

Cuéntame: The Promise of Qualitative Research With Latinx Populations

Edward A. Delgado-Romero, Anneliese A. Singh, and Jhokania De Los Santos
University of Georgia

A recent content analysis of the *Journal of Latina/o Psychology* (Delgado-Romero, Stanley, & Oh, 2017) reflected the increasingly important role that qualitative research methods play in the development of Latinx psychology. This finding parallels the paradigmatic shift in the field of psychology (Gergen, Josselson, & Freeman, 2015; Ponterotto & Grieger, 2007) toward a balance between quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry. In this article, the authors examine the unique promise that qualitative research can play in advancing multicultural psychology (Hall, Yip, & Zárate, 2016) relative to Latinx populations (e.g., Ojeda, Flores, Meza, & Morales, 2011), with the overlay of critical perspectives (Solórzano, & Bernal, 2001) in Latinx Psychology. We focus on the culturally consistent ways that qualitative research may empower Latinx populations and aim to give voice to their stories. We review best practices in qualitative research grounded by integrating Latinx cultural values and offer guidance for researchers considering qualitative research methods with Latinx populations.

Public Significance Statement

This article offers guidance and best practices for conducting qualitative research with Latinx populations. Qualitative research is increasingly important and significant for Latinx psychology.

Keywords: Latinx, qualitative research, philosophy of science

Qualitative research with Latinx people has the potential to bring forward the lived realities and within-group diversity of marginalized Latinx populations. Through such research, the narratives, voices, and lives of Latinx people

can inform and inspire others to embrace a nuanced and complex understanding of Latinx people in the United States. In a recent content analysis of the first four volumes of the *Journal of Latina/o Psychology* (Delgado-Romero, Stanley, & Oh, 2017), researchers found that 26% of the published studies used qualitative methodology, 7% used mixed methods, and three of the top four most-cited articles were qualitative studies. These findings reflect a general trend in multicultural psychology (Lyons & Bike, 2010), counseling psychology (Ponterotto & Grieger, 2007), and psychology in general (Gergen, Josselson, & Freeman, 2015) toward a paradigmatic shift that represents a balance between quantitative and qualitative research in psychology.

In this article, we review the important connection between qualitative methods and multicultural research, describe the aims of qualita-

Editor's Note. Andrea J. Romero served as the action editor for this article.—EVC

Edward A. Delgado-Romero, Anneliese A. Singh, and Jhokania De Los Santos, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia.

We thank Candice Hargons, Lauren Harper, Rebekah Ingram Estevez, Brooke Rappaport for their thoughtful comments in the review process.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Edward A. Delgado-Romero, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, 110 Aderhold Hall, G3H, Athens, GA 30602. E-mail: edelgado@uga.edu

tive research, and provide recommendations related to researchers engaging in qualitative research with Latinx individuals and communities. This article was inspired by ongoing conversations of the editorial board of the *Journal of Latina/o Psychology* regarding the need to provide best practices and guidance for the qualitative research process with Latinx populations. It is our hope that this article will coalesce the many resources available on qualitative research in service of advancing research in Latinx psychology.

Qualitative Methods and Multicultural Research

Qualitative methods anchored in diverse philosophical paradigms have gained momentum in multicultural psychology since the 1960s. In contrast, mainstream psychology has been dominated by quantitative research methods embedded in positivist and postpositivist research paradigms (Johnson & Parry, 2015). Some scholars have questioned the appropriateness of traditional quantitative research methods with minority populations (Ponterotto & Grieger, 2007). Hall, Yip, and Zárate (2016) described three broad research approaches to the study of race/ethnicity and culture: (a) emphasis on generalizability and the similarities and differences across groups, (b) focus on group differences, and (c) multicultural psychology (e.g., specifying and examining the mechanisms of cultural influence on behavior in underrepresented ethnocultural groups). The authors stated, “Unlike the other two approaches, multicultural psychology explicitly focuses on giving a voice to populations that are underrepresented in research . . . and is rooted in social justice traditions” (p. 40). Hall and colleagues suggested that researchers should work with members of underrepresented ethnocultural communities to collaboratively create research programs rather than simply applying preexisting models to minority communities. Such research often entails the use of critical perspectives to engage with issues of race, gender, and socioeconomic levels in the hopes of transforming inequitable societal conditions (Johnson & Parry, 2015). To ensure that critical qualitative work maintains consistent with its roots and social transformation purposes, researchers continue to push away from the boundaries of positivism/postpositiv-

ism in order to develop contextual understanding of the sociopolitical roots on injustices (Johnson & Parry, 2015).

