

Alternate Cultural Paradigms in Psychology: Long Overdue Recognition and Further Articulations

Journal of Humanistic Psychology

1–17

© The Author(s) 2021

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/00221678211048114

journals.sagepub.com/home/jhp



Andrés J. Consoli¹ 
and Linda James Myers² 

Abstract

Many ethnic-acknowledging psychology researchers, practitioners, and their allies have expressed dissatisfaction with Eurowestern, mainstream psychology in the United States as it shows serious shortcomings when used to understand and serve minoritized communities. Eurowestern psychology has been criticized for its imperialistic, one-size-fits-all view of humanity. Accordingly, we challenge the neglect of the history and value of ethnic acknowledgment in psychology perpetrated and maintained by Eurowestern psychology, including mainstream psychology in the United States. We operationalize such challenge by articulating the construct of alternate cultural paradigms, by following it with a series of contributions authored by leading figures from each of the Ethnic Acknowledging Psychological Associations (EAPAs) in the United States, and by closing with a commentary by a renowned scholar in the field. The current article, followed by five separate and distinct articles from authors identified with each of the EAPAs (i.e., the Association of Black Psychologists [ABPsi], the National

¹University of California, Santa Barbara, USA

²The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

Corresponding Author:

Andrés J. Consoli, Department of Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, 2147 Education Building, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA.

Email: aconsoli@ucsb.edu

Latinx Psychological Association [NLPA], the Society of Indian Psychologists [SIP], the Asian American Psychological Association [AAPA], the Arab, Middle Eastern, and North African Psychological Association [AMENA-Psy]), together with a concluding commentary conforms the Special Issue on alternate cultural paradigms in psychology in the United States.

Keywords

alternate cultural paradigm, ethnic-acknowledging psychological associations in the United States, Eurowestern psychology, mainstream psychology in the United States, hegemony

I have been compelled to listen to speakers, well-meaning though they may think they are, who signal to me rather clearly that subject position is everything. I have come to recognize, however, that when the subject matter is me and the voice is not mine, my sense of order and rightness is disrupted. In metaphorical fashion, these “authorities” let me know, once again, that Columbus has discovered America and claims it now, claims it still for a European crown. (Royster, 1996, p. 31)

Mainstream U.S. psychology has historically taken a monoculturally hegemonic stance, privileging a Eurowestern cultural view as primary, central, and universal. It is itself an unacknowledged ethnic minority psychology, imposed through imperialist power and neo-colonizing processes to most of the world population. As privilege remains invisible to its holder, mainstream U.S. psychology continues to not properly identify its singular Eurowestern cultural lens.

For those researchers choosing to be culturally authentic and acknowledging the cultural lens they are using, such honesty has often led to marginalization of their work. Thus, we have seen a need fulfilled without proper recognition. The neglect of the history and value of ethnic acknowledgment in psychology by mainstream U.S. psychology and the minoritizing done by the powers have been previously documented (see, for example, Leong, 2009). In this Special Issue, we are seeking to address another area of neglect, that is, the contributions of culturally acknowledged and grounded psychological knowledge produced by ethnically identified psychologists, some providing theory and research specifically for their ethnic group, and others humanity in general, given comprehensive historical contexts. On the occasion of this Special Issue, the various paradigms have been articulated by members of the established, national Ethnic Acknowledging Psychological

Associations (EAPAs), also often referred to as Ethnic Minority Psychological Associations (EMPAs), in the United States.

In this anchoring article to the Special Issue of the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* (JHP), we provide a description of how this project came about, a conceptual framework defining alternate cultural paradigms, and a brief depiction of the contributions. Before doing so, we would like to acknowledge and express our deep appreciation to Sarah R. Kamens, the Editor-in-Chief of JHP; Theopia Jackson, Senior Cultural Equity Editor; Sonasha Braxton, Cultural Equity Editor; and JHP entire editorial team for their commitment to the dissemination of knowledge by and for ethnic minority communities in the United States. Published in cooperation with the Association for Humanistic Psychology, JHP celebrated its 60th anniversary in 2021. Over its first six decades, JHP has stood out as a beacon of innovation and, most recently, as an advocate for social justice (Kamens, 2021).

