

APPLYING THE CULTURAL ACCOMMODATION MODEL TO DIVERSITY CONSULTING IN ORGANIZATIONS

Frederick T. L. Leong and Jason L. Huang
Michigan State University

In response to the increasing need for more consultation models that take into account culture, this article proposes an integration of Schein's (1999) Process Consultation Model with Leong's Cultural Accommodation Model (Leong & Lee, 2006) to address multicultural issues in consultation. Beginning with a review of each of these 2 models, the manuscript moves on to present the integrated CAM-PC Model. This is followed by an illustration of practical application of the CAM in a consultation case.

Keywords: process consultation, multicultural consultation, cultural accommodation, cultural validity, cultural specificity

The workforce in the United States has become increasingly diversified in the past few decades (U.S. Department of Labor, 2001). Workforce, 2000 (Johnston and Packer, 1987) predicted that Blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities would comprise a large share of the new additions to the workforce between 1987 and 2000 and they would be more than 15% of the workforce in 2000. The study estimated that new entrants to the U.S. labor force from 1985 to 2000 will be 57% Whites, 20% non-Whites, and 22% immigrants, as compared to the composition in the year of 1985, 83% Whites, 10% non-Whites, and 7% immigrants. As a response to the estimated diversification of the American workforce, the industry has seen an increasing popularity of diversity and sensitivity training to accommodate cultural differences in the workplace, with most government agencies and 36% of companies of all sizes offering some type of diversity training (Hemphill & Haines, 1997; Lippman, 1999). It is estimated that diversity training has been implemented in half of all U.S. firms with over 100 employees at an annual cost of \$10 billion (Lubove, 1997).

As a sequel to the Workforce, 2000, Workforce 2020 (Judy & D'Amico, 1997) showed support for the diversifying trend predicted in the first study, and predicted further increase in

Frederick T. L. Leong and Jason L. Huang, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Frederick T. L. Leong, Michigan State University, Department of Psychology, Psychology Building, East Lansing, MI 48824. E-mail: fleong@msu.edu

the percentage of non-White new entrants in the U.S. workforce. Based on the Census Bureau projections, the proportion of White non-Hispanics in the total population will decrease even faster, whereas Hispanics, African Americans, and Asians are expected to grow. Related to the change in the population, the ethnic composition of the American workforce is expected to gradually change toward diversification. The report projected that by the year 2020, White non-Hispanic workers will occupy only 68% of the total U.S. working population, whereas Asian, Hispanic, and Black workers are expected to constitute 6%, 14%, and 11%, respectively. Although the change in the composition is only gradual, regional differences in the rate of changing are quite large. For example, the change of workforce ethnicity will be rapid and dramatic in certain parts of the West and South and in many large cities.

Along with the diversifying American workforce, multiculturalism has generated increased attention in research and practice in consultation. Multicultural issues have been widely explored in both research and practice, and general guidelines for psychologists to support multiculturalism in organizational change efforts have been established (American Psychological Association, 2003). Researchers also highlighted the competencies that are important to effective multicultural consultation (e.g., Arredondo & Reinoso, 2003; Sue, 2001; Sue & Constantine, 2005). Much in the same way that there has been a call for cross-cultural competence in counseling and psychotherapy, there is an equally strong need for such cross-cultural competence in organizational consulting given the increasing cultural diversity of our organizations.

In his years of experience as a consultant, the first author has often found that a major challenge has been the lack of a general model in consulting psychology that pertains to multicultural issues in the delivery of consultation. To tackle this problem, Leong developed a conceptual model by integrating his Cultural Accommodation Model (CAM; Leong & Lee, 2006) with the principles of Schein's (1999) Process Consultation (PC) approach. PC is a process model in organizational consulting that deals with the mutual exploration of organizational functioning by the consultant and the client.

In addressing the questions guiding this special issue regarding challenges and useful conceptual models addressing consulting practice, this paper will first summarize the PC and the CAM models separately, and will then present the integrated conceptual model for multicultural consultation. This will be followed by a discussion of some of the consultation experiences to illustrate the model's applicability.

Schein's Process Consultation Model

Schein's PC approach is a philosophy to organizational learning and development that builds on the premise that the primary goal of the consultant is to help the organization to help itself. PC acknowledges that the consultant may never gather enough information about the particular situation and culture of the organization to be able to recommend effective solutions to the organization about its problems. Rather, it emphasizes an effective helping relationship between the consultant and the organization so that the consultant can guide the organization through the process of discovering its own problems and finding solutions. PC is defined by Schein as

the creation of a relationship with the client that permits the client to perceive, understand, and act on the process events that occur in the client's internal and external environment in order to improve the situation as defined by the client. (Schein, 1999, p. 20)

According to Schein, there are three models of consultation in which the consultant takes on different roles vis-à-vis the client, the purchase of expertise (PE) model, the doctor-patient

(DP) model, and the PC (PC) model. The consultant may operate under one of these modes at any given time, and may engage in different modes during the consultation process.

In the PE model, the organization purchases from the consultant some information or expert service that the organization is lacking. In general, the diagnosis that an organization is in need of such information or service comes from a manager inside the company. Schein (1999) noted that the success of the expertise model is predicated on many factors, some of which take place before the consultation begins. Success, he argued, is based on the following four assumptions: The manager has to be able to correctly identify the need of the organization. The manager has to be able to select the appropriate service and the capable consultant to address the problems at hand and has to communicate the problems to the consultant. And finally the manager needs to have considered the consequences of the delivery of service or the implementation of interventions.

