Psychology as the study of behavior hinges on the basic premise that the foundation for knowledge is stable. Such stability hinges on a solid methodology, such as good sampling techniques. Unfortunately, psychology has been a science and a profession largely built on majority concepts by individuals of the majority culture.

In this chapter, this issue is examined in light of ever-changing demographic patterns in the United States. Personnel issues are first discussed and curricular issues are later addressed. Potential solutions to the problem of the paucity of ethnic minority students and faculty are considered. It is important to note that such problems were thought to have been solved when concerns were raised in the 1960s and 1970s. In reality, this chapter suggests, the current status of ethnic minorities in the pedagogy of psychology is quite disappointing.

DEMOGRAPHIC SHIFTS

The composition of the American population has been changing dramatically over the past 10 to 15 years. Although this change has been more
noticeable in some states (such as California, Texas, and Florida) than in others, the trend is nationwide. In 1980, ethnic minorities made up 20.2% of the U.S. population. The 1990 U.S. Census (United States Department of Commerce News, 1991) reflects the tremendous growth that has been experienced by ethnic minority communities just within the past decade. In 1990, African Americans constituted 12.1% of the population; Hispanics, 9%; Asian Americans, 2.9%; and American Indians, 0.8%. It is interesting to note that the percentage of change in the population from 1980 to 1990 for Whites was 6%, for African Americans, 13.2%; for American Indians, 37.9%; for Hispanics, 53%; and for Asian Americans, 107.8%. Hence, ethnic minority groups are growing more rapidly than Whites. This demographic trend is not new and has been projected and predicted by demographers. Yet with these demographic trends in mind, has psychology positioned itself for the future? Will psychology be a relevant science and profession that will be able to deal with the changing demographic composition of this country? To answer these questions, we must trace the relationship and involvement of psychology with ethnic minorities to determine from its past and a present course of action what psychology's future direction will be.

ETHNIC MINORITIES AND ACADEMIC PSYCHOLOGY

Students

The representation of ethnic minorities within the field of psychology has been a concern for over three decades. However, data collection on the percentage of ethnic minorities in the field has not matched the expressions of concern. Bayton, Roberts, and Williams (1970) stated that it was difficult to obtain estimates of the number of ethnic minority members who were professional psychologists. They estimated that there were 200 African American PhD psychologists in 1970. It was not until after 1970 that surveys began to assess the ethnic minority representation within the field. One of the early attempts was made by Boxley and Wagner (1971), who surveyed clinical training programs and found that 4.5% of the students enrolled in clinical programs were members of an ethnic minority. Two years later, Padilla, Boxley, and Wagner (1973) surveyed 114 clinical training programs. They noted that there was a significant increase in the percentage of 1st-year minority students as compared with advanced students and that this might be a cause for guarded optimism.

Kennedy and Wagner (1979) also found an increase in minority student recruitment from 1970 to 1977. During this period, there was a tremendous growth in the percentage of ethnic minority students enrolled in graduate clinical psychology programs. In 1970, 4.4% of graduate students...
enrolled in these programs were members of an ethnic minority. By 1972, this percentage had increased to 7.3%, and by 1977, to 13.5%. Ethnic minority enrollment in graduate psychology programs declined and reached a leveling point of 11.4% by 1986 (National Science Foundation, 1988). Pion, Kohout, and Wicherski (1989) also confirmed that by 1988 this percentage had remained stable, with 11.3% of the graduate students being members of an ethnic minority. Zins and Halsell (1986) reported similar findings in the area of school psychology, in which 11.5% of the students were members of an ethnic minority.

Thus, in the early 1970s, there was not only a rise in concern about the representation of ethnic minorities in psychology but also there were active attempts to recruit ethnic minorities into the field. The increase in ethnic minority graduate students was a clear barometer that measured psychology's commitment to ethnic minority representation. Unfortunately, this commitment was not enduring. Although the concerns surrounding ethnic minorities that were ushered in during the late 1960s and early 1970s are still voiced today, the behavioral indicators of this commitment, as measured by ethnic minority student enrollment, leveled off by the late 1970s. This is evident as one reviews the data on ethnic minorities in higher education. Data collected by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (cited in Kohout & Pion, 1990), indicate that undergraduate enrollment of ethnic minorities in psychology experienced a modest but gradual increase from 17.7% in 1976 to 19.8% in 1986. The percentage of ethnic minorities who graduated with a bachelor of arts (BA) degree had also increased from 11% in 1976 to a high of 15% in 1981. However, from 1981 until 1985, the percentage of ethnic minority psychology students receiving a BA declined to 12.7% (Kohout & Pion, 1990).

At the level of graduate education, as mentioned earlier, ethnic minority student enrollment had experienced an initial increase in the early 1970s but leveled off toward the end of the decade. In 1980, 11.8% of the psychology graduate students were members of an ethnic minority. By 1988, the percentage had remained relatively static at 11.3% (Kohout & Pion, 1990; Pion et al., 1989).

The same trend was evident for psychology doctoral recipients. Kohout and Pion (1990) found that by 1987 the percentage of new psychology doctoral recipients who were members of an ethnic minority had increased from 6.5% in 1977 to 8.5% in 1987; a modest 2% growth in 10 years. Sanchez, Demmler, and Davis (1990) and Howard et al. (1986) also reported an initial and gradual increase in minority representation from 5.2% in 1975 to 8.6% in 1984 and to 9.2% in 1986. However, the authors noted that this rate of increase had stabilized by the middle of the 1980s.