We also would like to acknowledge the peer-reviewers who kindly accepted the invitation to serve in such capacity. The group of peer-reviewers is a who-is-who among ethnic-acknowledging scholars and includes Héctor Adames, Sawssan Ahmed, Alvin N. Alvarez, Merve Balkaya-Ince, Faye Belgrave, Lilian Comas Díaz, Huberta Jackson-Lowman, Jeff King, William Ming Liu, and Margaret (Marge) Smith. The process followed to arrive at such stellar set of reviewers involved inviting the lead contributors to identify experts in the field who we, in turn, could invite to serve in the expert reviewer role. In addition to expertise, these potential reviewers were not to have a conflict of interest or a close working relationship with the contributors. We were quite pleased that these expert colleagues readily accepted our respective invitations and produced impartial reviews that served to strengthen the already strong contributions. We would like to express our appreciation to Joseph P. Gone who agreed to provide commentary for this Special Issue and shared examples from his own cultural frame of reference. Finally, we would like to acknowledge Theopia Jackson once again, for serving as the discussant for the initial symposium from which this written work emerged and for being instrumental in helping this project come to the attention of JHP.

Project Background

The impetus for the current project was born out of a shared commitment among the EAPA/EMPA representatives serving in the Council of National Psychology Associations for the Advancement of Ethnic Minority Interests (CNPAEMI) in 2015, then chaired by the first author and who was doing so on behalf of the National Latinx Psychological Association (NLPA). The

second author, who served as a representative of the Association of Black Psychologists (ABPsi), expressed a desire to advance a crucial aspect of CNPAAEMI, detailed in its Mission and Goals, specifically, to “promote research and understanding using alternative cultural paradigms” (see www.apa.org/about/governance/bdcmte/ethnic-minority-interests). In response to that desire, the EMPA representatives serving in CNPAAEMI committed themselves to submit a collaborative program proposal to the 2016 American Psychological Association (APA) Convention. The proposal, co-chaired by the coauthors of this article, included presentations from ABPsi and NLPA, together with presentations by the Asian American Psychological Association (AAPA) and the Society of Indian Psychologists (SIP). APA’s Division 45: The Society for the Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity, and Race, a standing member of CNPAAEMI, ceded its place to the then incipient Arab, Middle Eastern, and North African Psychological Association (AMENA-Psy). Theopia Jackson, of the Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, graciously agreed to serve as a discussant for the symposium.

Following the proposal acceptance and the well-received presentation (Consoli & Myers, 2016), the presenters agreed to work together on respective manuscripts. CNPAAEMI representatives further agreed to pursue a different venue for publication as the monograph format relied upon until then by CNPAAEMI translated into a markedly limited dissemination of the final product, despite its high quality. The limited dissemination was due, in part, to the fact that the monographs were not indexed in national or international databases (to access the suite of prior CNPAAEMI publications, please visit www.apa.org/pi/oema/resources/cnpaaemi-pubs). This time, the plan was to pursue a special issue status in a peer-reviewed journal, with the coauthors of this article serving as guest editors. Although the proposed project was rejected by a few journals, it was accepted as a Special Issue concept by JHP, subject to its stringent peer-review process. We ask the readers of this Special Issue to keep in mind that the project has been in the making for 6 years and that the articles were completed at various points over the course of those 6 years. In fact, some articles were mostly written prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the latest anti-Black and anti-Asian actions, and the Capitol events of January 6, 2021. Other contributions were developed in the middle of those events. Therefore, articles may address those events to various degrees.

We would like to indicate an important terminology difference. Although CNPAAEMI’s Mission mentioned above speaks of alternative cultural paradigms, the term “alternative” needs to be understood in the “there and then” context of U.S. psychological discipline when such mission and goals were developed (i.e., early 1990s). At that time, alternative was put forth as a way

to signal an alternative to the mainstream paradigm of traditional Eurowestern psychology dominating the psychology field in the United States. We recognize the value of the term alternative and the worthy achievement it represents. It signifies an important stage in the path toward alternate psychological paradigms.

We readily acknowledge that alternative and alternate may have various meanings and connotations depending on the contexts, fields, and circumstances and that in some places, they may even be considered synonyms. Here, we distinguish them for the following express purposes. Alternative signifies clear differentiation from the dominant mainstream Eurowestern paradigm. In other words, it could be said that alternative is organized and defined in response to a dominant, yet inadequate, one. At some point in their evolution, alternative paradigms, proposals, or initiatives can be acknowledged as stand-alone alternate paradigms, meaning fully formed independent ones, transcending the initial juxtapositions of their origin. Moreover, alternate paradigms are immersed in proactivity, having surpassed reactivity. An alternate paradigm stands on its own as it affirms and advances a full knowledge production and identity. Moreover, alternate paradigms can be compared as they stand among equals. The term equals here signifies that each alternate system receives a full acknowledgment of its respective knowledge bases that sustain and give meaning to the professional, healing practices that system supports. Bringing it full circle, the mutual recognition among alternate paradigms fosters the understanding sought by CNPAAEMI's mission and goals. Such *understanding* affirms pluralism (i.e., the coexistence of diverse ways) and creates the potential for synergy, rapprochement, and intersectionality through collaborative and cooperative *research* (the terms are italicized to emphasize how the mission and goals of CNPAAEMI are still affirmed in the expression *alternate paradigms*, put forth here).