Compared to the PE model, the DP model assigns the diagnosing role to the consultant. The manager brings in the consultant to identify the cause of the problems in the organization and then to recommend an intervention. The success of the DP model relies on three factors. First, the manager has to accurately identify the organization units that are in need of diagnosis. Second, the people in the organization need to be willing to reveal information to the consultant, to trust the diagnosis, to accept the recommended intervention, and to understand and accept the related consequences. Finally, the client needs to be able to make the changes.

The PC model differs from the PE and the DP model in that both the consultant and the manager are involved in the identification of the problems from the beginning of the PC. Both the manager and the consultant understand that neither of them possesses enough knowledge about the problem at the time of initial contact. The consultant therefore refrains from drawing conclusion about the problems of the organization early with a priori assumptions. The PC approach is based on the implicit assumption that human interactions and processes are at the roots of all organizational problems. Through joint diagnosis, the processes that will make a difference to organizational effectiveness are identified. The consultant in this model then assists the manager to construct a valid action plan to improve these processes. It is important that the consultant sees the problems as the client's and helps the client to develop diagnostic and problem-solving skills.

Schein provided 10 general principles to guide consultants in building the helping relationship in PC. In the consultation process, the consultant is encouraged to follow these guidelines, especially when the situation is ambiguous. The following briefly summarizes these principles. Although they are listed independently in Schein's original writing (Schein, 1999), we believe that three content themes can be used to classify them into three categories. Further, the tripartite categorization presented here is intended to be heuristic: the groupings reflect difference in emphases rather than exclusive areas of practice.

Category 1. Consultant-client relationship. This category contains principles that pertain to the relationship between consultant and client. Always try to be helpful (Schein, 1999, p. 6). It is the client who owns the problem and the solution (Schein, 1999, p. 20). When in doubt share the problem (Schein, 1999, p. 55).

Category 2. Information collection. This category includes principles that pertain to the means and processes by which the consultant gathers data to understand the situation. Always stay in touch with the current reality (Schein, 1999, p. 6). Access your ignorance (Schein, 1999, p. 11). Go with the flow (Schein, 1999, p. 39). Everything is a source of data; errors are inevitable—learn from them (Schein, 1999, p. 60).

Category 3. Intervention. This category is composed of principles on the delivery of interventions. Everything you do is an intervention (Schein, 1999, p. 17). Timing is crucial (Schein, 1999, p. 49). Be constructively opportunistic with confrontive [sic] interventions (Schein, 1999, p. 49).

We selected Schein's model of consultation from among the various models available because of its focus on an open and dialectical exploration of issues that deals with ambiguity in organizational settings. The same ambiguity occurs in multicultural consultation in which the consultant and the clients and/or members of the organizations may be from different cultures or racial and ethnic backgrounds. In addition, Schein's approach also more closely resembles the "emic" approach in cross-cultural psychology (i.e., a culture-specific, discovery oriented, bottom-up approach to data gathering) in contrast to the "etic" approach more common in mainstream U.S. psychology (i.e., a universalist, top-down, hypothesis-testing approach with predetermined constructs and measures; Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 1992).

CAM of Consultation

Although Schein's (1999) PC Model is quite flexible and adaptable to ambiguous situations, it does not specifically address cultural factors in consultation. The CAM for cross-cultural psychotherapy (Leong & Lee, 2006), we argue, can be adapted for organizational consultation practice. Early components of the CAM were presented in a chapter by Leong and Tang (2002) and then further articulated in an article by Leong and Lee. The following summary of this model has been based on these two primary sources.

In 1996, Leong presented a multidimensional and integrative model of cross-cultural counseling and psychotherapy based on Kluckhohn and Murray's (1950) tripartite framework. He proposed that cross-cultural therapists need to attend to all three major dimensions of human personality and identity, namely the universal (U), the group (G), and the individual (I) dimensions. The U dimension is based on the knowledge-base generated by mainstream psychology and the "universal laws" of human behavior that have been supported by substantial bodies of research. The G dimension has been the domain of both cross-cultural psychology as well as ethnic minority psychology and the study of gender differences. The third and final dimension concerns unique I characteristics. The I dimension is more often covered by behavioral and existential theories in which individual learning histories and personal phenomenology are proposed as critical elements in the understanding of human behavior. Leong's (1996) integrative model proposed that all three UGI dimensions are equally important in understanding human experiences and should be attended to by the counselor in an integrative fashion.

In developing his integrative model, Leong (1996) used a famous quote from Kluckhohn and Murray's (1950) influential article. The Determinants of Personality Formation that was published in their book *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, as the beginning point for his model. The quote was: "Every man [sic] is in certain respects: a) like all other men, b) like some other men, and c) like no other man" (p. 35). Kluckhohn and Murray's contention was that some of the determinants of personality are common features found in the makeup of all people. This could be interpreted as addressing the biological aspect of the biopsychosocial model (Engel, 1977) generally used in today's medical sciences. For certain other features of personality, however, Kluckhohn and Murray (1950) stated that most individuals are like some other individuals suggesting the

importance of social grouping, whether that grouping is based on culture, race, ethnicity, gender, or social class. Lastly, they said that "Each individual's modes of perceiving, feeling, needing, and behaving have characteristic patterns which are not precisely duplicated by those of any other individual" (p. 37). Each person's individuality, often the focus of social learning theories and models, is thus implied. It suggests that all persons have distinct social learning experiences that can influence their values, beliefs, and cognitive schemas.