When the total percentage of doctoral psychologists in the field is reviewed, the limited and relatively static progress psychology has made in
increasing the representation of ethnic minorities, especially in light of the increasing growth of ethnic minorities in the general population, becomes evidently clear. In an early census of psychological personnel, Stapp, Tucker, and VandenBos (1985) reported that in 1983 4.9% of the doctoral psychologists were members of an ethnic minority (2.2% African American, 1.5% Hispanic, 1% Asian American, and 0.2% American Indian). By 1985, ethnic minorities grew to represent 5.1% of all doctoral psychologists. Howard et al. (1986) and Kohout and Pion (1990) noted that this was the same percentage as 10 years earlier.

Thus, after a careful review of the data on ethnic minority representation over the past three decades, it appears that there was initial progress but it was relatively short lived. Since 1980, progress has been nonexistent. The percentage of ethnic minority graduate students has not changed in over 10 years, even though undergraduate enrollment in psychology programs has been shown to be steadily, although modestly, increasing since 1976. Ethnic minority representation in the field of psychology has been approximately 5% since 1975, regardless of all of the efforts to recruit more ethnic minorities. Recent data from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) suggest that few ethnic minority high school students are planning to pursue psychology as a course of study. For example, of the students who took the Advanced Placement Test in Psychology the first year it was administered, only 4% were African American (ETS, 1992). What impact do these trends have on the teaching of psychology?

Faculty

The preceding data have tremendous impact on the training of psychologists and the teaching of psychology. One immediate implication is the lack of ethnic minority faculty: A paucity of minority students results in a shortage of minority faculty. Early studies (Boxley & Wagner, 1971; Padilla et al., 1973) found that in 1970 there were only 3.2% ethnic minority faculty members and that by 1972 the percentage had increased insignificantly to 3.3%. From 1972 to 1988, there was an increase of approximately 2%. Kohout, Wicherski, and Pion (1991), in their survey of graduate departments of psychology, found that the number of ethnic minority faculty members has shown little change in the past 10 years. Approximately 5% of all psychology faculty are members of an ethnic minority, with African Americans constituting the largest group (3%), followed by Hispanics and Asian Americans (1% each) and American Indians (at less than 1%). It is also interesting to note that ethnic minorities are significantly less likely to be tenured and more likely to be in tenure-track or non-tenure-track positions. In 1980–1981, the percentage of tenured ethnic minority faculty in doctoral departments was 3.1%, with 50.2% of the ethnic minority in faculty positions being tenured, 42.8% in tenure-track
positions, and 7% in non-tenure-track positions (Russo, Olmedo, Stapp, & Fulcher, 1981). In 1988-1989, Kohout et al. (1991) found that 4% of the tenured faculty were members of an ethnic minority, with 38% in tenure-track positions and 13% in non-tenure-track positions. Although there was an increase after 9 years in the percentage of tenured ethnic minority faculty, a larger percentage of the ethnic minority faculty were found to be in non-tenure-track positions.

Ethnic minorities are also more likely to be associate or assistant professors than full professors. One possible explanation for this is that ethnic minorities are new professionals and have not accumulated the required time in academia. However, after 10 years, one would expect some change. In 1980, ethnic minorities made up 2% of all full professors, 4% of associate professors, 8% of assistant professors, and 13% of lecturers or instructors (Stapp, 1981). By 1988-1989, only 3% of all full professors, 6% of associate professors, 11% of assistant professors, and 14% of lecturers or instructors were ethnic minorities (Kohout et al., 1991). Such a distribution influences the pedagogy of psychology. However, as Garcia (1980) astutely pointed out, “the concentration of Black faculty members in the junior ranks has several negative consequences. It severely limits the type of support they can provide for students, and it diminishes their overall effectiveness.”

Indeed, recently unpublished data by Wicherski & Kohout (in press) suggest that minority faculty are less likely than White faculty to be tenured. White (1992), with the National Science Foundation, reported that White psychologists constituted 95% of college and university slots, with 54% in tenured positions, 14% in tenure-track positions but not tenured, and 9% in non-tenure-track positions. Ethnic minorities fared much worse. Only 38% were tenured, 23% were in tenure-track positions but not tenured, and 8% in non-tenure-track positions.

The consequences for psychology of a lack of ethnic minority faculty affects the profession's capability to train future psychologists to work with ethnic minority populations. Early concerns about the failure to adequately train ethnic minority and nonminority students has been echoed by a number of authors (Dean, 1977; Dean, Parker, & Williams, 1976; Green, 1981; Sue & Sue, 1977).

ETHNIC MINORITY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

Rationale for Diversity

The lack of ethnic minority faculty or ethnic minority-oriented course curricula causes a cyclical reaction that has consequences for the relevancy of psychology for society as a whole and for ethnic minorities in particular.
Ethnic minorities today have a broad range of professional options from which to choose. Some make career choices on the basis of economic factors (e.g., to make better money), and others are motivated by interpersonal reasons (e.g., to contribute to the betterment of society and their ethnic group). In the latter instance, without sufficient ethnic minority presence, either in faculty representation or in training curricula, psychology holds little attraction for ethnic minorities. Hence, ethnic minorities may enter other, more viable scientific or helping professions. Jones (1987) pointed out four reasons ethnic minorities are not pursuing doctoral studies in psychology. First, there is the concern about the financial support necessary for 4 to 5 years of training. Second, poor undergraduate preparation or training has limited admission into psychology graduate programs. Third, ethnic minorities are not inclined to see psychology as a professional career in the same way they may see law, medicine, teaching, or social work. Finally, ethnic minorities are not mentored or guided at the undergraduate level to pursue graduate training in psychology.

