most commonly repeated theme throughout each interview. Several of the staff suggested that they that actually interpret various aspects of client’s experience and behavior as symptomatic of community trauma:

*One of the things they’ve been talking about here is a whole conceptualization of whether or not we’re just talking about a post-trauma person…or maybe we’re talking about a traumatized community* (P2)

*Our entire community is suffering from PTSD* (P1)

*People lose their homes, they lose their identity, and that really is a form of trauma – a historical trauma* (P3)
This is an area that’s under trauma and what looks like, is there a certain kind of trauma that people are subject to, you know, violence and scratching at our survival is a way of life so uncommon to the majority culture (P2).

It was clear that staff saw the surrounding community and clients who participate in services at the Center as suffering from significant trauma across multiple dimensions of their lives. Thus staff considered such trauma across these multiple dimensions. Staff even went beyond the recognition that clients may have shared many similar traumatic experiences in a solely linear and material manner to pointing out a less direct causal relationship, suggesting the existence of an “historical” trauma that gets passed down through generations within communities or cultures. In this way symptoms typically related to trauma may be inherited (in a cultural sense, of course and not necessarily in the biological sense). The idea of community trauma seems a more collectivistic way of conceptualizing experience, a way of understanding what might be labeled “disorder” as a culturally shared wounding which may manifest in the form of certain behaviors (e.g. hypervigilance, substance abuse, difficulty with emotional regulation) rather than as an individual pathology. Yet, on a few occasions, staff also questioned whether there could be such a thing as “community trauma” which conceptualizes the impact of trauma as a shared social experience – almost as if their understanding is not validated or articulated by their profession such that its reality or “truth” becomes questioned.

Interestingly, and perhaps related to the last comment above, although trauma may be understood as a community dilemma, cultural norms may prevent the experience of the impact of this trauma from being acknowledged and shared. Thus according to staff members, Tom in particular, individual clients are viewed as suffering alone with the impact of social and historical trauma as well as familial trauma (e.g. abuse). Tom
suggested that a cultural imperative in many African American communities “not to speak” about personal problems outside of the home has prevented many individuals from within this community from gaining support and healing from such traumas.

A third dimension in which staff considered trauma was at the existential level – not just historical shared trauma passed down through generations, or the more general impact of racism, or classism, but the daily experience of “scratching at one’s survival” that Theresa mentions. This idea is repeated by Sam in a later interview when he discusses the way in which African American and Native American communities have been “systemically oppressed,” which he sees as distinct from the “serious poverty” found elsewhere in the world - the “systematic” way in which certain groups, like African Americans and Native Americans, are forced into poverty within a context of relative wealth in the U.S. distinguishes it from other groups where presumably the circumstance of a singular historical or natural event like war or natural disaster, or effort, or immigration, or some such “accidental” or “personal” factors are the reasons for their economic predicament.

Another central narrative theme revolved around the psychological impact of social oppression/marginalization and the way that staff considered the intrapsychic impact of oppression/marginalized identities

*We understand that you [clients] are locked out of the American dream (P3)*
*There’s actually no way to explain to a person who’s not of color how much being of color defines your encounter with the world. (P2)*
*The most important perception of who you are is not society’s perception but your own perception…that’s something that has to be developed because when it’s been crushed it’s a tremendous challenge (P3)*
*People start to believe [regarding politics] it’s not gonna apply to me, how could I make a difference (P1)*
*There’s no one who’s been more disenfranchised than African Americans (P3)*
There’s a sense of being of two nations, because we’re not Africans, we’re not 100% most of us are not 100% African, so what happens is we’re like a people afloat (P2)

There are many places where you find serious poverty, like I said, it’s not just a matter of being poor so there’ many other places where you find serious poverty but the Native American population um, and the African American population has been systematically oppressed by every level of American life to very present day so I think that’s atrocious (P4)

It is an “unspeakable” impact, and an existential experience that cannot be put in words, especially not to someone that does not share or otherwise is able to access that experience. Put another way, this intrapsychic experience of oppression and marginalization can only find some understanding resonance in an interpersonal relation with another psyche that can access a similar experience. Moreover, this sense of the “unspeakable” is exacerbated by a clear sense that whom one is, is not whom one “really” is, or wants to be – that is, that one struggles all the time against an image of whom one is, and while for other people it may come “naturally” as a simple sense of self, for oppressed groups its something to be “developed,” it’s a “challenge,” and a debilitating struggle to continually enfranchise oneself, one’s psyche, as it were in the face of a systematic and sophisticated oppressive disenfranchisement of both the material and the psychological, or at the level of the material that comes to bear on the psychological.

This conceptualization of “psychological distress” in social terms, also comes to bear on the staff’s understanding of the social construction/function of poverty and racial discrimination and its impact on their community:

...You know we have something in this country called the deserving poor and the undeserving poor…often in a poor impoverished community of color, you have a lot of undeserving poor – that’s the perception but you take similar folks in similar situations and somehow there’s a little bit more compassion (P3)
Certain behaviors are attached to certain communities and locations are a critical part of that, so you have that coming at you all the time (P2)
What is the psychodynamics? Do we have a need to have places that we can point to and say, well, we’re the good people but not those people there – oh we’re safe (P2)
We kinda unconsciously and sometimes consciously value certain life over other life (P3)
The worst road, the ice, the snow, salt and everything stops at the top of the hill…it must say so much to the people who live here (P2)
I really feel there has been a systematic process of establishing, creating and maintaining the kind of distress and disorder that people see as “urban problems” – the problems of the African American community the problems of the poor, etc. (P4)

Staff were not only concerned with the way that being marginalized and stereotyped might impact individuals living within that community psychologically, that is the “psychic” impact of poverty – they were also concerned with understanding the psychology of social oppression itself – the function it serves in a social system. For example, when Theresa asks about the “psychodynamics” of stereotyping poor communities or when Michael says we “unconsciously value certain life over others” – both are alluding to some deeper psychological function of marginalization of certain communities of people. Theresa specifically offers the hypothesis that it may be that people feel they are “safe” if they are able to identify and designate certain communities or people as being the dangerous, violent, untrustworthy, (fill in negative disowned quality) people. In essence, it is about being able to protect an identity as the “good people” and disowning and projecting those aforementioned negative qualities onto those designated as “other.”

Clinicians’ understandings of trauma as a collective experience, one which is fundamentally social in nature, appeared to inform their choice of specific
interventions/practices. For example, the interest in creating a familial/group/community atmosphere at the Center could be seen as a way for community members to experience a sense of safety and cohesiveness that may be missing from their experience of their community outside of the Center. Or, it may be a way of replicating or extending within the Center a sense of community that is operative outside the Center, undaunted by (or perhaps as bulwark against) a stressful and challenging reality. In either case, communities such as the 8th district that have experienced significant marginalization and fragmentation, may benefit from having a safe place within which community connections are fostered and/or further developed in the community outside of the Center. Staff members thus made sure to create an environment within which clients could come to connect with each other as well as with therapists. I often observed therapists making it a point to engage incoming community members in casual conversations when they could, and remember details about their lives so as to communicate caring and friendliness. As a new therapist and researcher, I was encouraged to engage clients on this level as well, and was often invited to luncheons or picnics during which I got to know clients, and they me, in a more casual way. It is my understanding that such practices were not just “for fun” but rather were born from the strong intention to provide a space of community healing, to help forge a more positive, cohesive, and meaningful community identity and assuming that this was a possibility if the appropriate space and opportunities were to be provided.
Contextualized treatment model

Consistent with staff members’ focus on the social underpinnings of psychological issues, many of them also described ascribing to a psychological practice model that was non-traditional, contextualized and non-hierarchical:

I think this is a very unique clinic you can get some examples in terms of how the clinic is made up, in terms of the community etc., but I think that this is probably one of the few truly community based mental health facilities in the city (P3)
We needed to fix traditional ways of looking at things…involve the clients, and empowering them and saying – what do you need? Would you like to belong to this? What do you think about this? (P1)
I can’t help you [clients] using a standard that historically has been negative for you, then it means I’m doing you an injustice (P3)
We try to provide cohesive services within the community (P3)
We don’t see the person as being faulty, we see their conditions as being faulty (P3)
From a strength-based perspective, a holistic approach, we don’t see them as a problem, we see them as a solution (P3)
We have to incorporate everything as much as we can” (P1)
It’s not just about how you feel, but it’s about dealing with obstacles in your way, because you can feel wonderful but run into obstacles every five seconds” (P3)
I do not uh agree with the view that says this is simply a matter of people being poor or simply a matter of people being uneducated or simply a matter of people not wanting to do better for themselves so I really feel that there is a systemic problem here and in order to understand it you have to have that kind of historical and social political position – that’s my position on it (P4)

One staff member in particular, Michael, pointed out that not only do psychologists need to be cognizant of the psychological impact of oppression and attempt to be aware of their own biases, etc., but psychologists also need to think about how certain models of care or treatment models may, at base, be oppressive in and of themselves. Michael’s statement implies that one cannot simply tack cultural awareness onto a model of care that has “historically been negative” for a group of people; rather the model itself may need to be revamped, or rebuilt from the ground up.
The revamped, more “contextualized,” model of care (not something entirely new but one that is at the crux of community psychological models) includes several features or characteristics. A contextualized, community based model that addresses the experiences of marginalized communities includes a shift in conceptualization and also actual practice/behavior of clinicians. Thus staff described specific ways that they conceptualized problems according to a contextualized model and also the interventions that would follow.

First, virtually all of the participants described the social way in which they understood clients’ presenting concerns - in essence they seemed to understand emotional distress or problematic behavior as a function of systemic problems:

*Because someone’s a little louder, doesn’t mean they’re gonna get violent you know, because…someone may appear to have an attitude, you don’t know what just happened to them, maybe they should have an attitude*” (P3)
*I see work within the African American community as a response to racism and social injustice and the human cost of that so I really feel there has been a systematic process of establishing creating and maintaining the…sort of distress and disorder that people see as ‘urban problems’ the problems of the African American community the problems of the poor, etc. (P4)*
*So I do not uh agree with the view that says this is simply a matter of people being poor or simply a matter of people being uneducated or simply a matter of people not wanting to do better for themselves so I really feel that there is a systemic problem here and in order to understand it you have to have that kind of historical and social political position – that’s my position on it (P4)*
*The community psychiatry outlook is for me okay, basically an issue of social justice and all these other problems around the structural problems the historical forces that kind of create and perpetuate a social injustice, it’s not just about being humane and nice (P4)*

Based on my experience at the Center, staff’s concern for the intrapsychic impact of oppression was most evident in their careful considerations of case conceptualization (interpretation of client’s distress and behavior) and subsequent interventions. Although staff might feel compelled to diagnose according to psychiatric standards (DSM) as was
discussed earlier, they still struggled to find a way to balance this medical understanding with something more community oriented. One of the ways in which this was done was by frequently returning back to basic assumptions regarding the experiences of marginalized/oppressed groups – that is their symptoms/behavior must be interpreted in light of the struggles, which are often unvoiced or unarticulated of living under such conditions. For example, clinicians could be found responding to clients who were visibly upset and might be described in typical clinical settings as “acting out” and/or as dangerous, by giving them the benefit of the doubt and assuming that there was something for them to be legitimately angry about. Approaching these clients with an attitude of curiosity (albeit within strong boundaries to be sure to protect themselves and others around) did not necessarily preclude the necessity to sometimes hospitalize certain individuals, however, it did at times have the effect of diffusing the situation and calming the individual. Assuming that the client’s perspective and behavior is legitimate, according to his/her own point of reference (even if this does not match with what most others around them perceive at the time) is not only a skill inherent to culturally sensitive practice, but to any kind of empathic connection with another person.

Another important element of this model, as identified by several staff members, revolves around **acknowledgement and openness to the other:**

*Setting up when people come through the door, the acknowledgement, a sense of acknowledgment, that’s one thing we really work hard about…we acknowledge that people are here because often enough people here are disenfranchised and they’re sensitive to how they’re being treated, or mistreated” (P1)*

*You speak to people like they’re valued as people, it makes a difference, those are things that we practice” (P3)*

*We respect them, they respect us, you treat people with dignity and humanity at all times, you don’t stereotype people, because somebody is different than you doesn’t mean they’re a bad person (P3)*
You choose to treat someone like a human being and with dignity and respect and often you’d be amazed at how people don’t get that in any area of their life (P3) part of it is nuts and bolts basics of being a decent person beyond any skill professionally [I: Mhm] so just by bringing your humanity your concern your caringness to people with an interest in doing the right thing by what’s best for them – um I think by best for them means what’s best for them in terms of what they think is best for them (P4)

This openness encapsulates a sensibility about addressing the fundamental
struggles with which clients are struggling (e.g. lack of acknowledgement, marginalization) and this sensibility motivates the way in which therapists interact with clients. For example, Michael mentions how important it is for clients to feel like the Center is “their home” and that they have a say in how things operate there. Tom also mentioned the importance of the “ambiance,” of creating an atmosphere of welcome and safety. I often observed staff greeting clients in a casual tone, sometimes even joking with them or asking about family members. Staff might take a moment to introduce themselves to a new person in the community area of the waiting room or to acknowledge someone else’s ongoing client.

A second important feature of this contextualized community model has to do with collaboration and several staff members mentioned the specific way that they acknowledged and worked with the inherent power differential in the therapist/client relationship. During the interviews, participants spoke of seeing themselves as collaborators rather than authority figures (this also involves collaboration with other professionals as well):

I’m responsible to a certain extent and the client is responsible to a certain extent and the nature of your relationship will really entail how it plays out (P3)

We try to make people feel comfortable with the idea that this is their clinic, this is their home, we are here to serve you (P3)
It doesn’t mean there won’t be times in the relationship when there are disagreements, but a good therapeutic relationship you talk about that (P3)

One of the things we really instill is the fact that there’s not a right way or wrong way to feel. You feel how you feel. We accept you where you are, that’s they key (P1)

Sometimes people will say things and I consider myself to be pretty hip but sometimes you’ll get a younger clientele and they’ll use words and I’ll think to myself, can you tell me what that means?...I’m not afraid [to ask] and you can’t be afraid to put yourself out there like that and say help me to help you, help me to better understand you (P3)

We try to understand from their vantage what the problem is, from their vantage what is important, from their vantage, what are the obstacles to life looking more like they would like ti to look and then we go to work (P4)

Find ways to um, engage connect with and support the many provider agencies...who share this concern... getting a sense of what their lives are like and getting a sense of the way they do their work, and um engaging them we are now doing this in the process of changing attitudes, changing practice, generating new ideas, generating support, um, commitment, collaboration (P4)

Collaboration was central to clinicians at the Center, not only in their work with clients, but also with each other. This was evident in their interactions with clients, by eliciting client feedback regarding their therapy services and generally engaging clients as active participants in their own process of healing. In my own experience as a practicum student at the Center, I was often struck by the casualness with which the director might engage me, or the way in which he seemed to level any appeal I might have to his authority by making a joke or otherwise making the interaction seem less formal. As a practicum student, I appreciated his style of interaction because it gave me a sense that we could work together side-by-side, despite the fact that he was essentially my supervisor and had much more clinical experience than I did. It gave me a sense of safety in expressing my clinical opinion or concerns without fear that they would be rejected based on my (lack of) status. Based on my observations of how clients interacted with staff, sometimes in a joking or casual manner (although also still respectful) I
imagined that perhaps they too experienced a sense of safety or comfort in expressing their voice when staff members engaged them in this collaborative manner.

**Culture**

Of course the theme of culture cannot be separated out from the aforementioned themes.

Cultural considerations are a part of every aspect of treatment from conceptualization of trauma to implementation of a more general community model. At the same time, the specific ways that staff addressed the issue of cultural sensitivity in practice deserves to be considered as its own theme. Staff did not necessarily agree with each other or with themselves for that matter as to how to understand cultural consideration in psychological practice but **staff generally conceptualized culture as something that is both inextricable from, yet simultaneously separate from, identity and experience:**

*We’re multifaceted complex individuals (P1)*
*What we want to do often is to paint race and class with a broad bush and incorporate everybody as an integral part of that, your this race or this culture or socioeconomic so everybody gets that and I think that’s a BIG mistake that everybody makes because everyone’s different of course…we may be alike on one perspective or two perspectives but we still have different things that’s unique to us (P1)*
*The challenge often is getting people to understand that yeah, we’re the same because it’s mental health treatment, but we’re also different (P3)*
*Race and class is not everything, but it’s an integral part of who we are (P1)*
*I’m a Black man but I don’t see myself as a Black therapist (P3)*
*we see individuals who are white here and of other cultures and I approach it in the same way in terms of the same mindset – the person is the strength – now the problems may present differently now that’s where the interventions might be different but my mindset is strength, strength, strength, strength… (P3)*
*There is some things that are culturally specific, but I believe that strength-based perceptive, the holistic approach is good treatment across the board (P3)*
*If you’re a good therapist you can help anyone (P3)*
There’s like an internal part of the clinical work okay, when you have people dealing with their own race and cultural identifiers, whatever they are especially here…that means working through the emotionality and psychology of that and creating working environments in which that reality is kind of part of the work and that is part of the understanding that it is safe and valued to dig into it (P4)
We’re all [the staff] part of a process which is extraordinarily healthy and open about. dealing what it means to be who and what we are (P4)

Staff both highly value the integral role that social identifications (race, gender, class) play in a person’s experience, yet also strongly resist stereotypic or overgeneralizing idientiary recourse when it comes to understanding various cultural groups. Participants call for a consideration of both the specific and the general, the universal and the local, but various participants emphasize different aspects at different points even within an interview and those tensions are left unresolved. The issue of culture is left as a “both/and” idea which participants allowed to remain unresolved.

Many of the staff also made specific reference to their own cultural backgrounds and personal experiences of oppression/marginalization which then served to inform & motivate clinical work:

I’m very passionate about my work here because I understand the ramifications of not having certain things and the consequences of being locked out (P3)
The level of care that these people are receiving is not because the institution is supporting it, it’s because African Americans with a high level of training are sacrificing to be with them (P2)
I wanted to work with an underserved population, I wanted to work with people of color, African Americans…obviously I’m African American, so that’s gonna be near and dear to my heart (P3)
The same issues of racism and exploitations, we all know because we’re living it, we’re giving the highest quality of care because we’re living it! (P2)
I see myself as somebody who carries the fire - so I was raised in a Jewish home and the European holocaust was a formative experience of my childhood and I grew up very frightened and uh, very limited very unsure of myself and [2] um, so I feel like I’ve been tuned into where the atrocities are being committed (P4)
We talk about ourselves where we are and where we come from and also how this all plays out with the work with our patients/clients (P4)
Participants’ descriptions of their own experiences were intertwined with their understandings of and reactions to work with clients. In fact, participants tended to emphasize how their own backgrounds, be they cultural, religious, racial, gendered, etc. not only influenced but also grounded, perhaps even motivated their clinical work. Clinicians at the Center included themselves in any analysis of culture rather than focusing solely on the background of the client. This process of self-reflection was in some ways seamlessly interwoven into their interventions with clients, however, as Sam (P4) pointed out, they also took time to process identity issues more explicitly with each other during meetings. This theme of how personal identity and identifications were integrated into clinical work is illustrated with an example from my participant-observations in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

“There are those who choose the swampy lowlands. They deliberately involve themselves in messy but crucially important problems … when asked to describe their methods of inquiry, they speak of experience, trial and error, intuition, and muddling through” (Schön, 1983, p. 43)

In this dissertation I set out to explore what it means to practice community psychology in an inner city community mental health setting (“the Center”). However, I was not only interested in exploring potential answers to this question but also in developing a methodology that could adequately address the complex issues of culture and power implicit within this research question. Through the use of contemporary ethnographic methods, influenced by post-modern and interpretive theory, I was able to gather rich data that touched upon the complexity of practice in this setting. My analysis confirmed some past studies (for example Bloor et al., 1988; Gubrium,1992; Phillips, 2005) which demonstrated that psychologists (especially in more community oriented centers) are embedded within complex contexts and draw upon multiple discursive frameworks in their practice. The main principles of community psychology (e.g. contextualization, power, and collaboration) represented a primary organizing discourse at the Center and these principles were enacted in culturally specific ways in accordance with the values, needs, and interests of the surrounding community. Given that a crucial element of implementing community psychology theory consists of adapting community principles to a particular cultural milieu (in this case an inner city, largely African American community) my analysis focused on the issues that were most salient to this
particular community practice. Also, because the issue of context was so central to this practice, my analysis included an examination of the community context: history, physical space/location, and current social climate. Results based on this study suggested that such contextual issues are inextricably linked to practice at the Center and have a “voice” all of their own that can, as one participant suggested, “speak volumes” about the community and the nature of community practice. At the same time, other discourses, such as the discourses of psychiatry and market theory also shape practice at the Center and thus the issue of tensions among discourses will be addressed in this discussion section.

My theoretical foundation for this study drew from ethnographic/anthropological theorists, such as Geertz (1973) and Shweder (1991), and post-modern thinkers such as Foucault (1978) and Butler (1997; 1993; 1990) and thus I used this theory as a lens through which I understood my data. According to Geertz (1973), culture is an intersubjective phenomenon, existing between persons, rather than a static entity that exists external to individuals. He suggests that culture exists in the use of signs and symbols that makes experience intelligible through “webs of signification (p.5). Shweder (1991) too has argued for the intersubjective nature of culture, but he also brings in more explicitly the psychological or intrapsychic dimension. “Culture” as Shweder defines it, would not exist without psychic processes, and psychic processes are similarly constituted by culture. Although I started this project imagining that these theories of culture would help me to understand more about how clients are interwoven into social contexts and how psychologists might usefully consider those contexts from this intersubjective perspective, I began to conceptualize the culture of practice itself in this
way. According to Smith (2005), when trying to understand how to improve psychological services for a greater diversity of peoples, it is important to consider the climate or the “culture” of the practitioner’s office. As such, I understood practice at the Center to represent a culture comprised of certain actions, rules, rituals, discourses, values, interests, and mythologies that were sustained in dynamic fashion through interactions between and among both practitioners and clients.

From a Foucaultian (1978) perspective, one cannot address culture, as it is understood from this discursive perceptive, without also addressing issues of power. According to Foucault, knowledge, power, and discourse are inextricably linked and these intersections sustain and are sustained by institutions and institutional practices, including psychology. To Foucault “knowledge” represents a particular common sense view of the world that prevails in a culture at a given time, and “discourse” refers to a set of meanings, images, metaphors, stories, that together produce that particular version of events. It is discourse that defines and produces the objects of our knowledge and frames how we define or represent reality. Power, as understood by Foucault, is an effect of discourse and in the instance of psychology/psychiatry, scientific rhetoric and discourse puts the psychologist/psychiatrist in a relatively powerful position relative to those seeking mental health care services. However, Foucault does not profess a customary view of power whereby one person or group “has” the power whereas others do not. Instead, he adopts a more complex view of power, believing that power represents a matrix of relations which exists everywhere and “comes from everywhere” and as such, clinicians and clients alike are caught up in power relations that supersede their individual situation (Foucault, 1978, p.93). Although from this perspective
psychologists/psychiatrists would have greater access to discourse and “truth claims” about their clients (and thus to power), Foucault also suggests that there are always a number of alternative ways in which events can be construed which leaves room for the rejection/refusal of dominant discourses. These points of resistance are an integral part of the power matrices that Foucault describes. In my analysis, I used Foucaultian theory to highlight the ways in which clinicians at the Center and clients are caught up in (and resist) these discursive frameworks within which power is shifting and fluid.

These theoretical influences served as lens through which I interpreted my data, helping me to pick out certain themes or urging me to pay attention to the intermingling of discursive/cultural contexts and psyche. However, in Chapter 4 where I formally analyzed the data, I did not incorporate specific concepts from these theories, preferring instead to use more of my own language to describe and analyze the data. In Chapter 4, my data analysis was structured around identifying themes in the data that addressed my research questions: What comprises practice at this Center? What is the trajectory of community psychology principles in this setting? And what are the specific nuances, tensions, challenges present in practice at the Center? In this chapter (Chapter 5), I dialogue my analysis more explicitly with relevant theory.

Based on my data interpretation, I found that psychological practice at the Center occurred within a vastly complicated array of sociocultural and discursive contexts. Psychologists at the Center drew from both discourses of the profession, such as the rules, vocabulary and mythology of psychology/psychiatry, as well as from the local understandings, rules, and language of the community. Using the metaphor of narratives (or discourses) to understand these different traditions, one could say that psychological
practice at the Center represented an interplay of the meta-narratives of psychology/psychiatry and as well as the local narratives of the surrounding culture of the 8th district. The dialectic between professional and local understandings and language is at the crux of clinical practice at the Center, and understanding better how this process happens has the potential to illuminate the nuances and challenges of culturally sensitive care with marginalized populations. It is especially important to explore this process when working with marginalized and often particularly vulnerable communities in order to improve our ability to not only “adequately serve the needs” of these communities but also how we may continue to allow our professional understandings to be shaped by local values, customs, knowledge, etc.

In the following discussion I explicate the perpetual dialogue, between local and professional discourses present in psychological practice at the Center, a task accomplished first by discussing practice at the Center in light of past research on community mental health services and community psychology principles/theory. I will examine the trajectory of community psychology principles such as contextualization, power, and collaboration within the context of this particular Center. I will also include a discussion of how data from the current study comes to bear on previous discussions within multicultural psychology (as was reviewed in chapter 1). In addition, I will integrate other relevant theory into this discussion (e.g. Foucault, 1972, 1978, 1982; Geertz, 1973, 1983; Shweder, 1991). I then suggest a synthesis between previous empirical studies, regarding community practice, data gleaned from this study, and post-modern theories of culture, identity, and power.
Second, in order to explore some of my sub-questions regarding how staff were constellated within particular discursive and cultural contexts, I proceed to examine the particular ways in which staff were “caught” within these systems, how they dealt with it, and in what ways such constellations did in fact limit, constrain, or disrupt practice. Butler (1997b) discusses a central tension inherent in identity formation regarding our “fundamental dependency on a discourse we never chose, but that, paradoxically, initiates and sustains our agency” (1997b, p.2). I discuss the various ways in which I perceive Center staff and the practice itself to be caught in this dilemma of identity. Although practice at the Center (or probably in any clinical setting) is enormously complex and multifaceted, I have chosen to highlight that which stood out as most salient to me in my practice there, to my participants in interviews, and in my participant-observations.

In the third and final part of my discussion I address some of the limitations of the current research and potential ways in which this research can contribute to the field of psychology. I also suggest some ideas for future research regarding this topic.

**A Response to the Research: Exploring the Practice of Community Psychology**

Past research has documented a “gap” in mental health care services when it comes to marginalized communities (Atkinson, Morten & Sue, 1998; Chow, Jaffee & Snowden, Stevenson, 2001; 2003; Snowden 2005). In this study, I have focused on the practice of psychology in one particular community mental health center that serves a lower income or “underserved” population as a way to gain insight into how psychologists are trying to address this “gap” in services. It has been suggested that
perhaps psychology, as it is conventionally understood and practiced, may not adequately address the needs of non-dominant groups. That is, when issues of social position, power, and culture are central to the experiences/suffering of certain communities, psychology’s individualistic (or focus on very small interpersonal contexts) may be a poor fit (in its’ tendency to exclude issues of power/privilege). In my literature review I argued that, at least from a theoretical standpoint, community psychology - with its focus on social context and power - might offer guidance as to how psychologists could improve psychological services for those groups typically left “underserved” by psychologists. Despite the fact that psychologists at the Center rarely identified what they were doing as “community psychology,” their descriptions of their work and their actions reflected virtually all of the main tenets of community psychology.