Dissatisfaction With Eurowestern Psychology

Many ethnic-acknowledging psychology researchers, practitioners, and their allies have expressed dissatisfaction with Eurowestern psychology and its inability to guide them in understanding and serving the minoritized communities they are committed to work with. Eurowestern psychology has been criticized for its imperialistic, one-size-fits-all view of humanity, ostensibly operating as a Procrustean bed onto which all humans are stretched, in fact made to "adjust" to. We are intentionally using the term "adjust" here to honor Martin Luther King, Jr.'s call for the creation of the International Association for the Advancement of Creative Maladjustment in his invited, distinguished address delivered during the meeting of the Society for the

Psychological Study of Social Issues at the APA in 1967 and published subsequently in the *American Psychologist* in 1968. In that address, Dr. King spoke against adjusting to “racial discrimination and racial segregation. . . religious bigotry. . . economic conditions that take necessities from the many to give luxuries to the few. . . the madness of militarism, and the self-defeating effects of physical violence” (King, 1968, p. 185).

The systematic neglect of cultural differences by Eurowestern psychology has increasingly frayed its reach. The advent of multicultural, pluralistic, integrative, and intersectional perspectives signaled some movement outside of the hegemonic, neocolonial psychological discourse, but have for the most part maintained the same limited conceptual gaze of a short-sighted Eurowestern lens across its multiple subjects, including motivation, learning, human comportment, meaning, context, the mind, the relational space, the collective, and much more. Indeed, what has kept such narrow, hegemonic view of humanity alive has been social institutions, policies, and practices committed, either wittingly or unwittingly, to the perpetuation of the status quo. As much of our professional lives have taken place in academia, we review critically the role of universities in fostering a hegemonic paradigm while playing a significant role in the socialization of aspiring professionals into the psychology discipline.

Whereas universities have, at times, been instruments of liberation, much of their scientific production machinery has been an instrument of oppression through its lack of depthful diverse representation among its faculty members, let alone “demonstrated commitment” (a term put forth by Alberto Figueroa-García, who served first as Assistant Director and then Associate Director of APA’s Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs and was APA’s CNPAAEMI staff liaison for almost two decades before his sudden passing). What is missing is diversity at the level of cultural deep structure (Myers, 1988, 1993; Myers et al., 2018) which reaches beyond the superficial appearance of difference. One of the greatest challenges is created by the fractured and nonintegrative nature of the hegemonic monocultural orientation of dominant socialization which undermines the ability of adherents to grasp much less appreciate paradigms that are substantively different. This state of affairs results in narrow, growingly irrelevant areas of concerns and increasing incapacity to effectively address pressing concerns, the hegemonic composition of subject pools, and the concomitant, colonizing course content and sources (Arnett, 2008; Christopher et al., 2014; Fuentes et al., 2021; Myers et al., 2018; Thalmayer et al., 2021). Universities have been propped up by accreditation systems that burden and are burdened by bureaucracies, resulting in the perpetuation of bodies of knowledge by inertia, compounded by terminology that, while apparently progressive, is largely performative. For example,

while we celebrate the increasing acknowledgment of the traditional custodians of the land that is taking place among U.S. academic circles, such acknowledgment is bound to remain performative if it is not met through transformative praxis that results in the meaningful, substantial inclusion of Native American peoples and First Nations in the mission as well as the learning, research, service, and administrative activities of U.S. universities. To an even lesser degree, the necessity of diversity and representation beyond the level of cultural surface structure, that is, those aspects readily observable physically, is seldom if ever acknowledged or pursued.

