UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE PEOPLE OF COLOR RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDE SCALE

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Hsiao-wen Lo
Norman, Oklahoma
2004

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/792

UMI Number: 3147181

UMI®

UMI Microform 3147181

Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE PEOPLE OF COLOR RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDE SCALE

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

Denise Beesley, Ph.D.

Lisa Frey, Ph.D.

Jody Newman, Ph.D.

Rockey Robbins, Ph.D.

Robert Terry, Ph.D.

© Copyright by Hsiao-wen Lo 2004
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is with great appreciation that I acknowledge and thank my committee members. I am grateful for Dr. Denise Beesley's constant encouragement and tremendous support. She always had faith in my ability to accomplish my goals. Her conceptual, editorial, and personal assistance was instrumental and deeply appreciated. This project would not have been completed without her.

I thank Dr. Lisa Frey for her expertise in multiculturalism, statistical advice, and on-going support. I thank Dr. Jody Newman for her editorial feedback and encouragement. I appreciate Dr. Rockey Robbins' support in my pursuing this topic. He provided helpful resources and essential ideas for this project. A special thanks goes to Dr. Robert Terry for his statistical expertise and conceptual assistance.

I also want to express my gratitude to my parents, Ming-lung Lo and A-yeh Chen, and my brother, Chih-meng Lo. I acknowledge the sacrifice they had made for me. Lastly, I wish to thank my partner, Donna Davis, for her unconditional love and support.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement … iv

Table of Contents … v

List of Tables …viii

Abstract … ix

Chapter I: INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY … 1

Purpose of the Study … 2

Research Question and Hypotheses … 2

Chapter II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE … 4

Definition of Terms … 4

Race and Ethnicity … 4

Race and Ethnicity Minority … 5

Race and Ethnicity Identity … 6

Overview of the Race and Ethnicity Identity Models and Measures … 8

Black Identity Models and Measures … 8

Asian American Identity Models and Measures … 9

Latino/Hispanic Identity Models … 10

Native American Identity Models … 11

Multigroup Ethnic Group Models … 11

People of color Racial Identity Model and Measures … 12

Summary of Race and Ethnicity Identity Models … 14

Overview of Issues with Racial Identity Development and its Measures … 15

Review of Measures Relevant to Racial Identity Scales … 16

Measures of Ethnicity Related Stress … 16

Measures of Social Desirability … 19

Chapter III: METHODOLOGY … 20

Participants … 20

Instruments … 21

Demographic Data Sheet … 21

People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale … 21

Perceived Ethnicity Discrimination Questionnaire … 22

Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale … 23

Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire … 23

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale … 24

Data Analysis Procedure … 25

Chapter IV: RESULTS … 26

Chapter V: DISCUSSION … 34

Limitations … 42

Conclusions and Future Recommendations … 42

References … 45

Tables … 54

APPENDIX A. Prospectus … 73

APPENDIX B. Informed Consent … 118

APPENDIX C. Recruitment Letter … 119

APPENDIX D. Demographics Sheet … 120

APPENDIX E. People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale … 122

APPENDIX F. Perceived Ethnicity Discrimination Questionnaire … 124

APPENDIX G. Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale … 126

APPENDIX H. Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire … 127

APPENDIX I. Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale … 128

List of Tables

Table 1: Demographic Information

Table 2: Three-Factor Solution Factor Loadings for POCRIAS Items

Table 3: Total Variance Explained by Three-Factor Solution

Table 4: Four-Factor Solution Factor Loadings for POCRIAS Items

Table 5: Total Variance Explained by Four-Factor Solution

Table 6: Five-Factor Solution Factor Loadings for POCRIAS Items

Table 7: Total Variance Explained by Five-Factor Solution

Table 8: Correlations of Items Within-Scale and Between-Scales

Table 9: Correlations of POCRIAS Subscales

Table 10: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Ethnic Group Difference

Table 11: Estimated Marginal Means of Ethnic Groups

Table 12: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Gender Difference

Table 13: Estimated Marginal Means of Gender Groups

Table 14: Pearson Correlations among PEDQ and POCRIAS subscales (N = 259)