**Pushing the boundaries between community and clinic: Contextualizing care**

Several previous studies have documented the contextualized nature of community mental health care (Newberry, 2005; Phillips, 2005; Wynaden et al, 2005) which is perhaps not surprising given that contextualization is one of the organizing principles of community psychology. However, much less literature has focused on what the context of care looks like when it comes to psychological practice and how psychologists working within this a community model conceptualize their work. Based on my data analysis I found that the process of contextualization, similar to what Schön (1983) has observed, involved a process of “muddling through” various issues, discourses, and constraints in their everyday activities (Schon, 1983, p.43). Yet, despite
the fact that clinicians at the Center were often in the position of managing enormous amounts of information and forced to “think on their feet” this is not to say that their clinical work was completely ad hoc or without some underlying conceptual framework. Quite to the contrary, staff operated from a model that strongly (although at times implicitly) understood context as a central component of psychological care. Given the particular history of the 8th district, clinicians at the Center were especially concerned with issues surrounding race, class, and power. This emphasis on context also speaks to the importance staff placed on the sense of self-in-community discussed by Sarason (1974) and revisited by other theorists such as Fisher, Sonn & Bishop (2000) and Swenson(2006). Not only did staff place emphasis on client’s sense of self-in-community, but they also emphasized their own engagement as community members. For example, staff often met with each other, sometimes including clients, for various gathering, luncheons, picnics, outings that helped to foster group cohesiveness and community between staff and between staff and clients. Once the Center sponsored a holiday party during which one staff member in particular shared a favorite story of his with the group (which included both staff and clients). Staff were also politically engaged in groups and organizations outside of the Center which also bespoke their sense of connectedness to the community.

Participants understood both clinician and therapist as embedded within historical, social, political, and personal contexts. Community experiences of fragmentation, marginalization and individual psychological experiences were assumed to be intertwined and co-constitutive. According to this conceptualization, a central task of the Center’s practice revolved around addressing social marginalization and/or the intrapsychic impact
of this marginalization. When experience is conceptualized in this collective way, healing of the individual psyche is seen to require a mending of the communal fabric (the social) which makes up this psychic experience as well as attending to individual psychology. The participants’ conceptualization of the relationship between individual psychology and community conditions resonates with Shweder’s (1991) ideas about the interdependence of psyche or subjectivity and the sociocultural environment. According to Shweder (1991): “on the one hand, no sociocultural environment exists or has identity independently of the way human beings seize meanings and resources from it, while, on the other hand, every human being’s subjectivity and mental life are altered through the process of seizing meanings and resources from some sociocultural environment and using them” (p. 74). Shweder purports that what we think of as culture and as psyche cannot be understood separate from one another. Despite the fact that none of the participants stated that they had any familiarity with Shweder’s ideas, practice at the Center reflects what a psychological practice based on some of Shweder’s ideas might look like. However, practitioners’ attempts to work from a socially oriented model within the context of an individualistic psychiatric system was often not easy and required them to reconcile various resistances and tensions within their work. For instance, although staff did not report feeling especially conflicted about utilizing a psychiatric diagnostic system to describe client distress, despite their understanding of many symptoms as manifestations of social issues, I did experience times when staff appeared to be uncomfortable at having to diagnose a client with a psychiatric illness for practical reasons (e.g. to obtain financial/insurance reimbursement). In my time as a novice clinician at the Center I sometimes had to ask questions that would bring up this
tension – perhaps about why we were assigning a certain diagnosis that seemed to belie what was otherwise quite a different conceptualization discussed in my supervision. I gathered from the averted gaze and discouraged tone of my supervisors that sometimes these measures had to be taken in an effort to support the client, despite the way in which it could potentially also mark the client as “ill” when in fact the person might be having quite a reasonable reaction to recent or ongoing trauma.

Through exploring the work of practitioners at the Center I gained access to the issues, tensions, and struggles that are central to a culturally sensitive practice that attempts to incorporate non-dualistic understandings of human experience. For example, the issues of how and in what way to intervene in the community, the struggle of creating interventions that were based on community members needs which were of course, varied, all the while remaining within the bounds and rules of a medical institution that ultimately determined financial resources that would enable practitioners to continue their community work. It seemed that addressing social issues from a psychological perspective required a fundamental shift in the way psychology is practiced. Based on my data analysis, I interpreted that the process of shifting practice to incorporate culture involves finding ways to delicately balance between clinical and social understandings and negotiating the boundaries and limits of psychology/psychiatry and community. In essence it requires a pushing of the traditional boundaries between community and clinic.

In order to incorporate local understandings, difficulties, and interests into psychological practice, staff had to find a way to enter into the community and learn about the community context. Contextual factors included community history (e.g. history of the 8th district), current issues in the community (e.g. ongoing economic...
deprivation and marginalization), and sociopolitical conditions (e.g. social/racial positioning). Following current trends in psychology, (such as multiculturalism and cultural competency models) psychologists might be likely to take many of these issues into account in more “traditional” practice (as opposed to community oriented practice). However, often those sociocultural issues are relegated to the background, as something to consider but such issues would not fundamentally change the way that practice would be oriented. As Sampson (1995) and Geertz (1973) argued, psychologists have often adopted a layering strategy, when it comes to culture and/or social dimensions, which involves tacking on social considerations to otherwise individualized understandings of identity. Psychologists at the Center understood that in order to better incorporate cultural/social considerations the nature of theory and practice itself might require adaptation. In my interview with Tom (P1), he helpfully distinguished between what he saw as “traditional” and contextual or “holistic” models and suggested why a “holistic” model is more appropriate when working with “disenfranchised” communities. He explained that traditional models determine the specific model/shape of clinical practice a priori, in a universal sense without specific reference to needs of community and clients, whereas more contextualized models seek to ground therapeutic technique and interventions in the specific needs of the community.

As a starting point for contextualizing their practice, clinicians surveyed community members, requested feedback from ongoing clients in individual and group sessions, and participated in grassroots community organizations and political activism as a means to orient themselves to the kinds of struggles that might come from clients themselves in individual and group sessions. The Center also held specific meetings with
the explicit purpose of giving clients a time to voice their opinions about the workings of
the Center. For example, ongoing groups such as “patient advocacy” groups took place
each week to give clients a space to voice their opinions about what was going on at the
Center, what they liked or did not like, and any frustrations or concerns regarding events
in the neighborhood. At times, clients would voice complaints about what seemed on the
surface to be relatively benign issues such as wanting to have a greater variety of movies
(DVDs) available for them to view. However, upon closer examination, conversations
regarding what kinds of films would be shown touched upon important nuances in
contextualizing care. For instance, certain movies had been chosen by both staff and
clients which were deemed to be of interest to the community as a whole. The
community, although it has been referred to often here and by the Center almost as if it
represents a homogenous group, was of course, not homogenous. One client in particular
voiced her frustration that movies depicting only the destructive underbelly of “ghetto
life” were shown to the exclusion of films depicting other dimensions of her community
experience. This client’s voice reflects an important point of dissension regarding the
drawbacks of relying on universalist notions of community. While notions of community
can provide a sense of identity, unity, safety, and caring it can also become insular,
demanding “sameness” which then flattens out within group differences. This client’s
negative reaction to images of “ghetto” life suggest her resistance to being characterized
in stereotypical ways – an important piece of information for clinicians to take into
account when determining how best to “contextualize” care. This example highlights how
integrating psychological practice into any community is an imperfect process, one which
requires an ongoing dialogue and process of trial-and-error. Perhaps, the Center staff had
overlooked the needs of some individuals, however by providing structured time and place whereby clients are given the opportunity to voice their feelings, the Center staff allow themselves to be educated by, even evaluated by, their clients. The very experience of being given a place to voice honest feelings, and the clinicians’ implicit assumptions that clients will inevitably be disappointed with, or have a reaction to, the treatment offered at the Center, communicates a collaborative rather than an authoritative spirit when it comes to client’s healing. Such collaboration may address healing at the social level as well as the intrapsychic level, an idea to which I will return later.

Based on staff experiences with clients and information they gleaned through surveys, they also learned that many clients desired more access to resources such as food, places to shower, and/or clothing. Given the Centers’ high homeless population, such requests are not surprising. Within traditional models the material realities of clients’ lives are often excluded however, as Tom (P1) in particular, was adamant to note, such issues were pressing for clients at the Center and could not be ignored. For instance, Tom empathized with how difficult it would be for a person to focus/process on his/her emotional reality when he/she hasn’t slept, showered, or eaten properly for days. In Tom’s words: “it’s pretty hard to talk to somebody if they’re feeling dirty and grimy and stuff.” The Center’s survey results and Tom’s observations are consistent with findings from prior empirical studies which have found that the experience of economic poverty may create an “obstacle” to both providing and receiving psychological care (Chow, Jaffee, & Snowden, 2003; APA, 2000). However, the Center did not view these issues as “obstacles” but rather an element that needed to be incorporated into their services. Integrating the needs of the community for the Center staff stretched beyond “talk
therapy” or even specific political acts, and relied upon expanding understandings of “care” in its very foundational sense. Providing clients with a place to shower, wash their clothing, and obtain food, became part of the way that this notion of “contextualization” played out at this Center. Furthermore, providing such resources can be considered a way to address issues brought up by quantitative studies regarding the way in which physical/material realities present an “obstacle” to accessing mental health care services. Given that the Center sees itself as a “one stop shop” it can address these “obstacles” enabling clients to make use of what services are available there. In addition, Smith (2005) and James and Prilleltensky (2002) noted that powerful stereotypes regarding “poor” people shape psychologists’ attitudes towards clients. Smith (2005) in particular, claims that often psychologists will assume that poor people will be disinterested in or unable to engage in the process of psychotherapy due to the priority that basic survival needs take in their lives. The Center staff understood that individuals living in poverty may have a more difficult time participating in talk therapy given the priority of material demands, however, instead of assuming clients would not “fit” the traditional model of care, they simply shifted this model to incorporate those needs. I would argue that provision of material resources for clients might also be interpreted as an act of resistance to stereotypes regarding what type of person is appropriate for psychotherapy.

This process of contextualization of psychotherapeutic services and encouragement of critical thinking among community members is reminiscent of Freire’s (1970/2000) critical pedagogy in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Freire (1970/2000) suggests that knowledge must be imparted in a contextualized fashion if it is to be relevant and empowering to marginalized communities (in his book he refers
specifically to communities in the Brazilian countryside). He also suggests that a critical piece of educating oppressed communities lies in the raising of consciousness regarding political and historical circumstances or what he calls “conscientization.” Freire’s (1970/2000) pedagogical theory can be useful in understanding why contextualization of psychological practice might be beneficial. For example, as Freire suggested with respect to education, that teachers orient themselves towards collaborating with the community in order to understand what was most concerning or interesting to them. Rather than employing what Freire (1970/2000) referred to as a “top-down” approach to learning, whereby the teachers, or in the current case, psychologists, decide what is best for students (or clients), they should ground their understandings and intervention in the interests of the community itself. Staff at the Center employed this technique when they asked clients to fill out surveys and discuss their responses to treatment offered. Open dialogue, which is at the crux of Freire’s (1970/2000) critical pedagogy, was also essential to staff at the Center in their work with clients. Meetings during which clients’ voices could be heard, especially dissenting voices, suggest an atmosphere in which love, humility, faith and mutual trust are present (at least to some extent). Freire considers such characteristics to be essential for the existence of genuine dialogue. Staff at the Center also took to participating in community events and activism as another means to educating themselves about the social and historical context of the community. For instance, staff participated in local political events, grassroots meetings regarding changes in the community, and kept abreast of city urban planning. Staff felt they played an important role, much like Freire suggests, not only in being aware of these “cultural” issues but also in educating residents about what was happening around them and how it
might impact them. According to staff, clients from the community often (perhaps due partially to impact of oppression or oppressed identities) were unaware of what decisions were being made regarding their community (on a governmental level). For example, many residents were not aware of how plans to build a casino near their neighborhood might impact them or the fact that the city planned to cut a major bus line which would further isolate the community from the rest of the city. Staff’s efforts to inform clients regarding these issues is similar to Freire’s process of conscientization – the idea that when people develop a deeper consciousness of their situation, this leads them to construe their situation as an historical reality susceptible to transformation rather than as a static unchangeable reality. The Center’s efforts were not only geared towards addressing clients’ experiences of the community but helping them learn ways to resist/challenge these conditions.

Through their collaboration with the community, clinicians at the Center not only learned about some of the material realities of the community (e.g. economic deprivation), they also gained a sense of the intrapsychic impact that these material realities had on the community. Staff interpreted their observations of suffering, stories of victimization and violence, family disruption and fragmentation and spiritual struggles as evidence for the existence of what they called “community trauma or community PTSD.” Thus the particular trajectory of community practice at this Center revolved around a consideration of the traumatic impact of systematic oppression, community fragmentation, and subsequent psychological symptoms. All of the participants made mention of “community trauma” in their interviews and suggested ways in which such trauma could be treated from a psychological perspective. For instance, Theresa (P2)
shared that one of the issues the staff had been discussing at the Center revolved around the “whole conceptualization of whether or not we’re just talking about a post-trauma person here and a post-trauma person here, but maybe we’re talkin’ about a traumatized community…I mean, there is a certain kind of trauma that people are subjected to (. ) you know violence and scratching at your survival…so uncommon to the majority culture” (Lines 199-204). Sam (P4) also alluded to the impact of not only poverty itself, but the experience of economic and social marginalization in the context of relative wealth (as is the case in the U.S.). He refers to the systematic oppression of certain communities and how this type of oppression may have specific kinds of intrapsychic repercussions for individuals experiencing it. The idea of community trauma was such a central theme across all of my interviews that the topic warrants further consideration in terms of how community trauma is understood in the literature and the particular meaning it had when it came to the community served by the Center.

Although it was difficult to find much literature on the topic of “community” trauma, I did come across some discussions of “cultural” trauma. Smelser (2004) defines cultural trauma as “a memory accepted and publicly given credence by a relevant membership group and evoking an event or situation which is a) laden with negative affect b) represented as indelible, and c) regarded as threatening a society’s existence or violating one or more of its fundamental cultural presuppositions” (p.44). It is somewhat unclear how this definition might be applied to the current study, given that there is no clear “event” to which the community may be reacting. On the other hand, clinicians at the Center alluded to historical events and trauma resulting from ongoing systematic oppression as being central issues in many community members lives. Eyerman (2004)
offers a definition of cultural trauma that is more closely aligned to what staff were
describing when he writes: “As opposed to psychological or physical trauma, which
involves a wound and the experience of great emotional anguish by an individual,
cultural trauma refers to a dramatic loss of identity and meaning, a tear in the social
fabric, affecting a group of people that has achieved some degree of cohesion. In this
sense, the trauma need not necessarily be felt by everyone in a community or experienced
directly by any or all” (p.61). Eyerman (2004) also addresses the way that traumatic
events that occurred in the distant past, such as the event of slavery for African
Americans living in the U.S., still impact this community today. He goes on to explain
that historical traumatic events have not been experienced first-hand by later generations
and thus the events must be passed down through various forms of discourse (e.g. oral
room for both a consideration of the way in which trauma is mediated through discourse
as well as its’ psychological impact on communities. Furthermore, he links the
“articulating discourse surrounding cultural trauma” to the emergence of particular
identities as a way to repair the “tear in the social fabric” – he writes: “there may be
several or many possible responses to cultural trauma that emerge in a specific historical
context, but all of them in some way or another involve identity and memory” (p.63).
Eyerman (2004) uses the emergence of an “African American” identity as one of several
possible reactions to the failure of reconstruction to integrate former slaves as
“Americans” (p. 63). Perhaps, it may be even suggested that the appellation of African
American identity connotes a reaction to trauma, an identity based on a history of trauma.
Staff at the Center certainly perceived the ongoing oppression of ongoing identity/community fragmentation as rooted in this history, however they also noticed the ways in which it was recapitulated as part of the ongoing everyday trauma with which their clients were dealing. For example, Tom (P1), Michael (P2) and Sam (P3) all suggest that historical and systematic oppressive practices, such as economic and educational exclusion and negative stereotypes of “poor black communities” creates multiple layers of trauma. Racism, sexism, and classism were understood as working together to perpetuate ongoing oppression of the 8th district community (among others), while also perpetuating the mythology surrounding poverty in black communities in the United States. That is, the notion that “those [poor] people did it to themselves” and as Michael noted are thus “undeserving” of public sympathy or assistance. Furthermore, they interpreted that a large component of the cultural identity/experience of clients from the community was rooted in the intrapsychic impact of this marginalization and an identity that was at least partially rooted in this history.

Similar to Eyerman’s (2004) line of thought, the clinicians conceptualized collective trauma as being a fundamental experience around which a cultural identity was formed. It makes sense then, that although clinicians’ used the identity term “African American” to identify themselves and community members, they resisted defining this identity according to some inherent characteristics. Instead, they focused more on this shared history and ongoing experiences which were felt differently across community members but nonetheless were considered crucial to consider. Staff addressed the impact of this “community trauma” from both a psychological and social perspective. Although an explicit working model of intrapsychic impact of oppression was not discussed, it can
be deduced from clinicians’ interviews, as well as observing their practice, that living under oppressive conditions was assumed to do more than make life more stressful and unmanageable (as is often referred to in the literature regarding impact of poverty on mental health) – it also changed the way a person saw him or herself and the world. Participants’ descriptions of the intrapsychic impact of race oppression brings to mind W.E. Du Bois’ (1953/2005) concept of double consciousness. In his renowned collection of essays entitled, *The Souls of Black Folk*, Du Bois wrestles with issues of racism, discrimination and social injustice in 20th century America. Of his concept of “dual consciousness” Du Bois wrote “[it is] this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity” (1953/2005, p. 2), and of a two-ness, of being "an American, a Negro; [...] two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder” (p.5). During my interview with Theresa, she considered the impact of such “dual” identifications. She noted, “there’s this um this sense of being of two nations, because we’re not Africans, you know, we’re not 100%, most of us are not 100% African. So what happens is that we’re like a people that are afloat” (Lines 225-228).

According to Du Bois, the impact of having such a “double” or split self is significant in shaping people’s intrapsychic experience. Michael suggests that many clients’ perceptions of themselves have been “crushed” by negative constructions of how they are socially identified. Positive constructions of the self, a sense of spiritual connectedness, and self-esteem become difficult to hold onto or develop in the face of such ascriptions.

The finding that staff treated racial/ethnic identity as being best understood as an interpersonal/social phenomenon (rather than innate and internal), partially based on
shared experiences, lends support to comments from Helms (1994), regarding the multiple and varied ways that persons experience and understand such identities. For example, Helms (1994) suggested that instead of associating a standard set of attributes to different cultural/racial groups, a therapist might do better to assess how central various identifications are to that person in his or her life. As such, the suggestion is that therapy be tailored to the interests and needs of that particular client or group of clients, rather than determined beforehand. The staff reflected an understanding of cultural or racial identity in more idiosyncratic ways, rather than making generalizations that rest on the assumptions of homogeneity within cultural groups. These findings also lend support to Sampson’s (1993b) and Cosgrove’s (2003) critique of traditional multicultural psychology that has attempted to “layer” identity categories rather than understanding the interpersonal and power dimensions that create such identities in the first place. By assuming that such issues are interpersonally sustained and that power will inevitably be part of the therapy relationship, staff, at least in some ways, addressed this critique of an overly simplistic or superficial understanding of social marginalization based on race or ethnicity. I will return to a fuller analysis of power in the Center’s work later in this chapter.

One of the ways that clinicians chose to address concerns regarding internalized oppression was by providing a corrective relational experience for community members through a combination of acknowledgement, recognition, and empowerment. In Tom’s interview he stated, “when people come through the door, we acknowledge that they are here because often enough people here are disenfranchised and uh, they’re sensitive to how they’re being treated, or mistreated, and whether it be real or perceived our
perception is everything…so, what’s their perception is where it is, so we really work hard…to engage everybody who comes through here” (Lines 142-148). This process of acknowledgement, and engagement with community members was one of the most striking features of practice at the Center which might differentiate it from “traditional” practice. Clinicians made it a point, through their various interactions with clients in groups, activities, etc. to know the clients, and acknowledge their presence. So, the process of acknowledgment is an active process, one that extends beyond the confines of the consulting room and permeates interactions within the clinic as a whole. It is also a relational process, one which brings to mind Levinas’ (1969) concept of “facing” the “Other.” As participants noted, clients have often had many experiences throughout their lifetime of having assumptions made about them, feeling invalidated, and discriminated against on the basis of being identified with a particular racial group. In Levinas’ (1969) sense, these clients may have experienced a form of interpersonal “violence” which clinicians at the Center deemed would be important to address. Several participants made mention of how sensitive many clients are to the potential for this type of interpersonal violence to occur at the Center. Providing this basic acknowledgment and recognition of for clients superseded any traditional therapy interventions at the Center. The way clinicians used this way of relating was as an intervention in and of itself. As Sam (P4) stated, clinical work at the Center requires using basic care-taking skills as a human being, not necessarily learned through any kind of training. Here, traditional boundaries of traditional psychotherapy models are pushed again, with much of what is considered by staff to be healing happening in the space in between sessions.
Michael suggests an additional function of this interaction outside of session—that is, clients (especially clients who experience psychological crises and are in need of hospitalization periodically) will respond better to clinicians attempts to “help” if they feel they have been acknowledged and understood as a whole person; they will respond better during those more traditional psychological interventions which might otherwise have the potential to reenact authoritarianism and social exploitations.

Another important aspect of this contextualization piece which relates back to community psychology theory is the idea of agency, empowerment and resilience. All participants made comments about their role in helping to highlight clients’ strengths, conceptualizing them as people dealing with a “fault system” rather than as the problem themselves, as well as fostering resilience and “recovery.”

This analysis of contextualization which includes working collaboratively with the community to decipher their needs, responding to those needs through further interpretation and the emergence of an implicit model of “community trauma” and a focus on reversing the negative impact of oppression both psychologically and socially, implies issues of power. Thus far I have not explicitly discussed power issues inherent in discussion of these issues and I will now turn to this second major organizing principle in community psychology – power.

**Bringing the Center to the Margins: Negotiating Power and Identity**

Given staff’s explicit interest in social justice and civil rights ideology, many of their interventions stemmed from a customary (or Marxist) model of power. My analysis
of interview transcripts revealed that terms such as “oppressed” and “oppressors,” notions of “empowerment,” narratives about “fighting” large systems, and consciousness-raising and advocacy which reflects customary notions of power appeared with regularity. However, although staff ascribed explicitly to a social justice orientation that understood clients’ experiences in terms of customary dichotomized understandings of power (e.g. oppressed/oppressor), implicit within their work and in their discussions with me, it was evident that staff also considered more fluid, multifaceted effects of power in their clinical work. Especially when it came to addressing race, culture, class per se, participants’ explanations became more complicated, sometimes acknowledging the need for a more nuanced understanding of the role of power.

Foucault’s (1978; 1983) conception of power presents a useful guide with which to analyze and understand the way power relations were enacted within the Center. In his *History of Sexuality*, Foucault writes the following: “Power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations…relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships (economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relations) but are immanent in the latter” (Foucault, 1978, p.94). Similar to this concept of power, clinicians at the Center understood identity and power as multifaceted and relational, encapsulating both therapist and client. Client and therapist positions shifted in relation to one another and as such, there could not always be a clear “oppressor and oppressed” or person with/without power within interpersonal dynamics at the Center. Of course, as Foucault (1978) contends, some individuals within these “matrices” of power may have
more access to truth claims than others (thus more access to power) as was the case with clinicians at the Center who maintained the ability to name the client’s distress according to diagnostic criteria and to determine treatment. On the other hand, such power was not “held” in the way that a possession is held, and thus such claims to power were sometimes obscured. For instance, Theresa (P2), in particular, spoke at length about how her own social position(s) as “African American” and “woman” played out in her relationships with certain clients. She described her interaction with an African American male client who was a self-identified “pimp” and the way his social position/identity was emotionally “triggering” based on the way it implicated Theresa as a woman. Theresa described the way he interacted with her, which she experienced as his “messing” with her due to his tendency to “identify and analyze” women in an exploitative way as “triggering” to her emotionally: “But, I like him as a person except for when he’ll say something that’s so damn sexist…And he could say some sleazy stuff about women, okay?” (Lines 759-762). Theresa (P2) identified the complexity of having to hold in mind the movement of power as it was manifested between this client and herself. She understood this client’s exploitative language and actions towards others as a defensive posture, developed as a way for him to survive a social system in which he saw limited options and had limited access to power. It is here, in the interpersonal enactment of power, that the complex interweaving and co-constitution of community trauma, power and racial identity come together and become entangled at the emotional level. Theresa expressed a feeling of being “identified” as a “woman” by this client and subsequently “analyzed” as a commodity or object. Although Theresa may be identified as “woman” in this scenario, she is also “therapist” which affords her a different level of access to power
within the context of the Center. However, the tangled web of interpersonal dynamics as described by Theresa, was emotionally taxing and required her to have significant training in interpersonal dynamics and sensitivity to the interpersonal and intrapersonal workings of power. In this example, Theresa also struggled against acting out her aggressive self-protective impulse to tell this client to “shut his mouth” and instead managed to respond in a way that kept her connected and open with the client (by sharing with him her genuine feeling of being disrespected). According to Theresa, this interaction provided the client with an opportunity to understand his impact on others in a different way and was transformative for both parties involved. When social position, including “racial” or “ethnic” identity, is conceptualized in this more interpersonal way with specific attention to power, essentialized and/or simplistic understandings of social position are of little relevance.

In the literature, the interpersonal complexity of cultural and social identification is often avoided or if addressed, it is addressed in superficial ways. For instance, some studies suggest the preference of “matching” client and therapist ethnicity or race to promote culturally sensitive and hence more effective psychotherapy (Beutler, Machado, & Newfeldt, 1994; Gamst, Dana, Der-Karaberian, & Kramer, 2000; Maramba & Hall, 2002; Sue, 1998; Sue, Fujino, Hu, Takeuchi, & Zane, 1991). Although the role of race and ethnicity in psychotherapy is certainly an important one (and an improvement over the assumption that culture does not matter), such considerations have sometimes been based on assumptions of homogeneity among various social groups. Multicultural psychology criticizes traditional clinical psychology for assuming that Eurocentric models of behavior apply to everyone universally, which has spawned an enormous body
of research and practice regarding race, ethnicity, culture and identity within the field. However, even as such moves to consider diversity have fostered much needed attention on the topic, we must be careful not to let the pendulum swing in the other direction, paying such close attention to defining cultural/racial/ethnic differences that we begin to see these groups as homogenous. As Helms (1994) contends, making generalizations about appropriate psychological care based on racial/ethnic identity without considering the centrality (or also, I would argue, the person’s relationship to) of racial group membership is likely to be ineffective (Helms, 1994). Generalized conceptualizations of race/class/ethnicity overlook the fluid, multifaceted and intersubjective nature of identity. That is, as Shweder (1991) argued, if culture and a person’s psychology/psyche co-constitute one another, there could potentially be an infinite number of configurations in terms of how people experience and enact identity. Even mainstream multicultural research that proposes the preference for client/therapist “match” in terms of client retention and therapeutic effectiveness has started to consider the underlying variables that mediate these effects. According to Sue (1998), there are several mediating factors that actually determine the success of the match between therapist and client (e.g. ascription of a certain set of values or a worldview or language) which suggest that it is not some inherent qualities specific to various ethnic/racial groups that might make for a good working alliance, but rather aspects of culture and worldview.