To complicate matters, universities are largely the context for which disenfranchised and minoritized families labor tirelessly to send their progeny in the hopes of bettering their lot. Yet, many members of the dissatisfied throngs of ethnic minority psychology researchers, practitioners, and allies receive a formal education and training that is largely irrelevant to them and their communities. The majority of these dissatisfied groups graduate without conceptual tools to address and redress the experiences of minoritized communities and without an ability to appreciate our communities' strengths. In perhaps one of the most paternalistic, short-sighted academic frameworks, we are taught to view our own communities as "vulnerable" rather than as actually *vulnerized* by systems that consistently and persistently oppress our very own communities. Specifically, our minoritized and disenfranchised communities are exposed to toxic chemicals (e.g., lead in the alleged safely potable water, pesticides), worst air quality and noise pollution (e.g., housing next to busy freeways and large airports), discriminatory policing and police brutality, crowded living arrangements that prevent physical distancing during pandemics such as COVID-19, food and housing insecurity, healthy food deserts, exploitative working conditions, poorly funded public schools and health care systems, and much more. Again, these communities are not intrinsically vulnerable, they are systematically made vulnerable or, put succinctly, vulnerized. Our communities are, in fact, survivors of a brutal system. University curricula and training have, for the most part, done little to provide conceptual tools to question and disarm such oppressive powers and systems while insisting, instead, on an *adjustment* ethos of coping strategies and endorsing cultural appropriation (e.g., decontextualized mindfulness techniques). Furthermore, as prophesied by Carter G. Woodson, the eminent Black scholar, it will be of little value to be able to boast that more students of color have achieved higher education than in 1865, if they are of no use toward the liberation and elevation of their communities (Woodson, 1933).

To add to this mystification and miseducation, many universities have credited themselves with achieving minority-serving institution status. Yet most public universities are riding demographic waves that are diversifying

communities and the populations that the higher education system in the United States draws upon. In such context, the increasingly diverse student bodies are challenging the traditional curriculum and who delivers it. Psychology is no exception; this Special Issue seeks to offer a long overdue recognition of fully formed alternate cultural paradigms in psychology, as well as alternate efforts underway, all of which are likely to continue to be further developed and articulated. The goal is to provide conceptual tools that ethnically identified psychologists and allies can recognize themselves in and implement in a concerted effort to meaningfully accompany minoritized and vulnerized communities, be that through teaching, research, practice, or advocacy. While the only cultural lens many of us may have is the one into which we have been socialized by the dominant Eurowestern culture and its institutions, this Special Issue should give us pause to think more critically and deeply about other ways of being in and viewing the world that may be more just, sacred, and sustainable than the one we may have adopted with unquestioned acquiescence.

Paradigms and Alternate Cultural Paradigms in Psychology

Thomas Kuhn defines paradigms from a mainstream Eurowestern perspective as the “universally recognized scientific achievements that, for a time, provide model problems and solutions for a community of practitioners” (Kuhn, 1970, p. viii). A paradigm therefore includes ontological characteristics, and epistemological and ethical assumptions. Current mainstream paradigms emphasize so-called evidence-based practices (EBPs) in both research and psychological practice. Modeled after the Institute of Medicine’s definition of EBPs, such practice reflects clinical research, clinician expertise, and unique client characteristics (APA, Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice, 2006). Little or no regard is given to the real-time histories of community experience and practices as providing the most relevant and meaningful evidence, if the goal is transformative change to benefit the greater good of the whole.

While within dominant circles considered the gold-standard approaches to treating mental health concerns, and particularly within academia, EBPs are not exempt from certain limitations. Namely, the ethnocentric idea of universal applicability of EBPs may actually serve against the goal of addressing existing service inequities (Martínez et al., 2010). There are amply documented and specific community differences that warrant significant transformations of EBPs in an effort to not only recognize those cultural differences

but, most importantly, improve services for underserved populations. Yet, the so-called culturally adapted treatments seem to obscure the fact that treatments are products of cultures, to begin with. In unacknowledging culture as origin, there is concomitant ignorance of different forms and sources of knowledge that are just as important in determining best mental health practices and treatment. EBPs may therefore be viewed as a hegemonic paradigm that imposes a certain type of empirical epistemology as the sole method for collecting evidence to support efficacious treatment and mental health practices. Such pervasive discourse asserts that no other sources of valid or meaningful knowledge exist. This, in turn, imposes itself as a universalist paradigm that neglects its own status as a culturally bound paradigm and the psychology it results in. Furthermore, it neglects the existence of other Indigenous psychologies based on alternate paradigms and sources of knowledge (Arnett, 2008; Christopher et al., 2014; Thalmayer et al., 2021).

