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Greetings!

This last year at CRGE has been filled with tremendous growth, including the very welcome expansion of our research staff. Our past work has opened up new opportunities for CRGE to extend its reach beyond its academic location by offering more opportunities for mentoring of underrepresented junior faculty, the expansion of the qualitative community at University of Maryland (UM), and through conducting an important, national, large-scale, mixed methods study.

CRGE isn't the only place growing at UM. The University has recently made space for exciting leadership and new directions. To that end, the appointment of Dr. Bonnie Thornton Dill as Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities has been a boost to our spirits as we know that she will provide thoughtful leadership in the next few years. The successful search for a Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President, with the appointment of Dr. Kumea Shorter-Gooden, reflects an important shift in the administrative leadership at the university. We are thrilled to have her steering the diversity efforts on campus. We are also excited by our opportunities to work with the new Center for Health Equity at the School of Public Health and look forward to our upcoming collaborations with them!

This year, we have continued to seek and engage in multiple collaborations, expand our connections, and offer our resources to other diversity units on campus. Our development of an Academic Diversity Calendar, an online resource that allows the various academic diversity events on campus to be listed collectively has been an important step in unifying and highlighting the amazing intellectual events that occur on campus. Our involvement with the ADVANCE program has resulted in successful programing that supports and draws attention to the issues of assistant and associate women faculty of color as they make their way up the academic ladder. This mentoring pairs perfectly with our research project, “Understanding the Relationship between Work Stress and U.S. Research Institutions’ Failure to Retain Underrepresented Minority (URM) Faculty,” funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Our work on this project has revealed the extraordinary challenges that underrepresented minority faculty face in higher education institutions. A brief summary of the preliminary findings are presented on p. 14.

This March, in the spirit of celebrating the academic success of qualitative scholars on campus, we drew together some of the most exciting intersectional research being conducted by faculty and hosted a Qualitative Research conference. Over 100 faculty and graduate students attended reflecting the University’s devoted and eager qualitative community. The work presented varied broadly in topic and scope and the quality of presentations was outstanding. What is more, the positive feedback we heard has pushed us to work hard to continue to make events like this, as well as guest lectures and training opportunities, possible in the future. See pages 19-22 for a summary of this academic year’s Qualitative Research Interest Group (QRIQ) programming and conference event.

We are thrilled to feature in this year’s Research Reports two former CrISP scholars, Dr. Manouchka Poinson (May 2012), whose research looks at the experiences of Haitian immigrant women in Washington, D.C., and Dr. Lynette Boswell (December 2011), whose research measures the impacts of Federal Housing Programs in low-income Baltimore neighborhoods (see pages 4-13). We also have included a book review by our current CrISP Scholar, Cristina Pérez (page 23), as well as a list of suggestions by a group of doctoral students on how their advisors could better support their doctoral experience (page 26). I want to thank Beth Douthirt Cohen for convening the group, facilitating and providing faculty with the voices of graduate students.

Our community continues to grow, and this is clearly a sign of the support of UM and the need for community for scholars who engage in scholarly discussions both at and about the margins. As we enter our fifteenth year at UM, we welcome this expansion and look forward to the next steps in our journey!

Sincerely,

DR. RUTH ENID ZAMBRANA
Creating Spaces of Home journeyed through the lives and homes of twenty Haitian women who live in the Washington, D.C. area. With the initial goal of examining the Haitian woman immigrant, this project, by the very act of centralizing this population, has created a direct response to the lack of research being conducted on the life experiences of Haitian immigrants in the United States.

This study explored how a group of Haitian women immigrants understood, imagined, and enacted the concept of lakay, a word in Kreyol that captures a feeling of home. It can refer to a person, a place, artifacts, moments, memories. By focusing on these women, their strength is made visible. From the medical doctor, business owner, sales clerk, retiree, to the college student and cleaning staff whose lives were captured in this research project, Haitian women are as diverse and multi-layered as any immigrant group. Yet, there are also unique similarities that reflect the importance of understanding the context in which these particular Haitian women immigrants are embedded.

This ethnographic study addresses the specificity of Haitian women’s experiences in the Washington, D.C. area, a relatively newly established Haitian immigration destination in the U.S., and provides an in-depth analysis of their social worlds. I use an intersectional approach to map the simultaneity of gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, class and legal status on the lives of these immigrants and theorize how space, identity and notions of home are central to understanding how this group of women attempts to create lakay in the metro Washington, D.C. area. Rather than just referring to a place or space, lakay was also used to describe the feeling of identifying with someone who was Haitian, they were simply called, lakay. Identifying someone as “home” is a marker of Haitian identity. It is a sign of respect and mutual understanding of acknowledging one’s Haitian identity. As one of the participants in the study, Ritha, explains, “Sometimes in speaking the person can say, ‘Hey home how are you doing?’ and [through that naming] now you know that they are home and you make conversation.” Ritha thus demonstrates a connection with the other Haitians she encounters. This connection is one that resembles the familiar and common Haitian ancestral roots of a family.

There is a lack of focus on Haitian women’s experiences in the U.S.-based migration literature across all disciplines. Even more distressing, when Haitian women’s experiences are discussed, the literature on Haitian women immigrants has not offered a comprehensive portrayal of their experiences in America. However, the true experience of many Haitian women migrants is that they have been either the first to migrate and/or the focal point of the migration process in terms of facilitating the migration of others. We find that Haitians in the Washington, D.C. area are not visible due in large part to the small population size and the dispersal of the community, both factors that contribute to the lack of prominent social institutions that have historically drawn immigrants to an area. Despite this, the participants have created a space of home in Washington D.C. in which their investment in the community lies mainly in the churches and organizations to which they belong. From a transnational perspective, home for the participants is simultaneously located in the U.S. and in Haiti, and meanders through and between these nation-states.
Research Questions

The central themes of home, journey, and agency marked the parameters and provided the direction for the study. The following four research questions guided the study: (1) Where does the Greater Washington, D.C. fit into the story of Haitian Immigrants’ journey to the U.S.? (2) How do Haitian women negotiate their everyday lives and identities? (3) What happens when Haitian women are put at the center of migration research? (4) How are generational differences reflected in the lives of Haitian women immigrants?

Methodology

Semi-structured in-depth interviews and participant observation were conducted during a nine-month period focusing on twenty participants. The participant observation focused on the different social worlds that these women navigate. For example, visiting their churches, attending meetings and simply having informal conversations in addition to the interviews helped me to better understand their worlds. For the semi-structured interviews, most participants were interviewed once, while a select few were interviewed twice. The primary reason for interviewing participants only once was due to the time constraints that were caused by their work and family life. I started the interview process with the realization that I might not get another chance to interview the participants at a later time. As a result, I sought clarification on the initial interviews through a follow-up conversation either by phone or e-mail.

On average an interview lasted between 40 to 60 minutes. An interview guide was used for each of the interviews. Interviews were held mostly in the homes of participants or in their place of work. The interviews were person-centered, as I had to accommodate interruptions of family life, as when some participants did not have childcare and had to conduct their interview while watching their children. Other participants were interviewed at their places of work during their breaks. Participants were committed to the interview process and never cut an interview short but rather they liberally made themselves available.

To accommodate women from a variety of social, economic and age backgrounds, participants were offered the choice of conducting the interview in either English or Kreyol. The questionnaire consisted of the following 16 demographic questions: age, years lived in the United States, years lived in the Greater Washington, D.C. area, level of education, and financial status (e.g., I am very comfortable, I can pay all of my bills, I struggle to get by, and Other). To get a sense of where my participants lived and possibly to trace any niches for the Haitian community, I asked participants for their zip codes in order to design a zip code map of the neighborhoods in which they lived. Questions about race and ethnicity were important in the questionnaire format because
they allowed my participants to self identify. Other questions included: What is your documentation status (working papers, visa, permanent, citizen, other)? Did you go to school in the U.S.? If so, for how long and what kind of education did you receive? Are you presently employed? If so, what do you do? Are you married? What is your spouse's race/nationality? Where were you born? What is your race? What is your ethnicity? What is your religion? What language(s) do you speak? And what language do you feel more comfortable in?

The Participants
The participants were selected based on the criterion of being a Haitian woman who had either migrated from Haiti to the U.S. or was born in the U.S and now lived and/or worked in the Greater D.C. area. A combination of snowballing and other sampling techniques was used. The project started with a convenience sample of seven Haitian women whom I encountered through personal social networks. I also relied on the snowball method of recruitment, asking these women to identify others in their social networks based on the research criterion. As a site of cultural reproduction, the church was a location that I particularly targeted for recruitment.

The women all lived within the Greater Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, mostly in Maryland suburbs. I observed these women at work, in their homes, in their churches and at meetings that they attended. All of the interviews with the second generation were conducted in English. Language blending and switching was common in interviews and at moments we would start speaking Kreyol or Kreyol terminology was used throughout the interview. Interviews with first generation women varied. They were conducted in both English and Kreyol. First generation women (12) were all born in Haiti and migrated to the U.S. as adults. They all have children who were for the most part born in the U.S. Second generation women (8) are the daughters of Haitian immigrant parents. They were all born in the United States, with the exception of Deena, who was born in Haiti and migrated to the U.S. at a young age, thus making her a 1.5 generation immigrant.