Despite the fact that almost all therapists at the Center “match” their clients in terms of racial identity, which in many ways is experienced in positive ways by clients (given reports that it feels more “comfortable” than being at a predominately “white” clinic), there are also complicated issues of power and privilege that impact the
therapist/client relationships at the Center. According to Foucault, power is fluid and “coming from everywhere” and thus have an impact on relationships whether there therapist and client are “matched” with regard to ethnicity/race (especially when considering the multiple identities/identifications). For example, Theresa (P2) suggests that therapists at the Center, especially African American therapists, are seen by African American clients as “the lucky ones”. During her interview, Theresa stated: “I think we struggle with that as a staff, u::m (.) perhaps we’re labeled as the ones who’ve been somewhat successful and whatever, you would call that… we’ve been properly assimilated or we’ve been assimilated a li::ttle better than others. But, so (.) that’s who we are. We’re the ones who figured out how to do it OR else we’re the ones who we’re so fortunate that we fall in the manor and come out riding the pony, you know, we’re the lucky ones” (Lines 251-258). She did not go further to suggest explicitly how this might impact the therapy relationship, however there is potential for this scenario to invoke both feelings of inspiration and envy in clients. Sometimes, although there may be an immediate comfort in a psychotherapeutic situation in which there is “sameness” rather than difference, when working with someone with whom one identifies strongly, the issue of comparison is felt more intensely. Again, this is not to suggest that this type of dynamic would be unwanted, but that these nuances and complex dynamics of power and privilege in the psychotherapeutic relationship are extremely important to consider.

The question in this situation is not necessarily as some conventional understandings of power suggest, to figure out who is more oppressed, but rather how power is shaping the dynamic and how might the persons involved in the situation understand their positioning within this power matrix. Therapists have the added
intention of finding a therapeutic way to orient themselves in this web – acknowledging their own reactions to interactions with clients, and their own social identifications, while finding therapeutic ways to respond. This is particularly difficult in the earlier description of Theresa’s interaction with her “pimp” client in which she felt personally offended and threatened by “sexist” comments that her client was making. The process of negotiating identity in the psychotherapy relationship is complex and potentially rife with tension and challenge. It requires understanding and resolving issues of identity and power within the context of the therapeutic relationship.

Taking the negotiation of power to a more structural or systems level, participants attempted to utilize the access they did have to power to advocate for their clients. For example, when Tom described “fighting” with the administration for more material resources or challenging negative stereotypes of the community, or Michael organized community meetings to facilitate client involvement in local politics, or Sam saw himself as “carrying the fire” of public service psychiatry into more traditional psychiatric circles so as to gain more support for contextualized, community care. All of these actions represent various ways in which psychologists at the Center found, as Foucault might call, “points of resistance” already “present everywhere in the power network” (p.95).

With respect to the more general workings of power within the Center, people took on a variety of roles which were situated at varying levels of status. As such, hierarchies were sometimes subverted and power/status was relatively fluid. For instance, Tom’s (P1) tendency to subvert typical power hierarchies within the Center by taking a familiar approach in which he used humor to offset his position of power. At other points he could be seen using his power when it came to his interactions with the medical center
or the community in general in order to advocate for the Center and the community. Specific attempts at reversing typical hierarchies or power dynamics represent both an understanding of power in terms of the oppressor/oppressed dichotomies, and the intrapsychic impact of this dynamic as well as Foucault’s idea of resistance points. At the same time, as with any discussion of power, the ways in which psychologists, even community-oriented psychologists, may inadvertently use their position to advance the social status quo must also be examined. As Swartz (1996) warned regarding this precarious relationship between the clinic and the community, when we push boundaries of the clinic into the community, we may benefit the community in some ways, but we also “place boundaries and controls around people” and “interfere with and police their lives in an elaborate from of surveillance masquerading as service” (Swartz, 1996, p. 5). Although I cannot claim to know the extent of the impact of psychological/psychiatric discourse on this community given the limited scope of this project, it seems possible that despite the Center’s attempt to downplay psychiatric diagnoses, clients were nonetheless engaged within this discourse. For example, a client might be informed about a disorder such as “bipolar disorder” and the need for “compliance” with psychiatric medication. Now, perhaps this is the best that psychologists/psychiatrists can offer for a person exhibiting behavioral symptoms that are potentially harmful to themselves or others, but, despite the tempering of such treatment with more socially oriented interventions, it is likely that this person will see him or herself (if he/she believes the clinician!) differently than before they came to the clinic. Now, that said, this type of “control” can happen in a variety of ways – it can happen when persuading someone that they have a particular syndrome or disorder, but it
can also happen to convince them of their own value, of hope, and opportunity for growth. So, from my perspective, the effects of a therapist’s power may forever be caught up in this web, or his “matrix” as Foucault might call it, never to be defined as essentially one thing or the other. In other words, it will continue to flow in a variety of directions and the most effective way for a psychologists to address it may be just to track its “flow.” And, in tracking this “flow,” the points of resistance which Foucault also mentions, and that are always already also at work in the discursive matrix, may be opened, exploited, or otherwise responded (in)to.

The Bigger Picture: Tensions and Challenges

The social situatedness of the practice of psychotherapy is an aspect of the clinical work that is often overlooked in research regarding therapy effectiveness and cultural competency. Most quantitative and even some qualitative studies have done well to identify potential challenges and deepen our knowledge of the various issues and/or problems when it comes to providing psychological services for marginalized communities. However, many of these previous studies have neglected the context within which psychologists practice. If we are to take into account the socio-cultural-political context of clinical work, one might find, as I have in this particular study, that contextual factors have a powerful impact not only on clients but also on therapists and their work. Outlining the particular challenges and tensions of this particular community mental health center cannot necessarily be generalized to other contexts, however, given that the
majority of lower income communities are often served by public clinics, it is highly possible that similar processes may be at work in other centers.

One major challenge that permeated practice at the Center related to the way that staff reconciled tensions between various discourses, most notably meta-narratives of psychiatry wherein symptoms are interpreted as evidence of psychiatric “illness,” and community understandings that see symptoms as manifestations of social/systemic problems. However, rather than being a tension between medicalized understandings versus community understandings of emotional distress, clinicians experienced the tension between psychiatric and community discourse as a conflict of recognition. That is, the tension for them was one of whether or not a culturally grounded practice would be recognized as valid within the larger psychiatric institution or discourse (rather than relegated to the margins of the institution). For the Center, the struggle seemed to be between the way in which advancing a culturally specific practice made them vulnerable to being dismissed or even abandoned by a system that valued traditional (Eurocentric) psychiatric models of experience. For instance, Michael described a tension between wanting to be permitted to practice autonomously as a satellite clinic but also not wanting to be dismissed as a “Black” clinic and viewed as somehow different from the rest of the institution (which may also be another way of saying “less than”). In other words, Michael was caught between wanting to provide culturally specific care and challenge the tendency towards a “one size fits all” mentality, while also remaining within, and advocating for, an equal place within the system. Once again this particular dilemma brings to mind Foucault (1978) who noted that, “discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a
starting point for an opposing strategy” (1978, p. 101). As such, the Center’s appeal to the discourse of culturally specific practices provides them a place from which to advocate for their clients, however it simultaneously creates the possibility for their continued marginalization (by virtue of being labeled as different). According to Butler (1997), “subjection consists precisely in this fundamental dependency on a discourse we never chose but that, paradoxically, initiates and sustains our agency” (1997, p.2). For instance, the Center wants to be recognized and supported in its efforts to advance culturally sensitive practice that advocates for marginalized, and especially Black communities; however, in claiming this identity label, it risks being “dismissed” as a “Black” clinic and thus not included in the same privileges as the rest of the institution. At the same time, as Michael contended, if the Center does not assert that identity they might risk getting “swallowed up” in the larger system that may advance a “cookie-cutter” approach to treatment. Still, as he mentioned, there is a struggle between being frustrated by the negative impact of marginalization as a “Black” clinic, yet appreciative of the autonomy that identification provides them in determining what services they can provide (within the budget of the funding they are provided).

Despite the interest in utilizing culturally specific practices and not wanting to get “swallowed up” in the system, the Center drew upon psychiatric discourse a fair bit. As mentioned earlier, this of course showed up in official documents used by the staff which were developed by the medical system. Such forms used language such as “patient illness” which at first glance seemed antithetical to staff’s contextualized understandings of client struggles. Through my analysis I observed the way that staff straddled the line between discourses, drawing from psychiatric discourse when they need to in order to
abide by important regulations set out by the institution that financially sustains them. On
the other hand, sometimes the language of psychiatry was adopted in indiscriminant
ways, indicating that staff were not just using this discourse strategically but perhaps
actually bought into this discourse. For instance, when Tom tells me about the
importance of client “compliance” with medication, it evokes the authoritative medical
approach rather than the collaborative approach. Implications of this tension are that
practice at the Center must rely upon the discourse of psychology/psychiatry in order to
be recognized as such an agency and continue the support and funding necessary for its
existence. However, staff also may also simultaneously unconsciously and/or consciously
adhere to both psychiatric and community discourses which is an interesting tension that
deserves further attention in future research.

In addition to tensions between discourses of psychiatry and community
psychology, there is also a tension regarding the appropriate way to understand culture
and/or race. Several of the participants resisted generalized understandings of race and
class, or painting these identity categories with “a broad stroke.” Tom highlights the
important issue of heterogeneity within any group membership when he stated “we may
be alike on one perspective or two perspectives but we still have different things that’s
unique to us” (Tom). Michael suggests that he does not see his work as being particular
to an African American community, although when it comes to race/culture/ethnicity, the
“problems may present differently” and the “interventions might be different.” However,
embedded within the issue of racial group identification lies another tension regarding the
extent to which clinicians identified with and drew upon their own racial identifications
in clinical practice. Michael resisted identification as a “Black therapist” stating that “I
am a black man, but I don’t see myself as a black therapist.” On the other hand, Theresa and Sam both discussed their heightened awareness of their own racial identities and how this might impact their work with clients. Theresa, who identified as African American shared several of her own experiences of discrimination based on race and gender, and felt a strong connection to the kind of dual consciousness that many of her clients reported. She understood her own experience as something that could help her understand experiences of marginalization. Sam (P4) who identified as “European American” professed the importance of addressing the issues of white privilege in his practice through identification with his own European and Jewish heritage. To him, addressing the issue of white privilege includes this self-reflexive practice, in which instead of focusing on “the Other” and the problems “they” have, he focuses on examining the politics of domination and white colonialism and oppression and how this is likely to play out with clients. This self-reflexive stance is something that critics of traditional cultural competency movements, such as Sonn (2004) recommend. Sonn (2004) observed that “although useful at some level, cultural competence, can be problematic because there are complex issues of power and privilege that often remain unexamined” and he suggests that “developing culturally competent practice requires moving beyond learning about the other, to examine and deconstruct our own social identities and power and privilege afforded by those identities” (p.4).

Another tension/challenge that the Center faces has to do with material consequences: lack of funding, low salaries, “enormous” caseloads, and burnout. Swartz’s (1996) research documented that the lack of funding and support community health centers (and workers) receive contributes to high rates of burnout. Swartz (1996)
suggests that this lack of support for community work is at least partially a result of continued marginalization of community psychology/mental health services within the field of psychology/psychiatry. Community workers thus end up with tremendous responsibility for community welfare, and often have a strong inherent sense of obligation to the community yet have to ‘sacrifice” in some way, even if just financially (but often also emotionally) to continue providing these services. Theresa’s comment about “the level of care that these people are receiving is not because the institution is supporting” the work but because as she put it, “African Americans, with a high level of training are sacrificing to be with them…it’s a major sacrifice” (Lines 519-521) reflects this struggle. The feeling of being marginalized, underappreciated, and undercompensated has an emotional toll for some as well. Theresa described some ambivalence between her commitment to the community and negative feelings regarding her status as a community worker.

Swartz (1996) found that heightened “burn out” rates among community workers are not only the result of poor financial compensation, but also because of the identification and often permeable boundaries between staff and community. Although this “boundary crossing” has been presented earlier as an important means to allowing staff access to clients needs, it also creates the potential for increased emotional involvement which although helpful for community – can also have negative side effects for staff. For the Center, in particular, given the boundaries it is crossing, that is into a community suffering from the destructive impact of poverty and social marginalization, they run the risk of sustaining a type of vicarious traumatization. Theresa presents a fine example of this concept, when she recounted, “I have to work with these people whose
incidents are on television. When I come – you know, get up in the morning and say “*Oh my god that’s so awful, Oh my god those poor people*” and then I come to work and find out that I know them and I still can’t get over that” (Lines 677-680).

**Summary and Questions for Further Research**

Although it is difficult to sum up the main findings in this study due to its breadth and exploratory nature I will attempt a summarization and then let this summary lead into my questions for further study. First, my analysis shed some light on the question of how community psychology theory is translated into clinical practice. As explained by various community psychologists (e.g. Prilleltensky, 1994; Orford, 2008; Rappaport, 1997) psychologists at the Center worked within a contextualized model, paying particular attention to power and working in a collaborative manner. These three principles were enacted in various ways in this particular community. Contextualizing practice included extending psychotherapy beyond the confines of the consulting room, and this boundary crossing reflected specific intentions. Given that community clients were understood as requiring both social as well as psychological healing, psychologists expanded their roles to include the role of mentor, advocate, and perhaps even fellow community member. Psychologists worked alongside clients in a collaborative manner, taking their lead from clients and allowing themselves to be corrected in terms of their understandings of clients needs.

Second, social context, “psyche” and practice were understood as co-constitutive of one another. Both client and therapist identities were understood as a result of a
complex intermingling of power, privilege, and identity that required ongoing negotiation and self-reflection. This finding challenges mainstream conceptualizations of culture and cultural competency and supports post-modern/interpretive understandings of culture (Swededer, 1991; Geertz, 1973). Also, often, social considerations in psychology focus on specific identities of clients and therapists (more often the clients) but do not necessarily consider how social context permeates clinical practice as well. The current study outlined the various ways in which power dynamics shape and constitute therapeutic relationships as well as the identities and experiences of therapist themselves (in terms of compensation, resources, etc.). The possibility that community psychology practices and conceptualization continue to be relegated to the margins was also evidenced.

Third, the ways in which complex issues of power, identity, and emotional or intrapsychic experience are interwoven was highlighted through my analysis. Although this is not a new concept, there is relatively little in the ways of empirical research that attempts the explication of this theory in terms of how it is enacted in everyday practices. Personal narratives and/or theory based on personal experience is certainly empirically grounded, however, not explicitly framed as such and so the current research sought to add upon this prior theory and research.

Although by nature, ethnographic research is meant to focus on a specific group or case, and although it certainly was not this dissertation’s task, studying other community mental health centers alongside “the Center” would add complexity, and comparative breadth and depth to this study. Indeed, I often found myself wondering about psychological practice at other satellite clinics that operated under the auspices of the medical center, especially because they were mentioned several times during
interviews. Although in hindsight it would have been interesting to visit these sites even if just to get a sense of the physical space of the clinics, time and space constraints limited my analysis to the Center, and it is my hope that future research may respond to these remaining questions.

Also, as mentioned in my introduction, clients were not included as participants. I presented clients as they were seen and heard (and described) by myself and participants, however, I did not include them as participants. My rationale for excluding clients as participants mostly revolved around a concern for their confidentiality and logistics of having review boards approve my involvement of a “psychiatric population” in my study. Furthermore, given that this study was designed to serve as my dissertation research, I set out to limit the breadth of my study – although I ended up with quite a bit of data even without client participation. However, throughout my analysis, I did find myself wishing I had clients’ descriptions of their experiences to compare against my own and clinicians’ interpretations, and I do feel that this would be an important second step to the current research project.

Of course there are always ways and ideal situations one wishes for to strengthen the research and the research design. Hence, although I believe that my participant-observations of the activities of the Center and my own work there as a therapist served as important “check” to information I gleaned through interviews, it would have only added to the study to be able to dialogue these data points with an analysis of interactions between therapist and client during psychotherapy sessions. Although I was privy to interactions between therapists and clients outside of therapy sessions, and was aware of my own interactions with clients in individual and group therapy, I did not have access to
these more private conversations between therapist and client. If I were to conduct further research at the Center, I might see if I could gain access to tape recordings of therapy sessions and conduct a more in-depth analysis of the ways that complex issues of power, privilege and identity play out between client and therapist. However, that said, it was an aim of this project to demonstrate the ways in which what is therapeutic happens in a variety of ways outside of the traditional counseling session, and therefore, in many ways I was privy to many therapeutic encounters (e.g. in casual conversation with clients, in spending time eating lunch with a client, or organizing meetings where clients voices were elicited) during my time at the Center.

Overall, research regarding cultural sensitivity in psychological practice has a long ways to go. In this project I have suggested that one way to learn more about this complex issue is to first recognize what a complex issue it is rather than try to operationalize it. Traditional psychological models may not be appropriate for this task and thus it would benefit the field to look beyond its borders and shift paradigmatic understandings of individual psychology to include the social.

**Finally, and in conclusion**

Perhaps a good place to conclude is in, or with, the voice of the ethnographer or “participant observer” or researcher. As I conclude my research at the Center I am reminded of where I began and what brought me to this research in the first place – mainly my excitement regarding the work of Center clinicians which integrated social justice theory and psychology (my two personal passions). My experiences at the Center
brought to life the complexities of social context when it comes to psychological practice in a way that has greatly enriched my thinking as a researcher and as a clinician. Leaving the Center, I am left with a feeling of gratitude to my supervisors there who guided me through the very beginnings years of clinical practicum and who also generously agreed to participate in this study. My first goal, of this project, beyond its’ academic utility, was really to document the important clinical work that I saw happening at the Center. It was my belief, given Center clinicians’ enormous caseloads and innumerable daily tasks, that even if there was to be an interest in writing about one’s work, it would be unlikely to come to fruition. I hope that my representation of clinical work at the Center does it justice or at least participants might feel a sense of resonance when reading it (and I plan to provide them a copy of the dissertation if they would like to read it).

Leaving the Center I am left with a feeling of sadness regarding the continued difficulties this community is likely to face, but also a sense of hope about the Center’s potential to reach out and dig into community/social issues where many mental health centers do not. This feeling of hope inspires me to continue the important work I saw happening at the Center and to work towards bringing more awareness to the value of community work so as to ensure better support for these services.
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TITLE: Mental health care at the margins: A critical ethnography of psychological practice in an inner city community mental health care center
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Why is this research being done?
You are being asked to participate in a research project that seeks to investigate psychological practice in an inner city community mental health setting. The general purpose of this investigation is to gain more insight into the current gap in adequate mental health care services for marginalized populations such as racial/ethnic minorities and individuals of lower SES through learning more about the experience of clinicians who provide such services.

Who is being asked to take part in this research study?
You are being invited to take part in this research study because you are a staff member of an inner city community mental health clinic. The data from interviews you provide will be added to more general participant-observations, and personal reflections in an effort to tell a story of psychological practice within your particular community mental health center. The results are not meant to be generalizable but to represent an experience-near account of the complex interplay of factors when it comes to providing mental health care to individuals of minority, lower socioeconomic status. People invited to participate in this study must be past/current staff at the Center and be of at least 21 years of age.

What procedures will be performed for research purposes?
If you decide to take part in this research study, you will be asked to allow me to interview you. The interviews will take place over a 3 month period. I will ask to meet with you for ½ to 1 hour over 1-2 interview
sessions. The interviews will be taped and transcribed. Upon follow-up I will request feedback for your input on the results of the study. All interviews will take place in a confidential setting of your choosing and tapes from interviews will be destroyed after transcription. All mention of names will be erased or changed to protect your anonymity.

**What are the possible risks participating in this research study?**
The possible risks of participating in this research study are not greater than those encountered in everyday life. Participants will not be expected to proceed with discussions of topics that they feel will jeopardize their employment or otherwise cause undue discomfort or tension. In accordance with IRB guidelines I will ensure confidentiality of participants and any individuals mentioned by participants during interviews.

**What are possible benefits from taking part in this study?**
Participants will not receive any direct benefit other than the potential to contribute to the knowledge and understanding of psychological practice with marginalized populations and in turn perhaps assisting with the development of more culturally appropriate psychological care.

**Will I be paid if I take part in this research study?**
Participants will receive a $20 gift card to Giant Eagle grocery store for participating in the study.

**Who will know about my participation in this research study?**
Any information about you obtained from this research will be kept as confidential (private) as possible. All records related to your involvement in this research study will be stored in a locked file cabinet. Your identity on these records will be indicated by a case number rather than by your name, and the information linking these case numbers with your identity will be kept separate from the research records. You will not be identified by name in any publication of the research results unless you sign a separate consent form giving your permission (release).

**Who will have access to identifiable information related to my participation in this research study?**
The principal investigator, listed on the first page of this authorization (consent) form will be the only individual who will have access to identifiable information. All data obtained for research purposes will be kept confidential in a password protected file on the principal investigator's computer. Possible exceptions to maintaining confidentiality of research data include: 1) if you reveal information that suggests abuse of an elderly person or child; 2) an audit of research by University Research Conduct and Compliance Office, or 3) research data is subpoenaed by court system. In accordance with University policy, research records will be maintained in a locked file for 6 years at which point all records will be destroyed.

**Is my participation in this research study voluntary?**
Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. Whether or not you provide your consent for participation in this research study will have no effect on your current or future relationship with the University Medical Center, UPMC, or the Center.

**May I withdraw, at a future date, my consent for participation in this research study?**
You may withdraw, at any time, your consent for participation in this research study. To formally withdraw your consent for participation in this research study you should provide a written and dated notice of this decision to the principal investigator of this research study at the address listed on the first page of this form. Your decision to withdraw your consent for participation in this research study will have no effect on your current or future relationship with the University Medical Center, UPMC, or the Center.
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The above information has been explained to me and all of my current questions have been answered. I understand that I am encouraged to ask questions about any aspect of this research study during the course of this study, and that such future questions will be answered by the investigator listed on the first page of this consent document at the telephone number given. I understand that I may always request that my questions, concerns or complaints be addressed by a listed investigator.

I understand that I may contact the Human Subjects Protection Advocate of the IRB Office, University of Pittsburgh (1-866-212-2668) to discuss problems, concerns, and questions; obtain information; offer input; or discuss situations in the event that the research team is unavailable.

By signing this form, I agree to participate in this research study. A copy of this consent form will be given to me.
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COMPENSATION: You will be provided with a $20 gift card to Giant Eagle in exchange for your participation in this study.
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APPENDIX B

Interview Guide

Below please find some sample interview questions regarding general areas of interest as well as a basic overview of the type of information the interviewer will collect. Please note the interview will follow an iterative process and will vary depending on participants’ answers to questions.

1) Demographic information: gender, race, how long employed at the Center

2) Nature of training/background: type of academic program/degree, areas of interest, training in multicultural issues in psychology, preparedness for working in an inner city community clinic

3) Views regarding clinical work at 8th District/Center: what do you see as a main goal, function of your work with clients? some of the everyday challenges and tensions with regard to clinical work? describe the issues that were most salient in the most difficult cases; how are race and class incorporated into your clinical work? what makes working in an inner city public clinic unique from other private clinics?

4) Culture of center: how would you describe the culture of the Center? with regard to clients, and with regard to interdisciplinary work that occurs here?

5) 8th District Community: What is your understanding of the history of the 8th District? How does it or does it not impact your work here? What is your personal relationship to this community if any?
APPENDIX C

Transcript Notation Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Slight pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>Silence measure in seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=end of line or =beginning of line</td>
<td>No pause between utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlined Text</td>
<td>Words uttered with vocal emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALIZED TEXT</td>
<td>Words louder than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Talk that was inaudible or impossible to interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{text}</td>
<td>Transcriber comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text-</td>
<td>Sudden cutoff of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te::xt</td>
<td>Syllable prolonged/extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//text</td>
<td>Overlapping talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># at beginning of line</td>
<td>Line number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P#</td>
<td>Speaker participant number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaker Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Director and Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K or I</td>
<td>Katy Sampson</td>
<td>Interviewer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interview Transcript: Tom (P1)

Interview with P1

K: I just want to thank you for agreeing to sit down with me to talk and we’ve had so many conversations already informally that I feel have been really interesting and I’ve done a lot of my own thinking about my work here but uh, I think that being able to sit down with you a little more formally will be helpful for my research.

P1: Well good, well thanks.

K: and um yeah, I would like for this to be, somewhat structured and I only have some questions but I would like for you to feel to elaborate on any topics that seem more interesting to you (P1: okay, all right) or important to you. You are the director here –

P1: that is correct

K: - and what is your training as far as your degree?

P1: I have a master’s degree in clinical psychology and actually I dropped out of a Ph.D. program, I got like 10 credits short of my doctoral (I: Really). Yeah.

K: I didn’t know that, where was that?

P1: In California

K: Okay, wow, and that was in clinical psych?

P1: Clinical psych, clinical psychology, yeah.

K: Okay, great. And so, the focus of what I want to ask you about more is your experience here. And everyday work here ‘cause it seems a lot of times in the literature, that’s what kind of gets glossed over. And in my time here, I could see that there were just so many factors (P1: hm [interested confirming tone] not only in our clients’ lives and what they are bringing in but also how we are working here and how you as the director are playing multiple roles at any given time.

P1: Right.
K: So, I wondered if you could describe, you know, a typical day here. I know that everyday is different (P1: [LF] seemingly in recognition and agreement), throwing different things at you, but if you were to describe to me sort of a course of a day –

P1: yeah (.) let me just if I could Katy, go back and talk a little bit about how I got here, because

noise in the background from social group going in next room I think I might try to put it in perspective about (I: okay, absolutely) about what it is. I – I was uh, actually I was in another facility and uh, I’ve been here like 5 or 6 years I’ve done like a lot of trouble shooting kind of things, programs were having difficulty and I’d asked, I’d been asked, like oh, 2 years prior to even coming here (noise in background, voices shouting, laughing, talking continues) would I come over here and help straighten ( ) the program because this program has been here like, 33, 34 years, been established in the community (.) a::nd… what happened is it’s never made any money – well, it’s a nonprofit but ( ) it’s lost considerable money here. And the model was based primarily on a traditional outpatient model, in which you see the client for 45 minutes and for every hour you spend 15 minutes or downtime recording your work, that kind of stuff. (I: Mhm)

So, at the end of an 8 hour day, you’re lookin’ at, oh, about 2 hours that you lose (I: Mhm) that’s if everyone shows up. So, if everyone loses two hours at the end of the day, then obviously your productivity is down, if everybody shows up. But this is a tough clientele: there is a lot of reason why people don’t show up, it’s just not necessarily that they are not motivated for the treatment. It has a lot to do with other things, watching kids, the safety people feel about leaving their house, their house will get broken into – there’s a lot of factors that goes into that. So, when I came here, I saw total chaos and I’m not trying to paint a negative picture but I just want to put it in its’ proper perspective, u::m, that (. ) we were losing money, u::h, there were little or no groups, the model was a mental health model, that you use in outpatient and you see the people come here (I: Mhm) who weren’t doing many community based kind of things, we were pretty much isolated just here in the Center. So, immediately what we did is start to implement some things to try to change some things getting people more interested asking the clients, putting questionnaires out, what would they like to see here, (I: Mhm) that kind of stuff, so PART of the thinking, the thought process was, u::m, what does our clients need, it’s not necessarily about us, it’s about them. (I:Mhm) And so we needed to fix traditional ways of looking at things, sure, we could come in here and say, oh, you need this, this, this, this and that… and then, as a result of that you could do that - so, we sorta, we put out questionnaires, uh, involving the clients, and empowering them and saying: what do you need? Would you like to belong to this? What do you think about this? (I:Mhm) and those kinda things. And, u::m a lot of the stereotypes that were attached to mental health issues, u::h, the stigma attached to, if you’re taking medication, you must be crazy, uh, the churches in terms of where they were, in terms of u::h, well we’ll pray for ya, uh that kind of thing, as opposed to, maybe you got an illness, and lot of people are up in the churches prayin’ for ‘em, now I’m not against prayer but, uh, there were a lot of things that were going on there. So any way, long story – w-w-what happened was, due to what our clients were givin’ us in these questionnaires and talking with ‘em and involving ‘em in the process we decided to switch the format, lot of non-traditional things. For example, meeting the needs, we have a high homeless population here, so there were people coming in here that, um, u::h, were sleeping under the bridge or under a tree, or you know, under a car, or you know that kind- or in a box and hadn’t showered in days, sometimes weeks, so one of the things we talked about is implementing a shower (I: Mm)
it’s pretty hard to talk to somebody if they’re feeling dirty and grimy and stuff, um so that was one thing we implemented, and the other thing is, uh, they didn’t have any clothes!