In the history of U.S. psychology, Latinx populations have often been left out of mainstream psychological research as both authors and participants (Delgado-Romero, Galvan, Maschino, & Rowland, 2005; Liang, Salcedo, Rivera, & Lopez, 2009). When included as participants in psychological research, Latinx people have often been portrayed from a deficit perspective compared with White populations or have been presented at the pan-ethnic level, which limits the utility of such research (Sue, 1999). Latinx specific research has traditionally been published in diversity-focused journals that are often seen as less prestigious and may carry lower impact factors than mainstream journals (Shelton, Delgado-Romero, & Wells, 2009). Although this marginalization might have presented barriers to some researchers in terms of tenure and promotion, it also meant there was some freedom in breaking away from the traditional quantitative paradigm. Liang and colleagues (2009) examined Latinx focused research from 1970 to 2005 in seven counseling and multicultural journals and found that 18.5% of the articles published over that time were qualitative. The *Journal of Hispanic Behavioral Sciences* published the highest number of qualitative studies during that time span. Building on four decades of Latinx focused qualitative research, we argue that qualitative methods are well-suited to the multicultural approach (Hall et al., 2016) and can be used to create and examine conceptual models accurately to reflect within-group complexity and intersectionality of Latinx populations in context.

Aims of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is an overarching term used to describe several different traditions of inquiry and related methodology. Key to qualitative research is the idea that reality, society, and science are among the many things that are created and/or shaped by human thought and reflection, human interaction and discourse, language, storytelling, psycho-social-political processes, institutions, and the lived experience or positionality of the researcher (Hays & Wood, 2011). Qualitative research is conducted to develop concepts that can help people understand

phenomena in natural settings, understand meanings, experiences, and views from the perspectives of those who have direct, immediate experience with it. Because of the increasing popularity of qualitative methods (Gergen et al., 2015), several professional organizations have issued guidelines (Levitt et al., 2018) that comprehensively articulate parameters concerning the qualitative research process from conceptual foundations to publishing and presenting qualitative data (Ponterotto & Grieger, 2007). However, these general guidelines do not address Latinx research specifically.

Recommendations for Latinx Qualitative Research

We argue that qualitative research is particularly culturally compatible with exploring and investigating the dynamic Latinx culture. First, the emphasis on in-depth knowledge gained through intensive and personal data collection methods like interviews are compatible with the Latinx cultural value of *personalismo* (a preference for close personal attention in relationships; Arredondo, Gallardo-Cooper, Delgado-Romero, & Zapata, 2014). Latinx interactional styles of *platicando* [small talk] and emphasis on rapport building seem suited to interviews, focus groups, and other forms of qualitative data collection. Traditional Latinx oral traditions like *testimonios* [testimonies], *dichos* [folk sayings], *refranes* [proverbs/sayings], and *cuENTOS* [stories] are cultural practices that involve storytelling and lend themselves toward semi-structured interview data collection methods (Arredondo et al., 2014).

Despite the potential fit with Latinx culture, there is still some paradigmatic prejudice and lack of understanding that qualitative researchers face. For example, a research participant anonymously shared the observation “I know qualitative work is important but so are sophisticated methods,” thus equating qualitative work with a lack of scientific rigor. This mistrust of qualitative research is ironic given that the surge in the use of qualitative methods with minority populations can be traced back to the failure of traditional research methods to address the fullness of the experience of people of color (Guthrie, 2004) and the need to add critical perspectives and counterstories to challenge the narrative of White supremacy (Delgado &

Stefancic, 2012). Thus, in order to move away from limiting interpretations of what constitutes science and rigorous psychological research, researchers might embrace epistemological diversity and expand the scope and meaning of psychological research with Latinx populations.

Get Critical

Qualitative researchers often find critical theories like critical race theory (CRT; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012), and particularly “LatCrit” (Solórzano & Bernal, 2001), useful in research with Latinx populations. LatCrit posits that voices of Latinx people are uniquely competent to speak on race and racism because of their historical and contemporary experiences with oppression, White supremacy and the racial binary (White–Black) in the United States that often renders Latinx people invisible. For example, Balderas, Delgado-Romero, and Singh (2016) used LatCrit as a lens to interpret parent–child communication among undocumented Latinx parents. We note that CRT and LatCrit are not research methods, but rather critical theoretical frameworks that aim to challenge the master narrative of supremacy by examining the self-interest of those people who produce and control knowledge and attempt to define reality, and are a useful theoretical framework to use with qualitative research.