Results & Discussion
“Lakay Se Lakay”: The Uses of Home in Washington, D.C.
Reconceptualizing and reinventing the space of home is thus central to the transnational migration discourse. The term home is an emotional term that is commonly used by participants but not often examined. It is a term that describes both where a person lives and also invokes the feeling of home, where one belongs and wants to belong. Whether that home is located in a particular geography, across geographical borders or within the imagination of our memory, there is no denying the importance of this space. Through the processes of transnational migration Haitian women, like most immigrants, must engage in the work of building home in a new space. Whether through self-identification or collective identity, the women represent what Haitians in Haiti would call the Diaspora. By definition, the location of this diaspora is “plural, fragmented, dynamic and open” (Brodwin 2003, 384). The level of identity with this diasporic group differs for each transmigrant, depending on their relationship and emotional tie to the places they consider home. The transmigrants are “both ‘home bound’ and ‘homeless’; they are both nomads and settlers.” (Brah 1997, 192) It should be noted, “this homelessness is not defined by a lack of a home, but rather, it is characterized by a repertoire of ‘homes’ that Haitians have at their disposal, neither of which can ever emerge as the permanent and definite ‘home’” (Fouron 2003, 239). Their homes are rather “both here and there” (Fouron 2003, 239). As transmigrants who “remain tied to their ancestral land by their actions as well as their thoughts, they may not frequently or ever travel home again” (Schiller and Fouron 2001, 3). Thus home must be understood using its two most prominent uses: 1) the actual geographic location of a place where somebody lives, and 2) where a person thinks he/she belongs. “The stronger the emotional link to the place called “home” is, the stronger it influences a decision to migrate, requiring even more pressing grounds to make the decision to actually leave from ‘home’” (Demuth 2000, 25). The decision to move is not one that people take without a cause, in fact “most people prefer their home countries and will stay if conditions are even barely tolerable” (Demuth 2000, 26). As a “mythic place of desire in the Haitian imagining” (Fouron 2003, 239), for many home is located in Haiti. To attempt to build home outside of the remembered homeland is thus an act of continuous negotiations.
Due to various notions of home, participants in this study were often asked to define home. Tremendous cultural significance exists behind the concept of *lakay* for the participants. Locating home becomes a complex and nuanced process. Because the meaning of home is different for each person, it became more important to define the terms/parameters of that place. The participants invoked concepts of identity, culture, and memory, in order to gain access to this place called home. The first and second generation’s responses varied greatly as most second generation women discussed home in terms of where they live, while the first generation also imagined home as a place of belonging. Carol Boyce Davies (1994) writes, “Home can only have meaning once one experiences a level of displacement from it. Still, home is contradictory, contested space, a locus for misrecognition and alienation” (84).

“Lakay Se Lakay” gave each participant the opportunity to define home in her own terms. For all of these women, home was a concept that constantly changes as the needs for community and identification change. For example, some of the women in the study had lived in the major Haitian immigrant destinations such as New York and Florida, but there were also women who had always lived in the metro D.C. area, making D.C. the first stop for some and second stop for others. For the women who journeyed to D.C. after living in a city with a higher Haitian population, they showed a preference for the D.C. area as a potential home both due to and in spite of D.C.’s small Haitian population. Immigrants in D.C. were not forced to be a part of a community due to population saturation but instead were constantly making choices to connect with other Haitians and seek out a Haitian community in D.C. on their own terms.

For first generation women, home was tied to the homeland. They detailed memories of home and lamented about being unable to return home due to perpetual instability of Haiti. Creating home in America is, for the first generation, a process of necessity, one that certainly does not replace the homeland Haiti. For second-generation women, home was more closely located in the U.S. but was also connected to the memories and culture of their parents.

**Home for First Generation Participants**

Some women struggled to limit such a dynamic place to words; they often replied that “home is home” or *lakay se lakay*, with an implied sense of mutual understanding. Leonne, a first generation woman in the study nuances this understanding, “Haitians always say that ‘home is home.’ You must tell them it is not the same thing, even though they are comfortable here...home is [still] home, there is a big difference.” As Therese, a first generation participant further nuances the contextual understanding of what home is and can be,

Well most of the time for people who are older who are here, when they say home, it’s their country if they came from—Haiti. It’s as if you were talking about Haiti except if they are talking about here—'I'm going home right now,' so this is the home here but if you are talking ‘oh I’m thinking about home because things are not good or whatever happened’. [Then] This [home they are referring to] is Haiti.

As a place that holds positive association, home is also a place where some level of comfort is experienced. This comfort as Paulene, a first generation immigrant explains, derives from a feeling of belonging, “A place where I feel comfortable, where I feel I belong, where I have a network.” And for Edeline, another first generation participant, belonging and comfort are essential, “Home is where you feel really comfortable.”

The space of memory is where home is imagined, dreamed about and most desired for the first generation women. Their emotional ties to Haiti create this perpetual void where Haiti can only be longed for and imagined. When Darline left Haiti in 1983, she remembers the beauty of the country. At that time, “the country was good, but now even if you have money you cannot live in the country.” Similarly for Edeline, when she left, Haiti was clean, quiet and filled with vibrant businesses. She remembers Champs de Mars at night, the central square in downtown Port-au-Prince—sitting there with friends or going out to lunch. “The stores used to be real nice, when I went there though the doors are closed, there used to be a nice perfumery store, nothing was the same, it’s like you have a lot of little market women all over the place.” Edeline states specifically “I miss the Haiti I left,” contrasting it with the Haiti of the present.
While many of the first generation women have returned to Haiti for visits, their ultimate dream is to live and retire there. Of the linkages of home and memory, Judith Ortiz Cofer (1990) writes, “My grandmother’s house is like a chambered nautilus; it has many rooms, yet it is not a mansion…It is a home that has grown organically, according to the needs of its inhabitants. It is the place of our origin; the stage for our memories and dream of Island life” (23). Memories, for many, serve the need of filling the gap of longing for home and the circumstances that make returning home difficult.

Home for Second Generation Participants
Turning to the second generation, many of the women identify America with home and feel a sense of belonging here. Alice says that, “This is the only place I know so that’s the place I call home, for now I call America home. I feel I belong here; I was born here so I feel like I belong here.” Similarly, Roseline, she believes America is her home, “it’s where I’m supposed to be.” The second generation identified the U.S. as home. America is where most of them were born, raised and learned to blend and navigate culture. For most of these women, home was associated with a specific geographical location. Roseline has only visited Haiti one time and experiences her strongest emotional connection to the U.S. She says, “I feel at home mostly in the U.S. because I am a second generation Haitian. I was born in the United States.” Like Roseline, Mika has only visited Haiti once and knows very little about Haiti. Mika was born and raised in the U.S. and only knows about Haiti from what she reads or what her parents tell her. Both Arianne and Serena experience some level of disconnect to Haiti. Arianne left Haiti when she was young and Serena has not visited in ten years.

Conclusions and Implications
For immigrants, the process of building home, and in particular capturing the meaning and purpose of the use of the word lakay was of great importance. When analyzing the use of lakay, we see that lakay was not just a mere term that translates to home but instead lakay became a term that linked the Haitian diaspora transnationally. As such, the term was used only in reference to Haitians living abroad, in particular Washington, D.C. It became a common idiom that invoked and formed a bond of solidarity between Haitian immigrants. When Haitians traveled to the United States to states such as New York, Florida, Massachusetts and Maryland, they were subject to the use and identification of lakay.

This study about creating home in Washington, D.C. has taken the reader from the native homeland, Haiti, to the many states in the U.S. that served as homes for these women. The migration journeys of these women are stories of negotiation, struggle, and sacrifice. From the first generation to the second generation, what or whom home is took on different meanings. Yet, for all the participants of this study, lakay was a term of endearment, a term of identity and belonging. Lakay was a term of remembrance, the linking of an idea, a feeling, an emotion, a place—Haiti—to its many dispersed people.

Dr. Manouchka Poinson (2012) earned a PhD in American Studies from the University of Maryland, College Park. She received a Southern Regional Educational Board Dissertation Fellowship from 2008-2009 and was a CrISP scholar at CRGE from 2003-2005.

Interested in other CRGE research reports?
Go to: www.crge.umd.edu
Introduction

The central question of this study is whether the impact of federal housing investments varies across different neighborhood housing markets, and if so, to what extent. This research seeks to determine the impact of the HOME Partnership Program, a federal housing investment program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), on neighborhoods in Baltimore, Maryland.

For decades, scholars and practitioners have sought to determine the most effective method to spatially allocate scarce financial resources to produce measurable improvements in economically distressed communities. Today, many U.S. cities continue to grapple with concerns about public investments strategies and to identify mechanisms to leverage private investments that lead to the revitalization of depressed neighborhoods. As yet, scholars have been unable to conclusively answer questions regarding the impact of federal housing subsidies in distressed communities (Ding et al., 2000; Ellen et al., 2001; Galster et al., 2001; and Galster et al., 2006).