[said excitedly with sense of irony] if they take a shower they didn’t have any clean clothes to put on - they put their smelly clothes back on! So we purchased a washer and a dryer, a clothes washer and dryer, which helped out a lot, now that’s not the panacea but it certainly helps out in terms of where one is. So then we worked with the churches and drycleaner establishments and terms of donating clothes for people (I: Mhm) u:m, so it’s pretty hard like I said earlier for someone to come in and talk about oh, I’m being depressed if they haven’t eaten for 2 or 3 days, if they haven’t slept, and (?) something as basic as water, u:m making ‘em feel better about themselves. So, we switched that whole format and we were starting to change and reach out and again we’re not the panacea, but just to give ‘em some insights and ‘hey, uh, we’re about you, we’re about helping you, and, it’s not about us (I: Mhm) u:h we’re just a part of here and what we can do to try to help you uh, little things like coffee, that was one of the things they talked about, “we want to be able to come in here and have coffee,” u:h so we worked with people around food, donating food here and that kind of thing, so there’s A LOT of little different things and that’s what typical () so…getting to your question, your INITIAL question, is I do a lot of stuff so, I get here in the morning, I get here a quarter to 7, 6:30 - a quarter to 7, everyday and uh, I just do a little straightening up and, I-I-I typically, u:h I have a little bleach bottle 10% bleach and I wash down the couch, cause that’s (maldehide?) so we can wash ‘em down. Um, I make coffee in the morning, then I straighten up, put books out, magazines, brochures and things like ‘gat, for our clients, and then I get on the, uh internet and read my email, I take my voicemail, u:h…(2) and then I do a lot of administrative stuff, I do my stuff before everybody gets here, cause we don’t open ‘till 8:30 so I get here from that time, I just get – a lot of things I can do, administrative stuff, letter writing, uh, follow ups, I mean a lot of different kinds of things, before anybody gets here, uh, when people get here, it depends on Monday, Wednesdays, and Fridays I run groups, I see individual clients, I got a caseload like outrageous,

K: How many people?

P1: Oh my God I hate to say it on here, uh, I have way over 100, on my caseload [some distress, shame? embarrassment? in his voice] u:m (I: Mhm) u:h, but that’s not consistent but I got way over 100 people that I do see, on occasion. So, that’s just, some of the little things we do, then there’s a lot of m--, I order supplies, uh, ‘cause right now we don’t have anybody we got a temporary help and we’re hiring somebody to help take care of that stuff, so any kind of the u:h, technical things here: bill paying, all that kind of stuff, all the management stuff uh -

K: So, you really have your hand in almost everything.

P1: //everything, EVERYTHING here

K:-- that’s happening here!

P1: Uh, we do try to delegate some stuff, uh, and make sure that the bills are paid, I gotta check the bills, and all that kind of stuff - so now I leave here, at oh, about 6 in the evening, something like that, so it’s a long day.
K: It sounds like a lot of work.

P1: It’s allot work, allot work, but you know (. . ) part of that I don’t mind because I really do see, that people are getting help and I don’t know if you can put time on that, I mean it’s just, it’s just a process, and those are the kind of things that I think, you can’t put a value on it but you just know it’s working. And, the other thing I want to say is, is demeanor, the demeanor, I don’t want to say demeanor (. . ) the agency, the um, I’m lacking the word now (2) in terms of, u::h, I want to say ambiance but that’s not the word (. . ) u::m, people feeling comfortable, you know, uh, setting situations – you can’t - I know really believe that you - we’ve talked about this, that I don’t believe you can teach that, see I think, either you have it, you have a knack to work with people, or you don’t. (I:M hm) Either you legitimately like people or you don’t. And I don’t think you can train people to do that (. . ) and I think you, uh, you have to hav - have it. The little things, I think that means a lot, and we’ve also talked about this, uh, setting up when people come through the door, the acknowledgement, a sense of acknowledgement, that’s one thing we really work hard about when people come through the door, we acknowledge that they be here because often enough people here are disenfranchised (I: Mhm) and uh, they’re sensitive to how they’re being treated, or mistreated, and whether it be real or perceived our perception is everything, so what’s their perception is where it is, so we really work hard in terms of not a fake kind of thing but legitimately find out where the people are, say “glad to see you,” to engage everybody who comes through there. So, I think that has a lot to do - we’ve seen our-ou-our attendance skyrocket here. Um, and…I think a lot of it has to do with just engaging people here, just say “hey, we’re here for ya” there is a sense that, you know, that people legitimately care about you.

K: Now, it’s skyrocketed ss- since certain changes, or...

P1: -yeah, since we started implementing groups and things like ‘gat that’s one of the things I think happened ‘cause a lot of people go: Il, people got too many issues, I don’t want - you know this is interesting - the talk was, you know, part of the African American culture talks about u::h, what we say here, stays here, it goes in a lot of cultures but particularly the African American talks about – “what you say at home, stays at home.” A::nd there was a lot of people that said, when we were trying to talk about groups, “oh, people won’t come to these groups!” “ain’t nobody goin’ talk about what’s goin’ on with them!” and that kind of stuff. (I:Mhm) The key wasn’t necessarily the process but just to get ‘em out to socialize, ‘cause we have a lot of trauma here, in the 8th district and a lot of people, the majority of our clients have experienced a tremendous amount of trauma and that one of the things, I guess I’ve often said that not only are our clients traumatized but our entire community, i-i-is suffering from PTSD (I: Mhm) and I think we have to do a lot of that so one of the things that’s real lacking now is, we’re looking - and maybe I’m getting ahead of myself now, ‘bout what I’m lackin,’ but what we really do need, and we’ll be implementing that this year. uh, children and adolescents, (I: Yeah) we’re an adult, primarily an adult population, but we know that there is a big need to address the preadolescent and adolescent, so, we’re moving in that vein.
I: You know, I was just, someone was mentioning, I just took a crisis management training this morning and someone brought in an article about the gangs in Pittsburgh and especially in the North Side, I guess, there are a lot of, and I was actually surprised, I guess I’m removed from gang activity for the most part or I don’t see it, and that seems like adolescents get drawn into a lot, easily -

P1: Mhm, mhm, Yeah – well gangs represent what families missed. I mean, um, it’s an identity, it’s protection (I: Mhm) it’s nurturance, it’s love.

K: It’s that acknowledgement on some level that you’re saying that you offer here

P1: absolutely, absolutely.

K: - and validation of your existence on some level, even if it’s in a way that’s eventually destructive

P1: absolutely

K: - well, you mentioned a lot of things, like you said we have talked about before and made me think of questions…

P1: Oh, good, good!

K: Uh, and a lot of what you’re saying really speaks to the way that you and other clinicians here really incorporate issues of race and class into your work here, um and, more specifically, the history of this particular community in the 8th district here. And…I wondered about, it may be hard to reflect on this and take a step back and articulate it, but I wondered about how you, saw and you touched on it a little bit, how you incorporate race and class into your clinical work, either individually or as a director here and then also this specific community and dealing with issues specific to this community and dealing with issues specific to this community.

P1: Yea, first of all, I think we have to go back to you’ve got to start obviously with where the clients are. See, i-i- a lot of times what we want to do is we want to paint race and class with a broad brush and incorporate everybody as an integral part of that, your (I: Mhm, yeah) this race or this culture or socioeconomic so everybody gets that and I think that’s a BIG mistake that everybody makes because everyone’s different of course we all may be different race different sexes that kind of thing, different gender that kind of thing, what happens is everyone’s different and perceives things different. Everyone has difference of experiences so yeah, we may be alike on one perspective or two perspective whatever, but we still have different things that’s unique to us. And I think that’s the key in terms of, of, of- again we can’t be everything to everyone, but to help to identify what’s, what’s significant in that individual and start where they are. Uh (2) you know, it’s interesting because like I said, you know we do like, there’s the shoes there and things like ‘gat we have. Some, some of our clients will not take that because they say “there’s people that are a lot worse off than me.” And, and we’ve been given a chance, and by the same token people from the other perspective will take everything here and be out selling it,
okay? So, um, i-it’s just different and you just got to take - and we’ve been real good about people not stealing, now we got one or two people here who still they ( ) steal and that’s just the way it is. But getting back to the race and the class we have to incorporate it ‘cause that’s ALSO, it’s not everything but it’s an integral part of who we are. It’s just sayin’ – me to deny that you are a woman, okay? I mean, or me a male, uh that kind of stuff. So, that’s who we are, that’s not all we are, but that’s an integral part of who we are. So we have to take all of those things in conjunction with the other things, and if we DO NOT DO THAT, ‘cause we talkin’ ‘bout the entire person, not bits and pieces, and often times I think that’s what we miss when we come in there. W-w we address, well, if someone is coming in for depression, and we just treat the depression then we’re really missing the boat, mm-kay. So the same thing has to do with this, we have to incorporate, as far as I’m concerned, everything, as much as we can. Again, that becomes difficult because it’s a “wow!” with all of the problems we have here, how do you do it, that become difficult, how do you do it? So we say well, we just got to sit down and prioritize what’s the greatest needs that this individual has and then we got to base it and go from there (I: Mhm)

K: With some of the questionnaires that you had given to potential clients, or clients, you did get a general sense of some of their needs and that may have been connected to class with needing, you know food (P1: absolutely) or, you know, being homeless, and, and all that but that, you know that you’re saying that those are some of the ways that you take it up in a general sense but then you focus more on

P1: //specific

K: the individual person, what does that mean in their life? Because it could be very different like you said. One person might be very grateful to have the shoes and want to take them home and use them whereas other people, might um, might even feel ashamed?

P1: shame, that’s right, absolutely.

K: so, like you’re saying you can’t really predict that but just to be sensitive to the fact that people are gonna have a different relationship to whatever that social category is ‘cause that – well, I don’t want to go on with what I think about that, but um, you have, it sounds like, a very, much more kind of complex way of looking at it than some of the multicultural textbooks would teach (P1: Mhm) um, and that kind of leads into – before we get into some of the history of the 8th district and how you incorporate that – I am interested about if you feel like you were prepared in school with your training to do this kind of work.

P1: No, no way. Not even close. See I think a lot of it has to do - goin’ back to - I believe experience, u::h, is a great teacher (1) now maybe not the only teacher but just think, see I come up in an environment there’s like seven in my family, a::nd, u::m, we were always, u::m taught.that. you take responsibility for your actions and it’s on you and you get what you put in and that kind of stuff. (I: Mhm) Now, I chose not to follow that path ‘cause I wanted to find my own thing, okay? Uh, I embarked on my own little ways of finding things, so I got into the anti-Vietnam sentiment and went to California to Berserk-ly and I did all that stuff – protests and
getting’ arrested and put in jail and stuff like that. Now (2) I don’t regret any of that, ‘cause if I
had to do it all over again I’d do the same thing. ‘cause I thi::nk for m::e, ‘cause I was always
taught you got to stand up for what you believe, now interestingly enough I stood up for what I
believed but it wasn’t what my parents believed. (I: Mhm) so it was in direct opposition to that
kind of stuff and s::o I was out in California, I was out, like I said, in Berserk-ly and it was crazy
out in California, someone said like Robin Williams says “if you were in the 60s and you
remember ‘em, you weren’t in ‘em!” (I: LF) So the bits and pieces that I can recall about the 60s
– but it was good for me because you’re talking about social consciousness, u::h that I think was
happening, and um, I look back on that I’m thinking well that helped shape, it helped shaped my
thoughts and helped reinforce some of my belief systems and some of the things that just made
me more ingrained and more committed to making the difference, and so I-I-I got um, like I said,
schooling was one different kind even in California um, i::t was okay, I mean I wouldn’t trade
the educational kind of stuff but I think nothing, nothing can prepare you as far as I’m concerned
until you get off and get into it, and get your hands dirty, and you know and you role your
sleeves up and really find out what it’s about. Because I don’t know about your experience, but
you can’t teach as far as I’m concerned, you can’t teach, you can’t teach this out of a book, this
doesn’t come out of a book and and uh, um, I mean you can see it, I mean wow {voice filled with
awe} it makes sense, well that’s such {phone ringing in office, P1 does not answer it} and such a
theory that’s not gonna get it, you know. So, in answer to your question, no, I don’t think so.

And I, but, but on the one hand, I don’t think like directly it did, I mean it helped me to get my
foot in the door, um but I think I wouldn’t trade any of the life experiences for any class, any
course, that I’ve ever taken.

K: The life experiences when you were in the 60s.

P1: Absolutely, absolutely, absolutely. And my family too, my family I think were very
supportive but I just chose to do other things, I had to find me, I’m still looking but (I: [LF])
that’s that’s who…

K: yeah that’s a long process.

P1: Yea, yeah I don’t know if that answered your question but –

K: Yeah, so there are a lot of other life experiences that you feel which makes sense, I mean you
have your whole life and just your personal background also that you bring to your work, that
any… I think your tree is falling {tree in planter begins to fall over, P1 reaches over to catch it}
P1: Uh-oh! Those guys came today, and were fixing it, they were fixing this dogon place today
(I: [LF] oh boy) and they put new plugs in there, here I’ll put it around this way, I’ll put it this
way. Okay.

K: [LF] maybe the tree doesn’t like what we’re saying or something!
P1: I offended it! I offended it! Okay, all right, that will stay up.
K: Yeah, I’m not surprised that you’re saying that in school itself, your training in psychology maybe prepared you for a certain range of issues and a certain kinds of training or sensibility even (P1: Mhm) um, but, as far as all of the issues that come into play in any kind (P1: Oh yeah /nods/) And like you were talking about before just describing your day, I was struck by how you know, um (2) it’s hard to even describe what it was, but just how your whole self is involved in this work, you know it’s not just your professional skills that you’re using but you’re using your nurturing skills as a human being to clean and make sure everything is prepared and to make an environment that feels welcoming to clients

P1: Yeah that’s a good point and that’s one thing I failed to mention earlier and something I think we’ve talked about before in terms of, first few seconds, one accesses this program or any program they get an idea about what this is about, (I: Mhm) and one of my, I know we’ve talked about this as well, is about how this place looks, that’s one of my biggest pet peeves in fact I just got told today after three years I’ve been yelling about this, they’re gonna finally renovate this place (I:Mhm) Three years, three years in the making, so I feel good about that, but it’ll, it’ll, it’ll give a message to our clients- {knock at the door, he reaches over to open the door but does not open it} (P1 is distracted by knock on door) k’ll, it’ll give a message to our clients {P1 is distracted by knock on door, he reaches over to open the door but does not open it} (P1 is distracted by knock on door) k’ll, it’ll give a message to our clients

K: we can put this on pause, that’s part of the-

P1: yea, but {knocking stops} so, -so our clients go other places as well and to me the message is real clear. I mean you come here and where’s the commitment as far as I’m concerned, okay I’m gonna do this now, but this is my soapbox for today, is that where’s the commitment? because they see, they go to Bellefield, they go to 3501, they go to all of these other clinics, they go to the Drake building and stuff like ‘gat, and they come here and they look, it’s got a floor that’s all tore up, we got, furniture’s throw-back, it’s 60s stuff, and they’re goin’ “whoa!”some of ‘em have mentioned it, it was like – (I: do they?) O:o! ‘Very sensitive to that kind of stuff! That’s what I’m saying, people, even homeless people, it’s real interesting, um, come in here and they still there is a sense about ‘em looking and see whether or not I’m welcome here.

K: Mhm, yea I’m glad that you brought up the physical space of the center here ‘cause I was gonna ask you about that and we had talked about that before – how it speaks volumes (P1: ‘h) about um, how this space is valued or not valued (.) and definitely like you said they’re picking up on it and are sensitive to that (P1: yeah, mhm). So, another piece of that that I was thinking about, you know, this is a satellite clinic, and I want to remind you that you know if anything if we talk about feels uncomfortable, anything you don’t want me to write about –

P1: -we’ve already talked about this, we’ve already talked about this, it’s no big deal.

K: -but um, you know as a satellite branch of this much larger psychiatric institution um you have a certain kind of position or role in the context of that larger institution and I wondered about, you know, what your thoughts are about what the Center provides, even though I kind of
have a sense already, within that system that isn’t provided elsewhere and also what the relationship is, I mean you kind of are hinting at it as far as how it’s valued or not valued

P1: yea, well I think it is and if we look at a little bit of the history here, the Center was, has always, as I’ve been able to reflect on it has always been, “out of sight, out of mind.” (. ) “it’s okay, you do you’re thing up there” (. ) it’s um, lack of a better term, it’s like the scapegoat of a system (I: Mhm) you know like, o::h, “that’s the 8th district, that’s just the 8th district”

K: Now you mean the 8th district as the community or the Center here?

P1: Here - that kind of thing (. ) and I think that’s been allowed to permeate over the years because if you look in terms of our productivity, you look in terms of whom we’re treating, often our clients were – [sounded like he cut himself short here] who, who was comin’ here (. ) um but we’ve had to revamp the who::le system, so we had to get rid of a lot of people, um, as a result of that because it was like a cancer (. ) um, here that was just infecting everything, it’s a real sickness –

K: the people who were working here.

P1: that were working here (. ) (I: okay) Everyone.

K: So what do you mean by a cancer? That it was attracting a certain kind of-

P1: -oh yeah. This clinic was attracting a certain u:h mentality if you will, people that was just (. ) goin’ through the motions (. ) (I: I see) people who really legitimately didn’t care one way or the other. I don’t know, maybe that’s pretty strong – people may have perhaps had other things, other agendas or (I: yeah, righ) perhaps other things, you know

K: but there was a sense of maybe like apathy that was starting to -

P1: that was here for years, it’s been here for years.

K: okay -and as far as um (. ) as the Center’s role within the rest of the institution. Does it feel like you have a sp - function that you provide that other clinics’ can’t?

P1: Well, there’s no question, there’s no question in my mind – and ONE of the things that I want to say about this (. ) is that working within the system, I’ve learned early on that you have to be savvy enough to work within a larger thing, you just can’t go half-cocked, and then you would just be this angry person that just reinforces a lot of the stereotypes, “oh, that’s just P1 up there, raising sand” and that kind of thing (. ) um (. ) But I think what happens is, my philosophy is that I’m not goin’ go away, and I think that the belief system has to be there that something’s gonna happen. Because I’ve always been taught that, obviously, “if you are not a part of the solution, you’re part of the problem,” okay? (I: Mhm) And for me to say well, we’ll just have to take these crumbs these little things that have been passed out is saying that I give into the system (. ) that I’m - it’s okay (. ) and that, I don’t buy that, that’ never been my way of operating,
so I’ll just stick with it until somethin’ happens (. ) it’s taken us three years to do this and I bring it up every opp- I’ve written so many memos and, you know that kind of stuff. And I just think, and again, that’s not a medal, or saying “hey, look how wonderful we’re doin’ things” it’s just that (. ) that’s how I believe and I really believe that and I’m not gonna compromise - and I know the system works slow, but to me to settle for anything less, is saying that it’s okay (. ) (I:Mhm)

And, and, and so – I guess, maybe it’s also, Katy, I think (. ) maybe it’s because I’m sort of at the end of my career and I really don’t care about what people think, (I: [LF]) you know? and I think part of me has always thought that way. I’ve always been a little rebel rouser, kind of stuff and I don’t do it just for the sake of raising scene, cane, or sand or anything like that, it’s just that I believe in that and that’s - I really believe that, and if people don’t believe that than u::h (2) and I don’t have to be RIGHT either, but if I really believe something I’m not goin’ to quit, on that, you know?

K: And that not’s always, I would imagine it’s not often a popular-

P1: Well, it’s NEVER POPULAR, it’s never popular HERE! [with some humor in voice] (I: [LF]) but that’ okay, I don’t have any problem with that because the way I see it – now, I don’t want no medal, and for everyone to say “oh, this is wonderful stuff” but for me, it’s the right thing, it’s the right thing to do (. ) you know?

K: Mhm and for you, your heart is, it’s sounds really in your work here, it’s connected, there isn’t a differentiation for you that you can say just say, well I’ll split off from what I believe (P1: no) and go along with the system (P1: Mmn, no)

30:05  It’s interesting in my research I’ve been reading more about the history of the 8th district and I wanna incorporate that into my study, you know (P1: Mhm) and it just seems like there, and I haven’t quite gotten there yet, but there’s really some parallels in – in some of what you’ve described to me as the way that the 8th district clinic has in some ways been treated or viewed and the way the community has been treated or viewed in the past (P1: Mhm, mhm, mhm) in terms the city or however large you want to get, (. ) u::m as far as being overlooked or um, just also struggling to (. ) form some sort of cohesive community in the face of so much chaos and (. ) limited resources, so to me it seems like in some ways, and you can correct in me if I’m wrong, what you’re saying is that there has been a struggle here in the clinic to form that sort of cohesive unit

P1: -absolutely.

K: -of how are we going to do this when we are not getting a lot of resources from above or the system and we have to try to manage all of what’s going on – the homelessness, the violence, post-traumatic stress, without all of that and to me it seems like people in the community have had to do that too (P1: absolutely) and especially for people who are chronically mentally ill in the community and coming out of hospitals. So that’s kind of a long-winded way of saying it – but the history of and what has gone on in the community itself for many years is something that (. ) is very much part of what you do here, in the back of your mind maybe, even if it’s not up front all of the time. That’s something I wanted to hear more about. How you would describe the way that’s incorporated into the work here?
P1: Yeah. See (.) I believe it’s real simple: we talk about mind, body, and spirit. So when we talk about treatment we also talk about not also thought processes, how we view things, our perceptions, that kind of stuff (.) also taking responsibility of how are physical self and at times run down and not taking ( )of diets and things like ‘gat. That’s a big issue, and then where we are spiritually, spiritually, often times, _bankrupt_, okay? And, as far as I’m concerned it’s like, the spirituality often times is one of the first things that leaves the individual (I: hm) and interestingly enough, I think it’s one of the last things that returns. And so but I think we’re a strong uh, people, uh, spiritually and I think a lot of things, people mi- a::h, _confuse_ spirituality and religion, but I’m talkin’ ‘bout from a spiritual sense, who we are _spiritually_ and I think, one of the things, the nice things here, we do talk about _spirit_. About where you are _spiritually_ and a lot of times people want to get into religion but that’s okay, I think that’s fine with me. Um, we have Muslims here, we have – you know it doesn’t- you know? And if we can just sit down and talk about that stuff I think that’s the key that’s it’s okay. One of the things that we really instill is the fact that there’s no right way or wrong way to feel (I: Mhm) you know, you feel how you feel. We can accept where you are. That’s the key. And so sitting in some of these groups and these process groups I’m hearing _unbelievable_ things that happened to people. I used to believe that there is no such thing as evil, but there is some evil people! I mean there is some people that’s really evil. What they’ve done to people what they’d do to people, um - _victims_, we get a lot of victims here. It just _amazes_ me. Now the other thing is is that we’re lookin’ at in terms of _perpetrators_ now we get all of these _victims_ here but, where are all these perps (.) perpetrators? They’re here _somewhere_. I’m sure they’re coming through these walls, uh, why aren’t we dealing with them (I: Mhm) Why aren’t we addressing those kind of things that’s going on ‘cause we know they’re here. (I:Mhm) Okay? So that’s my next thing I I think we _really_ have to start looking in terms of “these people are victimized” cause it’s happening in their communities, it’s happening when they are kids, it’s incest and all this other kinds of things that goes on there so we look at from a victim perspective. ‘kay now, we also need to start bringing these perpetrators in here and start addressing those kinds of things, because they say, “oh, it was my brother, or my grandfather, or you know, my step dad. I mean all that kind of stuff goes on and what I was gonna say earlier in that what’s happened is, it doesn’t lend itself to get out because what we say here, stays here. So, the secrets manifest themself, generation after generation. People internalize that stuff and it doesn’t get addressed and so we’re just getting this stuff over and over again! See, the community I said earlier, the entire community is like that! and we’ve got people attending churches and things like that, and synagogues, and and and um, temples, and one of the things they say is well, “just pray, we’ll just pray.” well, o:okay, that’s one thing _[with skepticism]_ but we gotta start putting some things in place for ourselves too, and we gotta free ourselves up we gotta start talkin’ about that stuff we gotta start addressing that stuff. So, how do we incorporate that -(_-_) see we also, see there’s a lot of people here who don’t know anything about the 8th district. They live on the 8th district and don’t know anything about it. Uh, they don’t remember much “well my dad did or my mom, or my uncle used to live up here but you know” - they don’t know much about what’s goin’ on up here. 36:22 Now, the other thing about it is, I think we talked about some of it, we talked about celebratin’ black history _month_, but see this has got to be a- a daily thing (.) see it just can’t - I: I appreciate what people are trying to do and say “hey, look we gotta acknowledge that kind of
stuff, but this is, are far as me– it’s everyday (it’s on?) We got to celebrate our rewards and we  
got a focus on by all means necessary on the negatives but we also got to focus on  
empowerment, what are we going to do? how are we going to correct some of these problems?  
(I:Mhm) For example, we did a big voters registration at the last election, last presidential 
election and we had people from everywhere goin’- and a lot of people were goin’ “a:h, it  
doesn’t make any difference whether we vote” and sure enough it didn’t make any difference. (I:  
Mhm, mhm) And so that’s the - but (.) “well you still have a vote” you know, you have a right to  
do that kind of stuff so we’re doing a lot of stuff about that, (I: yeah) we take ’em to (Jake  
Weekly’s?) right down the street here, he comes down and he talks about the importance of  
politics and what plays a part in that. The awareness of what goes on around you that you’re not  
even aware of (.) that kind of stuff.  
{Knock at the door}  
K: Do you want to open it - or?  
P1: {hesitates and turns ear towards the door, listens for further knocking} Yeah - So anyway, I  
think, we talk about that kind of stuff – so, even the politics of what goes on. For example, I  
know you’re familiar and we talked about this, the gambling thing (I: yeah) the majority of the  
people here say “yeah, oh man, this is gonna be great, we’ll go down get some of these jobs!”  
You know, you know, “you’re not gonna get any of these JOBS, these jobs are not for you, come  
on let’s get real” you know? “Do you know how it’s gonna devastate this community, you know  
that when gambling enters everything goes up, foreclosures, divorce, violence you know?  
Everything goes up, you know, not good - everything goes up.” and “you’re not gonna be a part  
of that process, you’ll be a victim of this” so (.) things like ‘gat, I think we owe it to our clients -  
just like day-to-day kind of stuff, in terms of people not comin’ in here because “I won’t leave  
because I saw a guy get shot last night or stabbed and I know who did it, and I know my mom  
or something like ‘gat so I’m not goin’ to out because, they might –” you know, (I: yeah) that  
kind of stuff.  
K: Yeah, just real, real physical// obstacles in the way.  
P1: //Absolutely, absolutely|  
K: and that was something else that you’re touching on with um, the advocacy, that as a therapist  
here you’re doing more (P1: pshh, yea) than working with people within these walls (.) you’re  
advocating for them and encouraging them to be there own advocates in the community and the  
society and all that, and voting and umm (.) that was something that also stood out to me when I  
was here, something that I hadn’t seen working at a private clinic um, that there’s not as much of  
that, where the majority of clients are middle class (P1: Mhm, mhm) that there is more of a need  
for it in this community here and that’s an important piece of their getting better and being able  
to have boundaries (P1: oh, absolutely) and feel they have value and all that.  
P1: Just a typical part that, with the buses they were goin’ to cut out a main line there’s no  
infrastructure, little or no infrastructure here in the 8th district, no supermarkets, that kind of  
stuff. So, a lot of our clients go to across the Birmingham bridge to the Southside to the Giant
Eagle. The main bus line, it’s the only bus that goes from the 8th district there. Well, the Port-
Authority was gonna cut that bus (. ) out. Now that would have completely isolated this
community, nowhere to go get groceries, you know, there’s little mom’s and pop’s stores, overly
priced things. Um, a::nd (. ) a lot of clients were not even aware, they weren’t even aware that
that kind of thing was goin’ on. So we had to say, “hey, look you got to get down to these
meetings and gotta get you” – you know, that kind of stuff. Because, here’s what happens, the
apathy is such that,

{knock on door again}

-“well, it’s not gonna apply to me, I mean, how could I make a difference, why am I gonna make
an impact on anything?” That’s typically what happens, you know. Excuse me a sec{P1 motions
that he has to answer knock on door, to see who it is}

40:12 {tape recorder is turned off}

P1: {opens door and to see who it is person says something like, “oh you’re in here with
someone” and P1 says yes and he will talk to them later, he then apologizes again to me; P1
appears frustrated as he turns back to me} It’s a “no brainer!” {he says somewhat playfully
referring to the interruption}

K: It’s okay, I feel like, you know that’s part of the culture here too, you know?