Interrogate Researcher Positionality Within a Latinx Context

Qualitative researchers have conceptualized positionality as a central component that both describes the researcher’s worldview and the position they have chosen to adopt in relation to their research. Identities of both researcher and participants have the potential to impact the research process. This is done when identities come into play via our perceptions of others and in ways that we expect others will perceive us (Bourke, 2014). Through the recognition and acknowledgment of one’s multiple identities, such as gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual identity, historical and geographical location, and one’s biography, the researcher depicts how their intersectional belongings may influence the research process.

A positionality statement is a summary of who researchers are in relation to what and

whom they are studying. The purpose of this statement is to help researchers identify how their personal experiences, beliefs, feelings, and professional predispositions may impact their research and convey this material to other scholars for their consideration of the study's credibility, authenticity, and overall quality or validity. For example, see the positionality statements by May et al. (2015) and Balderas et al. (2016), in which the authors provide detailed positionality statements about their perspectives, political beliefs, commitment to Latinx communities, and Spanish language abilities. Although we would argue that such statements would be helpful with *all* research, positionality is important to understand in qualitative research, and such statements are consistent with the traditional Latinx cultural value of personalismo (Arredondo et al., 2014). Moreover, positionality allows for researchers to interrogate their own racism, privilege, and connections (or lack thereof) to the very people they seek to empower, lest their research inadvertently reinforces or reifies oppressive structures in society (López & Parker, 2003). This interrogation can be done through continuous monitoring of the research process (e.g., process notes, logs, journals) and developing a positionality statement through the process.

Parallel to the expectation of researcher positionality is reflexivity, which is used in qualitative research to secure credibility and trustworthiness. Reflexivity can be portrayed as the process of investigating the ways in which researchers and their positionalities affect what is and can be designed, gathered, interpreted, analyzed, and reported in an investigation (Gemignani, 2017). By explicitly disclosing the influences that have shaped the design and conduct of the research (Garnham, 2008), reflexivity becomes “a way for researchers to inform their audiences about their perspectives as well as to manage their subjectivities” (Morrow, 2005, p. 250).

An important way to engage in reflexivity is for researchers to consider the ways in which who they are may get in the way of presenting the voice of the participant (e.g., personal characteristics, personal experiences, beliefs, preferences, ideological stances). This is important so that the researcher does not miss important meanings that are being presented by the participant. In turning the researcher lens back onto

oneself, one can recognize and take responsibility for one's own involvement within the research and the effect it may have on the people being studied (Hays & Singh, 2013). As an example, Torres (Torres & Baxter Magolda, 2002) reflected on her ongoing and developing role as a researcher during a constructivist longitudinal study with Latinx participants with whom she shared an ethnicity.

Embrace Intersectionality and Complexity Within Latinx Communities

Latinx people are a diverse group of people who differ from each other across a variety of dimensions (e.g., country of origin, immigration history and circumstances, length of stay in the United States, regional identities, degrees of acculturation and enculturation). In addition, Latinx individuals hold many different aspects of identity (e.g., gender, sexual orientation, ability) that intersect with their cultural identity. Consequently, Latinx people represent a challenge to researchers who need to use neat and mutually exclusive demographic or identity categories (Sue, 1999). Fortunately, qualitative researchers embrace this complexity because they are free from the need to aggregate identity into artificial pan-ethnic categories. Researchers should describe participants as fully as possible, while still maintaining participant anonymity (often a challenge), because one of the strengths of the qualitative paradigm is the ability to understand who the participants are and their context historically and currently. For example, see Lo and Nguyen (2018) and their description of bilingual nurses in relevant detail.

Consider the Role of Language

In qualitative research, language is a system of meanings that can impose and narrow possibilities for interpretation and can be a method to organize and express reality in both research and clinical practice with Latinx populations (Arredondo et al., 2014). It is important to consider the role of language both broadly and specifically. Broadly, the dominance of the English language in research worldwide can be seen as reflective of the provinciality (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010) and colonial mentality (David & Okazaki, 2006) of U.S. psychology. Consequently, researchers are urged to

critically examine language issues when conducting research with bilingual or monolingual Latinx research participants, and to consider at what point translation is appropriate and how those decisions may impact the research process and outcomes. It is also important for researchers to advocate for the value (in both rankings and in the consideration of tenure and promotion) of Spanish or Portuguese language research such as that found in the *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*.