To further complicate the situation, for the first time in over a decade, distressed neighborhoods are not the only areas showing signs of hardship. With the 2008 housing market crisis and economic downturn, even once-stable communities are now experiencing signs of disinvestment and abandonment. The debate is no longer about where to strategically invest in distressed, low-income neighborhoods, but how cities should spatially allocate program resources to address the unique needs of diverse communities with different housing market types (Abravanel et al., 2010; Frankel and Pauzner, 2002; Accordino and Johnson, 2000).

Most empirical studies tend to focus on distressed areas; few analyze the impact of investments across different neighborhood housing markets, both distressed and non-distressed. This analysis builds upon the neighborhood change literature and evaluates the impact of federal housing investments across different local housing markets, based on the neighborhoods’ social, economic, and housing conditions. This study develops a neighborhood housing market typology (HMT) for the City of Baltimore in order to examine the impact of federal housing programs on the city neighborhoods. Specifically, it estimates the effects of the HOME Partnership Program production subsidies for rehabilitation and new construction in Baltimore.

Challenges in Baltimore and HOME Investments

Like most post-industrial rustbelt cities, Baltimore has undergone a cumulative cycle of disinvestment that began in the early 1970s with substantial population losses triggered by declines in the manufacturing industry and suburbanization of both White and Black middle class households. With a loss of almost 30 percent of its population, Baltimore neighborhoods were left with disproportionately high concentrations of minority, low-income households in areas with high rates of vacant properties and substantial disinvestments. This reality was not created over a short period of time, and in spite of numerous revitalization strategies, planning efforts and targeted federal funding for neighborhood rebuilding, there are many neighborhoods still in need.

Since the late 1980s, Baltimore has employed numerous housing production programs coupled with economic development programs and strategies. Such programs include Section 8 New Construction/Substantial Rehabilitation, HOPE VI, Section 202, Section 811, the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), and the HOME
Investment Partnership Program (HOME Program). Baltimore uses HOME funds as the major investment vehicle to address suitable housing needs for low-income households. The HOME program is a major federal housing program created in 1992 to address neighborhood revitalization and the lack of affordable housing. Its main purpose is assistance with property acquisition and new construction, with particular focus on rental unit renovation. Approximately $47 million of HOME dollars have been allocated to the city for housing and community development since 1992. Most of these funds have been targeted to middle market and distressed neighborhoods, as defined by the City’s current housing market typology. Historically, these neighborhoods have shown little to no change in the City in the 1990s.

Comparing a hand drawn, subjective housing market classification map developed by a real estate profession from the 1930s as well as a more statistically robust map created by the Reinvestment Fund in 2011, it appears distressed areas have remained unaffected by an overflow of city-wide investments which spans almost eight decades. Since the 1930s, Baltimore’s distressed areas, as demonstrated by the red zones in visual comparison housing market classification maps in Figure 1 (1937 map) and Figure 2 (2011 map), remain troubled. The 1937 and 2011 maps show limited change in the delineated red areas, and present only small pockets of improvement as the result of city-sponsored redevelopment projects and market-driven gentrification. This simple visual inspection begs the question as to why has there been a lack of improvement.

The Central Problem
Baltimore neighborhoods appear to follow the continuum of neighborhood change proposed by Anthony Downs in the 1980s and supported by scholars in the early 2000s (Galster et al., 2002; Mallach, 2006). This continuum ranged from newly developed neighborhoods with strong housing markets to more distressed areas with declining markets. Downs claimed that neighborhoods in the latter stages of decline were less likely to improve without massive redevelopment strategies. In spite of the presence of HOME subsidies or other coupled investments in distressed neighborhoods, it appears the magnitude of blight in these neighborhoods remains consistent. In more recent literature, scholars assert that public subsidies can be used to stabilize neighborhoods, but extremely distressed neighborhoods may be beyond the point where revitalization can occur even with the support of production subsidies (Galster et al., 2002; Cummings et al., 2002; and Briggs et al., 1997). As a result, the effects of investments on market forces vary in neighborhoods given their different market conditions or market types. While the HOME program is an important source of housing investments for the city, little is known of the Program’s economic impact in Baltimore neighborhoods.

Methods
The study aims to assess the impact of the HOME program in Baltimore and more importantly determine if the program has been effective in the city’s distressed and non-distressed neighborhoods. Two methods were employed to conduct analyses: cluster analysis and the hedonic regression model.

Developing a Housing Market Typology: Cluster Analytic Method
A neighborhood housing market typology (HMT) was developed to categorize neighborhoods into different market types ranging from stable neighborhoods to
distressed neighborhoods. Cluster analysis was used to create homogenous groupings of cases that share similar characteristics. For the development of the typology, social and economic indicators were compiled from census data, administrative data and neighborhood change indicators to define neighborhood housing markets.

The data were used to categorize neighborhoods with similar housing market indicators into five mutually exclusive market types. Five types would provide adequate spatial variation and representation among market categories. To assess the validity of the market cluster, geographic information systems (GIS) spatial analyses were conducted of local socioeconomic conditions and complemented with site visits. GIS maps and site visits showed that the inclusion of socioeconomic data tended to skew typology maps and did not provide an accurate representation of housing market types. Based on this initial analysis, a final typology was created that included administrative housing indicators, neighborhood characteristics and median household income. In turn, each market type was mapped to show their spatial variation in Baltimore. The final typology in Figure 3 (see page 12) presents five market types: Markets 1 and 2, contain the highest house prices, comprised of those block groups that would be defined as stable markets; Market 3, include those block groups viewed as middle markets; and, Markets 4 and 5, contain the lowest house prices, represented those block groups considered distressed markets. Based on the map, most of the distressed market types are located in the core of the City, near downtown, represented by the darker color tone. This area contains the lowest home values and household income in the City. The more stable housing markets are located in the northern section of the city which contains higher home values and household incomes.

Hedonic Model to Analyze HOME investments in Baltimore

Upon developing a HMT, a hedonic price regression methodology was used to determine the impact of the HOME program on Baltimore neighborhoods, with...
consideration of the different market categories. The data used in this analysis were HOME new construction and rehabilitation investments in Baltimore from 1994 to 2003. City home sale transactions from 2004 to 2005 was the basis for the dependent variable, based on the assumption that the impact of new investments would be captured in the home value increase of surrounding properties upon completion of the investment projects. This analysis addressed two central research questions: (1) Do HOME investments have positive impacts on surrounding housing sale prices? (2) How do the following factors influence the impact of HOME investments? a. Do household incomes impact the magnitude and direction of the investments? b. Is the impact based on the scale of the investment? c. Do other factors such as neighborhood housing markets influence the impact of investments based on scale and concentration?

To determine the impact of HOME investments on surrounding home sale prices, a multivariate model was estimated. The model's dependent variable was home sale prices within 5000 feet of a HOME investment. This variable was regressed on independent, control variables, which included: structural characteristics (i.e. housing condition and number of bathrooms), neighborhood condition (i.e. income and percent of vacant properties), distance to new construction or rehabilitated HOME investments, distance to HOME investments based on total dollar value (i.e. small, medium, large as discussed above). (For a full discussion of methods, please see the dissertation: http://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/12335).

Results
Data show that of the 446 HOME investments in the City since 1994, distressed markets were the recipients of approximately 76 percent of all investments. Based on the total sales in the city, distressed markets only contained 13 percent of sales which occurred between 2004 and 2005. Therefore, most HOME investments were not located near “arm’s length” home sales (meaning when a seller and buyer have no relationship to each other and therefore act independently) or in distressed markets.

The results reflect that lower income areas are greatly impacted by investments. Most investments, with the exception of small scale new and rehab investments, presented positive impacts on sale prices. In areas with average household incomes greater than $26,000, only small-scale rehabilitation projects were significant and these presented negative impacts. Medium and large-scale new construction represented very small but positive impacts on units. The value of investments and the impact of investments on surrounding property values present varying effects. Subsequent models that estimated sale prices across market types have different findings. With the understanding that socioeconomic variables are not the only variables that make up housing submarkets, it is important to separately estimate neighborhood housing markets.

The analyses yielded varied results for each of the five cluster areas. In brief, these results are:

- For Cluster 1, data show that for
the market type which contains the highest home values in the City, only medium-scale rehabilitation investment projects are significant. Medium-scale projects have a positive effect on property values, increasing the property value by approximately $478.

- For Cluster 2, another competitive market type, only small-scale projects and large rehabilitated projects have a positive impact while small- and medium-scale rehabilitation projects have a negative impact. This differs from Cluster 1, in which medium-scale projects produce positive impacts.
- For Cluster 3, a transitional market, only medium- and large-scale new construction reinvestment projects, and medium scale rehabilitation projects are significant. Medium-scale new construction and rehabilitation projects had a positive impact on housing sales, while small-scale new construction projects presented a negative impact.
- For Cluster 4, only large-scale rehabilitation projects presented impacts and these impacts were negative.
- For Cluster 5, no investments were significant.