Leong and Brown (1995) argued that psychological constructs or models need to be examined in regard to their cultural validity. Until their cultural validity is evaluated, cross-cultural extensions and applications of a construct or model beyond the cultural population on which they have been developed need to proceed cautiously. Leong and Brown further argued that much of the work of cross-cultural psychology is concerned with the assessment of the cultural validity of psychological constructs and models that have been developed primarily within the Western cultural context.

On the other hand, simply focusing on the U dimension completely ignores the G and I components that, we argue, are absolutely necessary for a complete understanding of human behavior. Although the U dimension in counseling (and, by extension, we argue, in consulting) is very important to the integrative model, it is necessary but not sufficient for understanding and often misguided for intervening (Leong, 1996). According to Leong, the G component of human personality is equally important as the U component. These groupings may be based on culture, race, ethnicity, social class, occupation, religion, or gender. All persons in one group, we argue, share some type of bond with other members of the group, and this bond will distinguish the group members from members of other groups. It is further proposed that belonging to a group will be a major determinant of a person's personality (Leong & Tang, 2002).

Moreover, membership in a group can affect an individual in many ways, and these ways can become the focus of interpersonal dynamics. For example, persons who have suffered from oppression because of their religion or race will no longer be speaking from a U perspective, as their experiences have not been shared by all persons. A consultant who tries to relate to these clients on a U level will be doing them a disservice, and this will most likely create negative relationships.

The G component of personality is especially important when discussing cross-cultural consultation. Important constructs related to this dimension include racial/ethnic identity, acculturation and value preferences. A culturally competent consultant, we argue, must be able to consider all these variables from the standpoint of the client, especially if the client is a member of a different group. Not doing so, we suggest, would make it impossible to accurately conceptualize the client's psychological state, which in turn would make effective consultation difficult at best. As noted by Leong and Tang (2002), there are many dynamics that must be taken into consideration in counseling situations involving a client and therapist of different cultural backgrounds. Each person must have some awareness of the experiences of the other in order to be able to form a relationship. This is, we argue, also true for the organizational consultant. A consultant operating only at the U level may alienate the client. Although the two may not have shared G-level experiences in their backgrounds, the consultant must be able to address issues that involve groups other than his or her own. Leong (1996) suggested that using only the U dimension to understand people is severely limited due to the importance of group differences, especially those such as racial, ethnic, and cultural, that can have profound influence on most individual members. Indeed, Leong and Brown (1995) proposed that when problems occur in establishing the cultural validity of a construct or model,

culturally specific variables (often referred to as “indigenous” variables in cross-cultural psychology circles; e.g., Kanungo, 1990; Watkins, Mboya, & Sachs, 2001) can add greatly to our understanding of human behavior. It is important to note here that human behavior always occurs within a specific cultural context. In other words, the integrative combination of the U and G dimensions of human personality, we believe, provides a richer model with which to understand human beings. This, in turn, requires us to examine issues of both cultural validity and cultural specificity in the advancement of consultation models.

Finally, there is the I component of human personality within Leong’s (1996) integrative CAM model. Although it is true that we all share some commonalities, as reflected by the U component, no two persons are identical in every way. Kluckhohn and Murray (1950) said, “Each individual’s modes of perceiving, feeling, needing, and behaving have characteristic patterns which are not precisely duplicated by those of any other individual” (p. 37). Kluckhohn and Murray seemed to be referring to an idea akin to the concept of the “psychological environment” (Lewin, 1951) that referred to the idea that although two people may share the same physical space, they may not share the same psychological space. To neglect the I component would be to run the danger of stereotyping persons from various cultural groups due to overgeneralizations from the G dimension. The I component of human personality, we argue, is equally important as the U or G components, but it will not be dealt with directly in the current paper because we are concerned primarily with the issues of cultural validity and cultural specificity (Leong & Tang, 2002).

The CAM, based on this integrative model, is proposed to be additive to both the universalist and the culture assimilation approaches to psychological theories of consultation. In ignoring the cultural dimension, the universalist approach is only culturally validated for the original group on which the theory was developed (i.e., White European Americans) but of limited cultural validity for racial and ethnic minority groups without specifically being validated on those groups. In minimizing the role of cultural factors, models based on a culture assimilation approach will also be of limited value cross-culturally and when applied to racial and ethnic minority groups. Both the universalist and culture assimilation approaches, we believe, suffer from many cultural gaps and blind-spots (Leong & Tang, 2002).

Leong and Lee (2006) identified three steps in the proposed cultural accommodation approach: (a) identifying the cultural gaps or cultural blindspots in an existing theory that may restrict the cultural validity of the theory, (b) selecting current culturally specific concepts and models from cross-cultural and ethnic minority psychology to fill in the cultural gaps and accommodate the theory to racial and ethnic minorities, and (c) testing the culturally accommodated theory to determine if it has incremental validity above and beyond the culturally unaccommodated theory.

For the first step of the cultural accommodation process, we need to examine what aspects of the consultation model or theory in question can be considered culture general and be extended to other cultural groups beyond the dominant culture (e.g., White European Americans)? We also need to consider what aspects of the theory are culture specific to the dominant culture and should not be generalized or imposed on other cultural groups? Furthermore, are there experiences of racial and ethnic minority groups, represented as culture-specific constructs that are not captured within the theory? These questions of cultural validity and cultural specificity will need to be examined in the cultural context of the environment. Once the theory has been evaluated, we can move to identifying its culture gaps and blind spots (Leong & Lee, 2006).