(P1: It is. It is.) So, I’m kind of glad it’s part of our interview as well (P1: yeah, okay)
it seems appropriate, it seems fitting

P1: You never know though, see that’s the thing. See somebody could be {makes cutting sound
and motion} going somewhere or we could be rushing somebody to the hospital

K: Yeah, you absolutely have to be available. I realize that. (P1: yeah, okay) The culture of the
center here itself, you know is also something that I being on the periphery because I was only
here sometimes, as a student (P1: Mhm, Mhm) you know, I didn’t have as much of an
opportunity to see how people really related to each other. I – I knew how they related to me (P1:
Mhm, Mhm) and I could observe and to me it seemed like there was a much more, I know I
probably have said this to you before, of that sort of, family or familial sense here, between the
staff and the clients that I also hadn’t observed working in Duquesne’s clinic or another
university clinic, and I have not very much experience but to me that was something that I took
notice of as an outsider. That, wow the boundaries just feel very different here and I actually
really took to that kind of like that I think because like you said there is so much more going on
with people beyond just this 50 minutes of a therapy session that um, it just can’t be contained
within that. (P1: No, no) So, is that a sense that you felt was among the staff also because it
sounds like the staff, there were some issues there and you don’t have to say too much about it.

P1: Yeah, that was exactly what was going on. We had people who were just here, there were
people here who really didn’t like being here, but they couldn’t find anything else. And again I
think what happens is - this is interesting, I think we attract u::m (. ) who we are (. ) and I think
what happens, I think the Center is like, I said earlier, like “outta sight, outta mind” kind of
thing, and so what I think what happened is, it attracted, people who were “outta sight, outta
mind”
K: hmm, that's interesting.

P1: Okay, I think they just gravitated and um, and that perpetuated the same patterns, same cycles, over and over again. So we attempted to try to find out where people were do they want to be a part of - and we did the same thing with staff, what are their goals, what do they wanna do, you know. And, a lot of staff didn’t’ want to be a part of that, okay? the change (.) it took us time to - well they actually will weed themselves out (I: Mhm)

K: So, they didn’t want to move to the model of being collaborative. Working collaboratively with clients?

P1: No, no, no.

K: Any reason you think that would be?

P1: Well, I think there’s a comfort level, I think that we all operate from a different comfort level and I think when you go someplace and you’re comfortable with what you’re doing even though it may be unhealthy, that you’re okay with that. Just like some people get into unhealthy relationships because that’s there comfort zone, they’re used to chaos so they stay in those unhealthy situations and I think that was goin’ on here. People were unhealthy (I: hm, interesting) with their own stuff.

K: And now with new people here does it feel different?

P1: Well, we’re workin’ on it. Let me tell you this, Katy, I been without staff, and I’m lackin’ 3 therapists now (.) and I been interviewing a lot of people. I-i-it takes a special person - and I been yelled at about hiring somebody in here um, I would prefer to go without until we can find the right fit (I: hm) u::h, because what happens is that person will weed themselves out (.) anyway. So you do all of this training and stuff (I: right) and than eventually right back into the same ‘ole place. So I been real picky about whom we’re get in here.

K: It has to be a good match.

P1: It has to be a good match – both ways. ‘Cause if you got the same ‘ole thing, then you gravitate to the same ole thing (I: uh huh) and the whole process is outta control.

K: Now, when you interview someone, what are you looking for, what kind of qualities are you looking for?

P1: Oh, first of all, I want to know – oh, you could tell. First few seconds you meet someone, you could tell. I mean I’m not trying to stereotype, but just where they are, uh, their demeanor. A lot of nonverbal stuff, I pick up on nonverbal stuff. I want to find out who they are, what makes them tick, what are they like, what are their desires, what do they want to do, you know? Who
are ya? You know? Why do you want to work here, why should you work here, why should we hire you to work here? Tell me why.

K: Well, what do you think a good answer to that question would be?

P1: Oh there’s a lot of good ones, a lot of good ones I’m looking for – you lookin’ for a job?

K: [LF] I think it’s telling as to what your values are and what’s important to you in your staff.

P1: yeah, yeah, that’s exactly it! We want to know what’s important for you, why do are you looking for this job, why are you leaving your other job, what do you know about us? What do you know about this place? What do you know about the people? How can you make an impact on somebody? Tell us something about someone you made an impact on. Why is it significant for ya, how is it significant for ya? I want to know who these people are. And the people I’m getting in, it’s not about – see it’s not also about them, it’s who, who, who they present because anybody can say things, a trained ape can react to certain things, but who you are as an individual, it’ll [pay, it’ll see?]

K: Yeah, so kind of seeing what their process is. If they are reflective, if they’ve thought about (P1: absolutely) why they do what they do (P1: Mhm, Mhm) So, just someone who’s in touch with –

P1: ARE THEY HEALTHY INDIVIDUALS, okay, we all have baggage but just some of us have more than others, okay? And for people who have a lot of baggage - don’t have time.

‘Cause, this will trigger - now this is interesting I always believed that our clients will get only as well as we are okay? So if we get unhealthy people okay, as staff, we will have unhealthier clients (I: Mhm) ‘Cause if –if I have all of these unresolved conflicts then my clients are gonna trigger that for me. See just for example, if I’ve been sexually abused and there’s a client sitting in front of me who’s sexually abused, and I haven’t resolved these issues [sound of keys falling out of P1’s pocket onto the floor, he bends to pick them up] okay? I haven’t resolved these issues, so what happens is, I’m gonna sabotage any efforts, consciously or unconsciously of that person getting well because I haven’t resolved all my stuff. So, I’m only gonna let that client go as far as I’m comfortable (I: Mhm) okay? and that goes with everything. I-if I have these racist attitudes and these bigoted approaches to things, then that’s what I’m gonna project to my client! So I’m only gonna let me client go as far as I’m capable of addressing things.

K: So is that something that especially that you’re looking at, a person’s attitudes about race?

P1: About everything. I mean because, my thinking is, the more rigid one is in their thinking, the more unhealthy they are. Okay? (I: hm, Mhm) So, to me we’re talkin’ about a balance, if we’re talking to our clients about a balance, okay then we have to be balanced, okay? (I: oh, yeah) or some semblance there of. If we don’t live a balanced life, how can we expect – how can we talk to someone about havin’ a balance in your life? okay. so yeah, I look in terms of where
THEY are, okay? So, it’s pretty hard for me to sit and tell someone all these nice things to do (.) you know and I’m not doin’ it myself.

K: Yeah, definitely starting to work as a therapist in my Masters program motivated me to stop smoking (P1: there you go) you know because it was just too much like “how can I sit here and push people to work through what’s hardest for them (P1: absolutely) if I can’t try, at least try, like you said, we’ll always have unresolved issues. {phone ringing} So, I don’t want to keep you too long – do you have an appointment?

P1: I don’t think so, they’ll knock on my door again.

K: okay um, I think we’ve touched on a lot of the things that I’d been thinking about (.) And there’s just so much –

P1: Well, we can to be continued if you like, I mean I don’t have no problem with that. I mean if you have other questions and you want to come back

K: Yeah, I was thinking that if I’m listening to this that I might think of more questions.

P1: Yeah, yeah

K: Um, (2) Oh, as far as the physical space of the clinic you kind of touched on that. You know, it’s falling apart and there’s old furniture and um (.) I was wondering about, as I was working here about that half-door there, when you first come in, and being buzzed in and all that, and if that was always here from the time you started –

P1: That’s been always here and I ask about that and here’s one of the problems that we’re havin’ (.) i::s we want to try to limit who comes in and who goes because of confidentiality (.) u::m also around domestic violence issues (I: Mhm)-if we have a client here and the significant other followed ‘em here

K: it’s dangerous.

P1: it’s dangerous. And from that perspective we try to control the flow of who’s what, where that kind of thing

K: Yeah because it does have less secure borders or boundaries because it is a community center, than people are coming in all the time (P1: absolutely, yeah) Have any clients, to your knowledge, ever said anything about the door?

P1: N::one, none (.) uh, that’s interesting, that is interesting. Now they’ll say “why don’t cha open the do::or!” {demanding, playful tone} You know, stuff like ‘gat but nothing – ‘cause see, that gives them a sense of of security as well. Because there’s people comin’ and goin’ all the time a::nd you don’t know, we can’t control a lot of stuff if if everyone is schou, schou, schou/makes a swishing noise and motions with hand/ all over the place.
K: That’s interesting ‘cause I guess I was reflecting on the physical space of this place here and I was thinking about symbolically what does that door represent, or how it functions. And in a way I don’t know if we can get that deep about it but maybe symbolically it’s part of that safe boundary (P1: safe, it is) that you create here so that it feels less scary and intimidating to get into some of these issues.

P1: Yeah, cause once you walk through there – eh, people can’t – you don’t want everyone to have access, so to speak. So it’s a safety kind of thing. Now here’s the other thing, they don’t mind (.) waiting, now sometimes they get anxious about and will say “let me out of here, what do you think this is, a prison?!?” (I: [LF]) You know that kind of stuff. But also - you know it’s interesting, we have others doors, we have three other doors that they can go out, u::m, we do fire alarms that way. But it’s interesting how this plays out, they come here and they’ll all go out that door.

K: Huh, and they know there’s another door?

P1: There’s three doors.

K: Is there three?

P1: Yeah, there’s the kitchen, the hallway Betty office and there’s one, right this way.

K: Huh, interesting. Is there anything else that –

P1: Well, I’m tryin’ to think off-hand there were probably a lot of things that I was gonna say and don’t remember off hand what it is. I think the key u::h to this whole thing is, we talked about this is (.i incorporates (.i a lot of things (.i u::h, in the individual, there’s more to one individual we’re multifaceted you know, complex individuals um, but if we can keep that simple we don’t have to get real crazy and go off on all of these things but I think we have to take the person, we take them where they are, you know? acceptance. now the other thing about that is – it’s about also, is acceptance of me. See, I can’t accept anyone else, if I don’t accept me (I: Mhm) Okay, there’s a little saying which is “you can’t give what you don’t have” okay? So (.i u::m if I don’t have anything to give (.i then I gotta look into why I’m here. And that’s where I think we were in the past, we had people here who didn’t’ have anything to give, for whatever reasons and so it’s very difficult if I’m gonna sit down to talk to you about stuff and I don’t have anything to give anybody. I’m bankrupt.

K: Yeah, that’s why self-care is so important in this field. It’s hard work.

P1: Pshew, It’s everything as far as I’m concerned it starts with self and if you don’t got self (don’t copy that what I just said) if you don’t have your self than you can’t get anything out, i-i- it’s not gonna work either. And they pick that up, they pick that up real quick. Cause what happens is that I project myself – (2) (I: well) {time apparently up} to be continued

K: I feel like we could talk for hours.
P1: Well, we could {tape recorder is shut off}
APPENDIX E

Interview Transcript: Theresa (P2)

Interview Transcription with P2

Prior to interview beginning subject asks for an explanation/description of my research. We get into a discussion about race relations/discrimination in Pittsburgh. Subject states that Pittsburgh is lagging behind in terms of equality in the workplace/opportunities for advancement for Blacks in Pittsburgh. I reflect something to the effect of “so you feel that Pittsburgh lags behind on this front” Subject responds below…

{voice recording device is turned on}

P2: …well it’s not a feeling about it - it has empirically researched by (Banks?) in his study that Blacks (.) (P2 is eating lunch during interview, chewing sounds audible while answering question) in Pittsburgh fare worse than Blacks in any other urban areas in comparison, across the nation. So it (.) I can do a an anthropological, you know, um, thing, just looking at my friends those of us who’ve left Pittsburgh and who did very well other places and who for whatever reasons aging family members and things of that nature come back and lose 30 and $40,000 a year from our salaries to be employed in this town.

K: Hmm, now are you from the area originally?

P2: Yes, I’m not from the 8th district, well you know as a child, yeah (.) but I’m from East City, yes.

K: So, you’ve seen that kind of discrimination throughout your life.

P2: I, think too - yeah very much so - and I also say that if you look at the major hiring practices for UPMC and other places that when it comes to higher echelon jobs where they have designated that they are going to hire an African American or a Black person, that they have developed search committees and I’ve said this publicly where they say, and I’ve even talked with VP’s and things that say that they’re not interested in hiring any Black person in this city (.) So they’re going to only bring in Blacks from out of town, as though somehow in this city where we have probably a higher educational background, because we’re a college town, they only will take Blacks from out of town for the higher echelon positions.

K: And, why is that do you think?

P2: Just some general plantation mentality.

K: What is it about Blacks in Pittsburgh that would be different from Blacks from out of town?
P2: It’s not about us, it’s not on us, it’s on the plantation owner’s mentality, it’s not our mentality.

K: Right, but I mean the people who are deciding to hire from outside of the city.

P2: I don’t know, there mentality is that they’re gonna get something better outside of Pittsburgh

K: I see, like people who are more educated or more –

P2: Well, whatever, their mentality is that they’re gonna get something better outside of Pittsburgh because they obviously – more qualified, or I’m not sure what it is that they’re looking for. You would really have to ask you know, the plantation owners why they only want to import their slaves but that’s the way they operate.

K: So, very much it’s connected with a mentality that’s carried over for generations that plantation owner mentality (P2: Right, oh yeah) and it’s still (.) even if it’s not on the surface, um, that they are consciously saying that’s what their ideas are, that they are behaving in a way that shows that //

P2: Well, I MEAN THEY! HAVE STATED IT during major searches (I: Mhm) When they’ve been questioned about major searches they say well we decided the search committee, the we don’t want - we’re bringing in someone and African American for this position and we want someone from out of town (I: Hm) So that’s not under the surface (I: yeah) they don’t even feel any compulsion not to say those things. They think they have a right to say that.

K: Mhm, okay, so it’s not – it’s very explicit

P2: yes, it’s not an undercurrent, it’s a practice.

K: Now, I’ve gotten that feeling or that idea in my short time being here as well, that that there’s been (.) that kind of sentiment has been expressed by staff here that it feels like there is some kind of discrimination within the medical system in terms of which clinics get, um, which money which funding and because this clinic is in a Black community, serving a predominately Black clientele that there is some discrimination as to how much funding is given here. Now does that, is that something that you think as well or is that?

P2: Well interestingly enough this is not my first encounter as an employee of WPIC, nor my first interaction with the Center. Previously, 26, 27 years ago I worked for WPIC and the only (3), I was just trying to think of how many African Americans were in the (.) O’Hare building but there was always this conclave who were here in the 8th district (.) (I: Mhm) And in those days most of the 8th district team was not as – well, there was among us, a one-upmanship you know, at the Center -

K: here
P2: No, I wasn’t an 8th district group person (I: I see) I was an Oakland team person. And then part of main outpatient, WPIC (I: I see) and I recall thinking that you know, getting that sense that working at the Center was not as prestigious as working on O’Hare (I: Mhm) and um (2) so I think that that mentality, is not just part of the Center or whites or the medical profession but I recall as an African American, having the idea, as a young person, that I was a little more tougher, and prestigious because I was on O’Hare street (I: Mhm) and not here. In this building I never actually ever, ever came here.

K: You never came here.

P2: Oh no, I did do some work you know, farthest I would go was {Matilda burrows?} I would go up there for rounds, but I would never go up to the Center, building.

K: You wouldn’t want to – you didn’t have an interest in coming here (.) at the time.

P2: (.) I think in our minds, there was always this question in our minds about whether real clinical work was going on here, you know. (I: Hm, yeah) I mean some of the staff wasn’t as well educated, our sense was that they weren’t as well trained as we were, they didn’t have the same academic backgrounds we had. (2) They were community workers not necessarily therapists

K: Hmm, I see. So there was a distinction, at the time, between community workers and therapists (P2: Mhm) clinically trained therapists (.) and do you think that that still goes on today, in general?

P2: YEAH, I do think so, I have to give you a kind of anecdotal

K: Please, yeah.

P2: One of my neighbors works at O’Hare, on O’Hare street and he’s so funny, um he like sees me and says “[WH] how are you doin’ over there, are you ok::y?” [LF] You know (.) {more chewing food} it always cracks me up ‘cause he always looks at me with such, um (.) empathy, like “are you okay?”

K: Oh, boy

P2: so, there’s, in his mind - and I don’t think he- it used to be offensive but I think he genuinely does worry, it’s like he’s worried to see if I’m okay or not, (I: Mhm) how am I faring and that kind of stuff.

K: And how do understand that, what do you think he means?

P2: M::m, I think without him re – well, first of all, I mean, there is some reality in the fact that we do - we are in a place where (.) there is a lot of trauma, u::m, there is a lot of (.) serious reason for people to be struggling (.) to survive, and the impact of that on their psyche on their
mental health it’s a very unhealthy environment where, it’s not uncommon that I’m gonna see
something on television and comin’ here, finding out that it’s connected to what’s, you know
one of the patient’s sisters died (I: Mhm) or you know, from a gunshot wound come in and find out well the boy who got shot, that’s my nephew, so, that’s a lot of trauma. And it happens on an ongoing basis, uh, it’s funny because I also live in Wilkensburg and I think that’s another traumatized area, but I have to truly tell you that (.) I don’t sense and I’m very enmeshed in that community, I don’t sense as much trauma (.) (I: Interesting) on an ongoing basis as I do in the 8th district so I do think, I don’t know, you know, if it pans out (.) if we look at the crime statistics or not, or I wonder if it has to do with – that might be a nice comparison, how many miles are we talkin’ and because you’re goin’ 2 miles up, 2 miles down, and 2 miles across, does that intensify, um, you know, everything that’s happening in other places, but because it’s such a small place, {makes a swishing sound, “shoo”} it makes it hotter, (I: Mhm) and harder, I don’t know.

K: yeah or even the geographic, um, relative isolation of the 8th district that it’s been sort of cut off in some ways from (.) just the way that the roads are, the transportation system

P2: When I come to work usually I cross all the way across town {takes a sip from her drink} and the worst roads, the ice, the snow, salt and everything stops at the top of the hill where the VA is {P2 knocks on the table near microphone adding emphasis to each word, snow, salt, and Va} and from then on it’s like put your car in double low and just slide on down.

K: Hm, it’s so interesting. You know all of that says so much, really.

P2: And it must say so much to the people who live here, I keep saying what is there, is there some kind of city ordinance, “don’t salt the 8th district?” Just that one thing has just made such an impression on me! (.) (I: Mhm) that as soon as I get past, see you know that’s where the two arteries are they can still go towards the university of East City or the VA and pow! as soon as you pass that, it’s no man’s land. It’s wi::ld [WH]. As soon as I get to the top of that hill, I have to put my car in low, I finally figured out how, cause I’m goin’ WHO::AA Oh no, what happened!! But now I know, be prepared, because there’s not goin’ be any salt on the street. It’s not gonna look like the rest of what you just came through.

K: Yeah, it’s just uh, overlooked it’s ignored, it’s neglected.

P2: Um, what is the psychodynamics? You know, is there a need for us, do we have a need to have places that we can point to and say well you know well we’re good people but those people there - oh we’re safe. And you hear that so much when you hear these little captions from people on television who’ve suffered some kind of trauma in their community and they say something like, well, {in a lower voice} “you know, we never expected this to happen in this community” (I: Mhm) Why? because people don’t live there or what? and the assumption is that certain behaviors are attached to certain communities (I: Absolutely) And locations are a critical part of that. So, you have that coming at you all the time. So, we never expected that- something like that to happen in this neighborhood, this community.
K: Yeah, that came up a lot 2 yrs ago, over 2 yrs ago now, at Duquesne there was that shooting
(P2: Yes) And I was working at the counseling center there at the time, or the clinic on campus
we did some of the responding to that, as far as offering more groups and stuff, but I became
very interested in the campuses response to it because Duquesne is a very white university in
general and it happened at a Black Student Union dance and all of the racial stuff just surfaced
like, quickly, and maybe not to the students of color maybe it’s not under the surface but I think
it’s pushed under the surface most of the time and that issue just brought up all of these, you
know it was that kind of dance and it was those people and it doesn’t happen on this kind of
campus usually. It wasn’t said in so many words but –

P2: But there was a distancing
K: Yeah and it was really, um (. ) eye opening for me. Just to look at that on our campus
P2: Yeah the whole idea that it has within it’s mission statement, so much language about
community, about Christian community
K: Yeah and there’s efforts you know that Duquesne it’s near the 8th district, it’s sort of part of
the 8th district geographically, it’s sort of right there. And so, I think they explicitly have said
that we are making these efforts and we want to be part of the community but underneath it there
are all these, really entrenched, institutionalized, uh, racist ideas and I feel like that, you know it
happens everywhere,
P2: You were talking about those neighborhoods or those places (I: Mhm, right) where certain
things aren’t expected to happen. Places where these traumas aren’t supposed to happen. One of
the things they’ve been talking about here is a whole conceptualization of whether or not we’re
just talking about a post-trauma person here and a post-trauma person here, but maybe we’re
talkin’ about a traumatized community (. ) (I: Mhm) and an area that’s under trauma and what
that looks like and what – it’s like, if we were in Beirut or something you know, I mean, is there
a certain kind of trauma that people are subjected to (. ) you know (2) violence and (2) and
scratching at your survival is a way of life so uncommon to the majority culture (4)
K: and that becomes a whole community that is traumatized (. ) (P2: Mhm) Yeah, and I’ve heard
P1 use that term before I think it’s very (. ) it’s an interesting idea, and an important idea, is there
a way in which conceptualized as a community rather than the individuals within the community.
P2: Mhm, now, I have to tell you something I have had the experience of living in other places
and being in other places (. ) and there’s actually no way to explain to a (. ) person who’s not of
color, how much being of color (. ) defines your encounter with the world (. ) um (. ) because I’ve
been a lot of places, I can say world (I: Mhm) um, there’s no way that I can walk down the street
of Johannesburg and they can know that I’m not South African (. ) Um, there’s n:o way that I
can walk down the street (. ) in Stockholm (. ) or London (. ) (voice is lower) and Vancouver, you
know these places where it’s not apparent that I’m not African and yet I’m not Europe. And so,
there is this particular:.r thing that you know um, I guess defines us from other people um,
Africans (and the Diaspora?) I remember being in Argentina and these Black ladies who were
about this tall \textit{motions with her hands to about 4 ft off of the ground} they were Brazilians and they were like grandmothers \textit{(said with some wonderment)} and they’re lookin’ and lookin’ like \textit{(makes gasping sound)} looking – and I’m in this jewelry store and their looking and looking at me and they say \textit{makes another gasping noise} \{el grande?\} and I’m like \textit{(makes puzzled look)} and then I realized there was 2 of us, me and a colleague and we were both almost 6 feet tall, and they thought that was just \textit{amazing} – and they were like, \{whispers something inaudible\} \{I: Mhm\} So, there’s this um this sense of being of two nations, because we’re not Africans, you know, we’re not 100\%, most of us are not 100\% African. So what happens is that we’re like a people that are afloat

\textbf{K: hmm (.) afloat}

\textbf{P2:} You know we don’t really - we have our origins and you know we’re like - it was like what Israel wanted so badly when the Jews decided that they had to have a homeland because they were Jews in Diaspora, I mean even at the time of Jesus there were 2 million Jews outside of Jerusalem \{I: Mhm\} You know so, they were such a \textit{scattered} people//

\textbf{K:} oh yeah, wandering

\textbf{P2:} -they had been such a \textit{scattered}, \textit{wandering}, so they had to br – you know, that’s what Israel represented for them, a base. But I submit that we don’t have a base and as a result (.) um, we’re always sojourners’ we’re always, aliens.

\textbf{K:} hmm, always “other” in a way

\textbf{P2:} yes, yes, we’re always other. And so how that gets played out, um (2) in the way we’re received, in the way we receive the world, there’s a part of what we struggle with here. I do believe.

\textbf{K:} And when you say, we struggle with, do you mean you struggle with as a staff, or you struggle with your clients who come here, or both

\textbf{P2:} Both, both. I think we struggle with that as a staff, \textit{u::m (.)} and perhaps we’re labeled as the ones who’ve been somewhat successful and whatever, you would call that, \{voice becomes softer again\} I used to do immigration, refugee resettlement \{I: Hm\} this is a refugee resettlement, so when we’ve been had people that we identified as people who [short LF] as you know, better or stronger along the process of resettlement so I guess we’ve been properly assimilated or we’ve been assimilated a \textit{little} better than others. But, so (.) that’s who we \textbf{are}, we’re the ones who figured out how to do it OR else we’re the ones who we’re so fortunate that we fall in the manor and come out riding the pony, you know, we’re the \textit{lucky} ones

\textbf{K:} That’s the way you’re perceived, you mean?

\textbf{P2:} No, I’m saying that’s how I look at us.
K: That’s how you look at it

P2: You know, we’re the lucky ones but we really – but we can pass along some things of survival, some survival skills some interactive skills, some things like we can give some nurturing, we can put some {sand on some wounds} we can um, be there when there floating, you know almost like an anchor, for the floating one, you know, floats out and floats back, floats out and floats back. And uh (. ) sometimes you know we’re cheerleaders, you know it’s like, I believe you can make it through the weekend without using I believe you can

K: Mhm, so really, um, advocating// for your clients

P2: Yes, I believe you can do that, Marcus does, you know, things systemically, at least, in his arena – now at this point I’m still (3) I’m still struggling with the whole thing, still struggling with the whole thing, and I can easily, because (. ) I think we are (. ) chameleons, you know, (2) that I can make myself survive wherever I am (. )

K: And- it sounds like you have been in a lot of different places, very diverse places.