Recruitment of ethnic minorities into psychology historically has been motivated by the federal policy of affirmative action. However, affirmative action has, over the years, taken on a pejorative connotation, symbolizing "less than qualified" (Ijima Hall, 1990). Ethnic minority faculty and students are viewed, by some, as having obtained entry into academia only through "special" consideration. Their qualifications are, therefore, judged as less than the standard or norm. Jones (1990) and Hammond (1990) both advocate that "affirmative diversity" rather than the moral obligatory stance of affirmative action should propel strategies for ethnic minority recruitment. Affirmative diversity is defined, according to Jones (1990, p. 18), "as the affirmation of the fundamental value of human diversity in society, with the belief that enhancing diversity increases rather than diminishes quality." From this perspective, recruitment of ethnic minorities would not be seen as a moral or legal obligation but rather as a strategy that would increase diversity and therefore enhance the appropriateness and quality of psychology education.

Recruitment and Retention Strategies

Recruitment and retention strategies for ethnic minorities in psychology have been addressed for many years. Potter (1974), in her 1972 survey of 69 clinical psychology programs, indicated that 34% of the programs recruited ethnic minorities. Guzman and Messenger (1991) found, in a survey of doctoral psychology programs, that 62% of the 230 responding

\[1\] The survey was sponsored by the Committee on Ethnic Minority Human Resource Development, the Minority Fellowship Program, the Committee on Graduate Education and Training, and the Committee on Accreditation of the APA.
programs had a departmental plan for recruiting ethnic minority students, and 54%, for recruiting ethnic minority faculty. Obviously, there has been an increase in recruitment activities in the past 20 years. Yet, in light of the static rate of ethnic minority involvement in psychology and academia, why have such recruitment efforts not been successful? A possible reason may be the manner in which recruitment is conducted. To understand better the recruitment strategies currently used by psychology programs, Guzman and Messenger (1991), in their survey, assessed which recruitment and retention interventions were found to be successful or not successful. The results reported in Table 1 indicate that most of the strategies for student recruitment worked moderately well. However, developing ethnic minority-oriented financial aid development and establishing ethnic minority admissions committees were the most effective recruitment initiatives, followed by adjusting admission criteria, using minority students, faculty, and alumni to recruit, and providing visible minority role models. Of particular note was the fact that simply having a list of ethnic minority students who had taken the Graduate Record Exams or who had shown early interest in psychology was not perceived as an effective recruitment strategy.

Regarding recruitment of ethnic minority faculty, the findings were not encouraging. There was no particular recruitment intervention that seemed to be significantly effective (see Table 2).

Bernal, Barron, and Leary (1983), in their study of ethnic minority-oriented graduate school application materials, found a modest but significant relationship between ethnic minority information in application packets and the proportion of minority students in the program. Two pieces of information were thought to be important to minority student recruitment—the description of ethnic minority training opportunities and the use of special admission criteria for ethnic minorities.

Kagehiro, Mejia, & Garcia (1985), in their advocacy to promote diversity, list seven short- and three long-term recruitment strategies. The short-term strategies include contacting universities with large ethnic minority undergraduate populations, contacting ethnic associations, having the departmental recruitment committee develop liaisons with other recruitment committees either on campus or with other universities, advertising in ethnic minority publications, using student locator services, using a multiple institution graduate application process, and contacting community agencies employing ethnic minorities in mental health or related occupations. For the long-term strategies, Kagehiro et al. suggest that psychology departments should become involved in career development at the high-school level, foster involvement of ethnic minority graduate students in ethnic minority communities to serve as role models, and, finally, recruit paraprofessional interviewers from survey research organizations that conduct studies with ethnic minority communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Never used</th>
<th>Do not know/no response</th>
<th>Have used</th>
<th>Level of success: No. reporting (of those who have used)</th>
<th>Mean value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None (1)</td>
<td>Minimal (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic fellowships/scholarships</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority-oriented fellowships/scholarships</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistantships</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special orientation for minority students</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority admissions committee</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority-oriented program/curriculum</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using minority students/faculty/alumni to recruit</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority role models</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority recruiting brochures/pamphlets</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE student locator service</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA MFP &quot;Early List&quot;</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted admissions criteria</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to minority recruitment fairs</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Guzman & Messenger, 1991. GRE = Graduate Record Exam; APA = American Psychological Association; MFP = Minority Fellowship Program.
### TABLE 2
Success Rates of Faculty Recruitment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Never used</th>
<th>Do not know/ no response</th>
<th>Have used</th>
<th>Level of success: No. reporting (of those who have used)</th>
<th>Mean value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APA Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs/MFP</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43 23 29 5 4</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita banks</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31 13 7 3 0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using minority faculty to recruit</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29 25 34 20 15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using alumni to recruit</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28 22 25 11 4</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using school location to recruit</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37 25 27 18 6</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of minority adjunct faculty</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>28 25 27 15 7</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University affirmative action office</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>55 41 33 17 10</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements in ethnic minority newsletters</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>56 33 40 16 5</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements in APA Monitor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>52 39 55 28 13</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Guzman & Messenger, 1991. APA = American Psychological Association; MFP = Minority Fellowship Program.
Despite their importance, retention issues within psychology have not been given as much attention. More focus has been placed on attracting ethnic minorities than on retaining the ones already in the field. However, as has been noted earlier in this chapter, 11% of the students who enter graduate psychology programs are members of an ethnic minority; yet, only 9% actually obtain a doctorate. Guzman and Messenger (1991) found that financial aid, special academic support, and mentorship were effective strategies to retain such students.

Few universities have used strategies to retain ethnic minority faculty. Those that did created special salary incentives and special faculty support programs. Russo et al. (1981) found that ethnic minorities are more likely than Whites to leave academia before a tenure decision has been made. Suinn and Witt (1982) reported that the major obstacles facing ethnic minorities at the time tenure is decided involved spending too much time in minority services, performing insufficient data-based research activity, and authoring too few publications. Wyatt (1982) in her 10-step recommendations to obtain tenure stressed the necessity of performing research and publishing as well as cultivating a political understanding of the university system and developing a support network.