Having reviewed the commonly used Western models of consultation with regards to their cross-cultural validity and degree of cultural loading, culture-specific constructs need to be identified to fill the gaps. This constitutes the second step in the cultural accommodation model. It is essentially an incremental validity model whereby the universal or culture-general aspects of these Western models need to be supplemented with culture-specific information. It is proposed that adding culture-specific elements to the Western models to consider the cultural dynamics of racial and ethnic minority clients will produce a more effective and relevant approach to consultation with these clients when universalistic models are not confirmed to be equally valid in the other cultures. When accommodation is needed the question then becomes what cultural variables should be used for this process. There are likely a myriad of cultural variables that may be implicated in the cross-cultural consultation triad (i.e., consultant, client, and the employees) and as such, are inherently more complex than those that constitutes the dyadic cross-cultural psychotherapy encounter. Leong and Lee (2006) proposed that the selection of the culture-specific variables for accommodation be guided by the evidence-based practice (EBP) approach. Therefore, consultants using the CAM need to undertake a review of the scientific literature with regards to the most critical and salient culture-specific variables to add to their consultation model.

In the next section, we will present an integration of the CAM into the PC model. This is founded on our belief that the consultant should incorporate culture specific variables in the consultation process so as to strengthen the applicability of PC consultation model to multicultural organizations. Then, in the final section of the article, we will illustrate how the CAM-PC is applied in consultation.

Integrated CAM-PC Model

We argue that the increasing diversity in the workforce calls for a theory of organizational consultation that addresses the creation and maintenance of effective interactions between employees of different cultures. Although PC provides consultants with a central philosophy and several principles to effect organizational change, it does not specifically address issues arising from increased diversity in organizations. The CAM, although offering a stepwise approach to culture-related issues, has not been applied yet in the consulting context. The integration of the CAM model with the PC approach to consultation, we propose, may offer an effective approach to consultation in organizations with diverse workforce.

Simply put, the combined new model is PC adjusted for cultural gaps. Under this model, a consultant will try to approach organizational processes from the U dimension of human behavior; then will consider whether in the particular consultation there are gaps between the U dimension and G dimension that need to be accommodated. I dimension may also need to be considered some of the time, though we argue less frequently than the other two dimensions. For example, self-evaluation as part of an employee evaluation process is a commonly used way for the employees to reflect on their past performance, serving as a mechanism to improve their subsequent performance. Representatives of an organizational client may, however, have observed that Chinese and Japanese American employees tend to evaluate themselves relatively lower than other groups of employees. Although research evidence shows that self-ratings are generally more lenient than other ratings, suggesting self-enhancement in self-report (Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Mabe & West, 1982; Tsui & Barry, 1986), the consultant using the model presented here would not

assume a universal effect of self-evaluation on employees from different cultural backgrounds. Rather, in considering group differences in self evaluation, the consultant would consider whether the lower self-ratings may have resulted from the modesty norms that are valued in the cultures whose members self-evaluated themselves lower, such as in Japan (Suzuki & Yamashi, 2004) and China (Farh, Dobbins, & Cheng, 1991). Such ratings may differ from self-enhancement effect that is typically found in Western cultures, in which most of the relevant research studies were conducted. However, using this model, the consultant would also need to understand that not all Chinese and Japanese American employees self-evaluated their job performances modestly. Such variations, we contend, derive from the I dimension. In addition, organizational norms and socialization in the beginning of some employees' jobs may also have served to offset the modesty tendency.

The integration between the CAM and PC rests on the CAM's compatibility with the philosophical root of PC. Central to PC is the helping relationship between the consultant and the client, with an explicit acknowledgment that the consultant may never collect enough information about the organization to be in better position than the organization itself to plan for changes. In view of the CAM model, although consultants may comprehend a great deal about the universal aspects of human cultures, they are unlikely to be equipped with all the knowledge about the G level factors relevant to the diverse organization to readily identify the processes impacted by them within the specific organizational contexts. We argue that only through mutual exploration between the consultant and the client can hypotheses about the source of the problems be formulated and tested from the U level to the G level.

Next, we will review Schein's general principles from the perspective provided by the CAM. The three principles in the category of consultant–client relationship prescribe the nature of an optimal relationship between the consultant and the client and reflect the philosophy of PC. Although the consultant may need to be aware of potential resistance in acceptance of this optimal relationship from clients from different cultures, these three principles are, in general, encouraged to be applied on the U dimension.

The four principles in the second category, information collection, prescribe how the consultant can better perceive and understand the reality in the organization. Using the CAM's framework, organizational reality can be analyzed, from the consultant's perspective, along the three dimensions of human behavior. Therefore, these principles could be expanded by integration with the CAM.

The first generic guidance would be changed to "Always stay in touch with the current reality and consider where behaviors fall on the three U, G, I dimensions." In this model, the consultant is encouraged to think of the current reality in terms of the three dimensions and to generate as hypotheses information to test for modification of conclusions otherwise drawn. Two types of assumptions should be especially cautioned against. The first is to assume universalistic characteristics on people who exhibit certain characteristics unique to a group. For example, Cox (1993) suggested that individuals such as Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans that are from cooperation-oriented cultures may feel uncomfortable in competitive environments, and therefore dislike competitive programs such as ranking systems. The consultant should recognize the acceptance of existing systems may very well be influenced by cultures and refrain from assuming universal effect on employees of different cultural background. Another mistake is to assume a commonly found G dimension to be uniform among individuals with that group's membership. For example, it is equally wrong to assume that competitive environments would be aversive to all individuals from cooperation-oriented cultures. Rather than

assuming the dimensions behaviors fall under without substantiation, the consultant will need to be explicit about the assumptions he or she has toward the organizational reality, and constantly collect information to test the assumptions.