Among a myriad of ways to redress the hegemonic, current state of affairs, one poignant avenue is the unequivocal affirmation of alternate cultural paradigms in psychology. Alternate cultural paradigms are defined as existing theories or frameworks beyond the hegemonic Eurowestern perspective dominating our field (Myers, 1988, 1993, 2016). They adopt different ontological, epistemological, and axiological assumptions compared with mainstream Eurowestern psychology, describing alternate conceptualizations of health, well-being, and human identity development. Alternate cultural paradigms are a main vehicle for social justice, aiming to address and dismantle oppression, disenfranchisement, and inequities experienced by individuals and marginalized groups while affirming emancipatory practices that foster not only reparative or restorative justice but, most importantly, distributive justice (Prilleltensky, 1997).

Myers et al. (this issue) articulated four elements that, taken together, constitute an alternate cultural paradigm. In their definition, an alternate cultural paradigm utilizes ontological, epistemological, and axiological assumptions consistent with the particular cultural frame of reference which likely differs from those commonly propagated in mainstream Eurowestern psychology. It provides an understanding of and appreciation for the lived experience and strengths of the cultural group not identified or captured in mainstream cultural analyses, for example, development of a nosology that speaks to healthful and/or pathological markers of oppressed, disenfranchised, and/or dehumanized people. Furthermore, an alternate cultural paradigm is not reliant on a Eurowestern worldview or perspective, but rather pushes psychological knowledge production toward a broader, inclusive, more expansive understanding of humankind. It does so by, for example, engaging ancient and sacred texts that predate Eurowestern civilization and by accompanying,

shoulder-to-shoulder, the oppressed and disenfranchised (Bynum, 1999; Martín-Baró, 1994). Finally, an alternate cultural paradigm has the capacity to identify, acknowledge, and appreciate the heights of knowledge across cultural groups by, for example, seeking to examine the convergence of knowledge across cultures in an inclusive, comprehensive, cohesive, and coherent manner (Myers et al., 2018).

Scholars such as George Albee, Franz Fanon, Paulo Freire, Lind James Myers, Ignacio Martín Baró, Abraham Maslow, and Maritza Montero, among others, have astutely articulated the understanding that problems in living and psychopathology must be considered in the complexities of contexts, including, but not limited to, oppression, inequities, and/or alienation of certain groups or individuals by other privileged and dominant groups. In rejecting the idea that Eurowestern psychological foundations are universal, alternate cultural paradigms recognize and respect differential cultural norms that may address power inequities and improve access to and actual treatment *with* (not *for*) underserved communities.

ABPsi, NLPA, SIP, AAPA, and AMENA-Psy Contributions

We elected to order the articles honoring the historical advent of the ethnic-acknowledging associations, that is, ABPsi (1968), NLPA (1969—formerly Association of Psychologists por La Raza, National Hispanic Psychological Association, National Latina/o Psychological Association), SIP (1971), AAPA (1972), and the most recently constituted AMENA-Psy (2017). Accordingly, the first contribution, by Myers et al. (this issue) on behalf of ABPsi, documents the pressing need for and availability of theories and practices that expand our cultural lens to include a more comprehensive, cohesive, and coherent understanding and appreciation of what it means to be human. No longer silent regarding the absence of a clear articulation of what mental health is in Eurowestern psychology and its reluctance to unravel the intricacies of real life human experience in historical and social context, the article by Myers and colleagues presents an incisive critique of Eurowestern psychology underscoring its failure to unearth its own oppressive roots and inadequate capacity for healing and uplifting humanity. Emphasizing the imperative to recognize the production of psychological knowledge beyond the mainstream cultural worldview, the role and development of Black/Africana/Pan African psychology are introduced. The authors, who are among the leading theoreticians and scientist-practitioners who have advanced a psychology focusing on people acknowledging African

ancestry, have done so in full awareness that all people based on the most current biogenetic, linguistic, archeological, and anthropological evidence share this common heritage. However, they do not minimize the unique position of Non-immigrant Africans in America (NIAAs) in human history, as descendants of those hundreds of millions of African people kidnapped and trafficked to America as caste enslaved chattel without any human rights to build the wealth of their captors and this nation, and emerge 350 years later as the moral and spiritual leaders of this nation's movement toward civil rights for all. In turn, the authors deftly enunciate an African-centered cultural worldview, its values, and promising psychological models, practices, and strategies. It is in this culturally grounded context that Myers developed the theory of Optimal Psychology, also known as Optimal Conceptual Theory (OCT), and Belief Systems Analysis (BSA), its corollary psychotherapeutic approach (Myers 1988, 1993, 2003). Both have been utilized with significant success (Myers et al., 2018) and are based on a cultural paradigm "rooted in the wisdom tradition of African deep thought from classical African civilization" (Myers et al., this issue).