ETHNIC MINORITIES AND THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (APA)

Organizational Perspectives

Early involvement with ethnic minority concerns within the APA can be dated back to the 1950s when the APA Council of Representatives established a policy not to hold its convention activities in hotels or educational institutions that discriminated against individuals on the basis of race or religion (Smith, in press). In 1963, the APA established an ad hoc Committee on Equal Opportunity in Psychology (CEOP) after prompting by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. CEOP explored the problems encountered in training and employment opportunities in psychology as a consequence of race. More specifically, CEOP was to

1. address the question of equality of opportunity in employment of Negro [sic] psychologists in professional and academic positions; (2) examine the recruitment and selection of students for training in psychology; and finally, (3) determine steps that may provide training and exchange opportunities for teachers and scholars in Negro [sic] colleges.

(APA, 1963, p. 769)

In 1967, CEOP made the following recommendations to the APA Council of Representatives:
(a) The APA should encourage effective measures to acquaint undergraduates in the Negro [sic] colleges with the career possibilities for Negroes [sic] in psychology.

(b) The APA should adopt appropriate measures to increase the participation of Negro [sic] psychologists in the APA.

(c) The Equal Opportunities Committee should obtain existing comparable statistics for non-Negro [sic] psychologists so that comparisons can be made with Negro populations and additional information be obtained with somewhat greater certainty. (APA, 1967, p. 1073)

In addition to accepting the above recommendations, the Council voted to change the status of CEOP from an ad hoc committee to a continuing committee. As part of its charge, CEOP undertook a survey in 1967–1968 to assess the family background, undergraduate and graduate education, occupational history, and present earnings of African American psychologists (Wispe et al., 1969). Nearly half of the 398 African American psychologists responding to the survey stated that race had limited their professional opportunities in psychology. “The inescapable conclusion to be drawn from this study, therefore, is that being a Negro [sic] psychologist may reduce the handicap of being black, but it does not remove it” (Wispe et al., 1969, p. 149). As Edward Johnson noted in his commentary on the Wispe et al. study, African American psychologists would increasingly become agents of social change, catalysts that would interpret “the current black mood” and usher in change (Johnson, 1969).

Major developments in advancing ethnic minority issues within psychology began to escalate and come to the forefront around 1969. The Proceedings of the APA reported that, at the invitation of the APA Board of Directors and Council of Representatives, that Charles E. Thomas, Chairman of the Association of Black Psychologists (ABPsi), presented a Petition of Concerns developed by ABPsi. These concerns addressed three major areas:

The limited number of black psychologists and of black graduate and undergraduate students in psychology, the failure of APA to direct its scientific and professional energies toward the solution of relevant social issues (with special emphasis on racism and poverty), and the lack of appropriate representation in the APA governing structure of black psychologist members. (APA, 1969, p. 27)

The statement of concerns developed by ABPsi sparked the APA to hold a Conference on Recruitment of Black and Other Minority Students and Faculty, at which the Wispe et al. (1969) study was discussed and from which general recommendations were made to improve the status of African Americans and minorities within the APA (Albee, 1969).

In September 1969, at the APA Annual Convention, students from the newly formed Black Students Psychological Association (BSPA) took
the podium during George Miller's presidential address asked to present their list of demands to the APA Council of Representatives that was meeting the following day (APA, 1970a; Simpkins & Raphael, 1970; Williams, 1970). The list of five demands focused on recruiting students, recruiting faculty, centralizing information on scholarship funds, providing practical community experiences for African American undergraduate and graduate students, and developing terminal programs at all degree levels that would equip African American students to function in the African American community. As a response to these demands from BSPA, the Council established the APA Commission on Accelerating Black Participation in Psychology (CABPP; APA, 1970b; Blau, 1970). CABPP, consisting of representatives from the APA, BSPA, and ABPSi, met in November 1969 and began to address essential barriers to minority participation in psychology, such as funding, communication, liaison, leadership, identity, and acceptance. Although CABPP was time limited and finished its work in July 1970, one of the concrete outcomes was the establishment of the Office of the Black Students Psychological Association administrated by Ernestine Thomas and housed within APA headquarters. The BSPA Office was funded by the APA for 3 years, from 1970 to 1973 (APA, 1971).

Again in the year 1969, a group of African American psychiatrists met at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) requesting that an organizational unit be developed within NIMH to promote mental health programs for ethnic minorities and that NIMH develop an affirmative action plan. From these concerns, NIMH established in 1971 the Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs (CMGMHP). Three prominent activities were prompted by the CMGMHP (Cheung, 1991). The first was the establishment of ethnic minority research and development centers that would conduct research relevant to ethnic minority groups. Six Research and Development Centers were established, with each focusing on the mental health needs and problems of a specific ethnic minority (i.e., African Americans, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and American Indians). The second was the funding of coalitions of minority and nonminority professional consumers. Groups such as the Coalition of Spanish Speaking Mental Health Organizations, and the Pacific/Asian Coalition, functioned as intermediaries between NIMH and the mental health community. The third project was APA's Minority Fellowship Program (MFP). The MFP was designed to support ethnic minority graduate students in their pursuit of degrees in psychiatry, psychology, social work, or sociology. The APA, under Dalmas Taylor's leadership, applied and was granted $1 million from CMGMHP to provide financial assistance to ethnic minority students for up to $7,500 per year for 3 years of study (Taylor, 1977). From 1975 to 1991, 727 ethnic minority students have been supported by the APA Minority Fellowship Program.