The role of language in the research process with Latinx people is a complex and multifaceted concept that can include the language and reading level of consent forms (Ojeda, Flores, Meza, & Morales, 2011); linguistic equivalency in translation procedures (Casado, Negi, & Hong, 2012); the relationship of language and emotion; the reality of regional variations; slang and indigenous Latin American languages (Arredondo et al., 2014); the role of translators and language brokers in the research process (Lo & Nguyen, 2018); and the contextual factors of bilingualism. For example, in a grounded theory study of Latina nurses, Lo and Nguyen (2018) critically examined the way that their participants navigated working with coethnic and Spanish speaking patients while also navigating an English-dominant and predominantly White profession. Therefore, the authors examined not only the use of language but also how their participants used different strategies to navigate inflexible institutional expectations that are often unrecognized as challenges for bilingual professionals.

Foster Diverse Research Teams and Community Inclusion

In their article on culturally competent research with Latinx immigrants, Ojeda and colleagues (2011) provided a comprehensive guide on how to integrate Latinx cultural values into the research process. Although modestly stated, their guidelines represent a radical departure from mainstream psychology in the sense that they infuse the entire research endeavor with the knowledge, skills, and awareness necessary for cultural competence. For example, the authors stated that research teams need to include bilingual and bicultural researchers as well as members of the Latinx immigrant community (Ojeda et al., 2011).

Developing a culturally competent, diverse, and multidisciplinary research team that can interface effectively with the community is critical for the recruitment and retention of Latinx populations. An inclusive and diverse research team can add richness and perspective to the conceptualization of research projects, ensure that research projects are representative of the Latinx population under study, and help prevent the objectification of participants (Lyons & Bike, 2010). To the extent that a research team can examine their intersectional and interdisciplinary similarities and differences, both within the team and with community participants, teams can explain and examine how their experiences shape their understanding of participants' experiences (Lyons & Bike, 2010).

Speaking Spanish Is Not Enough

Cultural or linguistic similarity with research participants is not sufficient to facilitate understanding, rapport, or a useful relationship (Few, Stephens, & Rouse-Arnett, 2003; Lo & Nguyen, 2018). The assumption that ethnic or language concordance, in and of itself, leads to culturally competent interactions may replicate structures of oppression in that such assumptions ignore the larger institutional context that have rigid expectations of the role of research and the researcher (Lo & Nguyen, 2018). Although cultural and linguistic similarity may provide intimate access to participants, coethnic researchers are also working within an English-dominant and predominantly White and U.S.-based research and higher education enterprise. Without acknowledging and accounting for the relative privileged power of researchers, cultural mistrust may result. For example, the first author received feedback from community research participants during a focus group in Spanish that they resented that the institutional context of the researcher (a public university) dictated the timing and duration of interventions in the community. In addition, medical and psychological clinics were closed during university holidays, which was a prime time of need for the community. Through this feedback, the first author understood that although he shared a language and ethnicity with his participants, he was also a representative of an inflexible and culturally insensitive institution that often negatively impacted the Latinx community. Although he felt

alienated from the university as one of very few bilingual Latinx faculty members on campus, he had to come to grips with the way his employment context both facilitated and inhibited his ability to engage with the local Latinx community. A supportive interdisciplinary research team and the courage of community members to provide honest feedback were key to improving the overall relationship between researchers and the community.

Use Innovative Qualitative Methods to Be Culturally Responsive

The most often used qualitative traditions within counseling and psychology include narrative inquiry, grounded theory, ethnography, and case studies (Hays & Wood, 2011). Innovative and less used traditions or methods like autoethnography can be helpful ways to connect Latinx individual and community experiences. Autoethnography focuses on an individual's self-study of a phenomenon (Custer, 2014) and the connections of the autobiographical to a larger context. For example, Aguilar (2017) used autoethnography as form of professional and personal development for faculty who prepare educators and leaders within the context of a Hispanic Serving Institution. Autoethnography can help empower Latinx people to study themselves and their own communities and develop a critical consciousness. Another innovative qualitative methodology is collective memory work (Haug, 2008), in which the collective experience and memories of a particular group within Latinx communities could be explored within a focus group context in order to highlight the meanings of experiencing a particular phenomenon. In deconstructing and reconstructing the account, one can gain insight into how a certain meaning and sense of the world is produced collectively.