While movement toward alternate cultural paradigms is at differing stages of development and focus within each of the EAPAs, the spiritual aspect of being seems to be acknowledged by all. However, spirituality as a construct is not the same in OCT Black/Africana psychology as recognition of Spirit Being, which presupposes a different ontological premise, that all is Spirit, Energy, Mind, Consciousness, Neberdjer (ancient Kemetic or Nubian/Egyptian term for Source Totality). To use the term spirituality to connote this creative life force would be to misread the variance in ways of being in and seeing the world, as well as likely exemplify the bent toward a more Eurowestern lens. Just as many may not distinguish the difference between spirituality and religiosity, such a distinction is essential to the proper understanding of the conception of humans as spirit beings manifesting in an infinite variety of unique and intricate ways in line with realization of their divine identity and purpose. This cultural reality has proven foundational for NIAA's survival and transcendence of over 250 years of enslavement as caste chattel, another 150 years without human rights in this society, only to emerge in the past several decades as the moral and spiritual leaders of this nation's movement toward civil rights for all people. Given the response to trauma so prevalent in mainstream American culture today in response to the COVID pandemic, a different paradigm is needed to account for these miracles of modern time.

Within OCT, the idea of liberation and healing from conceptual incarceration, intellectual imperialism, emotional and mental bondage, epistemicide, and other forms of psychological oppressions and trauma holds within inherent practical applications toward life well lived. True emancipation cannot be

void of application in the cultural worldview it put forward. To ignore this stated fact and reality reflects the need for training in an acknowledged emic psychology, such as Black/Africana psychology, that has heretofore been marginalized, if not ignored, while humanity is being pushed to the brink of destruction.

Similarly, the logic common to the epistemology of the wisdom tradition of African deep thought is diunital (both/and reasoning), not the dichotomous (either/or reasoning) characteristic of Eurowestern cultural tradition prevailing in this society and the rest of the Westernized world. Failure to delve into the deep structures of culture and entertain ideas beyond those trapping adherents in the dichotomous either/or thinking of the prevailing Eurowestern cultural paradigm fosters a superficial focus on matters proven to be of little consequence relative to solutions to critical concerns such as racism, sexism, and classism and for the general upliftment of humanity. The long-known principles of the ancient African sage Tehuti, also known as Thoth by the Greeks, include duality which observes and acknowledges everything is by nature dual. This understanding avoids the false placement of binary contrasts as oppositional as opposed to complementary and being of the same essence as inherently simplistic as opposed to complex and distinct at the same time. The psycho-educational and clinical applications of OCT and psychotherapeutic practice of BSA all reflect crystallization and articulation of an alternate cultural paradigm that has been demonstrated to have great resonance within Black/Africana communities and among diverse ethnic groups.

The second contribution, by Consoli et al. (this issue) on behalf of NLPA, is an empirical effort to identify alternate cultural paradigms from a Latinx perspective, according to members of NLPA. The process, conducted in an iterative manner where members of NLPA were informed of the results in four successive waves while being asked to contribute further, was followed by the systematization of the multiple responses received into a thematic map. The alternate cultural paradigms within Latinx psychology identified through this methodology can be best characterized as multidisciplinary efforts to promote health and wellness in Latinx communities by combating oppression and inequities while resorting to the use of culturally congruent norms and specific values. Furthermore, the thematic analysis identified a cluster of evidence-based treatments that have been adapted to Latinx populations, although these are not considered alternate cultural paradigms by the authors.

The third contribution, by Blume (this issue) on behalf of SIP, details the lack of representation of an Indigenous worldview in mainstream psychology. In fact, such mainstream, Eurowestern psychology exists within a cultural framework that has normalized the oppression and exclusion of Indigenous populations while advancing a colonizing mentality born out of a

myth of superiority rather than siblinghood. The values of independence, autonomy, and hierarchy that characterize Eurowestern psychology and its emphasis on the self are antithetical to an Indigenous worldview. The latter views “humans as part of an interdependent holistic system of co-equal partners,” and congruently, psychology must concern itself with the development of healthy relationships with others, rather than with the self (Blume, this issue). Blume explains that Indigenous American psychology is founded on the sacred nature of the whole and its members. Such core foundation offers an alternate paradigm that addresses “intergenerational psychological problems holistically across time.”