The second principle could be modified to be: "Assess your ignorance pertaining to the U, G, I dimensions." Consultants should first try to identify the dimension of behaviors that they are lacking knowledge in, and then to seek out information both from within the organization and from the literature. Just as the consultant is unlikely to understand all forces that influence the organizational processes, it is almost impossible to know all about the U and G dimensions of human behaviors. Therefore, the consultant, we argue, needs to actively seek information from the organization that may indicate what further knowledge is needed on either the U or G dimension.

The third modification would be: "Go with the flow and identify the gaps." In addition to finding out the cultures of the organization and the client's motivation and personality to assist consultation, the consultant is encouraged to gather information on the dimensions that immediately influence the organizational reality. For example, a consultant may discover that Mexican American employees are less satisfied with their jobs than their peers of other races in the company. Racial difference in job satisfaction have been found to be explained by structural factors (Konar, 1981) and cultural factors (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001). Structural factors refer to systematic differences in the ways employees are treated by the organization and by their supervisors (Moch, 1980). When consultants, for example, discover that Mexican American employees are treated less favorably compared to employees of other races because of some organizational practice, they can identify that it is the U dimension that has influenced the organizational reality: People feel dissatisfied when treated less favorably. On the other hand, cultural factors such as values and beliefs may have played a more important role (Moch, 1980). The consultant may find out that the Mexican American employees are in fact treated quite similarly to White employees, but they feel less at ease in the organization because the organization's task-oriented leadership style is in conflict with their propensity for relationship and friendship that arises from their culture (see, e.g., Zurcher, Meadow & Zurcher, 1965). In this case, the consultant might conclude that the G dimension has exerted greater influence on the organizational reality. When the gap is identified, the consultant will plan for an intervention with the client to accommodate the gap.

The fourth premise of PC could be modified to be: "Everything is a source of data to enlighten accommodation; errors are inevitable in testing hypotheses about U, G, I dimensions—learn from them." The use of the CAM involves testing of the consultant's formulated hypotheses about the dimensionality of behavior. From time to time, he or she may find that a previous hypothesis is not supported by additional information collected later, and thus needs to be reformulated. These errors provide important information for the consultant to get closer to the organizational reality and to modify possible intervention.

The intervention category in Schein's (1999) model consists of three principles that can at least be accommodated for unique G dimensions. Rewriting Schein's advice, "Everything you do is an intervention; consider beforehand and observe afterward at least the effects on the U dimension and the G dimension." Here, the I dimension is not stated explicitly in the principle because the consultant does not always have the opportunity to know the other party well enough to gather enough information about their I dimension. This lack of access to information, coupled with the following principle about timing of intervention, suggests that the consultant may often rely on information concerning the G dimension as a heuristic to effectively implement the joint diagnosis with the client.

Concerning Schein's belief that timing is crucial, consultants have to realize that there

are times that they may not have the luxury of time to gather sufficient information on each of the three dimensions before an intervention is under way. Sometimes a compromise has to be made so that the joint diagnosis can be carried out smoothly. The consultant can switch the mode of consulting without fully understand the possible effect, determining whether accommodation is needed, and if previous hypotheses on dimensions therefore would need to be changed.

Another principle of Schein's could be revised as follows: "Be constructively opportunistic with confrontative interventions while keeping in mind cultural differences." The appropriateness of a confrontative intervention may depend not only on its timing, the way it is delivered, the position and authority of the client, but also on the client's culture. For example, in Japanese culture, authority and power is evaluated and respected to a greater extent than in Western countries. A Japanese American client of a high position in the company may feel slighted by a consultant's confrontative intervention, although the same intervention may work fine with clients of other group origins.

Taken together, the integrated CAM-PC model encourages the consultant to explore the organizational reality together with the client with a focus on identifying the U and I dimensions that influence organizational processes and employee perceptions. With active information gathering and testing of hypotheses relevant to accommodation, the consultant may help the client discover the important cultural variables that can be the target of multicultural consultation.

Illustration of CAM

In extending the CAM of psychotherapy to the organizational consultation arena, we have argued that cross-culturally competent consultation requires (a) possessing the appropriate awareness of cultural factors in consultation, (b) acquiring the necessary knowledge about cultural differences and their impact on the consultation process and outcomes, and (c) developing the skills to use the cross-cultural knowledge in a culturally relevant and appropriate manner (Sue et al., 1982).

In this final section of the paper, we present a case example. It illustrates how to: (a) identify the cultural gaps or cultural blind spots in existing theories and models of consultation, (b) select culturally specific concepts and models from cross-cultural and ethnic minority psychology to fill in the cultural gaps and accommodate the original theory to racial and ethnic minorities, and (c) test the culturally accommodated theory to determine if it has incremental validity above and beyond the original and culturally unaccommodated theory (Leong & Lee, 2006).

A large consumer goods company contacted the first author to request consultation regarding cultural diversity training for its managers. Using the combined CAM-PC model, and after extensive interviews with the senior managers and the largest group of ethnic minority workers (Asian Americans), it was discovered that the central problem centered around cultural identity. Specifically, these Asian American employees were frustrated that even though they were highly trained scientists and engineers, most of them were overlooked for promotion into the managerial and supervisory side of the company where salaries were higher and the opportunity for effecting the direction of a unit were greater. These employees had collected data showing that there was indeed a systematic underrepresentation of Asian Americans in the managerial ranks when factors such as professional degrees, years of experience, and additional training were taken into account. Consistently, European Americans with lower professional degrees, fewer years of expe-

rience, and limited additional training were promoted into managerial ranks before their Asian American counterparts.