Table 15: Pearson Correlations among SCCS and POCRIAS subscales (N = 259)

Table 16: Pearson Correlations among EGMQ and POCRIAS subscales (N = 258)

Table 17: Pearson Correlations among MCSDS and POCRIAS subscales (N=253)

Abstract

This study assessed the psychometric properties of the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS; Helms, 1995). The factor structure of the POCRIAS was investigated and the relationships between the POCRIAS subscales and measures of ethnicity-related stress were examined. Data for 311 participants from various racial and ethnic groups indicated that the POCRIAS could benefit from further revisions. Results also indicated that the POCRIAS was differentially related to some ethnicity-related stress constructs and a social desirability measure. Implications for future research and recommendations for revisions are discussed.

CHAPTER I

Introduction and Purpose of the Study

Racial identity theories have increasingly received attention in psychology as they depict the complex cultural factors that influence mental health. Numerous racial identity models have been proposed and studied (Chow, 1982; Cross, 1971; Helms, 1984, 1990; Jackson, 1975; Ruiz, 1990; Sue & Sue, 1999; Thomas, 1971). Racial identity measurements have been developed and scrutinized (Fischer & Moradi, 2001; Kwan, 2001). Empirically, the relationships between racial identity and psychological well-being (Cokley, 2001; Kohatsu, et al., 2000; Miville, Koonce, Darlington, & Whitlock, 2000; Neville & Lilly, 2000; Pope, 2000), moral development (Moreland & Leach, 2001), gender role conflict (Liu, 2002), career inspiration (Helms & Piper, 1994), client-counselor relationship (Richardson & Helms, 1994), substance use (Burlew, et al., 2000), perception of racial bias (Alvarez and Kimura, 2001; Jefferson and Caldwell, 2002; Thomas, 1999; Thompson, 1999), and self-esteem (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Hargrow, 2001; Phelps, Taylor, & Gerard, 2001) have been investigated. As the supportive evidence of the importance of racial identity increases, the need for a well-articulated theory and a psychometrically sound instrument to assess racial identity increases as well.

Helms (1995) proposed a racial identity theory for racial minorities and subsequently developed a People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS). The POCRIAS is one of the few measures available that attempts to capture the racial identity development of all racial minorities. However, there has not been much empirical evidence to support the construct validity of this measure. Given the major contribution of Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Model, it is important to establish

the validity of the POCRIAS in order to support the theoretical model and to provide researchers, trainers, and practitioners with an additional tool to understand the effects of racial identity development.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine the psychometric properties of the People of Color Racial Attitude Scale (POCRIAS). Specifically, this study attempts to examine how well the POCRIAS measures what it claims to measure by exploring its construct validity. To do so, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted and convergent and discriminant validity were examined.

Research Question and Hypotheses

The first research question attempts to find out whether the POCRIAS items representing each racial identity status will load on the same factor in the factor analysis. It is hypothesized that items will yield four factors reflecting the subscales of the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale.

The second research question attempts to find out whether there is a significant difference in how different racial minority groups respond. Since the model claims to describe the experience of Asians, Blacks, Latino/as of color and Native Americans, there should be no significant differences across these groups. Therefore, the second hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference among the four groups in the scores on the POCRIAS subscales.

The third research question attempts to find out whether there are significant correlations between the POCRIAS subscales and perceived discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern, and group membership. It is predicted that scores on the

POCRIAS subscales will be significantly correlated with scores on a measure of perceived discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern, and group membership.

The fourth research question attempts to find out whether participants will respond to the items in a socially desirable way. Paulhus (1991) stated that to ensure that social desirability is not contaminating item responses, social desirability is often measured to provide discriminant validity of a measurement. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis predicts that there will be no significant correlation between the scores on a social desirability measure and the scores on the POCRIAS subscales.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Definition of Terms

The terms *race* and *ethnicity* have been used interchangeably or jointly in the literature for a variety of reasons, some are valid and others are somewhat questionable. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that these two terms are not synonyms. To insure precision and clarity, a discussion of the definition of *race, ethnicity, racial minority, ethnic minority, racial identity and ethnic identity*will follow .