Discussion
These findings present very different results from other empirical studies which note that distressed areas present significant and positive impacts. Finals models differentiated neighborhoods by market conditions and results show that distressed areas do not demonstrate significant or positive results. Therefore, the use of income thresholds to determine investment impacts and neighborhood condition is not a plausible method. If scholars ignore market differences, then disinvested neighborhoods may appear better off and not accurately represented, and more stable neighborhoods with a high percent of low income households may appear worse off.

The analysis of clusters presents implications for how scholars measure and evaluate the impacts of investments on surrounding property values. As demonstrated in this research, impacts differ significantly in different neighborhood housing markets.

Discussion
These findings present very different results from other empirical studies which note that distressed areas present significant and positive impacts. Finals models differentiated neighborhoods by market conditions and results show that distressed areas do not demonstrate significant or positive results. Therefore, the use of income thresholds to determine investment impacts and neighborhood condition is not a plausible method. If scholars ignore market differences, then disinvested neighborhoods may appear better off and not accurately represented, and more stable neighborhoods with a high percent of low income households may appear worse off.

The analysis of clusters presents implications for how scholars measure and evaluate the impacts of investments on surrounding property values. As demonstrated in this research, impacts differ significantly in different neighborhood housing markets.

The data suggest that HOME new construction and rehabilitation investments positively affect surrounding property values in Baltimore. However, these effects are based on the scale and concentration of housing investments. Small-scale HOME Program investment projects—meaning those projects in which only a small number of housing units are constructed or rehabilitated—were either not significant or presented negative impacts on surrounding housing values. This may confirm prior claims that investments must be large-scale to have a significant impact.

This study also suggests that investment impact varies by income, with significant differences between poor neighborhoods and non-poor neighborhoods. Areas with average household incomes of less than $26,000 showed few significant effects for housing investments; while in areas with average household incomes greater than $26,000, the effects were different. For these areas, small-scale projects had positive impacts, while medium- and large-scale projects had negative impacts. These findings may be the result of differences in social and economic factors that are more central in poor neighborhoods, which in turn affect the impact of investments. Further analysis of market types revealed equally important findings. Housing investments in distressed market types were not significant, which may be due to external and neighborhood quality factors that overshadow the effects of investments. Too many vacant and foreclosed properties may limit the effect of new construction or rehabilitation projects. Khadduri et al. (2002) suggest that investments should not be targeted to these areas unless there is a larger redevelopment plan. In less distressed and transitional areas, small-scale investment projects had little-to-no impact, while medium- and large-scale investment projects had positive impacts. These findings corroborate those of the existing literature in that larger investments have positive impacts on neighborhoods. However, this study differs from previous empirical findings because impacts for new construction and rehabilitation investment projects were similar, but for distressed markets the effects were minimal or not at all.

Conclusions
The question is not whether federal investments impacts across housing markets matter, this is evident based on the varying effects of HOME investments on surrounding
home values across market types. However, the larger question, particularly for distressed neighborhoods, is why? Why are HOME investments ineffective in influencing surrounding home values in distressed housing markets? And, what are the implications of analyses which attempt to explain the impact of investments in neighborhoods by solely evaluating increasing home values? Based on these analyses, federal agencies would determine that investments in distressed neighborhoods are futile and will do little to reverse the existing quality of the area. Other scholars, like Galster (2004), would conclude that single attention to urban form and physical infrastructure presents a failed solution to the ills of urban neighborhoods. The causes of poverty and economic distress for neighborhoods with disproportionately high concentrations of marginalized, low-income minority households are both multi-dimensional and intersectional.

The findings of this study show that home investments alone may have positive effects in less distressed markets, but for disadvantaged households the challenges are greater than concentrated new construction or massive redevelopment. These areas lack significant and adequate access to high wage jobs located in the outlying areas of the city. Many households have lived in these neighborhoods which contain low performing schools and few resources to assist households to advance towards greater financial mobility. These neighborhoods are ill equipped to leverage federal investments due to challenges such as: years of racial and income discriminatory actions; urban renewal, which razed minority neighborhoods and later led to the massive exodus of middle class Blacks in the 1990s; few job opportunities and workforce training; and layers of other obstacles. The solution for these areas will take time and significant investment, and in some cases it may mean cities start from a clean slate but use fair and equal processes in affording low-income households better quality neighborhoods. These steps mean using a multi-dimensional lens of understanding neighborhood change, and require policy makers to go beyond a focus on improving the physical conditions of areas to turn around neighborhoods plagued with decades of disinvestment.

For full list of references see www.crge.umd.edu/researchreports.html.

Dr. Lynette Boswell has a PhD in Urban and Regional Planning and Design from the University of Maryland in College Park. She was a CRGE CrISP Scholar from 2007-2009. Her research on housing market typologies was funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Doctoral Dissertation Grant. Dr. Boswell is currently working as the Division Chief of Research and Strategic Planning for the Baltimore City Planning Department. Boswell directs research initiatives in economic development, housing, public health, transportation and environmental planning for the city. Her division’s research focus includes: identifying city-wide redevelopment strategies and prioritization analysis, and supporting public policy analysis related to Baltimore’s Housing Market Typology.

Interested in Academic Diversity Events at the University of Maryland?

Check out CRGE’s

**Academic Diversity Calendar**

*with listings of Academic Diversity Events throughout the year.*

http://www.crge.umd.edu/diversity.html
CRGE was funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in 2011 to conduct a study on Understanding the Relationship between Work Stress and U.S. Research Institutions’ Failure to Retain Underrepresented Minority (URM) Faculty (Ruth E. Zambrana, Principal Investigator and Bonnie Thornton Dill, co-Investigator).

This mixed-methods study examines the associations among occupational stress (e.g. perceived discrimination), mentoring, coping strategies, and physical and mental well-being among African American, Native American/American Indian and Latino (Mexican American and Puerto Rican) faculty employed in research intensive universities. The 52 qualitative respondents were identified through personal contacts, advisory board members, and network sampling techniques. Data were collected through in-depth interviews (n=36) and focus groups (n=16).

In addition, a self-administered online survey with informed consent protocol has been emailed to approximately 1408 faculty members and we currently have about a 40% response rate. I expect that data collection will be completed by June 2012 and analyses will be completed by September 2012.

Preliminary quantitative data show:
• Mean age of respondents is 41 years with approximately 61% married and 49% with children.
• Fewer than 25% of respondents felt that mentorship had been important in their career development.
• All respondents reported relatively high levels of perceived discrimination.
• Females were more likely than males to perceive discrimination, to report more chronic conditions and stress-related physical symptoms, and to have higher depressive indicators.
• Mexican American faculty members were more likely to report excellent to very good health than their African American counterparts.

Preliminary findings suggest that the stressful culture of the academy (perceived feelings of isolation, marginalization, and devaluation) may have deleterious effects on physical and mental well-being among this group.

Given the lack of diversity in higher education with African American, Native American/American Indian and Latino (6.6%, .5%, and 4% respectively) faculty still considerably underrepresented as of 2011, these findings can serve to shed light on academic stress factors that may contribute to low retention and less favorable physical and social well-being for those in academic workplaces. There is a considerable gap in the literature on the impact of academic workplace stress on URM faculty.

Results of this study will be disseminated in invitational and professional conferences, including: American Sociological Association, National Women’s Studies Association, Society for the Study of Social Problems and the Latina Researchers Conference: Increasing the Pipeline for Future Scholars.
The overall focus of my research has been on understanding how children, especially children from low-income homes, develop in particular settings (home, child care) and the role that parents, especially fathers, and public policies play in child development. My early interest in child care was focused on understanding the availability of quality care for children whose mothers exited public assistance programs as well as how the quality of that care influenced children's development. This research led me to focus on the families in which these children live that resulted in the formulation of my research on fatherhood. Spurred by a policy interest to include more fathers in research, practice, and policy, I became interested in understanding the role that low-income fathers had in their children's social and cognitive development. Applying a life course perspective to my work, focusing on fathers ten years ago was historically opportune. At that time, the Clinton administration, through grant funds and policies, encouraged researchers to take stock of the science base and develop specific lines of research on fathers, with a special emphasis on low-income men, on whom there was a dearth of data. Consequently, I focus on the theoretical, methodological and empirical aspects of doing research on fathers. Specifically, I investigate how low-income minority fathers and mothers parent effectively, the predictors of father involvement, and how their involvement relates to child wellbeing.

In general, my research has shown that fathers are highly engaged in care-giving and physical activities with their infants and that this involvement varies by factors such as type of involvement and race and ethnicity. Moreover, I have found that the majority of fathers are involved prenatally—before the child is born—thus paving the way for long-term involvement. Looking at the sources of variation in how fathers are engaged with their young children, I have found that fathers' human capital, the quality of the relationship with their partner, the degree to which they share parenting with their partners, and risk factors such as SES and substance abuse are important predictors of which fathers will be involved with their children and for how long.

My work, along with that of other researchers, has shown that fathers’ positive involvement, including engaging in cognitive stimulating activities with their children, can make a difference in the development of children’s language and social skills. This involvement can be long-term and is related to children’s social adjustment, including the development of positive peer relationships. Moreover, I have found that there are several pathways by which fathers matter for their children’s development. Father involvement is indirectly related to children’s development through the mother-father relationship and the mother-child relationship. That is, involved fathers have children with higher social and cognitive skills because they have a positive relationship with their partners and their partners have a positive relationship with their children.