The process of arriving at the decision to focus on cultural identity as the organizing construct in which to make changes derived from two factors. First, interviews had revealed that both supervisors and Asian American workers identified cultural differences in language ability, interpersonal behaviors, and communication skills. Although supervisors and workers differed on the interpretations and attributions regarding the meaning of these cultural differences, there was little disagreement that it was those domains that were implicated in their concerns. For example, supervisors would point to the reticence of Asian American workers in teams as a potential issue in terms of leadership ability. On the other hand, the Asian Americans reported that their communication style in groups is a function of their cultural values (e.g., being respectful of authority and not dominating a conversation, using nonverbal cues, etc.). Thus, it appeared that using Schein's principle of staying close to the current reality and considering behaviors within the context of the U, G, and I dimensions, that the supervisors was operating at the U-level and the workers were operating at the G-level. At the same time, Schein's model also pointed out that "everything is a source of data" and the dinners with the executive and leading Asian Americans in the company confirmed the initial assessment because these highly successful Asian Americans were all highly acculturation (e.g., spoke English extremely well and socialized often with their European American counterparts).

Based on a review of the data from these interviews and observations, the lead author determined that it was an issue of organizational fit related to the level of acculturation of the workers and how they were behaving and being perceived by their supervisors and coworkers that was at the crux of the problem (see section below on cultural identity and acculturation). Second, management had decided that the best way to deal with these problems was to provide resources to the Asian American workers for them to resolve these issues. Hence, release time from work and monies for consultants and trainers were provided for them to attend relevant professional training. It was within the preparation work for these conferences that the decision to explore the role of cultural identity was arrived at by the parties concerned. In the initial interviews, it became clear that communication between management and the Asian American workers were not going well because the former was operating at the U-level (e.g., all workers are treated the same and they need generic skills to be selected for management level positions) and the latter was operating at the G-level (e.g., our cultural styles of communication is not accepted or respected and they are imposing their cultural norms and values on us). Focusing the training at the G-level where these Asian American workers were given the opportunity and space to discuss their cultural identity and acculturation levels and their impact on how they were perceived and evaluated by superiors illustrated the value of accommodating for cultural differences given the positive responses and ratings of the workshops offered.

If a culturally unaccommodated model of consultation had been used, the first author would have accepted the invitation to present diversity training for the company's managers' in terms of increasing their level of cultural sensitivity and awareness of cultural differences, which would be blindly applying the expertise model in consultation although ignoring the organizational reality. Such a model would have increased the manager's awareness and knowledge of Asian Americans' cultural attitudes, values, and beliefs but it would not have reached the underlying problem. Instead, Schein's (1999) PC model of consultation was used to guide the process of interviewing all relevant parties. After mutual exploration of the organizational processes, the underlying problem regarding the cultural identity of the Asian Americans began to emerge. The data for this decision came from the observation that it was

the low acculturation workers who were the most dissatisfied and most vocal critics of the company's policies and practices. Once identified, the cultural identity problem could then be accommodated for in terms of selecting culturally appropriate interventions and training programs. Using Schein's principle of being constructively opportunistic with confrontative interventions, participants were confronted with the discovery that cultural identity appears to be the organizing construct with which to understand and resolve their concerns and problems within the organization. In other words, it was the perceived lack of cultural background-organization fit as moderated by the workers' acculturation level that seems to be at the crux of the problem.

A major perspective on cultural identity for Asian Americans involves the concept of acculturation. According to Berry's (1980) acculturation model, the process of acculturation occurs when two culturally distinct groups/individuals come in contact with each other. This model is two dimensional and has an orthogonal structure based on a 2×2 matrix when one answers the following two questions: the extent to which (a) ethnic minorities maintain their traditional culture and/or (b) ethnic minorities abandon their traditional culture to embrace the host culture. Hypothetically, based on the answers to these two questions, four modes of acculturation/identities are defined, namely: assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization. This model depicts a dynamic, interactive, and fluid process of acquiring cultural identity.

An *assimilationist* relinquishes characteristics from the original/heritage culture, but acquires new attitudes, behaviors, values, and norms from the new mainstream culture. An *integrationist* is someone who values the balance and maintenance of values and behaviors from both the original culture and the newly acquired mainstream host society. In other words, they want to embrace both cultures. On the other hand, *separationists* have opposite characteristics from assimilationists. They maintain and propagate the original culture but reject the values and beliefs from the mainstream host country. Marginalization occurs when the individual/group rejects cultural and psychological contact with either the original culture or the mainstream society. Therefore, a *marginalist* can be seen as having an identity crisis as there is no sense of comfort in belonging to either the cultural heritage group or to the other mainstream host group (Chun, Organista, & Marin, 2003).

By using the PC model, it was hypothesized in the case example that the nature of the problem consisted of a cultural bias among the upper level management in terms of the cultural identity and acculturation level of the Asian Americans. It appeared to the consultants that, everything else being equal, senior managers often selected European Americans for these promotion opportunities and disproportionate percentages of Asian Americans were consistently overlooked for promotion into the managerial ranks. We believe this phenomenon occurred due to the attraction of cultural similarity, even when they were actively trying to counter this bias in cultural identity, we argue, they tended to select the Asian Americans who were either integrationists or assimilationist (Berry's model) for promotion opportunities. Over the years, it was the group of Asian Americans who had cultural identity as separationists (low acculturation levels) who were passed over for promotion into managerial ranks despite their seniority and higher levels of training and experience.