Another major development for ethnic minorities occurred in 1973
at the Vail Conference on Levels and Patterns of Professional Training. Although the Vail conference did not focus on ethnic minorities per se, it was the first national conference to actively seek representation of ethnic minorities on the conference steering committee. Having ethnic minority representation influenced the conference format, content, and selection of participants. In fact, 1 of the 10 task groups of the conference was designated to examine the problems of professional training for minorities. This task group focused on identification, recruitment, admission, and graduation of ethnic minority students. Final recommendations suggested that all psychology students be trained to function in a pluralistic society and furthermore that

(a) training experience should occur in a multicultural context both within the university and in field work settings; (b) the content of training must adequately prepare students for their eventual professional roles vis-a-vis a wide diversity of target groups; (c) students must be helped to maintain a balance between acculturation into a professional and scholarly role, on the one hand and retention of their group identity and cultural sensitivity, on the other. (Korman, 1974, p. 448)

The Vail conference was also important in that it recommended the establishment of a Board of Minority Advocacy and an Office of Minority Affairs within the APA that would be responsible for examining policies bearing on ethnic minority concerns. None of these recommendations were implemented until 5 years later in 1978 when the National Conference for Increasing the Roles of Culturally Diverse Peoples in the Profession of Psychology (known as the Dulles conference) was held “to explore specific ways in which these ethnic minority psychologists of color could become more widely involved in a meaningful and effective way in every aspect of the activities of the Association [APA]” (Attneave et al., 1978). Until this time, there was growing dissatisfaction with the APA Committee on Equal Opportunity in Psychology and with the Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility (BSERP) in that both governance groups had broadened their mandate and diluted their attention to ethnic minority concerns. The Dulles conference reiterated the Vail conference recommendations for the establishment of an Office of Minority Affairs and a Board of Minority Affairs. However, the APA Board of Directors and Council of Representatives approved only the Office of Minority Affairs, which became operational in 1979, and established an ad hoc Committee on Minority Affairs rather than a Board. The ad hoc Committee deliberated for three meetings and recommended to the APA Board of Directors the establishment of a board on minority affairs, which then became the Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs (BEMA). In 1980, BEMA was charged with

(a) Increasing scientific understanding of those aspects of psychology that pertain to culture and ethnicity;
(b) Increasing the quality and quantity of educational and training opportunities for ethnic minority persons in psychology;
(c) Promoting the development of culturally sensitive models for the delivery of psychological services;
(d) Advocating on behalf of ethnic minority psychologists with respect to the formulation of the policies of the Association;
(e) Maintaining satisfactory relations with other groups of ethnic minority psychologists;
(f) Maintaining appropriate communication involving ethnic minority affairs with the Association's membership as well as with ethnic minority psychologists and communities at large;
(g) Maintaining effective liaison with other boards and committees of the Association;
(h) Serving as a clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of information relevant to or pertaining to ethnic minority psychologists and students. (APA, 1980)

Since 1980, BEMA has focused on a number of issues that have highlighted ethnic minority concerns. BEMA established a number of work groups that reviewed the incorporation of cultural diversity curricula in psychology training programs (Task Force on Minority Education and Training); the representation of ethnic minorities within the APA, state psychological associations, and APA divisions (Task Force on Communication with Minority Constituents); the representation of ethnic minorities within the field of psychology (Committee on Ethnic Minority Human Resources Development); and the development of treatment guidelines in working with ethnic minority clients (Task Force on the Delivery of Services to Ethnic Minority Populations).

There was another event that occurred within the APA that served as a catalyst to encourage educational institutions to recruit and hire ethnic minority faculty and students. In 1979, the APA approved the Criteria for Accreditation of Doctoral Training Programs and Internships in Professional Psychology. One of the evaluative criteria by which all clinical, counseling, and school psychology programs would be measured was cultural and individual diversity. This criterion, known as Criterion II, stated that as a science and profession, psychology deals with the full range of human variability. It follows that social responsibility and respect for cultural and individual differences are attitudes which must be imparted to students and trainees and be reflected in all phases of the program's operation: faculty recruitment and promotion, student recruitment and evaluation, curriculum, and field training. Social and personal diversity of faculty and students is an essential goal if the trainees are to function optimally within our pluralistic society. Programs must develop knowledge and skills in their students relevant to human diversity such as people with handicapping conditions; of differing ages, gender, ethnic
and racial backgrounds, religion, and life-styles; and from differing social and individual backgrounds. (APA, 1986a, B-3)

In 1986, the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues (APA Division 45) was established, formally elevating the study of ethnic minority issues as a valued and legitimate discipline within psychology. The goals of Division 45 are to

(a) advance the contribution of psychology as a discipline in the understanding of ethnic minority issues through research, including the development of appropriate research paradigms;
(b) promote the education and training of psychologists in matters of ethnic minority concerns, including the special issues relevant to service delivery with ethnic minority populations;
(c) inform the general public of research, education and training, and service delivery issues, relevant to ethnic minority populations. (APA, 1986b)

Due to the internal reorganization of the APA Central Office in the late 1980s into four directorates (Science, Education, Practice, and Public Interest), with each having a corresponding oversight board, movement was made to sunset BSERP and BEMA, both situated within the Public Interest Directorate. Two summit meetings were held in 1988 and 1989 that resulted in the eventual establishment of the Board for the Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest in 1990. After 10 years in existence, BEMA was transformed from a board to a committee (Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs [CEMA]).

In 1991, APA also sponsored the third conference on undergraduate psychology. This conference, titled the APA National Conference on Enhancing the Quality of Undergraduate Education in Psychology but known as the St. Mary's conference (after the location of meeting at St. Mary's College, Maryland), addressed many issues, including ethnic minorities. One task group focused solely on ethnic minority issues, whereas the other task groups were encouraged to consider ethnic minority concerns across undergraduate educational issues. The primary recommendations involved the issue of understanding psychology as a study of variance (see Puente et al., 1992).