P2: Mhm, I’ve lived in King of Prussia where I was the only African American in my whole dang building! Psh. (I: Hm, wow). You know, I knew I was different (. ) but I also knew that after a while, they wouldn’t notice me as much, (I: Hm) you know.

K: They wouldn’t notice you as much.

P2: Mhm, I mean they would notice me as being different, but it wouldn’t be so shocking to them. I mean, I’d come out and they’d go, oh, oh, {makes a motion of someone looking uncomfortable, taken off guard, frightened?, trying to wave hello} hello [silent LF] (I: Hm) (. ) or they wouldn’t speak at all and I’d train them to speak in the morning and then (. ) after a while they wouldn’t be so nervous about seeing me and they’d all say, “hi, how are you::u?” You know, it became okay.

K: What were you doing there?

P2: I was working there, living there, so.

K: okay, what were you doing for work?

P2: um, at that time I was – I ran the national program for justice for American Baptist churches USA so, that was the headquarters there down in Valley Forge and I lived in King of Prussia, s::o I headed the division that (. ) did things like refugee resettlement. And Um (. ) investment, minority investments and that kind of stuff. We were part of a team, that wrote the Valdis principals and things like (I: Hm) that so we were really head of the team, part of the {voice lowers to almost a whisper} visitation team created for the elections in South Africa negotiate contracts with South Africanand some US entities. So I have a really kind of funny edge on myself, you know?
K: A funny edge?

P2: Yeah, I mean I don’t, um, I see this from a bigger vantage point (I: Mhm) though I have to say as a little girl, I grew up ‘till I was 5 on Burrows Street so I come from this {area?} I have to struggle to remember that.

K: You have to struggle to remember your roots here? (I: Mhm) (.). Like, it’s hard to remember it, or its’–

P2: U::m (2) I’ve just been other places longer, so it’s harder to- I don’t have as many memories of being here, because I was so young.

K: Mhm, Mhm yeah that’s pretty young

P2: so know, I didn’t – there are some things, I remember goin’ to a {Via wilds?} sc hool, I can’t remember my teachers face but I remember going to that school. I remember you know, walking in these communities and I don’t remember being being frightened at all, but I remember being different.

K: When was it that you were living here? How long ago was that?

P2: Oh, a long time ago, 50 years ago or more

K: and you don’t remember feeling unsafe or anyone telling you to be careful or anything like that

P2: U::m, Um (.)[h] I know that my mother didn’t want to live here, I remember that as a child that my mother didn’t want to live here (. and she was like pushing my dad (. we lived in the projects! to um, move. She wanted to move, she wanted to move, she wanted to move, (um) she wanted to move,[said as if she were reenacting what her mother said to her father at the time] Um, [WH] what can I say here (5) my mother was a rural girl, s::o (.2) I think she had some, uncomfortableness, with this urban setting (I: Hm, yeah) She hadn’t been here very long, maybe 5 years, maybe, somethin’ like that, I was a little girl only 5 years old, so she wasn’t totally happy, wasn’t totally happy, because, she didn’t have any dirt to dig in, or (.)

K: Mhm, it’s very urban for a rural person around here.

P2: Yeah, so and then we did get a house where she had a yard and she could dig and we could run in the grass and so that was her (. probably her idea of living (I: Mhm) s::o, how much of the otherness I feel came from that and not from some sense of racism, I don’t know (I: Hm)

P2: But I remember her like telling us a story about going to dinner at these people’s house who were white and they served like yellow corn (. and she was so appalled when she saw it on the table because she was like ['h][WH] “oh my god, they must really be struggling up north!”
‘cause she said she didn’t know what to do, she was so embarrassed you know, because you know, that’s what they fed the hogs.

K: [LF] funny.
P2: - and the horses they only ate white corn, which was you know, that sweet little – so she didn’t know what to think when she saw (. ) feed –

K: on the table!
P2: - on the table.

K: Wow, that’s quite an experience!
P2: (h) YEAH! , I guess so. So, that’s why I say to you, I don’t know – my major person who I interacted with was my mother, and I do know there was a estrangeness to this area but I’m not sure what was the grounds for it, because she was very much estranged in this area because of the whole urban thing, but I knew that we weren’t goin’ to stay here long.

K: Now, it’s interesting to me that, you, it sounds like you went away from here for quite some time, and somehow you’ve come full circle and you’re back in this community, working here, not living here – but um, (P2: Mhm) it seems like something pulled you back to work here and I’m wondering what/ your thoughts are –
P2: Um, basically| I came back because of my family and the issues of aging and really them needing some more support (I: Mhm) to help you know, to help someone survive because we really didn’t want her in a nursing home, so I came back, and my sister came back to keep her out of a nursing home (I: Mm) u::m, one of the things that I’ve discovered is that things are just as antiquated as they were when I left, if not more so. I ended up back here because I couldn’t get my foot in the door where I should be.

K: Where would that be?
P2: I should be higher in administration (I: Hm) um, I’m here, pshh (facial expression looks disgusted, tone is dismissive) doing this, okay? But if I were a white woman with the experience that have and the credentials that I have, I wouldn’t’ be here. It just wouldn’t’ happen.

K: So, this is not a chosen place where you would want to be this is sort of, u::h (. ) sort of what was left for you.
P2: Right, right, right

K: So (. ) it’s sort of been a disappointment for you to end up here? I mean, I- I can see you seem like you have a lot of experience and you feel like you should be in a higher position.
P2: Oh, I know I should be. But this is a plantation where they don’t have to listen to what – they don’t have to be equitable

K: Mhm (.) and is the plantation you are referring to not only the medical system here but the city in general (P2: Mhm, Mhm) so, comin’ back here was not what you would have preferred to do. I mean you came back here for family, and to take care of them but it sound like this is not the place where you feel you have the most opportunity

P2: oh no

K: - and you’ve had other um, – now when you went to school was it for psychology or social work, what was your training in?

P2: Yeah, I my bachelart degree was in psychology. I have uh - I did work in graduate school in social work and then I did a Masters in Divinity and then I did a Masters in Education, and then I’m ABD for my Ph.D.

K: Really?

P2: - in education. So, there’s no where else where a person with my background would be in a position like this, come on, for real [LF]

K: So what happened with your Ph.D. – that was in education?

P2: I just started travelin’

K: you started travelin’

P2: I started travelin’ I had opportunities, I had choices, I had – a wonderful job came up that was a job of a lifetime and I wasn’t gonna not, take it. And, I knew it would probably gonna threaten my ability to finish – I finished my comps and everything, I just didn’t have time (I: Mhm) I was too busy promoting big deals all over the place

K: Mhm, doing the refugee work and-

P2: Oh my god! I set up the first summit in Kansas City, Kansas for the gangs, I was in LA I did a national film there that was used across the country on the burning of LA. I was building stuff in Florida, and I rebuilt churches that were burned across the U.S. in major projects ( we built in major churches ) I was on assignment in South Africa (.) and um, Argentina, I was in London, well Conventry outside of London when Diana died, also I was on assignment there.

K: mm, wow

P2: yeah, right, so, come on for real(.) let’s be honest, do you expect me to be here?
K: Well, like I said it does seem like you have a lot of experience for -

P2: Well, that’s the way it is, and that’s silly, but that’s the way it is, that’s the real deal, so this is um, {sighs} (2) I’m good to the people I understand their ways, I’m ordained, so I’m used to taking care of people it doesn’t bother me. I’ve been ordained for 26 years so I’m one of the front-runners in that area, so. I’m used to what it means to struggle in areas where you’re required to have much and you’re given back little.

K: Required to have much and given back little. hm(.) and that applies to your work here as well. (P2: sure) It really does seem like the center here is struggling to provide a very important service, I think, to the community and to give back a lot to the community without really having a lot of those resources (P2: Mhm) um, financially and otherwise. And, so you’re work here you feel it’s not where you want to be but you do have, you feel like you can work with the clients here and you have - and that’s important work?

P2: Well, sure, I run a soup kitchen in Wilkinsburg, I’m totally committed to doing this kinda work, but I don’t want you to think that, I don’t want you to come and do your Ph.D. thinking that you’re encountering the people who work at this level, for real for real, Earl with his background, Marcus(.) 7 years, the doors of opportunity are not as open to us(.) and so as a result these people get a very high level of care at low costs.

K: That’s really interesting(.) and really makes, as I’m listening to you, I have a sinking feeling, that doesn’t, uh –

P2: So it’s on our backs (I: yeah) so someone does pay the price

K: So you’re working - I mean it just seems like a lot to contain, on a daily basis that you’re working with people coming in struggling with, like you said, a history of trauma, community trauma, facing discrimination and oppression everyday of different sorts and at the same time you’re also, as a staff and as individuals, struggling with some of that yourselves

P2: The same issues of racism and exploitation, we all know it because we’re living it, and we’re giving the highest quality of care because we’re live it. So right now I make $40,000 less than I made 10 years ago, just to be here. (I: whoa) So there is a cost and I’m paying it.

K: It feels like- well, you’re paying a cost to work here -

P2: I’m paying it! Yeah, I’m paying a cost so it’s not, I mean they may withdraw, they may keep the money, but the money comes from somewhere, it comes from me, okay. It comes from those of us who come highly trained and work for hardly anything. (I: Mhm) (2)

P2: I mean, if you understand that perspective

K: yeah, absolutely, there’s so many questions I have related to - I’m just trying to think about uh(.) what I want to ask you about that(.) It’s just a really – uh, such a paradox in ways you know
(P2: Mhm) um, and I did - it’s interesting that you’re saying this because like you said I’m in a fairly removed position I did have some experience working here and seeing what’s going on and dealing with some of the challenges myself which were different coming here as a white woman, from – you know as a practicum student (P2: Mhm) then they would be in your position but, you know, I definitely just felt like, um (.) a lot of issues of race and class were constantly there, coming up.

P2: yes

K: -and again different for me as a white therapist who they might imagine, clients might imagine had a privileged background or didn’t have the similar experiences

P2: But there used to that, their really not that uncomfortable with that

K: Yeah, I noticed that, but at the same time um, I felt like it’s still in the room somewhere

P2: Okay, yeah, yeah, the credibility issues are floating around somewhere

K: yeah, or even just in um you know having a client who, I’d go to ask P1 something, about – you know he needed something that I didn’t know about, and he’d leave the room, the session room because he didn’t want me to think that he was stealing my stuff, you know when I wasn’t in there – and he had been in prison so there were a whole other host of issues, but it was always to me something to consider, what does this have to do with what I represent and because (.) you know, there is a history!

P2: oh, yes

K: - I mean I even wondered about that coming in here

P2: I’m really sort of amazed because when you think about it you realize you know the level of care that these people are receiving is not because the institution is supporting it’s because African Americans, with a high level of training are sacrificing to be with them (I: Mhm) that’s what I’m trying to say, it’s a major sacrifice, and I talk about it to myself every morning you know– “what the hell are you doing?” you know, ”why are you doing this you can’t hardly pay your rent?” Your one, your one, your 2 week check the whole thing goes to my damn rent (.) so then how do I make it, I’m like how am I gonna get through the next few weeks for gas, ( please don’t make me start having to charge gas ‘cause that will really kill me ) I mean this is what it takes to be here

K: Yeah, I think what I started before as I have been reading, and was talking about being an outsider and try to understand, and a little bit from what I learned from talking to people here, but it does seem like there is such a parallel process between (.) what’s gone on in the community historically, it’s been overlooked and neglected, and sort of treated as if almost as - well, I’ll just bulldoze over that community almost act as if it doesn’t matter. And you’re
experiencing that, the clinic is experiencing that, even in the physical condition of the space and you’re experiencing that as a staff person. I feel like there is a parallel process, the same kind of attitude almost, you’re kind of pushed to the side or overlooked or maybe sometimes like you said purposefully, [LF] it’s not such a, I have been thinking of it as something unconscious almost, and I think a lot of it is, but some of it is conscious, like you said-

P2: there’s a lot of grand design crap that goes on

K: grand design crap? (P2: Mhm) from the top (.)

P2: there are people making grand designs about what this place, this city should look like, this just trickles down (2) it’s amazing, it just trickles down {chewing food}

K: I think it’s interesting like you said about Duquesne too, what’s on paper as a mission statement and also at UPMC, and I’m not trying through this project to villanize anyone but just to open up, your know, well what are these contradictions here?

P2: I’ve never known any African American from outside of Duquesne who’s ever put in an application to Duquesne, who’s ever been brought in for an interview. I’ve never known,

K: you mean a student from there you mean?

P2: no, when they post positions I’ve never known anyone who gets called in for an interview.

K: hmm, interesting (.). from Duquesne

P2: I’ve never known! it just don’t happen!

K: Yeah, they definitely have a history of that, I want to say that they are trying to correct it but I know people I’ve known who’ve had experiences bad experiences on campus, racially being harassed because they’re Muslim or for various reasons, it’s not and this may be the case in other universities as well, I don’t know, but um, it’s really not addressed, it’s the way I think it should be

P2: And I think this is a cost, and it’s really odd because what I think I’m seeing is if we just look at– and you should want to take a look at the Bangs report – B-A-N-G-S, that Bangs report you’ll really want to look at that report, you don’t want to do this work without looking at that report, okay?. Because you want to get that down in your gut, I’ll tell you what else he said, I was just in a meeting with him, well a presentation with him about 3 weeks ago, he also said the East City plan is crap

K: The East city plan is crap – what plan is that?

P2: That’s the one where they kids are gonna get money
K: Oh, the Hope, whatever -

P2: Yeah, East City Hope, Okay, here’s what he said there’s a problem (.) he said, you gotta look at this (.) Kalamazoo, they explained what they did an analysis of Kalamazoo plan, but the Kalamazoo gives the first money and the East City hope gives the last $5,000 (I: Hm)

P2: So in other words, how much does it cost you to go to Duquesne?

K: Well, because I’m a Ph.D. student, the tuition is covered but it probably would be 30 grand or something like that.

P2: Okay, so the kid has to come up with the first 25 and then they’ll give them 5.

K: Really? That’ interesting ‘cause I have heard about it, I just never heard that.

P2: Well, I was there ‘cause we invited him to Wilkinsburg to sit down with us

K: The person who was –

P2: Bangs, from University of East City, Graduate School of Social Work and that’s what his analysis was, that you know that they’re givin the last 5. So you and I don’t have to be rocket scientists to figure this out, where are they gonna get the other 25 from?

K: Right, I mean that’s–

P2: and the UPMC money is going into it, and all that yeah, it’s not coming out anywhere near the Kalamazoo, and you’ll want to look at the Kalamazoo project which is paying the whole ride and it’s only 2 years old– and then you want to look at the Hope and you’ll see the big differences even though there saying that ( in the study ) it’s not the same program, heh. (I: Mhm) So, there’s your hope for getting out and those are some of the things that I think are really important. 90% of African Americans that I know who get educated and want to make something of their lives, leave East City (.) (I: yeah) and all of my friends who’ve left are successful (.) and all of my friends who’ve stayed are poor [LF] you know, if - there’s a real issue, you know, it’s a real issue
K: It’s really segregated here still, I mean I grew up on Long Island in the suburbs so it wasn’t
diverse in my neighborhood but I went to school in the SUNY New Paltz which is close to the
Bronx and so it was a pretty diverse campus. Um and when I came here I definitely felt it, it just
seemed, most places have their segregation, even New York city but people are crammed so
much more together and there’s not as much - it does seem like African American communities
are separated here even geographically speaking

P2: Mhm, East Hills up on the hill you know, you can corner it off in a minute if they wanted to

K: yeah, it was striking to me as someone moving here from the outside, even my first - it’s very
interesting to me that I ended up doing this kind of research in the 8th district because of on of
my first experiences here when I came here for interview was that I got in a cab, like a taxi cab,
and was staying in a hotel the one that’s right near the arena there near Duquesne and I didn’t
know Duquesne was so close so I called a cab and he was driving me there and he said to me,
“don’t go to the left there, that’s the 8th district district” but to me I thought he said, the hell
district

P2: [LF]

K: ‘cause he kept saying, you know, you might get shot – unless you have a gun –

P2: [LF louder and harder]

K: - and so I was thinking, you know, my point of reference is New York city, so I thought, it
must be really bad if that’s you know – and I thought to myself the hell district, that sounds like a
scary place!

P2: [LF]

K: the hell district, you know and as I learned more about it – it’s not that and just working here
and like you said from the news and the statistics there is a good amount of violence here but I
certainly didn’t feel like, you know–

P2: (h) we were in hell!

K: - yeah, yeah, that’s so telling I think in what you’re saying that even just perpetuates the idea
just the way people talk about it, about what a violent place – and it really just cuts off any real
interaction because it is that real interaction, I think, that can sometimes dispel those stereotypes

P2: That’s right!

K: So I should probably I mean I should probably write that somewhere that that was my first
experience, that’s pretty amazing (P2: Mhm) (. ) So I realize [glances at clock] we’re, ooh, just
about out of time here. Do you have a client coming at 3 o’clock or anything?
I don’t think so, but if they show up

K: Um, I didn’t get to talk to you much about your clinical work, um, with clients –

P2: Well, you really did.

K: Well, we did get some, I don’t know if there was any specific example or instance of a case that felt particularly challenging to you or (.) I feel like we touched on that without specifically -

P2: One of the things that really fascinates me, is like, um (.) like I said to me is um (.) I have to work with these people, whose incidents are on television (.) (I: yeah) When I come – you know, get up in the morning and say [WH] “Oh, my god that’s so awful, Oh my god, those poor people” and then I come to work and find out I know them (.) I still can’t get over that (.) I don’t know why it just it just [‘h,h] (.) I just can’t – I’m like [WH] that was you son, that was your daughter, that was - I’m like, “o::o, ho::ney, how horrible!” (2)

K: Yeah it’s really, uh, horrific (P2: oh {nods}) for it to be right in front of you like that

P2: It really is and very exhausting, that’s the other thing about the clinical work, um we’ll often say, like we’ll be in group [‘h] (.) and it’ll be so intense (.) that (.) when we come out (.) we’ll end up looking at each other and saying “oh my god, I’m so tired” (I: Mhm) or you’re kinda pumped up for minute and then as soon as the adrenaline goes down, you feel like you’re on the ground, ex::hau::sted, EXHAU::STED! and I often hear my colleagues transferring back and forth – Marcus goin’ “I’m tired today” [says in a lower voice, imitating masculine tone], and Earl sayin’ – “exhausted.” (I: Mhm) I think it has to do with the level of, um, intensity that (.) they bring, our patients, and the level of intensity it requires to meet them. so that you come here like wo::o, WHOA! I’m tired. And I have to think, I do not remember really being this exhausted in any of my other positions.

K: Interesting

P2: Okay, and even though, um (.) I’ve been some places that were physically challenging to me, you know, I mean [h] machine guns in my face and stuff like that, but I don’t think that I’ve ever been this exhausted as I have here. Because you know, I’m lookin at some damn ( Eco ) soldier and it’s like “get that damn gun out my face!” (I: [LF]) [LF] you know, he’s like, “MADAM, you must state your business” [said in lower tone, imitating male, French accent] and I said, “you know damn well, you know damn well, I’m the woman who bought that damn rifle you got that has a USA emblem on it (.) Okay? That’s who I am, the taxpayer who bought that gun, now, get that rifle out of MY FACE!” (.) I slept pretty good that night! Now he::re, I sleep too, but I’m exhausted it’s like “o:h my go:d!” after li::stening to so much of the pa:in and the a::gony they go through I sometimes, I am exhau::sted and I hear ( ) is hard work, sometimes to get [WH] them up off of that ground and dust them off, and help them start breathin’ in deep again and believin’ they can go out there dammnit and they can live and they can make it, they can survi::ve it’s just s:o intense. And if you’re counseling on a campus you know how sometimes they come in with I’m leaving, I’m going home, or I can’t make the next test, and
now that- (2) cause I used to be (.) a Chaplin for University of East City and CMU you know, so
(.) you know, I know what’s it’s like to pump those guys up and that’s serious work sometimes
‘cause they’re really having crisis. [h] I thought that was
just take that, and just I’m not sayin’ you’re not – I’m just sayin’, take how, you know
sometimes you got a kid who just wants to run away or leave or whatever and you’re doin’
everything to – just take that and just triple it (2)

K: Yeah, it’s really hard.

P2: [h] It’s ha::rd wo::rk (2) so hard that I think that many of us would rather avoid it or deny it.
You know, just kind of be in denial about it

K: About how bad it is, yeah.

P2: Sometimes I resent it (.) you know I resent it it’s so damn hard (2)

K: There’s so much it seems like just in my brief time being here and I’ve been working over at
Mercy Behavioral Health too, which you know, also there’s a lot, it just feels like there’s just so much that feels outside of the realm of even what can be worked on within the realm of
individual therapy//

P2: YE::S! Ye::s!

K: I feel like just systemically there’s so much that feels like (P2: [LF) how could you possibly
provide all that, or possibly address all that?

P2: [LF] You CAN’T! (h)If you did there wouldn’t be nothing left you would sit down and say
{gestures with hand} “well THIS used to be our psychologist!”/uses high pitched joking,
sarcastic tone/ (I: [LF] again in a funny tone) “now she’s just melted away!” [LF]

K: Yeah!

P2: - you would just wither away, completely!

K: Yeah absolutely and for you I would imagine there is a different level, I would imagine even
a deeper identification with some of the racial issues like you mentioned that you’ve struggled
with (.) you know I felt it sometimes as the child of an alcoholic and my brothers’ a recovering
addict, and sometimes with the addiction issues it get stirred up a lot – but sometimes that can
make it that much more intense and with you some of the discrimination you’ve faced and the
feelings you’ve had about that and being here I imagine that plays into your work as well.

P2: Very much so, one of the things I like you know, I have triggers! I have triggers, u::m and
then not only with whites or the white-black issue. Like I have triggers, like I don’t like pimps
[LF] I mean (I: [LF]) they’re just not my favorite type men, okay? And (.) you know (.) there’s
one of ‘em that keeps his mouth shut (.) for the most part – but there’s one who likes to MESS
with me! Okay? It’s as though because he’s such a wonderful - what would you call it? (2)
{other voices audible in the hallway} he’s so good at, you know () identifying women, and
analyzin’ {snaps her fingers} women (I: Mm) That he KNO::WS {snaps again} I can’t STA::ND
him, okay? But, I like him as a person except for when he’ll say something that’s s::o da::mn
sexist () (I: Mm) and O::H!, I could backhand him, you know? WA::M! and it’s like “SHUT
YOUR MOUTH UP!”
‘Cause I do – () (I: Yeah) And he could say some sleazy stuff about women, okay?
K: sure, geez.
P2: ‘till you feel like the hairs stand up on the ba::ck of your neck, all right? It’s like, [‘h, h]
WHO::OU!
K: and how do you manage that, in the moment?
P2: you know it’s really funny you know I thank god that I’ve been trained very well, you know
I’ve been trained very well. Earl told me the other day there was a little edge on my voice when
the guy said well, “I don’t have any problems slappin’ a bitch!” {repeats slapping a bitch to
herself describing how it felt to her, shaking head in disbelief} (I: [LF]) ( ) so I was like,
50 deep breaths here [LF], (h)okay? ‘Cause that was like off the chart, I mean that
to me, that was just off the cha::rt – “I don’t have any problems slappin’ a bitch”
P2: {Claps her hands together excitedly} YES!
P2: Mhm, it’s like this zipper that goes right here {points to center of body} that little zipper just
goes, woop! {gestures towards zipping it up her center} (.) And before he left he came and
apologized to me and hugged me. (I: Mhm) And, I hugged him, you know, and I said you know
what, we’re gonna get past this, and he said [WH] “I’m so sorry I shouldn’t have said that” But
you know I said I’m glad you felt comfortable enough to be that honest, so we could get that up
and we could get that out. So, but he’s not the one who gets me it’s another one that triggers me
and knows he triggers me (I: Mhm) and he says, you know, I hear a little anger in your voice and
I say, yeah, you do hear anger in my voice because you’re disrespectful and disrespecting me ()
(I: yeah) and I feel () offended by that
K: yeah, there has to be room for your experience of him there too.
P2: Yes, yes, yes. So, there are certain things and I guess that goes across the border for all of us,
there are triggers (I: Mhm) You know, and I don’t like the pimps () no!, I like the pimp talk! (.) (I: Mhm) And when they do that it just feels like, [WH] he did not say that!
K: now you said you had really good training, did you get that training when you were in school or did you get that training on the job?

P2: Um, I think I got really good training at Western Psych. – um, I’ll admit most of my success across the country working was a lot of the training that I received early on in my first professional position at Western Psych. I was really trained well. One of the things they did there was in the old Western Psych. colleagues, you worked with an older colleague and um, they really worked with you. And we went back and had clinical meetings about everything and we talked through things and every week I had to take my cases in to talk to Dr. Ballavue (?) my consulting psychiatrist. And we would go through each case and talk about the transference issues –

K: That’s great

P2: - and so, I got really incredible training right from the start. And then here since I’ve been back, well - I’ve always been able to use Bob, you know, Dr. Marin as a consultant. And then since you know I’ve been here, Earl is a really good source of, m::m, you know, training, (I: Mhm) he’s a really good consultant.

K: Do you feel that you feel supported by the staff who is here for the most part?

P2: Yes, I- (.h) one of the things is that because I come, because ‘a who I am (.) you know, who was the poet again who wrote that book, ( When and Where I Enter ) I am (.) pshh, (3) If I wann – If I wanna know something they’re gonna tell me, okay? And, I don’t feel threatened by no one ’cause I know so many things that they don’t know, and I don’t care you’re gonna tell me. So I hold my own with these guys –

K: Are you the only woman here now? I guess there are psych residents or something around, yeah

P2: Yeah and they come in and out, and Betty comes in and out, but I’m the only woman therapist

K: And Yvonne left, right?

P2: And Barbara, yeah, so (.yeah) they left on the same day (I: wow) I made it quite clear that I’m not gonna give any ( pains ) and I’m not gonna give any either, okay? ‘cause there’s somethin’ to that

K: Something to the fact that they left on the same day? (P2: {nods}) Do you feel like you experience some sexism within here?

P2: Um, it might not be intentional but if I d::o, I just get it cleared up
K: it's pretty hard to avoid a workplace, at least in my experience, that doesn't have some of that. Especially as you start to rise – have positions where you have a little bit of power or you know you have an education

P2: And you should surely know that in ministry 26 years ago (.) [h] (2) that every time I sat down at the table, I was the only woman – you know? It was just disgusting! And not only that, but they felt threatened to have us at the table then. It was like we were comin’ there to castrate everyone. And it’s like, get your head out of your neck! We don’t care anything about that! That’s not why we’re here! “Well why do you want to do this?”[said in a lower, masculine voice] I’m like “WHAT DO YOUR ME::AN why do you want to do this?” So they were very neurotic! Um, sometimes I can just overlook it, ‘cause I beat ’em at it, you know. They say I couldn’t do it and I did. (I: Mhm) So I don’t even care anymore about whether they like it or they don’t like it that I’m here or whatever, they get on my nerves. It’s like they did with that paint, it’s like psssh, I really don’t care, okay? I’m not tryin’ to live up in here, do it handle it, I’m not gonna pick colors, I’m not gonna do this!

K: So in your training, um, (.) you felt like you had a lot of good training through Western Psych. and in your graduate training did you feel like it prepared you for the kind of work you’re doin here now? Did it have sufficient courses in looking at diversity or any of that stuff?