Greater complexity can also be added in making sense of the case material. To the extent that acculturation level is an important component of cultural identity, some possible relationships between career variables and acculturation for Asian Americans have already been delineated by Leong and Chou (1994). In providing an overview of the research and theoretical literature in Asian American ethnic identity and acculturation, Leong and Chou proposed an integration of these two areas. Using this integrated model of cultural identity, Leong and Chou went on to propose significant relationships between

Asian Americans' cultural identity and various career variables such as occupational segregation, stereotyping, discrimination, prestige, mobility, attitudes, aspirations and expectations, stress, satisfaction, choice, and interest. For example, they proposed that Asian Americans with a separationist identity are more susceptible to occupational segregation, whereas those with an assimilationist identity are less susceptible to occupational segregation. This pattern could be the result of the cultural background of less acculturated Asians or stereotyped tracking of Asians by the majority-dominated working world.

Leong and Chou (1994) also proposed that occupational stereotyping would follow the pattern of occupational segregation for Asian Americans. Leong and Serafica (1993) noted that Asian Americans are typically stereotyped as being more qualified in the physical, biological, and medical sciences and less qualified or likely to be successful in verbal, persuasive, or social careers. They have proposed that Asian Americans who hold separationist identities may believe occupational stereotypes to be more valid. At the same time, separationist Asian Americans may be more subject to occupational stereotyping. Assimilationists and integrationists, on the other hand, may be more resistant to such stereotypes and therefore more likely to enter nontraditional career fields (e.g., law, sales, and social work).

Leong and Chou (1994) also proposed that assimilationist Asian Americans will perceive and experience the least amount of occupational discrimination (e.g., existence of glass ceilings) because they will tend to attribute lack of success of Asian Americans to individual lack of ability and not to discrimination. In addition, Leong and Chou proposed that Asian Americans who are assimilationists and integrationists may view their job in much the same way European Americans (e.g., as more of a virtue in and of itself), and thus choose occupations based on what they enjoy (Leong & Tata, 1990) whereas separationist Asian Americans will view careers more as a means to an end (e.g., financial security). However, assimilationists may tend to choose occupations traditionally closed to Asian Americans (e.g., politics, media) to "prove" to European Americans they are not stereotypically Asian.

Finally, Leong and Chou (1994) proposed that Asian Americans who hold separationist identity may exhibit less self-efficacy in career choice, interest, or expectations because of the strong reverence and respect of parental authority in Asian cultures. These individuals may choose their careers based more on family desires or needs than on their own desires or interest. Therefore, these individuals may experience more stress and less job satisfaction. Recent research is beginning to find support for Leong and Chou's proposition that acculturation or cultural identity is a significant factor in understanding the career behavior of Asian Americans.

By accommodating for the important role of cultural identity and acculturation of Asian Americans in this company, the consultant in the case example was then able to switch to an expertise model of consultation to design a series of training workshops for both the senior managers and the Asian Americans directed to reducing the bias in selection of individuals for promotion into the managerial ranks.

The proposed solution of providing training related to cultural identity and the associated cultural norms and behaviors was identified through this integration process. This training consisted of prework in which participants completed the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn, Rickard-Figuerora, Lew, & Vigil, 1987), job satisfaction and job stress measures, as well as open-ended questions asking for critical incidents in which their cultural orientations served as either a barrier or a facilitator for their career advancement. The individual scores for these measures were then provided to the participants as well as the correlations between the scores (which found a negative relationship between acculturation

and job satisfaction and job stress as hypothesized by Leong & Chou, 1994). The scores, correlations, and critical incidents were then used as the basis for group discussions about the role of acculturation and career advancement as outlined in Leong and Chou's formulations. Using both small group discussions and role plays, the training helped participants recognize and monitor how their cultural identity was impact the perceptions and judgments from their coworkers and supervisors. In general, the conclusions reached by the participants was that the "separationist" position within Berry's model of acculturation was the most disadvantaged one and heated discussions occurred regarding whether or how to change one's cultural identity. Bicultural competence (acquiring behavioral competencies that allowed one to move comfortably between two cultures) or the "integrationist" position in Berry's model was offered as a possible solution.

It should not be assumed that the training was an easy process for the trainees because one's cultural identity is close to one's core identity and changes to that part of oneself is not easy or even desirable at time. Indeed, some of the Asian American workers resented the training that was being provided and protested that they "should not have to give up their Asianness to move up the corporate ladder." More rounds of cultural accommodation were needed because some of the Asian Americans wanted to acquire the behavioral competencies to be perceived as managerial material whereas others did not and insisted that the managers change their expectations (e.g., whether I speak with an accent should not be factored into the evaluation of my potential to be a manager).

According to the CAM, the gaps in the existing consultation model with Asian Americans can often be reduced by incorporating culture-specific variables to make it more relevant and useful for this ethnic minority group. By using the integrative model of examining U, G and I dimensions of human personality, we argue that the consultant can increase the cultural validity of the cultural accommodation approach discussed in this paper. Furthermore, the cultural accommodation approach emphasizes the importance of using the person-environment interaction model rather than just focusing on the person and ignoring the cultural context variables in the lives of racial and ethnic minorities.

A caveat needs to be provided regarding the current extension of the CAM from the field of cross-cultural psychotherapy to multicultural consultation. Although the concepts within the CAM are quite broad (e.g., universalism or cultural identity represented within the group dimension), there are also some limitations that need to be acknowledged. To the extent that the accommodation for culture-specific variables in consultation occur at the individual-level or the dyadic level (e.g., between supervisor and supervisee or between consultant and client), then is a greater chance of ready portability given the similarity to the psychotherapeutic relationship between therapist and patient. On the other hand, caution needs to be exercise when the CAM is applied at highly levels of analysis such as teams, work groups, or organizational-level phenomenon given that the model was not originally developed to be applicable to these levels.