Other innovative methods might include not only the research tradition selected but also (or instead) the data collection of photo elicitation, video logs (vlogs), blogs, journal entries, art, poetry, song lyrics, dance, and/or mural projects (Barone & Eisner, 2012; Finley, 2011) relative to Latinx issues. Although there are many approaches to working with Latinx populations, participatory arts-based methods such as photo-voice are being increasingly relied upon. Photo-voice is a visual participatory method that

seeks to expand the representational modes and breadth of voices that act to portray and improve people's social realities (Wang & Burris, 1997). In using this approach, researchers can engage and empower marginalized groups in artistic expression of issues that are of significance to them in hopes of effecting social change (Catalani & Minkler, 2010). When working with any of these innovative methods, methodology should be guided by what would be most culturally responsive for Latinx participants, rather than what is traditional, most common, easiest, or seems most "hip" to do.

Build Trust

Trust building is a foundation of qualitative research (Hays & Singh, 2013). Many times, trust-building considerations center on the development of rapport with participants. However, the reality is that trust is built and maintained (or not) before, during, and after the research process. Thus, is it important to consider how trust is built with the Latinx community at every stage of research, from ensuring that the informed consent form is at a reading level and in a language the participants can understand, to considering the role of the participants in providing feedback to the researcher on analysis (e.g., member checking), to ensuring that the final product or outcome is relevant and accessible to the Latinx community and the larger community to combat the existence of stereotypes about Latinx people.

Trust can also be built through acknowledging and engaging with the reality of intersectional aspects of identity. Working with intersectionality is particularly important for Latinx people who hold multiple marginalized or oppressed identities. For example, in a phenomenological and feminist investigation of the resilience of transgender people of color, Singh and McKleroy (2011) found both ethnic pride and ethnic oppression as some of the common themes of their participants. Specifically, Latinx participants shared their conflicting feelings of safety about being interviewed by a Latinx or trans researcher, depending on context (Singh & McKleroy, 2011). Safety can also be a salient issue for Latinx populations who are oppressed in other ways such as being undocumented (Balderas et al., 2016).

A researcher's need for efficient, pragmatic, and quick data collection may also run counter to the participant's need for trust and safety. For example, a focus group may be the most efficient way to collect data in a short amount of time; however, the degree of safety participants may feel in a group process with other Latinx people may vary according to the issue being investigated (Balderas et al., 2016; Singh & McKleroy, 2011). There may be more than one interview or meeting needed with participants to allow the space to trust interviewers. Interviews may need to take place in participants' private spaces, such as a home or a religious setting, to facilitate comfort with the research process. In addition, Minkler and Wallerstein (2003) discuss the importance of extending long-term commitments even after funding for community-based participatory research has stopped. Thus, the focus to remain committed to the development of relationships beyond the single research project or funding period is critical. Significant and intentional time is needed when considering trust and rapport building, as it is not only a critical aspect of culturally responsive qualitative work with Latinx people but will also result in richer data, thicker narratives, contradictory interpretations, intimate experiences, and deeper meanings (Gemignani, 2014).

Rodríguez, Rodríguez, and Davis (2006) pointed out that one indicator of Latinx community trust was positive word of mouth, that is, when community members use their referent power in their community to vouch for work being done by psychologists. Positive word of mouth can build trust in the community, just as negative word of mouth can erode it. For example, the first author spent several years in his local Latinx community serving on the board of nonprofit agencies and attending community events before proposing a research and service project. Not only was the "face time" important, but many community members reported that meeting the first author was the first time they had met a psychologist in person (much less a Latinx psychologist) and that they previously had only seen fictional psychologists in movies or on TV. Active community engagement can serve a psychoeducational purpose (i.e., educating the community about psychologists who espouse a strengths-based, culturally sensitive

worldview) and serves to enhance the quality of the research process (Rodríguez et al., 2006).

Collaborate With the Latinx Community

One of the greatest assets for the Latinx community is its own people. Researchers may collaborate with members of the Latinx community through forming an advisory board for a research team or given project (Ojeda et al., 2011). The advisory board would be composed of stakeholders in the community who participate in the development of pertinent research questions, user-friendly instruments, culturally acceptable interventions, data analysis, effective dissemination strategies, and all facets of translating research theories and methods to the community (Portillo et al., 2001).