The fourth contribution, by Yoo et al. (this issue) on behalf of the AAPA, focuses on race, racialization, and racism in the lived experiences of Asian Americans, in an effort to go beyond the traditional concerns for culture and ethnicity. Their article is directed primarily at researchers. Although an analysis still fitting within the purview of the mainstream Eurowestern cultural paradigm, its introduction in the field of Asian American psychology may provide a solid foundation for future developments in the area. The article offers a compelling exposé of essentialist stereotypes of Asian Americans in U.S. society and situates historically the political formation of an Asian American racial identity. The authors draw from Asian Critical Race theory and do so from a psychological perspective to further develop research within Asian American psychology. The article underscores the unique types of oppression experienced by Asian Americans across time while simultaneously honoring their resistance and resilience within an Asian Americanist perspective.

The fifth contribution by Awad et al. (this issue) was first presented at the CNPAAEMI Alternative Cultural Paradigms Symposium by MENA on behalf of CNPAAEMI member APA Division 45. MENA has since organized itself into the AMENA-Psy, and its piece is being included under that name. The writers trace the roots within the broader discipline of Arab American Studies which began in the 1920s. Arab American Studies documented experiences of discrimination toward Arab/MENA Americans occurring between 1914 and 1930, when Arab/MENA American immigrants were experiencing discrimination on interpersonal, institutional, and societal/cultural levels. The authors document a strong identification with multicultural psychology and the interest in understanding AMENA families since the 1990s. Moreover, a renewed interest in understanding the populations of foci has taken place following the events of September 11, 2001 (known as 9/11), in the United States. The authors emphasize experiences of discrimination, cumulative trauma, and acculturation that characterize many AMENA populations. The authors argue that despite being a particularly diverse group when it comes to culture, religion, history, and language, a geographic recognition of an AMENA identity is based on shared human values such as hospitality and family.

These five articles are followed by a thoughtful commentary written by Joseph P. Gone (this issue). Gone is Professor of Anthropology and Global Health and Social Medicine at Harvard University. An enrolled member of the Aaniiih-Gros Ventre tribal Nation of Montana, he serves as the Faculty Director of the Harvard University Native American Program. Professor Gone is uniquely qualified to serve as commentator for this Special Issue considering his renown expertise on cultural matters based on his own Native American experiences in professional psychology and his extensive editorial service.

We hope readers are inspired by this distinctive set of projects and respect their differing stages of development. Some contributions may resemble more what we frame here as alternative, others may be described as in the thick of a transition into alternate, while others could be seen as there already. Regardless, we trust the readers will find in each and every contribution that constitute this Special Issue a consistent invitation to consider the diverse ethnic and cultural roots of professional psychology, a healing, transformative, utterly humanistic practice.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the encouragement received by our colleagues in the Council of National Psychology Associations for the Advancement of Ethnic Minority Interests and by Gordon C. Nagayama Hall.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Partial support for this project was provided to the first author in the form of a two-quarter sabbatical leave, granted by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

ORCID iDs

Andrés J. Consoli  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0828-4293>

Linda James Myers  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4588-3607>

References

American Psychological Association, Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice. (2006). Evidence-based practice in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61(4), 271–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.271>

- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63*(7), 602–614. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602>
- Awad, G. H., Ikizler, A., Abdel-Salam, L., Kia-Keating, M., Amini, B., & El-Ghoroury, N. (this issue). Foundations for an Arab/MENA psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*.
- Blume, A. W. (this issue). Promoting new psychological understandings by use of an Indigenous American psychological paradigm. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*.
- Bynum, E. B. (1999). *The African unconsciousness: Roots of ancient mysticism and modern psychology*. Teachers College Press.
- Christopher, J. C., Wendt, D. C., Marecek, J., & Goodman, D. M. (2014). Critical cultural awareness: Contributions to a globalizing psychology. *American Psychologist, 69*(7), 645–655. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036851>
- Consoli, A. J., López, I., & Whaling, K. M. (this issue). Alternate cultural paradigms in Latinx psychology: An empirical, collaborative exploration. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*.
- Consoli, A. J., & Myers, L. J. (2016, August). *Ethnic Psychological Associations expand psychological knowledge: Alternative cultural paradigms*. Symposium conducted at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Denver, Colorado.
- Fuentes, M., Zelaya, D., & Madsen, J. (2021). Rethinking the course syllabus: Considerations for promoting equity, diversity, and inclusion. *Teaching of Psychology, 48*(1), 69–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628320959979>
- Kamens, S. R. (2021). Toward a humanistic future: Sixty years of the Journal of Humanistic Psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 61*, 3–7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167820977321>
- King, M. L. Jr. (1968). The role of the behavioral scientist in the civil rights movement. *American Psychologist, 23*, 180–186.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Leong, F. T. L. (2009). Guest editor's introduction: History of racial and ethnic minority psychology. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*(4), 315–316. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0017556>
- Martín-Baró, I. (1994). *Writings for liberation psychology*. Harvard University Press.
- Martínez, K. J., Callejas, L., & Hernández, M. (2010). Community-defined evidence: A bottom-up behavioral health approach to measure what works in communities of color. *Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in Youth, 10*(1), 11–16.
- Myers, L. J. (1988, 1993). *Understanding an Afrocentric world view: Introduction to an optimal psychology*. Kendall/Hunt. (Original work published 1988)
- Myers, L. J. (2003). *Our health matters: Guide to an African (Indigenous) American psychology and cultural model for creating a climate and culture of optimal health*. Ohio Commission on Minority Health.