Building on how parents are involved with their children at home, I am also interested in examining the cultural and contextual factors that influence parenting, including risk but also strengths, and how parenting behaviors relate to children’s school readiness. To this end, I am currently conducting a study of Latino mothers and fathers and their young children to understand: (1) what are the developmental early skills of young Latino children that foretell later competencies at the start of school? (2) How do mothers and fathers additively and interactively socialize different skills in their children? (3) What are the mechanisms through which early environments relate to later children’s skills? and (4) How do mothers’ and fathers’ cultural values, resources (education and literacy), and family-level processes (chaos, mother-father relationship) relate to parenting behaviors?

Recent Publications


Dr. Natasha Cabrera is an Associate Professor in the Department of Human Development in the College of Education and a faculty affiliate of CRGE. Her areas of research are: parent-child relationships, children’s social and emotional development in different types of families and cultural/ethnic groups, school readiness, fatherhood, predictors of adaptive and maladaptive parenting, and translation of research into practice and policy.
Quantitative Testing of the Cultural Competence of Novice Teachers

A Research Report by Dr. Sherick Hughes & Tamyka Morant

Introduction
Problems and questions related to competence comprise one of the few common links in all teacher education research. While content-area competence remains in the forefront of this research, the concern for cultural competence has emerged as a central thesis. This concern centers the development of educators who have the type of competence that seems crucial to implementing the promising practices in diverse school settings (e.g., Lindsey, Robbins, & Terrell, 2003; Lindsey, Roberts, & Campbell Jones, 2005). While the most robust research on the topic suggests that (a) practical experiences in urban schools, (b) critical multicultural training/education, and (c) mentoring by engaged, veteran teachers/university faculty are key, this research is often limited to qualitative data and retrospective self-report strategies (Grant and Secada, 1990; Lindsey, Robbins, & Terrell, 2003a, 2003b, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1999, 2000; Hollins & Torres-Guzman, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Sleeter, 2001). In order to examine cultural competence from a different perspective, this research report documents findings from a larger alternative study of cultural competence conducted during the 2009-2010 academic year.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether a faculty/teacher dyad applying the Cultural Competence Continuum (i.e., the continuum) as an ordinal scale can reliably rate novice teachers' culturally reflective writing. The continuum was initially developed by Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs (1989) and it was later expanded to be more applicable to k-12 schools and school leaders by Lindsey et al. (2003, 2005). It is a continuum of six levels: cultural destructiveness, cultural ineffectiveness, cultural blindness, pre-competence, cultural competence, and cultural proficiency—the most advanced stage of cultural competence. The following methods and analyses were applied.

Methods
The methods and analyses reported here represent one portion of a larger study on symbolic racism, racialized political correctness, and cultural competence. The methods build upon the recent Physical Therapy Education research of Wong & Blissett (2007) and apply and test this alternative form of cultural competence assessment in Teacher Education by substituting: (a) faculty/faculty dyad with a faculty/teacher dyads, (b) physical therapy education students with novice educators, and (c) implicit cultural vignettes with explicit, and somewhat stereotypic Black cultural vignettes (i.e., Black students using Black English Vernacular in school, although not all Black students do so in school or outside of school) describing grade school classroom experiences based on actual events described in Sheets (2004). This portion of the larger study considered one central research question (Q1) with a corresponding null hypothesis (Ho1):

Q1: Can a faculty/teacher dyad using the continuum as an ordinal scale rate novice teachers' culturally reflective writing reliably?

Ho1: There is no significant relationship connecting a trained faculty/teacher dyad using the continuum as an ordinal scale to reliable ratings of novice teachers' culturally reflective writing (i.e., with at least a substantial agreement level of kappa ≥ 0.61).

Design and Sampling
A representative sample of novice teachers from a flagship university in the Southeastern U.S. participated in the study. A total of 224 responses were gathered from novice teachers whose identities were kept confidential. Novice teachers were recruited to read and write about cultural vignettes, which were entitled Tyrone and Tyree Vignettes, and received incentives from the host institution to participate in this study. There were not enough non-White novice teachers in the participant pool to perform meaningful descriptive and inferential statistics. The overall sample size did, however, provide adequate variability, given that statements were coded as representative of all six of the six possible levels of the continuum to assess reliability.

Procedures for Participants
Participants went to a quiet room, alone to read the Tyrone and Tyree Vignettes and to respond to two open-ended questions. Two raters read and coded 224 entries independently four months later. Coding of the entries was assigned based on the continuum. The 6 levels of the continuum were reduced to a numeric ordinal scale for future data analysis with 1 = "cultural destructiveness" (CD), 2 = "cultural ineffectiveness" (CI), 3 = "cultural blindness" (CN), 4 = "cultural pre-competence" (PC), 5 = "cultural competence" (CC), 6 = "cultural proficiency" (CP).

Results
Two hundred and twenty four total entries were coded by each rater (See Chart 1). Of the six codes in the continuum, the most frequent ratings were cultural blindness (Rater 1 = 18.8%, Rater 2 = 36.6%) and cultural pre-competence (Rater 1 = 40.6%, Rater 2 = 29.5%). "Cultural competence" ratings (Rater 1 = 17.9%, Rater 2 = 11.2%), ratings of 0 due
to extremely brief or unintelligible remarks (Rater 1 = 9.8%, Rater 2 = 9.8%), and “cultural ineffectiveness” ratings (Rater 1 = 8.5%, Rater 2 = 8.0%) were less frequent. The least frequent ratings were of “cultural destructiveness” (Rater 1 = 3.6%, Rater 2 = 1.3%) and “cultural proficiency” (Rater 1 = .9% Rater 2 = 3.6%).

Discussion
Results demonstrate that analysis of writing samples using the continuum as an ordinal scale for dyadic rating is a reliable method for rating novice teachers’ culturally reflective writing toward an ongoing and seemingly more critical assessment of critical competence. Using the suggested standard interpretation of the strength of agreement shown by kappa coefficient values (0 = “poor,” 0.01-0.20 = “slight,” 0.21-0.40 = “fair;” 0.41-0.60 = “moderate,” 0.61-0.80 = “substantial,” and 0.81-1.0 = “almost perfect”), the weighted kappa value of 0.62 in this study between the two raters can be interpreted as substantial. Hence, the null hypothesis can be rejected. The results of this study indicate that assessing writing samples using the continuum as an ordinal scale for dyadic ratings may be a promising alternative method of assessment for novice teachers’ vicarious and potentially on-the-job cross-cultural interactions. It may also provide an additional source to begin triangulating the data received from novice teachers’ retrospective self-reports.

Conclusions
Several limitations and benefits surfaced at the conclusion of the study that may inform future research that engages this method as a reliable alternative to assessing cultural competence. First, online training time augmented by face-to-face training time may strengthen the interrater co-constructions of the meanings within the continuum, which would likely increase the proportion of agreement of the faculty/teacher dyad in this study. Second, future studies may also consider rating novice teachers’ responses to actual experiences in local culturally and linguistically complex classrooms after students have been rated on their responses to vicarious classroom-based vignettes and cases. Third, the study met the challenge posed by Wong & Blissett (2007) to find “outside” raters. The faculty/teacher dyad in this study was rating students from a similar department, but a different host institution provided a large participant pool. Finally, this study did not explore the ability to use the continuum to assess actions described in reflective writing and to detect changes in cultural competence reflected in those actions, particularly among novice teachers who do not self-identify as White. Moreover, future studies could raise important questions about novice teachers of color educated at predominantly White institutions (PWI). How might teacher education at PWIs vs. Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic Serving Institutions influence novice teachers’ ratings along the continuum, particularly those self-identifying as Black and Latino (Blanchett, 2006; Cook, 2010; O’Connor, 2006)?

In sum, the results of the study are promising for the future of educational research on competence by adding an additional, research-based level of scrutiny to assessments. We may benefit from an alternative way to rate and assess novice teachers’ culturally reflective writing by adding this type of assessment to our toolbox of triangulation. Such an addition could be useful in the disruption of the disproportionality issues that have been linked to cultural biases and mismatches in diverse educational settings (Delpit, 1988; Delpit, 1995; Delpit, Harry & Klingner, 2006; O’Connor & Fernandez, 2006).

For full list of references, please see www.crge.umd.edu/researchreports.htm

Dr. Sherick Andre Hughes is an Assistant Professor of Minority and Urban Education at UM and in Summer 2012 will begin as an Associate Professor at the School of Education at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Tamyka Morant is a doctoral candidate in Curriculum and Instruction and was a CRGE CrISP Scholar from 2007-2009.
The Qualitative Research Interest Group (QRIG), as one of the major program areas of CRGE, is a working group composed of faculty and graduate students who use qualitative research as an important method in uncovering the lived experiences of marginalized populations. QRIG is an essential aspect of the work we do at CRGE—it reflects a commitment to supporting the emerging research of junior faculty and graduate students. QRIG’s reach crosscuts disciplines, fields and subject matters.