Conclusions

The value of the proposed CAM is in providing a guideline for conducting culturally sensitive and culturally appropriate consultation. Although it is possible that a flexible model such as the PC could have arrived at the same formulation, we propose that this is not highly likely because Schein's model is silent about cultural considerations. On the other hand, the added value of the CAM is that it specific recommends attending to the U,G, and I dimensions and then tries to accommodate universal approaches such as Schein's with group level

variables such as cultural identity and acculturation as illustrated in the case study. Research studies are needed to investigate whether the culture specific variables (e.g., cultural identity) can account for significant amounts of variance in career and work outcomes in this cultural accommodation process. Future research is needed to demonstrate incremental validity in which culture specific variables account for additional variance above and beyond those accounted for by the variables in the current consultation models.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist*, *58*, 377–402.
- Arredondo, P., & Reinoso, J. G. (2003). Multicultural competencies in consultation. In D. B. Pope-Davis, H. L. K. Coleman, W. M. Liu, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural competencies: In counseling & psychology* (pp. 330–346). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chun, K. M., Organista, P. B., & Marin, G. (2003). *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model. *Science*, *196*, 129–136.
- Farh, J. L., Dobbins, G. H., & Cheng, B. S. (1991). Cultural relativity in action: A comparison of self-ratings made by Chinese and U.S. workers. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 129–147.
- Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, *41*, 43–62.
- Hemphill, H., & Haines, R. (1997). *Discrimination, harassment, and the failure of diversity training: What to do now*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Johnston, W. B., & Packer, A. E. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty-first century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.
- Judy, R. W., & D'Amico, C. (1997). *Workforce 2020: Work and workers in the 21st century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1990). Culture and work alienation: Western models and eastern realities. *International Journal of Psychology*, *25*, 795–812.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 557–569.
- Kluckhohn, C., & Murray, H. A. (1950). Personality formation: The determinants. In C. Kluckhohn & H.A. Murray (Eds.), *Personality in nature, society, and culture* (pp. 35–48). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Konar, E. (1981). Explaining racial differences in job satisfaction: A reexamination of the data. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *66*, 522–524.
- Leong, F. T. L. (1996). Towards an integrative model for cross-cultural counseling and psychotherapy. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, *5*, 189–209.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Brown, M. (1995). Theoretical issues in cross-cultural career development: Cultural validity and cultural specificity. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Handbook of vocational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 143–180). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Chou, E. L. (1994). The role of ethnic identity and acculturation in the vocational behavior of Asian Americans: An integrative review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *44*, 155–172.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Lee, S. H. (2006). A cultural accommodation model of psychotherapy: Illustrated

- with the case of Asian-Americans. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, and Training*, 43, 410–423.
- Leong, F. T. L. & Serafica, F. C. (1995). Career development of Asian Americans: A research area in search of a good theory. In F. T. L. Leong's (Ed.) *Career development and vocational behavior of racial and ethnic minorities* (pp. 67–102). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Serafica, F. (2001). Cross-cultural perspectives on Super's career development theory: Career maturity and cultural accommodation. In F. T. L. Leong & A. Barak's (Eds.), *Contemporary models in vocational psychology: A volume in honor of Samuel H. Osipow* (pp. 167–205). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Tang, M. (2002). A cultural accommodation approach to career assessment with Asian Americans. In K. Kurasaki, S. Okazaki, & S. Sue (Eds.), *Asian American mental health: Assessment, theories and methods* (pp. 265–281). New York: Kluwer Academic.
- Leong, F. T. L. & Tata, S. P. (1990). Sex and acculturation differences in occupational values among Chinese-American children. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 208–212.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lippman, H. (1999). Harnessing the power of diversity. *Business and Health*, 17(6), 40.
- Lubove, S. (1997, December 15). Damned if you do, damned if you don't. *Forbes*, 160, 122–134.
- Mabe, P., & West, S. (1982). Validity of self-evaluation of ability: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 280–296.
- Moch, M. K. (1980). Racial differences in job satisfaction: Testing four common explanations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 299–306.
- Schein, E. H. (1999). *Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Sue, D. W. (2001). Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 29, 790–821.
- Sue, D. W., Bernier, J. B., Durran, M., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P., Smith, E., et al. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 10, 45–52.
- Sue, D. W., & Constantine, M. G. (2005). Effective multicultural consultation and organizational development. In M. G. Constantine & D. W. Sue (Eds.), *Strategies for building multicultural competence in mental health and educational settings* (pp. 212–226). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Suinn, R. M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn–Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 47, 402–407.
- Suzuki, N., & Yamagishi, T. (2004). An experimental study of self-effacement and self-enhancement among the Japanese. *Japanese Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(1), 17–25.
- Tsui, A., & Barry, B. (1986). Interpersonal affect and rating errors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 586–598.
- US Bureau of the Census, 1996. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2001). Counting minorities: A brief history and a look at the future. *Report on the American workforce*. Available at <http://www.bls.gov/opub/rtaw/rtawhome.htm>
- Watkins, D., Mboya, M., & Sachs, J. (2001). Approaches to learning and achievement in specific school subjects of Black African students. *IFE Psychologia*, 9, 143–151.
- Zurcher, L. A., Measow, A., & Zurcher, S. L. (1965). Value orientation, role conflict, and alienation from work: A cross-cultural study. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 539–548.

Received December 17, 2007

Revision received April 9, 2008

Accepted April 10, 2008 ■