P2: No, that really wasn’t goin’ on when I was in school, back in the what, the 80s and 90s, that just wasn’t - you know, we were really just startin’ to talk about this kinda thing, not really knowing how to articulate it (I: Mhm) um, the discussion about diversi – I left here in ’87 – the real powerful discussions about diversity first began in the business world because you know economics is what drives the nation and they started realizing that it was really business savvy to talk about things like diversity. Um –

K: interesting, yeah, point

P2: in my previous position to ( remoo ) in Valley Forge, one of the things that I had to do was – I was – I wrote all the statements, for, you know, statements on economic justice and na na na, when the delegates get together ( ) Episcopal church has decided to receive gay clergy and whatever, whatever – that’s a process (I: Mhm) and I orchestrated that process for American Baptist and we were very diverse, so one of the things we had to do was wrestle with this diversity problem I had to have men and women on the committee, I had to have lay and clergy, I had to have North, East, South and West represented and I had to have conservative, moderate, and oh, reformers, all at the table at the same time. So they for::ced me to work diversity because that was the only way – if I didn’t get all of those people at the table and that statement got presented, I was gonna get ( ) – somebody was gonna get up and walk out, you know, grand stand, but if I had a representative of a:ll the different positions and then the person got up and said you know what, I felt that way too but I had to back down or I had to modify because the greater good is this or that, that’s how I learned about diversity, you know, really hands on kind of way, and we often studied and prepared a statement for like 6 months to a year before it was presented so we would go to the actual cities and study things. So I said, when I wanted to do peace work, I took ’em into Boston and they walked the streets Eugene Rivers and the gang
people there, and met with the people at 10 point and the governor, and then I flew them from Kansas City, Kansas to meet with the gang people there. Then I flew them to L.A. to this place where they have this daycare that does all this peace stuff so I would create a traveling curriculum an experiential curriculum, that’s what taught me, being forced to have to think it through and think of all the angles, that taught me about diversity. (I: Hm, and -) so I guess I’m saying to you, I knew the written work but what it felt like and the angst that it creates to try to do that. I learned tryin’ to work that, oh trying to work it

K: That sounds like an amazing experience that you had
P2: Yeah, I was really blessed, you know
K: That’s really great. Well, I’m sure we could talk, I could talk to you for hours probably but I think we can stop it there

P2: And if you need more ti- if you get to workin’ and think “oh, I need to get something” – call me, we’ll set up another ( ) for you and we can try to crank it out

K: Okay, that’s great ‘cause I might have – you know as I’m listening to it, I might think, Oh I wanted to ask her that, or um, so – maybe I’ll even just call you and ask for clarification

P2: that would be fine

K: I really – thanks so much for agreeing to sit down and talk to me I feel like I could talk to you for a long time you just have some much to offer such a long, and such a broad experience

P2: yeah, thank you

K: and like I said, I really appreciate you agreeing to - allowing me to benefit from it and my study.

P2: Well, you’re very welcome. You know the guys are gonna have their angle on things and they have good angles but it’s nice to have some fresh perspective

K: Absolutely, yeah

{voice recorder turned off}
APPENDIX F

Interview Transcript: Michael (P3)

Interview transcription: P3

K: So, um (.) so again just thanks for sitting down with me to talk

P3: You’re very welcome

K: So, you have been here for how long now?

P3: I have been here for almost 7 years. It will be 7 years in July.

K: okay, and um (.) so I’m just gonna start with some general questions about how you got here and what brought you here, and we’ll go from there. And like I said, anything that seems more interesting to you or that you want to elaborate on, just (P3: all right) feel free to do that.

K: So, how did you come to work here, 7 years ago?

P3: Well, I attended the social work program at the University of East City, and graduated and I wanted to work in a community setting. Uh, I wanted to work with an underserved population, I wanted to work with people of color, African Americans, um, so, um I talked to my um (.) advisor, my field instructor and he suggested that I apply down here. Um, I did, I got the job and um, you know, sort of, got started pretty quickly. So, I’ve always been brought up in the helping tradition you give back, you know, each one teach one, that type of philosophy (I: Hm) Um (.) that you are because of other people, so it’s never about you, it’s always about the next person and you have a responsibility to make a difference in everybody’s life because someone sacrificed for you to be in the position that you’re in um, so it’s always been about helping people, helping people that are less fortunate than you are, um it’s about trying to really fill that gap in mental health services when it comes to people of color, or particularly African Americans.

K: And so you’re saying that that was something that was a value, as you were growing up, even before you went to school?

P3: Mhm, yes, definitely. Definitely, raised in the church, um (.) it was always about helping other people, you know when I graduated um, from college, um, you know my dad said to me, “okay, great job, now what are you gonna do?” So [LF within the word] when I graduated from graduated school he said uh – and he’s still sayin’! I: [LF] “Now, what are you gonna do? (I: [LF]) I mean this is great but don’t get comfortable, you have to keep moving you have to keep growin’, you have to keep developin’ um, because problems don’t stop a:nd um, there are a lot of people that sacrificed, and were injured and died, just so you could have this opportunity, s:o, um, don’t let it go by the wayside keep movin’ keep progressin’, keep helpin’ people.
K: And, now (.) the message you got was specifically– or what you’re most interested in is specifically helping people of color// or African Americans

P3: Well, PEOPLE| people in general but (.) obviously I’m African American so, that is gonna be near and dear to my heart. But really, not just African Americans but people who need help in general. I say African-American because, number one, I am African American, and I was brought up in that tradition but, number two, if you look at it, um all the socioeconomic um indictors, um African Americans lag very far behind and I think if you look at the history health care system, u::m, uh, the effort to provide culturally competent, quality care, u::m, has been u::m less than acceptable at times. So um, understanding that history and knowing that history, um, definitely there’s a need to really specifically try to help people who have been disenfranchised. And there’s no one who’s been more disenfranchised than African Americans.

K: One of the things that I’m wanting to incorporate in the story I tell about what goes on here, is the history of this community itself. (P3: okay) You know and (.) one of the things I saw going on here was that, that, it is a community based care but really goes further than that in really integrating, (P3: definitely) u::m what is the history of the people here? And I wondered if you could speak a little bit about how that comes into play in your work here?

P3: Okay, So let me be specific do you mean the history of the community, or the history of the Phoenix House, or

K: well, if you could speak to (P3: okay) both and that would be great if you have something to say about them

P3: Okay (.) well one this that’s important to understand is that a lot of the folks in this community in the 8th district have been historical displaced, okay. A::nd, u::m, you know, urban urban redevelopment has really meant over the years historically that, you know, Black folks get moved out big buildings go up, u::m, people lose their homes, they lose their identity, um a::nd that really is a form of trauma, um and it’s an historical trauma (5:19) u::m, I think one of the things that is a benefit in the Phoenix House and what we do at the Center is we try to provide cohesive services within the community. We try to make it a one-stop shop. Now, we can’t be everything to everybody, but can try. And, I think what we try to do is make people feel comfortable with the idea that this is their clinic, this is their home, we are here to serve you u::m, it is about you when you come in here u::m (.) and the whole history of the Phoenix House is about helping individuals and families improve their lives. Um, because there’s a lot of poverty in the community you know, there’s a lot of unemployment in the community, um, there’s a lot of frustration in the community. And, um (.) it plays out (.) in other ways that may appear to b::e, um, you know, this this is just a bad person, or or people are bein’ irresponsible but it’s really people are, are actin’ out their pain, (I: Mhm) um, so what we’re tryin’ to do is get people to understand, that we do understand that a::nd here’s another option. you know, we’re tryin’ to provide another option, you know, we understand that you’ve been impoverished, a::nd you’ve been discriminated against a::nd you know, you may have been miseducated or non-educated, u::m, we understand that you’re locked out of the American dream, you know, um, for
you in many ways, it’s a nightmare. U::m, so what we’re tryin’ to do is give you a place, where, um, you can not only develop in terms of your mental health but also in terms of empowering individuals socially and culturally, politically, getting them involved in the voting process. You know, we do voter registration— I mean, we encourage clients to— we have an advocacy group a::nd they do voter registration. u::m, doin’ things like helpin’ people to, get into college, you know, many of our clients are now, goin’ on further, you know, u::m (. ) so, also I think it’s important to understand that um, it’s not just about (. ) how you feel but it’s about (. ) dealing with the obstacles in your way, because, you can feel wonderful but run into obstacles every five seconds, so what we try to help people do is to sort of manage those obstacles and um, be able to, um, realize their full potential, um, through self-esteem and through confidence and through empowerment and realize that they can make a mistake and that’s okay, but they can still progress, a::nd u::m, the most important perception of who you are is not society’s perception but your own perception. but, you know, that’s something that has to be developed because when it’s been crushed, um, it’s a tremendous challenge, it is a tremendous challenge.

K: I can tell as you talk about it that you have, you have such a personal connection to your work here and uh -

P3: Oh, I’m very passionate about my work here. Because I understand the ramifications of u::m, of not having certain things. u::m I understand the ramifications and the consequences of being locked out, you know what it not only means for the individual but for the individual’s family for the individual’s community, um, I understand the connection between a healthy individual in terms of their mental health um, and someone who’s able to be productive and someone who is able to be there for themselves and be there for others. u::m, I also understand that our clients are resilient, you know, and we come from a strength-based perspective, a holistic approach, uh, that means, we don’t see them as a problem, we see them as a solution. we see them as having problems but not as a problem. It’s a very important distinction to make because when you see someone as being the problem than that becomes the focus. You know, let me fix this person (I: Right, right) as opposed to, let me help this person and there are some things that have gotten you to this point so let’s build on that, let’s work on that, and then we can move forward in a positive way but we don’t need to focus on the negative. We know what the issues are, now let’s resolve ’em (I: Mhm).

K: Now, it sounds like, um, from what you’re saying about - you’re looking at the person first, as a person with problems, not the person as a problem

P3: Exactly.

K: and um, it also sounds like, from what you were saying before you know, experiences of discrimination and a long history of oppression, um, in the nation, as well as in the community, they have a specific kind of history here, um it’s sounded like what you were saying is that when people are acting out, or breaking down, it’s looked at as that’s a bad person -

P3: - Mhm, stereotypical.
K: - that’s a problem but it’s really, it sounded like you were saying that it’s really kind of a manifestation of these social inequalities –

P3: //Mhm, exactly

K: -social problems

P3: which impact mental health, tremendously

K: And that’s something that um I noticed is a pretty prevalent perception here. And I wonder about, and this is something I wondered about when I worked here too, is this clinic in particular is within a larger psychiatric um, institution that often times conceptualizes problems in a different kind of way, like more so a biological model and I was wondering about how that - if that’s something that comes up in your work where you feel like you’re juggling those or-? Does that make sense what I said?

P3: Yeah and what I would say – and that’s a good point and you’re right – and what I’ve tried to do over the years i:;s, um (.) basically catch the system up, cause one great thing about what we do, I BELIEVE, there is some things that are culturally specific, but I believe, the strength-based perspective, the holistic approach is good treatment across the board. Because what it does is it says okay, I have this circle pattern, and I’m not sayin’ that circle pattern has to fit everybody, I’m sayin’ the holistic approach means that I’m gonna meet you where you’re at, I’m gonna help you where you’re at, and, you know, the cultural part of this, is um, “yeah” there are times when we feel misunderstood but I think that we also have an opportunity to advocate and we’re able to still do the things that we need to do for our clients because it’s still therapy - a good therapist, is a good therapist, is a good therapist – so, you know, you’re not a good BLACK therapist, I mean if you’re a good therapist, you can help anyone. u::m (.) if you know, I don’t - obviously I’m a Black man but I don’t see myself as a Black therapist, I do therapy – we do see individuals who are, who are, white here and of other cultures and I approach it in the same way in terms of the mindset (I: Hm) okay, the person is the strength - now the problems may present differently. now that’s where you have, the interventions might be different but my mindset is – strength, strength, strength, strength. Um, so it isn’t – it’s important to make that cultural distinction and your right, the larger system often you kinda get swallowed up in, “what’s perceived as, okay, this’ll work for everybody across the board and this is what you’re supposed to do u::m, but you also have to look at your reality and your own specific programs and that’s what we do and I think all programs do that, I hope they do (I: Mhm) u::m (.) because I can’t help you, using a standard that historically has been a negative for you. Then it means I’m doing you an injustice.

K: So, you’re really conscious of adapting the therapy – to individualize it (P3: definitely), but taking into account what might be the commonalities and the shared experiences of groups of people (P3: exactly). And do you feel like in graduate school that you were prepared to do this kind of work? Do you feel you had the courses necessary?
I have to say yes, and I had some very good internships in graduate school. But we did a lot of role playing, I had, my professors were very hands on, U::m, I would say yes. We would break up into groups I mean it wasn’t just studying the theories, we actually would do the therapy. U::m we would play the therapist we would play the role of the client, we would play the role of the observer, so you got it from all different angles. U::m, interesting too, because a lot of the people that were my professors, I now have some contact with somewhere, you know, in terms of, you know, the hospital or – all of them – not all of them, many of them seem to be in the system you know, in terms of being, you know, a doctor or a social worker. You know, there’s some connection. (I: Mhm) So (. ) there, there’s familiarity there too.

K: Mhm, great. And um you know, in terms of again, just the larger system of the medical system that you’re in, I’m wondering what the relationship between the Phoenix House, or the Center I should say, not the Phoenix House, and the larger system is.

Well, I think, I think it’s decent, u::m, h (. ) you know the CHALLENGE often is getting people (. ) to understand that yeah, there are - we’re the same, because it’s mental health treatment, but we’re also different I mean if you - for example, if you have a clinic that only all men come to (. ) you know (. ) there’ are gonna be some issues specific to those men. If you have a clinic where only all women come to, there are gonna be some issues that are specific to only women. you know we have children’s hospital there’s a reason why we call it children’s hospital because we focus on children, okay, and that’s okay! and I think it’s okay to understand people in that context. The battle or the challenge often is with dealing with the larger system, in terms of the relationship, is getting that larger system to understand that, u::m, we’re all part of the same system, but we’re all separate from the same system too. So, sometimes, we’re kind of out here, on an island, because I think this is a very unique clinic you can get some examples that are somewhat similar in terms of how the clinic is made up, in terms the community etcetera, but I think that this is probably one of the few, truly um, community-based mental health facilities u::m (. ) in, in, in East City, I mean where everything is just, in the heart of the community and sometimes it is the battle to get the larger system to understand that, but the good thing is that we have the autonomy (. ) to be able, as long as we follow the guidelines and all those other things which we do, we have the autonomy to still, um, implement our own program. So, it’s important that they understand but, it’s more important that we be able to provide these services for our clients. So if you don’t understand, but I’m still able to provide the services for my client, um that’s okay.

K: And uh, so in your experience in other clinics you’ve worked at this is a very unique kind of set up.

P3: This is extremely unique um.I’m gonna tell you a story. When I first started here the very first and I will never forget this. The very first day I walked in the door, you know, and everyones’ askin’. “are you the new therapist? are you the new therapist?” and I say “yes” you know, “my name is Marcus Flonoy, nice to meet you” a::nd they say oh, “nice to meet you too,” a::nd there was a woman that said, and I know to this day I still remember her, she said to me, she said, “you know, this was our clinic lo::ng before you got here and it’ll be our clinic lo::ng after you’re gone” and I said, “okay.” AND, AND, and then she said to me, “it’s nice to have
you.” Now, WHAT I TOOK FROM THAT was, we’re happy that you’re here (.) um, but understand, this is our house and right now you’re a guest, you know and 7 years later, I’d like to think that I’m a little bit more than a guest [smiles] but I understood it. and I wasn’t offended by it, I completely understood it. I’m a stranger to them, initially and I’m a stranger to the clients initially, a::nd you know, they’re tryin’ to figure out ‘well, who’s this person comin’ in here? I’ve been here, and we know the clinic, we want to know who you are. You know, we wanna know who you are,” you know, “we wanna know who you are.” And I respect that.

K: Mhm, so that was a coworker who said that to you or that was a client?

P3: Mmn, no that was a client.

K: Oh that was a client, okay, wow.

P3: yeah, that was a client, yeah.

K: in a way that speaks volumes I feel like about (.) a feeling that maybe some clients have about this being their home base (P3: exactly, exactly). That’s wonderful in a way – that’s great. Yeah it’s neat. I had another question as you were talking that I can’t quite, u::m (. ) so I guess that kind of leads into another area I wanted to ask you about which is the culture of the center itself and the relationship between staff and clients and staff with each other. That’s something that really struck me as I was here, for the short period of time that I was, and I was wondering if you could say a little bit more about that.

P3: Okay. One of the good things about the relationships between the staff and the clients is that, um, even if you don’t have a particular client (.) you know them, you know them by name. And I think that’s very important because, in a crisis (. ) um, even if someone who’s psychotic (.) when you develop a strong relationship with them outside of the crisis – if the crisis becomes the nature of the relationship, for example, a parent the only time they say something to their child is when they’re angry with them or tellin’ something they did wrong, that becomes the nature of the relationship – so when you’re dealin’ with another individual, you always wanna build the relationship outside of (I: Hm) the potential crisis because when and if there becomes a crisis, that relationship will be more solid. If a CLIENT doesn’t particularly like me or the way I’m doin’ things or you know, we don’t have a good relationship and they have issues, they’re decompensating, it’s gonna intensify it (. ) okay, um, but if we have a strong relationship, then – and I’ve seen this happen- you know, there is a difference in the way that people respond to you. So the relationship is strong is very community orientated, it’s about the individual, u::m (. ) we don’t have a lot of issues in here terms of altercations and things like that because we know our clients, we know when they’re comin’ in we know what they’re upset before they even say anything. We know when they need to vent, we know when they need to process, u::m, we understand them, they understand us. We respect them, they respect us. you treat people with dignity and humanity at all times, you don’t stereotype people, because somebody is different than you doesn’t mean that they’re a bad person. Because someone’s a little louder, doesn’t mean they’re gonna get violent, you know, because, u::m, someone, um, may appear to have an attitude, you don’t know what just happened to them. maybe they should have an attitude you
know it’s about giving people the benefit of the doubt, it’s about respecting and expecting respect. So, we set expectations, but we also try to meet our own expectations, and that’s important because if I’m puttin’ it all on you, then that’s not a collaborative relationship, you know, the treatment is about collaboration, it’s not just about me sayin’ you must do this, you need to do this – that’s the authoritative model. We’re about the collaborative model, the strength-based model, the holistic approach. That means I’m responsible to a certain extent and the client is responsible to a certain extent and the nature of your relationship really will entail how that plays out. So, I think the relationship between the staff and the clients are very good, and I think the major reason why it is, is because they understand that you know (. ) I’m a therapist and you know, you’re a client but I’m no better than you, I don’t have this, this – you know, I don’t try to take authority over you. U::m, I’m hear to help, I’m here to understand, I’m here to build options for you, I’m here to provide options for you um, I have your best interests at heart. It doesn’t mean there won’t be times in the relationship when there are disagreements, but a good therapeutic relationship you talk about that, you know, um, and people feel empowered when they have choices and when you choose to treat someone like a human being and with dignity and respect - and often you’d be amazed at how people don’t get that in any area of their life, and you, and you speak to people like they’re, u::m ( . ) valued, u::m, as people, it makes a difference. So those are the things that we practice and ( ) here.

K: Yeah, I could see how that would help to build the relationship, whether it’s a cross-cultural, cross-racial relationship or not. (P3: exactly, exactly). that openness to the other being however they are and trying to understand that.

P3: - and not bein’ afraid to say, “what did you mean when you said that?” ‘Cause sometimes people will say things and I consider myself to pretty hip but sometimes you’ll get a younger clientele and they’ll use words and I’ll think to myself, “can you tell me what that means?” ‘Cause I don’t know what it means ( . ) and I’m not afraid and you can’t be afraid to put yourself out there like that and say help me to help you, help me to better understand you. The more I can understand you, the better I can help you (I: Mhm) and um bein’ able to do that I think is a positive

K: yeah, that’s really important. I think that’s a real strength of your model here and way of taking up cultural competency in a non ( ) what the way to put it? - stereotyping way,

P3: Mhm, non-threatening, yeah

K: - yeah, it’s not like you’re gonna study a given a culture and know all about

P3: //right, right, right

K: what this is it’s really about how each person experiences their (P3: right, right) own reality and background!

P3: ‘cause we’re not tryin’ to tear people down to build people up, we’re sayin’ you know ( . ) you have things goin’ for you, we want to improve on those things, you know, we’re not tryin’ to
change the way you talk, we’re not tryin’ to change the essence of who you are, we’re not tryin’ to — we accept you, and respect you, but what we’re sayin’ maybe you’re doin’ some things that aren’t healthy you know, and and and there are reasons for that, you know, we’re tryin’ to help you where you’re at but we’re not tryin’ to change, to reconstruct people. You know, ‘cause we don’t see the person as bein’ faulty, we see their conditions as bein’ faulty. We see their treatment in terms of society often as bein’ faulty you know, we see some of the circumstances in terms of what they’ve been exposed to as bein’ faulty, but we don’t see them as being faulty, and actually they’re strong, they’re resilient, um and in many ways people don’t even know that, I mean you talk to them about everything that they’ve been through they’re so busy in it that they don’t understand, “wow, I went through all that, and I’m still here and I’m fighting and I’m winning”

K: So in some ways you end up bear- just being a witness (P3: right) or bearing witness to the fact that they’re still here and they survived it (P3: right, exactly) and that’s so often an issue with people going through serious trauma that they have to realize that they’re still here like sometimes it can feel like they got lost somewhere along the way and didn’t make it through

P3: right, right, right

K: Do we have time for one more question?

P3: Yes, we do.

K: Uh, well, I was wondering about, if you could speak a little bit to some of the major challenges about working here, which you’ve touched on a little bit, or anything that’s an area of improvement for the work here, or something that could be developed more.

P3: um, resources are always a challenge. Um, particularly in a community that has um, multiple needs, um, resources are a big thing in terms of bein’ able to provide, not just therapeutic services ‘cause I think we do a good job of that, but other services um, maybe legal counseling, you know, things like housing programs, um, things like um, you know, um, employment opportunities, you know now these things are out there but there’s such a need for them we need more of these things, Um things to not just help people to be comfortable (.) you know, but to thrive, we want people to thrive you know um, it starts with survival, and then after that we want people to say, well, now that I survived, now I can take it a step further. Now, I can thrive and a lot of these things are lacking, these resources are lacking um and you know for a variety of reasons, you know, we’re in a war right now and a lot of our funds are being depleted and a lot of the programs are bein’ cut um (.) but the bottom line is people need this type of help, people need this type of support. And, it’s NOT, a hand-out it’s a hand-out, I mean this is fundamental stuff, I mean if you tell someone uh, I’m gonna uh, I’m gonna, I want you to run this marathon but um, but I’m gonna take away one leg and one arm, now, you might be able to run it, you know, you might be able to run it but I think it’s probably gonna be a little bit more challenging for you. and, so I think just for people to get the basic opportunities um, is key and I say opportunities, not guaranteed results, but opportunities and I think that’s very very important. ‘Cause you know we have something in this country called the deserving poor and the
undeserving poor, you know, and some people are more, u::m, deserving than others, right, um, often in a poor impoverished community of color, um, you have a lot of undeserving poor - that’s the perception, you know, but you take similar folks and similar situations somehow there’s a little bit more compassion, a little bit more understanding (I: interesting, yeah) they know that! And ‘They’ve been sayin’ that for years! Um, and they’ve been screamin’ it and yellin’ it and I think now they have, they have us to be able to advocate for them. So really the resources are key.

K: I’m just curious about that deserving/undeserving poor. What do you feel like goes into that distinction?

P3: Well, I think unfortunately (. ) we live in a society where when an issue doesn’t impact the majority, in a big way it doesn’t become a bigger issue. I can give you an example- HIV is probably the biggest example, you know, in the late 80s, HIV was considered to be a disease that only affected, homosexual males (. ) u::m, and then as years went on, we found out - so we said “okay,” so HIV, that’s drug users, okay, and then we went on and said it’s not, it’s affecting Blacks, um, then women (. ) HOWEVER, if you LOOK at it, it really only became this big, big issue when white males began to die. Now, it was ALWAYS an issue but when it was – particularly when it was just considered to be a disease you know, suffered by homosexuals and people who use drugs and also African Americans, cause those are the undeserving [said in lower voice with emphasis]. You know I’m not sayin’ everyone feels that way, but there’s a big perception of that, a::nd, so I think right now for instance with trauma, all the violence, all the school violence, we’ve been sayin’ this for years, you know there have been Black kids that have been traumatized for years, I mean it’s great that we’re getting this, publicity but this isn’t new, this stuff isn’t new. it’s just when it hits certain folks than it becomes an overall issue. And that’s sad, it’s sad that we kinda, u::m (. ) unconsciously and sometimes very consciously, value, certain life over other life. And, I think if we just look at it as being trauma, period, as we just look at it as being, whatever the issue is, as crime period, you know you never hear a term like, white-on-white crime but you always here, Black-on-Black crime. it’s crime, it’s crime! I mean it doesn’t matter who does it if you commit – it’s crime. So I think the consistency, just be consistent with whatever we’re doin’ um, and not make those distinctions in term – only when they need to be made, but there’s no need to make a distinction if someone’s suffering and in need, they’re suffering and in need. There shouldn’t be a distinction to be made. who’s suffering you know, u::m is it someone u::m who’s Black or someone who’s White or someone who’s young or someone who’s poor someone who’s a drug user – I mean, we do value human life differently and that’s, that’s sad. It really is sad.

K: I heard, some sort of - I can’t remember where it was, but it was about how murders are punished – if you murder a black man or a white woman or a black woman that you can actually see trends in terms of, and hopefully it’s getting better, in how much jail time.

P3: yeah, sentencing.

K: the sentencing exactly, Even with things like that or like the news coverage
P3: well, I’m sure you follow news, just recently the young Black boy who was killed about 5-6
years ago was shot in the back by State troopers, and they weren’t prosecuted but there was just a
civil judgment made and it’s its a child you know, a child, shot in the back for supposedly
um, on some level bein’ involved with a stolen care. You know, I don’t even know if that’s true,
but that was what was said, but even if it was true – stolen car – death, there’s somethin’ you
know, THERE’S SOMETHIN’ THAT’S JUST NOT RIGHT ABOUT THAT that even if the
toughest person on crime would have to admit that

K: And you’re trying to kind of work within that here, that that’s in the background

P3: Yeah, oh yeah {said in a lower voice, almost whispered, with emphasis}

K: - that there is that stigma or even more than that –

P3: Oh, oh, are you kiddin’ me {said in a lower voice, almost whispered, with emphasis}

- I see so many clients who have lost sons, you know murdered, it’s sad, it’s really is sad, and you
know a lot of times, all they want is just validation of feelings, you know um, I’m a human
being, my son’s a human being, um, and that’s what we try to provide, we try to be that
supportive, supportive individuals

K: Thank you, I’m sure there are more questions I might have and as I listen to this they might
come up, would it be alright if I give you a call just to clarify things

P3: Definitely, definitely,

K: But thank you very much I appreciate your time

{After interview P3 had to see client which was reason for shorter interview however he
commented on how he actually had enjoyed the interview and it felt good to talk about his
experiences – that they often only have meetings to discuss clients at the clinic but don’t
typically have a sustained period of time dedicated just to their thoughts.}
APPENDIX G

Interview Transcript: Sam (P4)

Interview with P4

I: Okay, so how long have you been here?

P4: Uh, since 1995.

I: Okay and can you tell me a little bit about your background and your training and how you came to work here?