- Myers, L. J. (2016, August). Alternative cultural paradigms. In A. J. Consoli, & L. J. Myers, *Ethnic psychological associations expand psychological knowledge: Alternative cultural paradigms*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Denver, Colorado.
- Myers, L. J., Anderson, M., Lodge, T., Speight, S., & Queener, J. (2018). Optimal theory's contributions to understanding and surmounting global challenges to humanity. *Journal of Black Psychology, 44*(8), 747–772. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418813240>
- Myers, L. J., Lodge, T., Speight, S. L., & Haggins, K. (this issue). The necessity of an emic paradigm in psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*.
- Prilleltensky, I. (1997). Values, assumptions, and practices: Assessing the moral implications of psychological discourse and action. *American Psychologist, 52*, 517–535.
- Royster, J. J. (1996). When the first voice you hear is not your own. *College Composition and Communication, 47*, 29–40.
- Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2021). The neglected 95% revisited: Is American psychology becoming less American? *American Psychologist, 76*(1), 116–129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000622>
- Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. The Associated Publishers.
- Yoo, H. C., Gabriel, A. K., & Okazaki, S. (this issue). Advancing research within Asian American psychology using Asian critical race theory and an Asian Americanist perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*.

Author Biographies



Andrés J. Consoli is a faculty member at the University of California, Santa Barbara and a distinguished visiting professor at the Universidad del Valle, Guatemala. He is a fellow of the American Psychological Association (APA) and a former president of the National Latinx Psychological Association, the Interamerican Society of Psychology (SIP), and the Western Association of Counselor Education and Supervision. He serves as Vice-President for International Affairs of APA's Society of Counseling Psychology (2020–2023). He received SIP's Interamerican Psychologist Award for distinguished contributions to the advancement of psychology in the Americas and

the Excellent Contribution Award for remarkable contributions to international research, program development, and teaching/mentoring by SCP's International Counseling Psychology Section. With more than 100 publications, he is the lead editor of the multinational book titled *Comprehensive Textbook of Psychotherapy: Theory and Practice*, published by Oxford University Press, and a coauthor of the binational book titled *CBT Strategies for Anxious and Depressed Children and Adolescents: A Clinician's Toolkit*, published by Guilford Press.



Linda James Myers, Academic Professor Emerita, The Ohio State University, is an internationally recognized scholar and thought leader, whose Africological perspective in the production of psychological knowledge places the wisdom tradition of African deep thought at the forefront of the paradigm shift supported by contemporary science converging with Eastern philosophies. Her work, Optimal Psychology and Belief Systems Analysis, its psychotherapeutic approach, deepens our understanding of the achievement of the higher stages of human development, providing great insight into cultural deep structures, eradication of societal

isms, and shifting consciousness to enhance health, moral, spiritual, and energetic growth, as well as individual and collective sustainable well-being. She is a recipient of numerous honors and awards, including the NCBS Bethune/Woodson Award for Outstanding Contributions in the Development and Promotion of Black Studies, ASCAC Building to Eternity Award for Outstanding Scholarship and Activism, IBWC Oni Award, Columbia University Teachers College Social Justice Action Award, Fulbright Scholar, NCBW Sojourner Truth Award, Mental Health Association of America Outstanding Pioneer in African American Mental Health, and The Ohio State University Hans Kilian Award of Merit for Research and Advancement of Metacultural Humanization Nominee. She is a Past President and Distinguished Psychologist of the Association of Black Psychologists.