Over the past six years, QRIG, in addition to offering an academic home for qualitative researchers at UM, has also supported the growth of emerging qualitative scholarship through faculty seed grants. With the support of the Maryland Population Research Center (MPRC), CRGE has awarded over $68,000 in seed grant awards to promising qualitative faculty scholars across campus. This human capital investment has been spread over four colleges and fifteen departments, numbers that reveal how necessary interdisciplinary seed grant funding is for emerging qualitative scholars at UM.

### 2012-2013 QRIG SEED GRANT AWARDEES

The Qualitative Research Interest Group (QRIG) at CRGE, in collaboration with the Maryland Population Research Center (MPRC) (see www.mprc.umd.edu), is pleased to congratulate the following faculty qualitative researchers for their innovative research!

**Perla M. Guerrero,** Assistant Professor, Department of American Studies

**Latinas/os and Asians Remaking Arkansas: Race, Labor, Place, and Community**

**Shannon Jetté,** Assistant Professor, Department of Kinesiology

**“Living in Two Worlds:” Urban American Indian Female Youths’ Constructions and Lived Experiences of Health, the Body and Exercise**

**Marian Moser Jones,** Assistant Professor, Department of Family Sciences

**U.S. Homelessness and Service Providers in the Wake of War and Recession**

**Jeffrey Q. McCune,** Assistant Professor, Department of Women’s Studies/American Studies

**Some Place Like a Home: An Ethnographic Study of Homelessness Among LGBT Youth of Color**

**Joseph Richardson,** Assistant Professor, African American Studies

**Exploring the Risk Factors for Recurrent Violent Injury, Linkages to Care and HIV Risk Related Behaviors Among Young African-American Men in Prince George’s County**
During the fall of 2011, the Qualitative Research Interest Group (QRIG) was pleased to host Dr. Nadia Kim, Associate Professor of Sociology at Loyola Marymount University. Dr. Kim’s presentation focused on the methodological approaches in her most recent work, *Imperial Citizens: Koreans and Race from Seoul to L.A.* (Stanford, 2008). In the book, Dr. Kim addresses how immigrants experienced America’s racial inequalities both upon arrival in the U.S. as well as perceptions formed before immigration. Her book explores cross-border immigrant contact with U.S. culture, paying careful attention to the way it travels through militarization and other extensions of U.S. power in South Korea. What follows is a summary of the methods talk she gave at a lecture sponsored by CRGE and co-sponsored by Asian American Studies.

**Methods: Translating Ethnography**

In order to understand perceptions of race among South Koreans at various points in the immigration process, Dr. Kim’s fieldwork took place in the U.S. and South Korea. In Seoul, Dr. Kim conducted focus groups aimed at understanding collective systems of meaning. In addition, she employed in-depth interviews in conjunction with ethnographic participant observation at a large church with a congregation largely made up of college students and professionals, a demographic likely to migrate to the U.S. At the church, Dr. Kim identified the ways in which (White) American religious influences have traveled abroad and have become entangled in conceptions of race globally. Other ethnographic sites included the boarding house where she lived and her aunt’s apartment where she gained access to middle-aged participants, family dynamics, and their interaction with American media and entertainment. Finally, Dr. Kim turned to widely-circulated newspaper archives (1920-2000), Chosun Ilbo and Donga Ilbo. Here she uncovered editorials and coverage of news events (i.e. Sammy Lee and the LA Riots) that articulated an understanding of racial discrimination in the US mostly towards African Americans who were depicted as more visible and politically powerful than Korean immigrants. Meanwhile, Asian Americans were discriminated against as foreign but also remained largely invisible. Paired with interviews and participant observation, she was able to analyze “issues of nationalistic pride and struggles with racial discrimination and ‘foreignness’.”

Dr. Kim’s multi-methods approach, then, allowed her to explore the micro as not simply determined by the macro, but instead to theorize a two-way dynamic process in which she “understood immigrants’ ideologies and identities on the one hand, and the U.S. armed forces, U.S. cultural economy, and transnational influences on the other, to be mutually constitutive [while] also driven by the ‘external force’ of U.S. neoimperial power.”

Woven throughout her presentation was an acute attention to her position as a researcher both in the U.S. and abroad. She carefully reflected on the ways youth and gender located her in relation to her participants, but also the ways in which her status as a U.S. citizen brought with it power and privilege. Her work also reflected a tension around feeling at once an insider and an outsider, even as she understood this “dichotomy [as] falling prey to the very essentialism of racialized ethnic categories that social scientists so painstakingly critique.”

*Cristina Pérez is a second year doctoral student in the Department of Women’s Studies and a CrISP scholar at CRGE. Her research interests include transnational feminisms, border studies, and sexuality.*
On Friday, March 2, CRGE and the Qualitative Research Interest Group (QRIG) sponsored a conference on Qualitative Research Methods & Discovery: Intersectionality across the Disciplines. The conference was the accumulation of six years of building a working research community across the UM campus that understands the necessity of using qualitative research in studying the lives of marginalized populations. At the conference, faculty, graduate students, staff and outside attendees had the opportunity to hear the 2009-2011 QRIG seed grant awardees present their research projects. Over 100 people participated in the conference. Ninety seven percent (97%) of the participants used qualitative methods in their scholarly work and 47% had never attended a CRGE event before the conference. Presenters discussed their qualitative methodological challenges and rewards. Particular attention was given to the ability of qualitative research to illuminate the lived experiences of marginalized populations.

Dr. Ruth E. Zambrana, Director of the CRGE and Professor of Women’s Studies, opened the conference and welcomed Dr. Bonnie Thornton Dill, Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities. The morning panel entitled, Negotiating Intersectionality: Transracial Contexts, was moderated by Dr. Vanessa L. Sheppard, Georgetown University Medical Center. Panelists included Melinda Martin-Beltrán, (Teaching, Learning, Policy & Leadership); Faedra Chatard Carpenter, (Theatre, Dance, and Performance Studies); Meina Liu, (Department of Communications); Matthew J. Miller, (Department of Counseling & Personnel Services); and Stephen John Quaye, (College Student Personnel Program). The panelists discussed issues such as the complexity of language and code switching in qualitative research, conducting dynamic qualitative research.
mentoring, pedagogy & practice

with adolescent and elderly populations, uncovering racialized performativity, and understanding informants as experts.

In the afternoon, Dr. Kevin Roy, Chair of the QRIG committee, welcomed Dr. Nancy Struna, Professor and Chair of the Department of American Studies who served as moderator of the second session entitled: Integrating Intersectionality: Sexuality, Health & Culture. Panelists included Noah D. Drezner, (Higher Education) and Jay Garvey, (College Student Personnel Administration); Miriam Phillips, (School of Theatre, Dance, and Performance Studies); Michelle V. Rowley, (Women's Studies); and Jacqueline Wallen (Department of Family Science). The panel included discussions of issues such as conducting research that purposefully queers various practices and spaces, the relationship between tradition and change in performance, and the nuances in understanding the health of racialized elderly women.

Conference attendees participated in a lively discussion following each of the panel sessions and praised the significance of the methodological discovery and the diversity of topics presented. In the conference evaluation, participants made it clear how important events like this conference are for building a strong dynamic qualitative community at UM. Participant suggestions for future qualitative research opportunities included: training on specific qualitative methods/methodologies; how to get qualitative work published in scholarly journals; how to apply for grants for qualitative studies; and trainings on new directions in qualitative research (virtual, social media, cultural geography, etc.), among many others. QRIG will continue to highlight the exciting and innovative interdisciplinary research projects across campus with future presentations.

CRGE hopes to expand our training and academic offerings to meet this unique and essential scholarly community at UM—a qualitative community whose scholarly work contributes to the knowledge of how issues of power, identity, and privilege impact marginalized populations around the world.

A Mentoring Reflection

by Djuan D. Short
B.A. May 2012, Psychology

I have worked with Dr. Zambrana as my teacher, mentor, and advisor for two years. As a research assistant, I have worked on several projects where I have increased my research and writing skills through annotating empirical articles and books. In the spring of 2011, I enrolled in an independent study with Dr. Zambrana and conducted a systematic literature review that resulted in a final project entitled Racial Diversity in the Academy: Examining Mental Health and Health in African Americans. This independent study contributed to my intellectual development and social consciousness particularly around the intersections of intergenerational poverty, poor education systems, and social mobility. In the summer of 2011, I served as a research assistant at CRGE.

As an undergraduate student, I have gained invaluable research experience and theoretical knowledge at CRGE that strongly influenced my decision to pursue a graduate degree (an MSW). Eventually, I also intend to seek a doctorate in social work. Upon completion of an MSW degree, I plan to work in programs that help ameliorate social and health inequalities in racial/ethnic communities.

While working at CRGE, I have had access to many resources. Most importantly, the connection with Beth Douthirt Cohen has been most helpful because she helped me to construct well-developed personal statements for my graduate programs. With her help I was able to submit excellent applications to the schools of my interest and have been accepted into many prestigious universities such as the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Michigan, Columbia University, and New York University, among others. While I have not yet chosen a graduate program, I have been fortunate to have someone like Dr. Zambrana to help me make the right decision.