Membership Perspectives

With all the organizational and structural changes that have taken place in the APA that address the concerns of ethnic minority representation, it is interesting to note that the ethnic minority membership within the APA has not proportionally increased since the early 1980s. However, data collection on race and ethnicity was not documented within the APA in the early 1970s. Russo et al. (1981) stated that of the 1978–1979 APA
membership, 1,384 or 3.1% of the APA members were members of an ethnic minority. In 1983, Stapp et al. (1985) conducted a census of all psychologists, and it was calculated that ethnic minorities constituted 4.9% of the APA membership at the time (2.2% African American, 1.5% Hispanic, 1% Asian, and 0.2% American Indian).

For unknown reasons, APA members have been reluctant to identify their race and ethnicity in survey questionnaires. When the membership was asked about their ethnic and racial background, only one third of the APA members self-identified themselves as members of an ethnic minority on the APA 1985 Directory Survey. The data indicate that in 1985, ethnic minorities made up 2.6% of the APA membership (APA, 1985) which is approximately the same percentage reported by Russo et al. (1981) for the 1978 APA membership. In 1989, ethnic minorities made up 3.4% of the APA membership (APA, 1989).

Ethnic minority participation within the APA governance structure has been of some concern. In 1991, the Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs (OEMA) conducted a survey of all governance members regarding their race and ethnicity. The survey found that of 445 governance positions, ethnic minorities held 53 or 11.9% of the elected or appointed positions in the APA (OEMA, 1991). This is considerably more than their APA membership representation, yet is less than their representation in society.

In summary, although ethnic minorities have made strides in representation and participation in the past 50 years within the APA, they are far from assuming a significant political role within the Association that can dramatically impact its course of operation.

MULTICULTURAL CURRICULAR ISSUES

Current information about the status of education involving ethnic minority students suggests an inconsistent pattern. Data reported earlier in this chapter indicate that the percentage of ethnic minority psychology graduates at any level has not grown since the early 1980s. In contrast, there is some evidence that there has been an increase in the number of institutions offering courses that focus on minority psychology. In addition, since the mid-1980s there has been a substantial increase in resources that are directly relevant to teaching ethnic minority material and diverse students.

Undergraduate Curriculum

Over the past three decades there have been four professionally sponsored conferences and surveys that have investigated the undergraduate curriculum in psychology. The early McKeachie and Milholland report
(1961) did not consider ethnic minorities in psychology. They did note that one contemporary pressure on undergraduate curriculum development was the increasing "heterogeneity" of students, but their use of this term reflects their prediction of broadening student characteristics that are based primarily on diversity of vocational goals and ability levels. In the next decade, the Kulick, Brown, Vestewig, and Wright survey (1973) asked more specific questions about the inclusion of minority issues in the undergraduate curriculum. They inquired about the percentage of the introductory course time that was spent "in analysis of current social problems such as . . . discrimination" (1973, p. 27). They found that such content was minimally addressed in most courses: 84.6% of the 4-year colleges with psychology majors and 67.8% of the 2-year colleges spent 0–10% of the introductory course time on this topic. In addition, the Kulick survey of curriculum offerings during 1968–1969 specifically asked about the presence of courses that were "designed to meet the special needs of [these] racial and ethnic groups: Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Rican, American Indians" (1973, p. 67). Their survey revealed that 7.4% of the 4-year institutions with psychology majors and 11.0% of the 2-year colleges had such courses.

The next APA undergraduate curriculum survey (Scheirer & Rogers, 1985) also collected data about the inclusion of ethnic minority courses in the curriculum. Unfortunately, this 1984 survey reported such courses as a percentage of all courses offered, whereas the 1969 survey reported the percentage of institutions offering those courses, so that direct comparison over time is not possible. Nevertheless, Schreier and Rogers found that of over 4,000 undergraduate courses, 69 (1.7%) were specialized courses dealing with specific minority groups or with minority issues. If one assumes that institutions only have a single course on minority psychology (and this is a tenuous assumption), then at maximum such courses were available in 37.3% of the 4-year colleges and 12.3% of the two-year colleges. These estimates do indicate a growth in institutions, especially 4-year colleges, that included in their program courses dealing with minority psychology. There is additional evidence supporting this trend. Hicks and Ridley (1979) reported that among a sample of 103 colleges, the number offering at least one course in African American psychology grew from 35.9% in 1972–1973 to 42.2% in 1978–1979. However, they point out that the majority of these courses were offered by departments of African American studies rather than by departments of psychology.

St. Mary's Conference on Undergraduate Psychology

More promising is the emphasis placed on diversity and minority populations in the most recent undergraduate conference. The St. Mary's conference convened approximately 60 teachers of undergraduate psychol-
ogy, who were organized into seven working groups. One working group was to consider strategies to increase the attraction of minority undergraduates into the field of psychology (Puente et al., 1992). In addition, all other working groups were to consider their specific charge in terms of ethnic minority groups whenever appropriate.

Puente et al. (1992) recognized the changing demographics in U.S. society and the impact that this will have not only on the undergraduate population but also on the field of psychology. They stressed that multiple strategies will be needed to attract increased numbers of minorities into both the service and the science components of professional psychology. They cautioned that recruitment into the field must begin early—for example, in high schools—and more broadly—for example, in community colleges. They provided suggestions for developing linkages among these educational levels.

Included among the strategies discussed by Puente et al. (1992) is the recommendation to broaden the content of various courses by including both minority scholarship and material addressing minority psychological issues. Adding courses to the curriculum that are specifically concerned with minority content and issues was also recommended.