Researchers can collaborate with the Latinx community through participatory action research (PAR), whose roots in action, research, empowerment, critical theory, and constructivism are particularly powerful (Hays & Wood, 2011). Further, youth PAR (YPAR) has been on the rise as a systematic approach to help young people create their own sense of efficacy in the world and address the social conditions that impede liberation and positive, healthy development (see Cammarota & Fine, 2008, for existing guidelines and projects on YPAR). Active participation from community members in PAR includes intervention development and implementation, which bring forth social justice and equity in the research process (Wells, Miranda, Bruce, Alegria, & Wallerstein, 2004). Equitable partnerships in PAR bridge the gap between academic researchers and community members, which allows for the development of knowledge and exploration of community problems and how they can be addressed. Shattell, Hamilton, Starr, Jenkins, and Hinderliter (2008) concluded that PAR was a useful approach in getting to know the Latinx community in their "natural environment" and allowed Latinx families to feel more comfortable, respected, and cared about in the research process. A Latinx community member in the study stated that the community-based model works well with the cultural values of Latinx populations (e.g., personalismo, *respeto* [respect]), given that Latinx people value being hospitable and like to feel important and respected when they are getting assistance (Shattell et al., 2008). Research-

ers collaborate and partner with communities in order to allow individuals to “become aware of the nature of their disenfranchisement, the mechanics through which inequity is perpetuated, and their ability to change their circumstances” (Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991, p. 2). PAR holds immense promise for insuring that research focuses on topics of deep concern to communities and is conducted in ways to build community capacity, empower Latinx people, and work to reduce health disparities.

Think About How to Present Your Results

In addition to making sure that study results are available and accessible to Latinx community members, qualitative researchers also need to ensure that their results are published in peer-

reviewed journals to help diversify academic psychology. A significant concern for qualitative researchers is how to present their research within the confines of journal page limitations that were designed for quantitative studies, and how to meet criteria for research quality originating out of quantitative positivist and post-positivist paradigms that are ill-suited to evaluate qualitative research (Levitt, Motulsky, Wertz, Morrow, & Ponterotto, 2017). There are some journals that offer larger page limits for qualitative research (e.g., *The Journal of Counseling Psychology*), and there are also concrete examples of how to present qualitative research in the *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*. Previous publications can be models for how to publish qualitative results in a culturally sensitive and

- Become competent and well read in multiple research paradigms and inquiry approaches
- Understand the sociocultural, political and historical context of the community to help identify research problems that are of concern and are relevant to the community
- Develop a culturally competent research team that can communicate effectively with the community
- Select preferred communication style of study participants and have knowledge and skills in cultural nuances to effectively collect and interpret qualitative data
- Have consistent communication with and exposure to the community to build supportive trusting relationships
- Examine and select valid measurements in research with the target population carefully
- Distribute study findings for the purpose of advancing mutual goals, empowering the community and further promoting continued collaboration with researchers
- Increase the potential for translation and adaptation of evidence-based research into sustainable community change approaches

Figure 1. Checklist for conducting qualitative research with Latinx individuals and communities.

aware manner. Although previously published studies are instructive, these examples are not meant to constrain the types of research methods and presentations undertaken or inhibit innovation and creativity. Within the inherent formalism of a professional journal, researchers can represent their research in a myriad of different ways. For example, contrast the use of pictorial representations of data in Buckingham and Brodsky (2015) versus the more traditional use of extended quotes by Delgado-Romero, Unkefer, Capielo, and Crowell (2017). The ideal format is the one that best represents the data, the phenomena of interest, and their interpretations and analyses. Within Latinx-centric qualitative research, there are many possibilities for new and exciting research and for context-specific replications and reexplorations of issues, processes, and phenomena that have been already studied.

In Figure 1, we present a checklist that summarizes action items for conducting qualitative research with Latinx individuals and communities. This checklist may be useful in executing culturally competent qualitative research that focuses on values relevant to psychology, such as awareness of power differences and empowerment perspectives similar to humanist, constructivist, and narrative traditions that posit that the client is the expert of their own experience (Anderson & Goolishian, 1992).