This has been an awesome experience. This opportunity gave me the academic and research experience that I initially sought, while unexpectedly guiding my growth as well. This experience was so much more than I expected it to be but I gained a lot of knowledge and skills working with these awesome women. I would like to give a special thank you to Drs. Zambrana and Logie, Beth Douthirt Cohen, and Wendy Hall for all of their hard work in support of my academic aspirations and successful acceptance to graduate school.
I have been in training at CRGE for the past two years as a CrISP Scholar. Among the many theories and skills I have developed during my time here, I believe that the greatest impact has been on the expansion of my intellectual knowledge base and my political consciousness. I came to graduate school with a BA in Politics and Women’s Studies and while my undergraduate work focused largely on feminist discourse and culture, I spent the four years after college teaching special education. Both of these experiences allowed me to sense and see structural inequality but my coursework and time at CRGE has given me the language to articulate these complexities. It is here that I have learned to play with theory so as to line it up with my political investments, and then to start from there as I build my own work.

**Playing with theory.** During the last two years as a CrISP scholar, I have built on my previous knowledge of intersectionality. In a moment in which some scholars are unsettling intersectionality by pointing to what they understand as the fixed identities that underpin the framework, my work with scholars who remain committed to refining intersectional thinking, has encouraged me to continue to think about the value of this theoretical lens and what it offers my own work. I have had the opportunity to spend considerable time engaging with the value of intersectional thinking while discussing social justice and interdisciplinary issues in projects such as the access of Mexican American women to higher education and the health of communities of color. I have found myself particularly compelled by the argument that intersectionality forces scholars to engage with histories of race that shape current social locations and structural inequalities.

This experience has brought into sharp relief the impact of structural inequality. It has allowed me to bridge the gaps between my previous thinking and the world of sociological theorizing, capturing how both structure and agency shape experience. I can also now speak to this dynamic between structure and agency using a more refined theoretical and methodological vocabulary. Furthermore, I have learned the role of quantitative methods in telling the story of injustice.

**Lining up theory and political investments.** My political investments lie in creating scholarship that critically engages the relations of power. In the past two years, I have witnessed and been a part of this kind of scholarship. This hands-on learning experience has offered me the opportunity to learn how to push theory and draw on various methods in a way that reading from a book would never allow.

While my political investments require an eye to broader social structures, they also require an understanding of the structures of the academy. My work on various research and administrative projects has allowed me to connect with faculty from across campus and learn about building networks and collaborations to facilitate the success of the projects. My mentoring relationships have inspired me in my work, have helped me hold firm in my political commitments, and have kept me energized in the face of tremendous work. My relationships here have also served as a model of how to structure future mentoring relationships; particularly the relationships in which I am asked to mentor others.

**Building my own work.** My principal responsibilities at CRGE have entailed work on health status, stress and education. My own work aims to understand how discourse around sexuality and violence are entangled in social constructions of national, every day, and temporal borders. Yet, my research responsibilities and my own work have become interconnected as issues of inequality are centered in both bodies of knowledge. Furthermore, my own emerging research has the potential to draw on broader sources and speak to larger audiences now that I have had the opportunity to engage with theory that travels amongst disparate topics while using multiple interdisciplinary lenses. Together, the consciousness I built on here and the technical strengths I have gained ranging from qualitative methods to improved writing skills, allow me to foreground structural matters in addition to culture and discourse in present and future projects. So as I reflect on my time as the CrISP Scholar, it is clear that my experience at CRGE has contributed to my intellectual growth and offered me an invaluable lens through which to navigate academia.
1) ADVISING AND/OR MENTORING. Knowing what you can offer us and communicating to us that we need to look for the rest somewhere else helps tremendously. For example, having a conversation where you tell us what you think you can offer us, and what you think we should seek elsewhere (e.g., “I want to intellectually engage with you, and this is my strength so our time together will be spent on your research. You should find logistical support from other sources such as…”). As a group, we recognize that we need both someone who can offer us concrete advice in helping us pick classes, build CVs, and generally keep us moving forward (advisor). But we also need someone who inspires us intellectually and can help us understand our place in the academy (mentor). Sometimes we are able to find this in the same person and other times we know we have to meet these needs in different places. As new students, especially, we did not understand this distinction between advising and mentoring—if you can help us understand and navigate these needs met, it would be invaluable in contributing to our success.

2) HELP US BUILD A RELATIONSHIP WITH YOU: BOUNDARIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. Whether you are offering advising or mentoring or both, we need you but we may not always know what we can ask for or how to ask. To that end we would love the space and opportunities to talk openly about our relationship with you, where boundaries exist, and the safety to ask questions about our relationship without painful repercussions. We also understand that relationships are two-way streets. Due to this reciprocal nature of the relationship, it is often difficult to navigate what our responsibilities are to you, what is expected, and what is optional, even when you imply that certain things are and even when we have a great relationship. Across the board all of us feel that the “optional” (e.g., I, as your advisor, am offering you an opportunity to do something for/with me, but you do not need to engage on this project) and “required” (e.g., If you do not engage on this I will be frustrated with you) expectations in our relationships with our mentors are unclear. We understand that this may be primarily a reflection of how expectations and responsibilities are communicated in the academy—a form of communication that we believe sometimes needs to be more explicit.

3) TRANSPARENCY AND TEACHING US THE TRICKS OF THE TRADE. We know that finishing graduate school is about our intellect but we also sense there are a lot of invisible rules that we don’t yet know about. If possible, please make those invisible unspoken “rules of the game” visible (e.g. “rules” around how quickly we can expect you to respond to e-mails, what you expect from us when we come and meet with you, whether we are allowed to seek out theoretical input on our work from other professors, or how rough a draft of writing can be when we show it to you, etc.), instead of just enacting the consequences of these unspoken rules without explaining them. Most pitfalls in our relationships seem to be because we do not know the protocols and the cultural expectations around our relationships with you. Knowledge of these unspoken rules also helps shape our interactions outside of your office and helps us to build skills necessary for the profession, side step political snares, and allows us to focus on producing strong research.

4) INVESTMENT IN OUR FINISHING. We understand that you have a lot on your plate and that you can’t invest heavily in everything or everyone. But our collective experiences suggest that when folks invest
in us, we excel. Communicating this investment to us, advocating on our behalf, and helping us be forward thinking is invaluable to us. This investment also allows us to reveal to you what we believe our struggles are, and to seek advice from you. We are then also able to understand your critique of our work as part of that investment.

5) COMMUNICATION AND FEEDBACK. We know communication and feedback aren’t always possible in the same way for everyone. Along with clear communication about our relationship and the pitfalls in the academy, clear communication about feedback is critical as well. Setting up how you best give feedback and how we best hear it both in terms of format as well as how to mix positive and critical feedback help us develop our scholarship and will ease some of our anxiety about making our relationship more successful.

6) CHECKING IN, EVALUATING, AND LETTING US GO. One of the best practices we’ve seen is setting up a regular meeting between advisees and advisors. A set meeting once a month goes a long way; meeting with us twice a semester seems essential. Other best practices may involve allowing us the safe space to provide, perhaps once a year, feedback on what we are getting from you generally (perhaps collectively and anonymously) as a reflection of routine maintenance of the relationship. Most importantly, throughout our time as graduate students giving us (perhaps via email) the option of switching advisors. Departments which expect students to switch advisors after the first or second year are the departments which help us to navigate our advisor relationships the best. Offering us the opportunity to seek mentoring elsewhere without political or personal repercussions is one of the greatest ways you can support us.

7) FACILITATING INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY. A few of us shared stories of advisors bringing together all their advisees for intellectual (versus social) gatherings, over meals, brown bag lunches, and presentations of our work. Academia can be very isolating so these opportunities help us build connections with each other and with you, and help us to form an intellectual community that is connected to you. It also allows us a chance to see how students who are further along in the process navigate their relationship with you; learning that is invaluable to us as the advisor/advisee relationship is unlike any other relationship.

8) TRY TO MEET US WHERE WE ARE. We know we have a lot to learn. We excel faster when we are able to expose our struggles with writing, our methodological insecurities, or our lack of political awareness without being written off. It is our impression that your opinions of us are formed early on and then seem intractable, and that your investment is conditional on us “selling” ourselves as superstars from the beginning. Yet, we do not always know this at the outset, or know how to sell ourselves in this context. Most importantly, we see ourselves in a period of tremendous growth—and we hope that you will be around to see that growth.

9) JUDGE US MORE SLOWLY. Your judgments of us are very powerful and shape what we believe we are capable of and how we see ourselves as possible scholars. We know you have advised a lot of students and taught a lot more. We know that often tracking those students into “those you think will succeed” and “those you think will fail” allows you to measure out your time/efforts in an environment where you have no time. But, often as international students where English is our second (or third or fourth) language, those of us from low-income backgrounds, and/or as students of color, this tracking places us at a disadvantage based almost solely on a real or presumed acquisition of a specific and narrow, albeit essential, skill set. We sometimes are stronger writers than you assume we are and we sometimes are weaker writers than we want to be. Perhaps asking for writing samples early on and offering us opportunities to discuss where we think our strengths and weaknesses are and how we can build those skills early in our programs will help ensure that we do not get to comps and discover that despite our consistently good grades in our coursework, our writing or research is inadequate. Please also give us the opportunity to adjust to a profoundly different intellectual/cultural environment before judging our potential. Please offer us multiple opportunities over time to prove ourselves after your initial judgment.