Issues of classroom atmosphere and instructional techniques in the face of changing classroom demographics were also addressed. Special attention was paid to creating a sense of community within classes containing diverse students and building on minority perspectives and experiences.

Puente et al. (1992) made the additional point that increased diversity of students may also have an impact on aspects of teaching that occur outside the classroom. In this regard, they indicated that faculty may need to reconsider their assumptions and expectations regarding academic advising and career counseling as undergraduate demographics change.

Since the mid-1980s, there has been an increase in available resources that can be used to implement some of these recommendations. This recent growth is in contrast to the sparse explicit treatment of ethnic minority undergraduate issues in many of the regular psychology journals. For example, although there have been a number of articles in the American Psychologist addressing ethnic minority issues in graduate education (e.g., Bernal & Padilla, 1982) and in mental health services (e.g., Sue, 1989), relatively few have looked at undergraduate experiences. A similar picture is seen in Teaching of Psychology, the publication most directly oriented to teaching psychology to undergraduates. Since the introduction of this journal in 1974, with some exceptions (e.g., DeFour and Paludi, 1991), there have been few minority contributors and contributions that discuss ethnic minorities and undergraduate education in psychology.

Especially helpful in terms of integrating ethnic minority scholarship and research regarding ethnic minorities throughout the curriculum are several annotated volumes recently published by the APA. Each volume
describes available resources with respect to specific minority groups: African-American males (Evans & Whitfield, 1988), African-American females (Hall, Evans, & Selice, 1989), and Hispanics (Olmedo & Walker, 1990). In addition, the volume editors classify the research in terms of relevance to courses typically found in undergraduate programs. Another valuable resource is the volume edited by Bronstein and Quina (1988) that presents suggestions for minority content as well as descriptions of specialized courses addressing minority perspectives.

More attention has also been given recently to teaching techniques and activities for active learning in classes that are composed of diverse students or that deal with material regarding minority groups. These are welcome additions because many of the activities readily available (Benjamin & Lowman, 1981; Benjamin, Daniel, & Brewer, 1985; Makosky, Whittemore, & Rogers, 1987) had not been explicitly designed for these situations. Although some of these latter exercises can be adapted for relevant use to gain a perspective on minority psychology, only a few are directly oriented to minority groups (e.g., Engle & Snellgrove, 1981). A number of contributors to Bronstein and Quina (1988) also suggest course-related activities. Two additional sources (Aronson, 1987; Brislin, 1988) consider dynamics in diverse classrooms; these were both presented at the annual APA G. Stanley Hall Lecture Series, which is oriented toward teachers of introductory psychology. A recent article (DeFour & Paludi, 1991) provides discussion questions and experiential exercises that can be used to explore material related to minority experiences in psychology of women courses.

Quina and Bronstein (1988) pointed out that one concern of teachers in dealing with ethnically diverse students and ethnic-related material is handling student reactions. They provide illustrations of instructors’ reports of student hostility, defensive reactions, anger over injustice, and concerns with the course, with other students, and with the instructor. Presumably, most contemporary instructors do not have training in incorporating ethnic issues and in dealing constructively with student reactions and emotional responses. In this regard, they include suggestions for relating student reactions, including personal experiences and perspectives, to relevant theory and research. An excellent example integrating theoretical content with student experiences and reactions in confronting such material is discussed by Tatum (1992).

More personal accounts as well as objective assessments of the impact of integrating minority scholarship on classroom process and teaching objectives are needed. These accounts could help to address teachers’ concerns about student reactions, discussion processes, and classroom atmosphere.

Progress can also be seen in the availability of materials that consider minority students’ expectations regarding their undergraduate experiences and career paths. McGovern and Hawks (1986) provided a useful model
for responding to gender and minority group similarities and differences in curriculum and career interests. Woods's (1988) recent volume on advising psychology majors has several relevant chapters directed toward specific minority groups.

On the other hand, relatively little attention has been paid to ethnic minority students' experiences in research internships and in field practica. Prentice-Dunn and Roberts (1985) reported favorable consequences of summer research internships for African American undergraduates' interest in psychology careers, but their article practically stands alone, and they did not do actual follow ups. Although practical field placements are assumed to strengthen professional interests (Puente et al., 1992), both empirical documentation and case studies regarding this assumption are lacking. Reports are also needed regarding the steps toward and problems encountered in establishing such experiences for ethnic minority students. Such reports should address whether ethnic minority students are more sought after in particular settings or in working with particular populations and whether ethnic minority students encounter particular problems in various settings.

Another question that needs consideration is whether teaching styles or learning styles differ among ethnic minority groups. Tharp (1989) reviewed numerous research studies that pointed out that compatibility between some students' natal cultural patterns and school routines and teacher behavior may impact student achievement and school experiences. The extent to which this issue is salient or relevant to undergraduate education in psychology remains to be seen.

Graduate Curriculum

Unfortunately, similar patterns have occurred in graduate education. However, instead of focusing solely on these limitations, it might be more useful to begin with a rationale for diversity at the graduate level. Ridley (1985) lists five clear imperatives for developing culturally relevant training curricula.

1. The professional participation imperative holds that psychology and its institutions should reflect in numerical composition the cultural diversity of society.

2. The ethical imperative maintains that treatment of culturally different clients by professionals who lack the specialized expertise or training is unethical.

3. The cultural-context imperative holds that all mental health practice and psychotherapy occurs in a cultural context.

4. The scholarly imperative affirms that there is a need on the part of the profession to correct the inadequate and in-
correct presentation of ethnic minorities in the psychological literature.