Conclusion

The use of qualitative methods focused on Latinx participants will continue to be a defining feature of Latinx psychological research. Qualitative methodology purposely represents, involves, and benefits understudied populations (Hays & Singh, 2013), and furthers the accumulation of a rich foundation of knowledge and information regarding Latinx people in the United States. The future of qualitative research with Latinx populations relies on the ability of researchers, grounded in Latinx communities, to develop, conduct, and disseminate culturally sensitive research that will both represent the reality of Latinx people and issues and broaden narrow views of what counts as scientific research in the human and social sciences. We argue that Latinx psychology and qualitative research are not only compatible, but also that psychologists who are culturally competent ex-

perts in building rapport and understanding the worldviews of others are uniquely situated to deliver on the promise of qualitative work with Latinx populations.

Abstracto

Un análisis de contenido reciente del *Journal of Latina/o Psychology* (Delgado-Romero et al., 2017) reflejó la importancia de los métodos de investigación cualitativa en el desarrollo de la psicología Latinx. Este descubrimiento es paralelo al cambio paradigmático en el campo de la psicología (Gergen et al., 2015; Ponterotto & Grieger, 2007) para un equilibrio entre los métodos cuantitativos y cualitativos de investigación. En este artículo, los autores examinan la promesa especial que la investigación cualitativa puede desempeñar en el avance de la psicología multicultural (Hall et al., 2016) para las poblaciones Latinx (e.g., Ojeda et al., 2011), con perspectivas críticas (Solórzano & Bernal, 2001) en psicología Latinx. Nos enfocamos en las formas culturales en que la investigación cualitativa puede empoderar a las personas Latinx y dar voz a sus historias. Revisamos las mejores prácticas en investigación cualitativa, y ofrecemos orientación para los investigadores que consideran los métodos de investigación cualitativa con poblaciones Latinx.

References

- Aguilar, I. (2017). Internal revolutions: Auto-ethnography as method for faculty who prepare K-12 leaders at Hispanic-Serving Institutions. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 16, 359–373. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2016.1262264>
- Anderson, H., & Goolishian, H. (1992). The client is the expert: A not-knowing approach to therapy. In S. McNamee & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Therapy as social construction* (pp. 25–39). London, UK: Sage.
- Arredondo, P., Gallardo-Cooper, M., Delgado-Romero, E. A., & Zapata, A. L. (2014). *Culturally responsive counseling with Latinas/os*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Balderas, C. N., Delgado-Romero, E. A., & Singh, A. A. (2016). Sin papeles: Latino parent-child conversations about undocumented legal status. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, 4, 158–172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lat0000060>
- Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (2012). *Arts-based research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bourke, B. (2014). Positionality: Reflecting on the research process. *Qualitative Report*, 19, 1–9.
- Buckingham, S. L., & Brodsky, A. E. (2015). “Our differences don’t separate us”: Immigrant families navigate intrafamilial acculturation gaps through

- diverse resilience processes. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, 3, 143–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lat0000042>
- Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Casado, B. L., Negi, N. J., & Hong, M. (2012). Culturally competent social work research: Methodological considerations for research with language minorities. *Social Work*, 57, 1–10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sw/swr002>
- Catalani, C., & Minkler, M. (2010). Photovoice: A review of the literature in health and public health. *Health Education & Behavior*, 37, 424–451. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1090198109342084>
- Custer, D. (2014). Autoethnography as a transformative research method. *Qualitative Report*, 19, 1–13.
- David, E. J. R., & Okazaki, S. (2006). The Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS) for Filipino Americans: Scale construction and psychological implications. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53, 241–252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.2.241>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Delgado-Romero, E. A., Galvan, N., Maschino, P., & Rowland, M. (2005). Race and ethnicity in empirical counseling and counseling psychology research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 33, 419–448. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000004268637>
- Delgado-Romero, E. A., Stanley, D., & Oh, J. (2017). A content analysis of the Journal of Latina/o Psychology 2013–2016. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, 5, 5–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lat0000086>
- Delgado-Romero, E. A., Unkefer, E. N., Capielo, C., & Crowell, C. N. (2017). El que oye consejos, llega a viejo: Examining the published narratives of U. S. Latino/a psychologists. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, 5, 127–141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lat0000071>
- Fals-Borda, O., & Rahman, M. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action-research*. New York, NY: Apex Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3362/9781780444239>
- Few, A. L., Stephens, D. P., & Rouse-Arnett, M. T. (2003). Sister to sister talk: Transcending boundaries in qualitative research with Black women. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 52, 205–215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2003.00205.x>
- Finley, S. (2011). Critical arts-based inquiry: Performing revolutionary pedagogy. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 435–450). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Garnham, B. (2008). Data generation. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 192–193). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gemignani, M. (2014). Memory, remembering, and oblivion in active narrative interviewing. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20, 127–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800413510271>
- Gemignani, M. (2017). Toward a critical reflexivity in qualitative inquiry: Relational and posthumanist reflections on realism, researcher's centrality, and representationalism in reflexivity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4, 185–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/qup0000070>
- Gergen, K. J., Josselson, R., & Freeman, M. (2015). The promises of qualitative inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 70, 1–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038597>
- Guthrie, R. V. (2004). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hall, G. C., Yip, T., & Zárate, M. A. (2016). On becoming multicultural in a monocultural research world: A conceptual approach to studying ethnocultural diversity. *American Psychologist*, 71, 40–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039734>
- Haug, F. (2008). Memory work. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 23, 537–541. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08164640802433498>
- Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hays, D. G., & Wood, C. (2011). Infusing qualitative traditions in counseling research designs. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89, 288–295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00091.x>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Johnson, C. W., & Parry, D. C. (2015). *Fostering social justice through qualitative inquiry: A methodological guide*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board Task Force report. *American Psychologist*, 73, 26–46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151>
- Levitt, H. M., Motulsky, S. L., Wertz, F. J., Morrow, S. L., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2017). Recommendations for designing and reviewing qualitative research in psychology: Promoting methodological