P4: Sure, um, I’m a psychiatrist, uh, I’m in East city as a faculty psychiatrist at Western Psychiatric Institute, I came here in 1979, uh, to do research, uh, in neuropsychiatry actually. and um, I began in geriatric psychiatry specifically, uh, to do that, but in parallel to that I was working as a volunteer, um, in antinuclear or so called peace movement groups and um, in the late 1980s as the iron curtain began to drop or as it was being raised, however you want to think about it (I: yeah) there was uh, a movement that I was part of and there was a shift in where the kind of things that people uh, socially minded, politically active were interested in doing that for me led to exploring the so called gang problem as a uh place where as a psychiatrist, I thought I might be able to make more of a contribution that I wanted to make in the peace movement. so I explored this for a couple of years and eventually I got connected with a group called gang peace counsel in Western Pennsylvania which had just formed here in 1993 following the first national gang peace summit in Kansas city and that summer following ’91, ’92, and I became affiliated with that group and um, as. I started doing some work still as a volunteer, the idea of being connected with the Black community of East city seemed of interest to me I’ve always been very socially minded conscientious minded, concerned about uh, issues of social justice and civil rights (I: Mhm) and um, it turned out to fit my clinical obligations, I had to provide some additional outpatient time so I began working here as a staff psychiatrist in 1995 roughly.

I: uh so it sounds like you said it sort of uh, your coming to work here was partially based on your personal interests and values but it also fit into what you had to do professionally

P4: Well, I had to provide some additional clinical service and I much rather prefer doing it this way then doing outpatient geriatrics

I: Uh, so you’ve been here ever since

P4: Mhm.

I: And um, what’s it been like?

P4: Wonderful.
I: Wonderful. Could you say more?

P4: Well, uh, tell me, tell me, what you’re interested in.

I: Well, um you like I said I’m sort of interested broadly in community mental health as sort of its own tradition separate from possibility, depending on how people define it but also the more kind of um cultural, race, class, social issues and how those incorporated into clinical work, Now with you my background in in clinical psychology and other people I’ve interviewed here more so come from a psychological background so it’s especially interesting to me to hear how as a psychiatrist if you would refer to yourself as a community psychiatrist or if there’s some other term…

P4: Yeah, so at that time I was more a faculty psychiatrist who had this kind of orientation of you know providing a service as part of you know, commitment and concern as part of the country’s history

I: What about the history of this area in particular?

P4: Uh, you know it wasn’t it didn’t really matter to me where it was other than i t was convenient, however, um yeah so that wasn’t special per se it was just finding something that was accessible [I: okay]

I: I kind of interrupted you were you going somewhere else with that?

P4: Yeah, so I was saying that um, I didn’t strongly feel an identity for myself as a community psychiatrist at the time, [I:okay] but from a professional and personal standpoint that has clearly been one of the outcomes of doing this work [I: Mhm] So the end of the story is in part is I’m still here, still doing this. Uh, couple of years ago this will be third year in September, I became the Medical Director of this clinic, I made that shift when there was brought on board an administrator who I thought I would be happy to work with and therefore to make the commitment of accepting the responsibility of doing something I was prepared to do. I think I had been asked if I would become the Medical Director up here before that because we had been without a Medical Director for a couple years…by 2005, um so that was one part of it. So, one professional outcome is I became medical director and I’m still here, but then this has grown into a larger uh venture which is very important from a community psychiatry standpoint which is that um, the state of Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth has given to Western Psychiatric Institute also to Lake Eerie college of osteopathic medicine and also to the University of Pennsylvania, grants to create centers for public service psychiatry – the same thing that you’re talking about, community psychiatry basically [I: Mhm] In order to create opportunities for the commonwealth to be able to track and retain psychiatrists who want to serve communities um, serving in poor urban communities is not the focus, it’s much more general than that but that’s been another part of it so that’s why we have as of September of 2008, a Center for public service psychiatry and I am the associate director of that.
I: So through Center what kinds of services are offered:

P4: So the Center is first charge is to create training opportunities for psychiatrists who want to work in the public sector

I: and like you said it’s not just in poor, urban communities but it’s broader than that

P4: it could be urban or rural [I: okay] there are many counties around the state who have virtually no psychiatrists, physician uh, coverage so training and education is one part it, the other part of it is to serve as a Center embodying this mission this outlook and to find ways to um, engage connect with and support the many provider agencies and the many provider professionals who share this concern either because they think it’s important or because they are suffering in some way because they cannot provide the service that they want to. This means traveling to X town or Y town or Z town or many other places to meet people as community mental health professionals and getting a sense of what their lives are like and getting a sense of the way they do their work, and um engaging them we are now doing this in the process of changing attitudes, changing practice, generating new ideas, generating support, um, commitment, collaboration, that we hope is going to give the commonwealth and I should say the country more broadly an opportunity to move in this direction.

I: Mhm. I’m wondering if because there has been this fairly recent interest in supporting these kinds of efforts, was it different before? Was the state of community work, overlooked, not supported

P4: so let me just if I can do two things here, let me go back to your first question and then we can go back to this part, okay?

I: Yes, Uh-huh.

P4: So, since you – uh, to talk a little bit more about being here and this work, I think you’re asking me um, how has it been here and what it’s like, or what do I do here, the challenges, I’m not sure which part

I: all of it [LF]

P4: so it is um, really wonderful work, I totally love doing this, most days I actually really do love doing it and the um, payoff is I see it as providing a clinical service I see it as um making it a little bit more likely that some people get a service or quality of service or opportunity that they wouldn’t otherwise get and um, providing leadership and providing collegial opportunities support for students, like yourself, um but especially psychiatry residents because the way it has been I actually haven’t had much opportunity or role in working with the non-physician students - other people have done that as you know. So anyway, there is clinical service education again, but um since I guess you’re interested in, I’m surmising you’re interested in the values, attitudes, motivation part of this work so I would just say briefly that um, I uh, see work within the African American community as a response to racism and social injustice and the human cost of that so I
really feel there has been a systematic process of establishing creating and maintaining the kind of
um, sort of distress and disorder that people see as quote, unquote, “urban problems” the
problems of you know the African American community the problems of the poor, etcetera. So I
do not uh agree with the view that says this is simply a matter of people being poor or simply a
matter of people being uneducated or simply a matter of people not wanting to do better for
themselves so I really feel that there is a systemic problem here and in order to understand it you
have to have that kind of historical and social political position – that’s my position on it.

I: Yeah, I uh this is a question that I struggle with myself and I’m curious how you deal with it.
How do you address that or incorporate that when you’re in the room with someone individually

P4: working

I: yeah, um I’m sure there’s not a simply answer, but what are your thoughts on how to keep that
presence or awareness and address that in some way

P4: so part of it is nuts and bolts basics of being a decent person beyond any skill professionally
[I: Mhm] so just by bringing your humanity your concern your caringness to people with an
interest in doing the right thing by what’s best for them – um I think by best for them means
what’s best for them in terms of what they think is best for them in some broad sense. So we
think about it, my co-workers and I as like an empowerment strategy the mission is
empowerment um, so the mission is empowerment the mission is doing what is best for them to
help people acquire the sense or a stronger sense, I should say a stronger sense of helping people
better acquire a sense of hope, a sense of power in their lives, and a sense of community, sense of
being a related part of and committed to, supportive of their community. Now their community
means this neighborhood my family this city, this part of the city, this county, this world [I: LF]
this universe, whatever it is, okay? [I: yeah] so the idea is to see this kind of flexible, so that’s the
way I think about it. so the mission here is empowerment and it’s empowering people to
strengthen their own sense of power in the community.

I: so are those values part of what – or the focus on the values part of what differentiates
community work from um, traditional kinds of psychiatry – not that those aren’t there but the
specific focus on it?

P4: Well, do you know about the recovery movement in psychiatry?

I: A little bit, yeah.

P4: So, um, so the recovery movement in psychiatry is taking the little crystal of recovery from
alcoholics anonymous and twelve step programs and uh generalizing that a a strategy as a goal,
as a process to sort of guide um all aspects of psychiatry for people who aren’t connected with it
and who don’t identify with it, recovery is um is separate from what they do, but that reflects the
state of psychiatric world and not how the work has to be done. So for me, it doesn’t matter
whether I’m here or somewhere else I’m always doing empowerment [I: Mhm] You don’t have
to be a psychotherapist to do empowerment [I: oh, absolutely not] um, doing medication checks
the right way can have the same outcome, in that sense, *if the world was the way it should be*
(according to me) all treatment would be recovery oriented, the public service psychiatry center
is really built around the idea that uh, the system will better serve it’s ends if all treatment is
recovery oriented

I: recovery oriented meaning including all of the - kinds of like empowerment, being present
where that’s person is at, all the stuff you mentioned is that what you are referring to?

P4: yes, so i-it’s totally compatible with what we’re doing okay? although in practice it would
make differences there are certain things that are being done which may not be affordable in a
recovery oriented system, there are certain things being done that may not be in the best interest
of people um, when you have to decide what’s more important, because in the end there is a
practicality part of this so the finances are a reality and uh, the politics of money has it that some
things get funded and some things don’t so in that sense knowing what neurotransmitters are out
of alignment in someone with schizophrenia is related to recovery BUT it may not be worth the
dollars to pay for that when there are people who can’t afford the medications.

I: to pay for…

P4: for that research, for that kind of research. It doesn’t mean you shouldn’t do the research that
determines it may be needed knowing that molecule could be the most powerful efficient way to
help people have a sense that they are empowered, I’m just saying it’s complicated like that.

I: Yeah, and you bring other dimensions that I’ve wondered about especially when i was working
here, the economic and the political dimension that are also part fo the work and um when you
were first talking about affordable I was thinking about clinicians time also, you know that there
is also that piece of it – I wonder how that impacts your work if you’ve noticed that there is more
pressure economically especially since you’ve been doing this for a while, have you noticed any
shifts where there is more pressure from insurance companies or focus on productivity or any of
that stuff

P4: sure, we feel that – life is pretty crazy most days of the week. so it takes a lot to kind of stay
grounded not be angry, not get frustrated, to feel that despite all that we are doing something that
is valuable but I think the way you framed it before is really useful you know how do we bring
recovery principals to the footsteps of somebody who walks in your door for help so, it’s like an
outlook and um then you know you have their values, their skills, that you make use of so that
you see that this is what the complaint is about – just like what do we do when we talk to
somebody, we try to understand from *their* vantage what the problem is, from *their* vantage what
is important, from *their* vantage, what are the obstacles to life looking more like they would like
it to look and then we go to work. There’s negotiation, clinical skills, psychotherapy skills,
whatever, around the alliance building about acquiring a shared definition of the problem about
uh, then doing something that is gonna make a difference. So it begins right there – if you walk
in my office that’s where it starts.
I: Yeah, and that’s uh, again I don’t have background in medicine but it makes me wonder you did mention some of the recovery values are not necessarily considered most valuable in the world of psychiatry in general.

P4: Yeah, but I don’t think this is a physicians problem – the profession may have a double dose of it but you can have a very non-recovery oriented, non-empowerment oriented professional without being – so you don’t have to be a physician to be in that place.

I: Sure, sure, I guess um, I’m just thinking about what does it mean to do what you say you’re trying to do with your patients – what does it mean to be living through or being a community psychiatrist here and doing community work and how you’re viewed there within the field?

P4: So the question is how we’re viewed. You know, I’m not sure what a useful answer to that would be, so maybe we can come back to it, Katy right? [I: okay, yeah] Uh, it’s mostly viewed with indifference um, and lack of awareness [I: Mhm okay] but there are lots of places where this is prevalent, I mean I think there really is a top-down, as well as a bottom up, there really is a top-down movement in this direction. Uh, it’s very easy to find within the American Psychiatric Association um, people who have been presidents of organization and lots of other places of people who totally support this outlook so at leadership levels I think there is a lot of support for it – uh, but when it comes to making decisions in your backyard or his backyard that can be a bit more of a problem. Uh, private practice can be recovery oriented but um if you’re not involved in serving underserved populations there are certain aspects of the recovery challenge or mission which are not being served by the system – right, so that’s a bit of a problem. On the other hand um I don’t remember the data but it’s substantial that the number of psychiatrists who are working in some sort of community setting now is very high now – I think like 40%. [I: Hm, that’s interesting] So it’s no longer a purely private practice kind of model or ideal, so I think that is changing.

I: Okay, that’s helpful. I’m interested most in your perspective.

P4: I mean you could find people who have that view okay, and actually in terms of taking in what I’m telling you – you know I’m not a mainstream kind of person on this kind of thing okay? And also I don’t easily get discouraged and I have a lot of experience at this point uh, you know feeling great about things that a lot of people don’t really care about and I certainly don’t perceive the indifference or the opposition because it really doesn’t’ matter to me, it really doesn’t matter to me.

I: Okay, that’s helpful. I’m interested most in your perspective.

P4: I’m saying to you though to tell you that I’m not a good person to ask about how other people think because I’m not that knowledgeable about it I’m very limited in terms of what I can
actually read and study and so on and so forth, and then my outlook I’m so like a mission oriented person that it doesn’t phase me.

I: Yeah, you strike me as you’re focused on what you want to do and the importance of your work and so you really you kind of zone the rest of that out it’s probably helpful style where there is just so much going on

P4: However, however, actually so you’re making me think – is that really true? For instance I work in a very current traditional department which is very large and is more in certain ways contemporary, transformation oriented recovery orientated and just getting on track with that and I really see as part of my work bringing this outlook to other people who are receptive to it. And I am very good at doing that, okay? and so there’s a way in which I am actually very aware of it and it is like the work. I teach residents, this is a teaching program for residents as you know, and they really like coming up here, they gave us the program of the year award people are coming back this year who were here last year so I really see as what I’m doing and what we’re doing as getting the message out there – carrying the fire so to say. Do you know about carrying the fire?

I: It’s the title of the book the people who went to the moon for the first time [I: oh, okay] so the person who stayed on the satellite I mean who stayed on the space ship

P4: wrote a book about the whole process which he called carrying the fire – I didn’t read the book

I: [LF] it’s a good title though

P4: but I see myself as somebody who carries the fire, so I was raised in a Jewish home and the European holocaust was a formative experience of my childhood and I grew up very frightened and uh, very limited very unsure of myself and (2) um, I eventually learned that the point of my father saying all sorts of terrible things about the Germans and being Nazis and all that stuff that the pay off for all that, for hearing all of that, cause I really didn’t go for that, because he was also very idealistic person and thought he was supposed to respect other people and so I kind of, I didn’t kind of I did put this together for myself – but what my dad was saying that when bad things happen you don’t sit around when atrocities are being committed the trick is to get yourself in gear, maybe put yourself at a little bit of risk, maybe a a lot um and um, that’s what’s important that’s how you know what’s important… but why was I telling you that?...Oh, about carrying the fire right, so I feel like I’ve been tuned into where the atrocities are being committed and I think the realities of day to day life for people who are poor especially for the peoples who have been systematically oppressed, okay, in the United States, that is primarily people of African descent and Native Americans, they are different than any other immigrant group. There are many places where you find serious poverty, like I said, it’s not just a matter of being poor so there’ many other places where you find serious poverty but the Native American population um, and the African American population has been systematically oppressed by every level of American life to very present day so I think that’s atrocious.
I: and you were drawn to work with that community with one of those communities anyway
partially because of–

P4: well I worked I did work in the Navaho area – not for such a good reason though, I wanted
not to be in the Vietnam War

I: Okay

P4: Those are my, those are my fear years. So I was a progressive person but uh, now it’s kind of
different it’s kind of different

I: the image of the flame is really rich – what do you feel like the fire is, what are you carrying?

P4: you know, It’s the uh, feeling the knowledge the conviction that’s important, actually there’s
another dimension I should talk to you about, the spiritual dimension but um– but fire is like
FIRE IN YOUR BELLY! M’kay, uh, so that’s some sort of conviction some sort of intuition that
you can make a difference. You know fire is about transformation, remember the alchemists you
know transforming lead into gold [I: yeah] so when you see that there are problems that you can
make a difference to and that those differences have value you know that’s what fire is about.

I: that’s a beautiful image, um, and I can tell that there is so much personally that you bring to
your work and your own background…did your family immigrate here?

P4: Uh, no my grandparents immigrated here, so a lot of Jewish life, Jewish culture
it’s coherent it’s supportive, it’s scared, it’s paranoid, and it’s very competent, so those are the
things. But for a long time I felt like I had mostly the fear part of it

I: Uh, huh, and then it turned into something else it seems

P4: Yeah, well I was very interested in psychotherapy and psychoanalysis so that was my way of
dealing with my own personal problems [I: Yeah, I can relate to that [LF]] so that was a big part
of it so I’m really a psychotherapist at heart, that’s another reason why I do things the way I do
them. So I feel like a I’m a psychotherapist at heart and I tell that to residents so that they can
have a model of docs, psychiatrist who can be kind of mainstream as far as science and
psychiatry and still have that connection

I: have the human side, yeah. I mean its seems fairly recent that psychiatry moved away from
that more, that it used to be much more integrated…Well, I don’t want to keep you if you have
other appointments, I mean I could keep talking to you but

P4: There’s a question for me then that will help me decide. So the purpose of your research is to
find out what kinds of things?

I: Well, it’s very uh, open ended um, and I based my research project on what I had experienced
here, I had so many questions about what does it mean as a white therapist to be coming and
doing this work in the hill district, and how do my clients see me, and what does it mean you
know I talked to Earl a lot about funding this clinic and wondered about it’s position within the
rest of the University Medical Center so my interests are varied and the research project- the
question are coming from the data in talking to you and others and and integrating with my own
observations here, I want to tell a story and highlight themes of this work because I feel this
work is so valuable and a lot of past studies were not quite as qualitatively focused and also I’m
wanted to look at the systemic dimension – so long answer

P4: no, that’s perfect. so I’d like to take another minute If I can, do you have time?

I: Absolutely, I have as long as you’d like to talk to me. I just didn’t want to – I know that your
time is valuable

P4: that’s right so, there are 2 or 3 things that cross my mind that I want to share with you, okay?
First of all like perspectives to have on culture and political reality okay um, one which I think
is like a message to get out into the world is that uh, a big part of what we cal the white world
and the black world is about history and culture and that the biggest problem with the white
world is to re-identify itself with culture, all right? Specifically what I’m thinking is just this very
simple idea that we don’t really know, what our cultural identity is when we call ourselves white,
all right (I: Mhm) and um, there is a historical and subterrean unconscious reason why we don’t.
So you know, the general reality is that there is white America and then there are people from
other countries (1) okay. So, Asisan American, Afircan Americans (I: right) other continents I
should say, okay [1] so there’s that kind of bakcgournd and uh th::e white world, would perhaps
benefit from just remembering the simple fact hat we are Europen culture in a general sense,
from different countries, etc, but the idea is that there are Africans Americans, there are Native
Americans, and Asian Americans, etc, so White American is really European America and that is
a progressive and transformative label because um, it takes us a little bit beyond the place of
being the class of privilege and the white oppressor so-so the reason I think why white sticks,
okay and everybody else is from another continent is a little bit of white domination (I shouldn’t
have said the word here) but it’s part of being the white upper class the white oppressor etc.
okay, so that tissue of like what do you call it what is the problem is related to this because the
tendency WE white folks have to talk about about the problems THEY have is from a very white
perspective, okay (I: Mhm) and so there’s another thing, I think the existential people know
about this a little bit so you know about so-called “whiteness studies” (I: Mhm) so I’m talking
about whiteness studies, so whiteness studies, about what it means to be white, okay and the long
and short of it is that if you wanted to change a label that would make a difference, um, I think it
would be really powerful for people to identify with the label of European because that would be
transformative (I: Hm) because moving from being white to Europen is moving from being
everything that whiteness embodies, um, to being just another culture in this multicultural uh, rather extraordinary country of ours (I: Mhm). So, that’s one thing I wanted to mention okay,
um. and then and then along with that there is the sort of politics of domination and um, the fact
that the white dominant part of our country has been driven especially in relationship to the
[inaudible, African] experience by profit and economics, so it’s really important to kind of
explore what the payoff is for being white, what the payoff is for helping other people and as I’m
sure you know, the downside of being white and helping other people is that you unconsciously
cast yourself into the position of an imperial controller, a colonist etcetera, and what looks like
being nice and liberal is actually kind of a self-serving way of token, not that being white is bad
but there is that kind of structural problem, anyway, so I think it’s really important to kind of nail
that and then within that you know is, who are the white folks who are particularly influential
they tend to be wealthy people and they tend to be men (I: Mhm), so there’s the issue of gender
and feminism in there, which I think is really important to consider...so that’s one part of it, I
just wanted to say all of that. Um, And then also, so the point is that IS what this kind of work IS
about, okay? So the public psychiatry the community psychiatry outlook is for me okay,
basically an issue of social justice and all these other problems around the structural problems
the historical forces that kind of create and perpetuate a social injustice, it’s not just about being
humane and nice [social justice is a trick here]

I: It requires a lot of self-reflection, constantly looking back on one’s self and how I’m viewing
an interpreting what I’m looking at and how that is informed by my background and my position.
I’m glad that you brought up the issue of whiteness because it was I hesitated a little bit to do this
type of research – going into this urban area doing research into urban areas with African
Americans because diversity is often seen as having to do with the “other” diversity doesn’t
mean =

P4: =white, that’s right

I: but I do feel there’s so much going on, there so much more that in that, and that reflecting can
be incorporated into it - so I’m really glad that you mentioned all of that it’s very important

P4: and then there’s like an internal part of the clinical work okay, um. u::m. that when you have
people dealing with their own race and cultural identifiers, whatever they are especially here, but
we’ll just simplify here “black” and “white” although there is no simple black and no simple
white okay, so that means many thins to many people but in any case that means working
through the emotionality and psychology of that and creating working environments in which
that reality is kind of part of the work and that is part of the understanding that it is safe and
valued to dig into it is really difficult in doing that here, going back to the beginning of what
we’re doing here, so doing that here, I think, it actually, it has been very – um I fell very um.
really uh, proud, actually about the way in which Earl and I, and other Marcus has been here for
a long time and others, who you might not know, Thelma we’re all part of a process which is
extraordinarily healthy and open about. dealing what it means to be who and what we are.

I: And you talk with each other and those issues =

P4: =we talk about that, yeah. in moving in we talk about ourselves where we are and where we
come from and also how this all plays out with the work with our patients/clients. so that’s one
other piece okay, um. so that’s a whole story in and of itself which I’m sure you’ve thought lots
about. So – the other thing I wanted to tell you uh, that I think is really important and you
reminded me about this when you mentioned about being existential, okay. the existential folks
who I hear talk about this seem to be talking about being in the here-and-now with another
person as kind of a phenomenological, experiential truth and that’s really important and not
getting lost in you theories and constructs and your reflections on how things came to be the way
they are etc. so that’s important and I agree with all that. But, um, one thing I feel is uh, the existential point of view is at risk for missing is uh, the spiritual reality of the present and that’s another dimension that is not existential the way it seems to be I’ve only read a page or two here and there the existential psychologists in general may not be orientated to the spiritual dimension. And my guess is that it has to do with the historical piece of how it came ot be and there is certainly existential people who, at least one person I know from Duquesne who I did know, who appreciates this and it’s a critique he might agree with, but it’s totally possible to integrate an existential and spiritual point of view with each other but um the existential point of view seems to me I’m remembering Norman Mahler for example at the moment, seems to me to shy a little bit away from um, from um morality and ethics from human values and in the interest of not being judging of other people existential points of view sound to me like there’s no place for having opinions about what is good and bad because there is the implication is that you can’t do that without doing injury to other people’s existential realities or some such thing and uh, I think that’s crazy okay? that’s actually not true and there’s a misunderstanding about what the current reality is

I: yeah, that is a criticism I’ve heard against some of the more post-modern ways of understanding experience

P4: so there’s are points of view and understanding bout what it means to be aware of what’s happening that offers a way to respect all of that but actually go to another level with it. If you haven’t come across Ken Wilbur?

I: It sounds familiar

P4: so Ken Wilbur has really to nail this problem and help us see how to move beyond and through it he’s not the only person to know how to do it but his work is essentially around this question, okay? and um. (3) and the core of knowing how to do that has to do with going back into yourself and looking more clearly actually in an existential way, phenomenologically about who and what you are because it turns out it’s like a testable hypothesis it turns out that um the self that has to be respectful of all points of view, is a fiction, it’s a construct and um, uh, and um, in religious traditional and more generally spiritual traditions have been working with that and um, integrating that into so spiritual practice for me is like the centerpiece, we talked about carrying the fire okay? so I’ve become a very deeply spiritual person over the last 15 years and um, I have discovered a lot of really important things, pleasure and others stuff, by doing that and it’s relevant to this work, that’s why I’m telling you this. and I feel that amongst people who take on ambitions and feel it’s important to carry the fire, you’ll find this kind of orientation because it’s part and parcel of what it mean to see that you’re doing something that has value beyond the value of your own personal life, alright? so I guess the question is how do you embody that, how do you realize that alright? so I think that the work here for me, the work of being here is really part and parcel of having that kind of orientation toward myself and everybody else. So, when people walk into my office um, when people walk in here I have said a few times, this is a person who is totally humiliated and ashamed of everything. that he or she has done, okay. so my orientation is and I have said this on occasion that when you walk into my office, you are a child of god, okay? so uh, for me when you talk about empowerment that’s
actually where empowerment comes from. now I’m not talking about believing in god, I actually
don’t believe in god, okay?

I: yeah, it doesn’t’ have that ring to it, to me at least

P4: so when you see that, when you see that, then things become pretty amazing, they become
very great, so I like seeing it like that because it does the job for me and I works really well. and,
uh it makes a difference alright? but it has to do with like the whole nature of this work. so for
many people, and certainly this is true of within the African community that there is an intuition
and unconscious knowledge, that kind of transcendent self that transcendent sense of who I am
and who you are important is what keeps us going and makes it so that there is no doubt that of
course I’m doing this of course it makes sense. except on the days when it doesn’t

I: [LF] yeah, there’s always gotta be those days. so when you see people how often do you see
them if you’re working with a patient. do you see them like monthly or more often than that?

P4: yeah I mean for me, uh, officially most people are seen every month etc. but for me it doesn’t
matter, 15 minutes every month – you’re still a child of god every 3 months even 30 minutes it’s
always relationship building so like so many things that I really try to share with residents is that
you shouldn’t be confused about what a med check is about and they say well, we only have 15
minutes and I try to help them see that that if they really know their stuff – that means they have
a whole hour in a year

I: Mhm, so you just look at it completely differently. Um, I have a question that takes us back to
last winter I guess, I was curious about we had holiday party over at the auditorium and you
played something

P4: A child’s Christmas in Wales, Dylan Thomas – did you like the story? Had you read it
before?

I: Yeah, and no I hadn’t read it. I was just wondering about what led you to want to tell that
story?

P4: Oh, I see. In college I had an English teacher freshmen year of college who made us write an
essay about a poem and the poem I chose was a Dylan Thomas poem called Fern hill and I was
very much not a poetry reader at the time at the end of the year or something I came across a
Dylan Thomas record and I was curious to hear him recite it and it was A Child’s Christmas in
Whales so I just loved it was wonderful and I decided that maybe when I’m old enough to have
grandchildren I’ll memorize it and recite it for them. so about 15 years ago or something like
that, I started to memorize it and then I started doing it different places, that’s how it came about.

I: neat. well do you have anything else that we haven’t talked about

P4: You’ve been a good audience
I: well I really appreciate you talking to me and I have to say that doing these interviews I really have enjoyed it.

P4: I bet, I bet, what you’re doing is wonderful.

I: it’s just a matter of organizing it and figuring out what to do with it.

{tape recorder turned-off}