5. The legal imperative asserts that treatment of culturally diverse clients by a practitioner without certified cross-cultural credentials would be a violation of the clients' civil rights.

Kagehiro et al. (1985) added another dimension: the inclusion of cultural pluralistic training curricula. The authors argued that generalizability may be sacrificed at different stages in the research process because one has not taken into consideration cultural variables. They suggested that there are two negative outcomes of the resulting limited knowledge base: psychology and society suffer, and reduced professional competency and credibility occur.

One of the first major studies on the incorporation of multicultural curricula in psychology training programs was conducted by Bernal and Padilla (1982), who surveyed 106 clinical psychology programs as to their ability to train psychology students to serve ethnic minority populations. They found that programs were lacking in course work that focused on ethnic minority mental health or sociocultural issues. Out of 76 training programs responding to the survey, only 31 (41%) reported that they offered one or more courses that would contribute to a student's understanding of ethnic minorities or other cultures. Only 15 (20%) of the training programs offered ethnic minority courses or cross-cultural clinical courses. No program, however, required students to complete a culturally oriented course for the completion of a doctorate.

Another survey conducted by Wyatt and Parham (1985) found that only 7 of the 169 internships programs surveyed had seminars in which ethnic minority issues were discussed. Dunston (1983), who conducted a survey of graduate psychology and internship programs, found that 66% of the graduate departments and 64% of the internship programs included ethnic minority content within their curricula or training program. Within psychology departments, 48% of the courses on ethnic minorities were elective.

To obtain the current status on the degree of multicultural training in graduate programs, the APA Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs used data obtained from the 1990 Graduate Study in Psychology and Associated Fields (APA, 1991) on 570 psychology programs that stated that they offered minority-oriented courses or curricula. The data revealed that 34% of all graduate psychology programs, both master's and doctoral programs, self-reported that they offered some course work on ethnic minority issues. When separated into doctoral and master's programs, 40% of the doctoral and 24% of the master's programs offered minority-oriented courses.

In the area of curricula, it appears that since the early study conducted
by Bernal and Padilla (1982) not much has changed. Approximately 60% of graduate training programs do not offer any multicultural course work.

CONCLUSION

This chapter attempted to highlight the role ethnic minorities have played within psychology. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, a time when the United States was in the throes of the civil rights movement, psychology's representatives were made aware of the discrepancy in ethnic minority participation and representation in psychology. Both within the APA and in the general field of psychology, attempts were made to rectify this imbalance. Unfortunately, because of many factors, the drive toward ethnic minority parity reached a plateau in and has remained static since the late 1970s. The ramifications of this are many. A lack of ethnic minority students translates into a lack of such psychologists who can teach, conduct research, or provide culturally relevant services. In turn, the noticeable absence of ethnic minority psychologists in the academic or applied world results in the inability of psychology to relate effectively in a society that is ever changing and becoming more ethnically diverse. If this trend is not rectified, psychology will be seen as irrelevant to the problems of society and, therefore, will be less attractive as a profession to ethnic minorities. We believe that psychology is faltering in the recruitment of ethnic minorities. Recruitment for ethnic minority students or faculty has not increased in over a decade, even with conference after conference extolling the value and virtue of ethnic minority curricula and student representation, even with such financial aid programs as the Minority Fellowship Program, and even with the APA accreditation criterion of cultural and individual diversity by which applied programs are evaluated.

The issue is not that psychology is not doing anything, but rather what is being done, how it is being done, and who is doing it. Psychology must operationalize all the goals it has promulgated since the Vail conference. Rhetoric will no longer suffice. Recommendations should be operationalized and put into action that can be behaviorally measured. Reaching and influencing ethnic minority communities will require different strategies. Ethnic minority psychologists must be supported in educating and developing these initiatives. Finally, there is the issue of who is responsible for such actions. The APA has been the lightning rod for developing and implementing intervention strategies. Many turn to the APA for the solution but blame the organization for the current state of affairs. Although it may be convenient to turn to the APA to resolve many of the issues facing psychology, the APA is relatively ineffectual when it comes to requiring individual psychologists to act. Furthermore, the Association is seen as even less influential with departments of psychology, where most of the
critical pedagogy occurs. Given support and guidance, psychology departments can have the greatest effect on ethnic minorities. They are the ones that admit students. Furthermore, they are often the conduit for the development of new knowledge. The APA can assist psychology programs that want to become ethnically diverse, but it is the individual universities that must take the initiative to diversify their student body and faculty. In a current study performed by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Matyas and Malcom (1991) found that in a survey of 276 college and universities, there was no concerted effort to attract or retain women, ethnic minorities, or disabled students in science and engineering, despite the abundant rhetoric to the contrary.

Guzman (1991), in a review of a number of psychology training programs, concluded that there were seven characteristics that earmarked good programs that attracted and retained ethnic minority students and provided multicultural training. He found that programs that had a broad-based commitment to diversity from all segments within the university had better chances of recruiting and retaining ethnic minority students and faculty. Second, in these programs funding was appropriately used to attract and retain ethnic minority candidates. Third, the admissions policy incorporated a larger array of factors than standardized academic scores. Fourth, because of the intensity of recruiting and retaining ethnic minorities, successful programs had established an ombudsman or coordinator position that lessened this burden on faculty, allowing them to teach and conduct research. Fifth, all the programs had exerted efforts in hiring one or two ethnic minority faculty who, in turn, showed the dedication and drive to pursue diversity within the department. Sixth, all such programs had shown sensitivity by providing a social support network using some form of mentoring. Finally, all the successful programs offered multicultural training either in the form of course work or actual multicultural training tracks.

As the future of our society continues to change in the direction of cultural pluralism, psychology must take ownership of this challenge that extends beyond a litany of rhetorical recommendations.
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