- integrity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4, 2–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/qup0000082>
- Liang, C. T. H., Salcedo, J., Rivera, A. L. Y., & Lopez, M. J. (2009). A content and methodological analysis of 35 years of Latino/a-focused research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37, 1116–1146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000009338496>
- Lo, M.-C. M., & Nguyen, E. T. (2018). Caring and carrying the cost: Bicultural Latina nurses' challenges and strategies for working with coethnic patients. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 4, 149–171.
- López, G. R., & Parker, L. (2003). *Interrogating racism in qualitative research methodology*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Lyons, H. Z., & Bike, D. H. (2010). Designing and interpreting qualitative research in multicultural counseling. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (3rd ed., pp. 413–425). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- May, S. F., Flores, L. Y., Jeanetta, S., Saunders, L., Valdivia, C., Arévalo Avalos, M. R., & Martínez, D. (2015). Latina/o immigrant integration in the rural midwest: Host community resident and immigrant perspectives. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, 3, 23–39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lat0000029>
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (Eds.). (2003). *Community-based participatory research for health*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 250–260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.250>
- Ojeda, L., Flores, L. Y., Meza, R. R., & Morales, A. (2011). Culturally competent qualitative research with Latino immigrants. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 184–203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0739986311402626>
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Grieger, I. (2007). Effectively communicating qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35, 404–430. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000006287443>
- Portillo, C. J., Villarruel, A., de Leon Siantz, M. L., Peragallo, N., Calvillo, E. R., & Eribes, C. M. (2001). Research agenda for Hispanics in the United States: A nursing perspective. *Nursing Outlook*, 49, 263–269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1067/mno.2001.119691>
- Rodríguez, M. D., Rodríguez, J., & Davis, M. (2006). Recruitment of first-generation Latinos in a rural community: The essential nature of personal contact. *Family Process*, 45, 87–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2006.00082.x>
- Shattell, M. M., Hamilton, D., Starr, S. S., Jenkins, C. J., & Hinderliter, N. A. (2008). Mental health service needs of a Latino population: A community-based participatory research project. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 29, 351–370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01612840801904316>
- Shelton, K. L., Delgado-Romero, E., & Wells, E. M. (2009). Race and ethnicity in empirical research: An 18-year review. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 37, 130–140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2009.tb00097.x>
- Singh, A. A., & McKleroy, V. S. (2011). “Just getting out of bed is a revolutionary act”: The resilience of transgender people of color who have survived traumatic life events. *Traumatology*, 20, 1–11.
- Solórzano, D., & Bernal, D. D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, 36, 308–342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0042085901363002>
- Sue, S. (1999). Science, ethnicity, and bias: Where have we gone wrong? *American Psychologist*, 54, 1070–1077. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.12.1070>
- Torres, V., & Baxter Magolda, M. (2002). The evolving role of the researcher in constructivist longitudinal studies. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43, 474–489.
- Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behavior*, 24, 369–387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/109019819702400309>
- Wells, K., Miranda, J., Bruce, M. L., Alegria, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2004). Bridging community intervention and mental health services research. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 161, 955–963. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.161.6.955>

Received October 29, 2017

Revision received September 7, 2018

Accepted September 8, 2018 ■