10) AWARENESS OF BROADER STRUCTURES. We are also aware that there are larger structures that shape and contain our relationships in the academy. We understand that these structures mean that sometimes you have too many advisees or too little time to invest in students as promotions are more about publications than your advising of us. We now understand (although we had no idea about this as new students) that there are departmental policies and university pressures and so where we can help advocate for change, we would like to be of assistance.
Intersections of physical disability, race, gender, generation, socioeconomic status, language, nationality...

LIYANA  http://www.liyanatour.com/

A website that includes podcasts, music clips, etc. with the band, Liyana, from Zimbabwe. Liyana draws upon the talents of eight musicians, all born and raised in Zimbabwe who all attended a school home for children with physical disabilities. The music of Liyana is in five different languages. The website has podcasts with the members, videos of performances, and interviews with Prudence Mabhena, the lead singer of the group.

Health Disparities Chart Book (2011) www.iod.unh.edu

The basic purpose of this chart book is to answer the question of whether working age (18-64) people with disabilities in the United States experience health disparities similar to those experienced by members of racial and ethnic minority groups in the United States. Because of the perception that disability is solely an aging phenomenon, we limited our analysis to people of working age.
Pink or blue. Male or Female. Mommy or Daddy. Categories that we all take for granted are blown wide open in “transparent,” a new documentary film about 19 female-to-male transsexuals living in the United States who have given birth and, in all but a few stories, gone on to raise their biological children. “transparent” focuses on its subjects’ lives as parents – revealing the diverse ways in which each person reconciles this part of their history - giving birth and being biological mothers - now that they identify as male and are perceived by the world, but only sometimes by their children, as men. The first-person stories in “transparent” explain how changing genders is dealt with and impacts the relationships, if at all, within these families.

Be Like Others (2008)

Although gay/lesbian relationships are illegal (punishable by death) in Iran, sex reassignment operations are permitted. In 1983, spiritual leader Ayatollah Khomeini passed a fatwa allowing sex-change operations as a cure for “diagnosed transsexuals”. Be Like Others shows the experiences of patients at Mirdamad Surgical Centre, a sex-reassignment clinic in Tehran, and explores the differences between sexuality, biological sex, and gender for a group of young men who are choosing to or being forced to undergo sex reassignment surgery. The film navigates the complicated systems of inequality for these young people as some of them realize that despite not wishing to change their gender or sex that identifying as transgender rather than gay allows them to live free from harassment.

Need Intersectional Articles?

Go to the Intersectional Research Database
(enter through www.crge.umd.edu, link off home page)

CRGE has an online searchable database of intersectional articles in multiple disciplines including education, public health, public policy, sociology, women’s studies, LGBT studies, and racial/ethnic studies. The database offers abstracts written by UM graduate students of a wide selection of intersectional articles. This database is both a resource for choosing articles for your courses and also a resource for graduate students. Please spread the word!

By Cristina J. Pérez

In his 2011 book, *Tacit Subjects: Belonging and Same-Sex Desire among Dominican Immigrant Men*, Carlos Ulises Decena pushes at the boundaries of queer scholarship by moving outside existing fixed, primarily “out” LGBT identitarian frameworks, centering subjects often not considered, and creatively reworking research methods. Indeed, Decena’s text forces us to unsettle the very language we use to understand subjectivity generally, and in particular, the subjectivity of Dominican diasporic men who have sex with other men. Counter to scholars who suggest that “coming out” offers queer subjects protection, identity, and a source of pride, Decena believes that his subjects’ inhabitation of the tacit (meaning assumed but not verbalized) subject, allows them to open up possibility in confining space. To that end, his book begins by drawing on José Quiroga, whose work elucidates the difference between the two Spanish words meaning “to be.” Together, the two authors argue that the Spanish language allows for a distinction between a permanent state of being - ser, and estar, a “verb of position” (Quiroga as cited in Decena, p. 8). It is the latter that Decena uses to understand a set of identities being constantly (re)shaped by context. He argues that as his subjects navigate different spaces and straddle multiple borders (global, communitarian, class, etc.) they must also manage information, often times playing with the notions of visibility that have come to define the often racially unmarked LGBT subject.

Tacit subjectivity, then, is born of a study of Spanish grammar where “‘sujeto tácito’...is the subject that is not spoken but that can be ascertained through the conjugation of the verb used in a sentence” (p. 19). In this way, the tacit subject does not keep his sexuality a secret, rather his declaration of his sexuality would only be “a verbal declaration of something that is already understood or assumed” (p. 19). Thus, participating in the narrative of coming out is not only unnecessary but threatens the subjects’ economic survival as well as a potential loss of the privilege gleaned from performances of masculinity.

Decena’s work is notable for centering subjects to whom queer theory rarely pays attention and thus necessarily complicating our understanding of the closet and the privileging of visibility. In addition, he pays special attention to the ways ethnographic methods might capture an unstable subject, one constantly shifting based on context. Decena uses multiple methods, including 25 life histories communicated via semi-structured interviews, ethnographic observations, and autoethnography. This mixed qualitative methods approach allows him to begin to capture the ways in which his subjects navigate family relations, migration, gender/masculinity, and returns to the Dominican Republic. His interviews also serve to document what he, drawing from literary theory, deems “desencuentros, or failed encounters with dominicanidad in New York” (p. 70). His argument here is that these narratives allow us to see how “dominicanidad, or Dominican identity, as a contested repertoire of meanings, practices, and institutional arrangements” (p. 70) allowed these men
to construct relationships with and against a Dominican Republic sometimes understood as antithetical to “gayness and modernity” (p. 71).

Of particular methodological interest, one in line with his investment on drawing from Spanish grammar, is Decena’s insistence on printing the Spanish responses of his participants alongside his English translation. This focus on translation directly references the link between culture, identity, and language for this population and the work any ethnographic scholar must do as the scholar interprets the lived experiences communicated by participants.

Overall, Decena’s Tacit Subjects offers significant contributions as it broadens our theoretical and methodological understandings of how to do work in and with the queer diaspora. Decena’s book is an excellent example of how to use multiple qualitative methods, such as interviews, ethnography, observation and careful translation, to understand the tacit, intersectional, and shifting components of the lives of diasporic queer subjects. However, the book’s greatest strength is that it draws and builds on strong intersectional research that demands we pay attention to gender, class, race/ethnicity, and sexuality simultaneously. Given this strength and building upon it, one is left wondering what happens as those intersections shift. How might we make sense of women who navigate similar contexts, who necessarily have a different relationship to performances of gender, and whose identities, because they may be enmeshed in culturally-specific notions of what is private or public, may embody tacit subjectivity differently? Is tacit subjectivity unique to Dominican men or might this notion travel as similar groups navigate similar kinds of contexts? I ask these questions not as a critique of the work placed in front of us, as these questions operate outside the scope of Decena’s project, but rather as possibilities that open up as we pay attention to subjectivity that (sometimes) refuses to be spoken into existence.

Cristina Pérez is a second year doctoral student in the Department of Women’s Studies and a CrISP scholar at CRGE. Her research interests include transnational feminisms, border studies, and sexuality.

Qualitative FAQ

At CRGE, we get many frequently asked questions about qualitative methods. Here is a recent one...

Q: How do I select from the multiple digital voice recorders (DVR) currently on the market?

A: Great question. And very study-specific. Here are some questions to guide you in your selection: Will you be interviewing in noisy spaces? Do you need to be able to discern multiple voices (more than three)? Are you recording interviews solely or will you be recording lectures, conversations, classrooms, etc.? If you have a smart phone, can you use it for your recording needs? How many hours of data will you need to store on your DVR before copying it to your computer? How much do you want to spend? Most of us do not need the most expensive DVRs, and most DVRs now come with lots of bells and whistles. Some can even help with transcription. Some double as video recorders. Many now have a USB/Flash Drive port that is part of the recorder itself (so you don’t have to have additional wires to transfer the sound files to your computer). Be an informed consumer and your DVR can take you through the next few research studies. See www.consumersearch.com/digital-voice-recorders for reviews and ratings for the best recorders on the market.

Want more hints & a suggested qualitative methods bibliography?

Go to www.crge.umd.edu/qrig.html
We have sample qualitative research syllabi from across the disciplines and a QRIG blog with more helpful hints.
At the Qualitative Research Conference, Dr. Noah Drezner (EDUC) (left) and doctoral student Jay Garvey (EDUC) (middle) discussed their study entitled “Queering Philanthropy: Understanding Alumni Giving in the LGBTQI Communities” and Dr. Michelle Rowley (WMST) (right) gave a presentation entitled “Queering Home: Exploring the Organizational and Communal Terrains of Sexuality Rights and Equity in the Anglophone Caribbean.” Both Dr. Drezner and Dr. Rowley’s research was funded by QRIG Seed Grants.
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