

REPLY

Disciplinary Perspectives on Multicultural Research: Reply to Dvorakova (2016) and Yakushko et al. (2016)

Gordon C. Nagayama Hall
University of Oregon

Tiffany Yip
Fordham University

Michael A. Zárate
University of Texas El Paso

In their comments on Hall, Yip, and Zárate (2016), Dvorakova (2016) addresses cultural psychology methods and Yakushko, Hoffman, Consoli, and Lee (2016) address qualitative research methods. We provide evidence of the neglect of underrepresented groups in the publications of major journals in cultural psychology and qualitative psychology. We do not view any particular research method as inherently contributing to “epistemological violence” (Yakushko et al., 2016, p. 5), but it is the misguided application and/or interpretation of data generated from such methods that perpetuate oppression. We contend that best practices for representing ethnocultural diversity in research will require a diverse toolbox containing quantitative, qualitative, biological, and behavioral approaches.

Keywords: multicultural, cultural, qualitative, quantitative

In their comments on Hall, Yip, and Zárate (2016), Dvorakova (2016) addresses cultural psychology methods and Yakushko, Hoffman, Consoli, and Lee (2016) address qualitative research methods. Dvorakova has criticized us for conflating cross-cultural and cultural psychology. Dvorakova also contends that because of its comparative emphasis, the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (JCCP) is not representative of cultural psychology and offered the journal *Culture & Psychology* (C&P) as more representative. Nevertheless, consistent with JCCP, a PsycNet search (from C&P's inception year of 1995 to the present) for the terms *racial identity* or *ethnic identity* in C&P revealed that just over 5% ($N = 33$) of the articles in this journal addressed these topics. We agree with cultural psychologists that culture is not external to the individual, because the individual and sociocultural context are mutually constitutive, but a critical sociocultural context, racial

and ethnic group identity, appears to be largely missing in cultural psychology. Moreover, only 2% ($N = 13$) of the articles in C&P are on people of color in the United States (based on PsycNet search terms *African Americans*, *Blacks*, *Latinos*, *Latinas*, *Hispanics*, *Asian Americans*, *Native Americans*, *American Indians*), and less than 2% ($N = 11$) are on immigrants or refugees or ethnic minorities worldwide. Thus, it appears that cultural psychology has yet to consider the perspectives of underrepresented groups.

Yakushko and colleagues' (2016) emphasis on qualitative research methods as a means of giving voice to underrepresented communities is consistent with our approach. We included research on focus groups to illustrate this point but did not provide an exhaustive discussion of other forms of qualitative approaches. Although Yakushko and colleagues advocate qualitative methods as a means of strengthening the multicultural research model, it is not clear that qualitative researchers have devoted any more attention to underrepresented groups than have other researchers. The American Psychological Association began publishing the journal *Qualitative Psychology* in 2014. Although 66 articles have been published, a PsycNet search (from 2014 to the present) of this journal's articles reveals that there is only one article on people of color as defined earlier, one on immigrants or refugees, and one on racial or ethnic identity.

Gordon C. Nagayama Hall, Department of Psychology and Center on Diversity and Community, University of Oregon; Tiffany Yip, Department of Psychology, Fordham University; Michael A. Zárate, Department of Psychology, University of Texas El Paso.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gordon C. Nagayama Hall, Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, 1227 Eugene, OR 97403. E-mail: gnhall@uoregon.edu

Unlike Yakushko and colleagues (2016), we do not view any particular research method as inherently contributing to “epistemological violence” (Yakushko et al., 2016, p. 891). Rather, it is the misguided application and/or interpretation of data generated from such methods that perpetuate oppression. It also seems that qualitative approaches are just as open to misuse as are quantitative approaches. One key is to develop a diverse set of researchers testing similar ideas to identify concepts that replicate and to broaden the questions being asked, independent of research methodology. It is important for multicultural psychologists to be engaged in and influence all areas of psychological research to avoid the risk of marginalization. As we indicated in our article (Hall et al., 2016), we view different research approaches and methodologies as potentially augmenting one another, and our goal is not to attempt to supplant other approaches. We contend that best practices for representing ethnocultural diversity in research will require a diverse toolbox

containing quantitative, qualitative, biological, and behavioral approaches.

References

- Dvorakova, A. (2016). The cultural psychology endeavor to make culture central to psychology: Comment on Hall et al. (2016). *American Psychologist*, 71, 888–889. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000053>
- Hall, G. C. N., Yip, T., & Zárate, M. A. (2016). On becoming multicultural in a monocultural research world: A conceptual approach to studying ethnocultural diversity. *American Psychologist*, 71, 40–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039734>
- Yakushko, O., Hoffman, L., Consoli, M. L. M., & Lee, G. (2016). On methods, methodologies, and continued colonization of knowledge in the study of “ethnic minorities”: Comment on Hall et al. (2016). *American Psychologist*, 71, 890–891. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000060>

Received September 27, 2016

Revision received November 1, 2016

Accepted November 2, 2016 ■