Race and ethnicity. Numerous definitions for the term race exist, depending on the disciplines and perspectives of the researchers; nevertheless, it is generally defined as "an inbreeding group of individuals with a specific geographic locus" (Zuckerman, 1990). Human populations were originally categorized based on the geographic regions they resided in, such as Negroids who occupied Africa, Caucasoids who occupied Eurasia, and Mongoloids who occupied Asia (MacEachern, 2003). It was believed that the unique physical features were a result of evolution in order to adapt to the climate and environment (MacEachern, 2003). The definition of race is becoming complicated due to immigration, the fluid nature of physical features, and changes of definition throughout history and across cultures. Although the definitions vary, the overall agreement is that race is genetically transmitted and physical features remain the core of the definition of race (Ocampo, Bernal, & Knight, 1993; Pulera, 2002; MacEachern, 2003).

Similar to the term *race*, *ethnicity* has various definitions. It is generally acknowledged that ethnicity is transmitted through socialization, in contrast to the genetic transmission of race (Buriel & Cardoza, 1993; Scupin, 2003), and is based on a collection

of cultural characteristics, such as languages, foods, clothing, music, values, and customs (Scupin, 2003).

Oboler (1995) offered an interesting perspective and asserted that ethnicity was used to understand immigrants' assimilation process. This may provide a plausible explanation of the frequent use of ethnicity when examining Asian and Hispanic populations, the largest recent immigrant populations in the United States, but not Black populations, generally not perceived as recent immigrants. This is consistent with the observation in reviewing the literature in that Black people (the Negroids) and White people (the Caucasoids) are generally the focus when racial issues are examined and individuals of Hispanic or Asian (The Mongoloids) descent are the focus when ethnic issues are examined.

Given the available definitions in the literature, the differences between race and ethnicity seem to be clear. However, these two terms have been used ambiguously and inconsistently in the field of psychology. To provide a solution, Phinney (1996) contended that these two terms be combined into one construct and proposed the term *ethnicity* be used as a broader term that encompasses race. Helms and Talleyrand (1997), however, strongly encouraged the effort in distinguishing these terms. They contended that race has evolved from an initially biological based category into a social construct with significant psychological implications and is, therefore, well worth further investigation.

Racial and ethnic minority. According to the U.S. Census 2000, there are six "mono-racial" categories: White, Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, and some other race. The White group

consists of 75% of the U.S. population, therefore, continues to be the majority and the rest of the groups are considered as "racial minority" groups. It should be noted that all the "racial" minority groups except the Blacks are Mongoloids. Even though they are generally perceived as "racial" groups, the differences between these groups are due to ethnicity rather than race.

A commonly used label "Hispanic," a minority group that consists of 12.5% (35 million) of the U.S. population according to the U.S. Census 2000, is not included in the racial categories but listed separately. The term Hispanic, which initially referred to Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, has become widely used nowadays to refer to individuals who are Spanish speaking or from Latin America (Oboler, 1995) although this group varies tremendously in their races, cultures, countries of origin, religions, and immigration history.

For the purpose of this study, racial minorities are defined as individuals who self-identify as Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Black. Individuals who self-identify as Hispanic are included in this study for analysis because of their minority status even though they are not a racial group. The intention of this research is to study how these individuals' psychological functioning is affected due to their minority racial or ethnic status. Given that their racial identity development may be different from people who are mono-racial, people who self-identify as biracial or multi-racial are not included in this study to avoid inappropriate overgeneralization of their experience.

Racial and ethnic identity. Parham and Helms (1981) defined *racial identity* as a "person's beliefs or attitudes about her or his own race" (p. 250). Helms and Cook (1999) further expand on this definition and describe it as an individual's identification

with one's racial group, emphasizing the process in which one recognizes and overcomes the psychological effects of the internalized racial oppression. Bernal and Knight (1993) defined *ethnic identity* as a multi-dimensional psychological construct that consists of a collection of self-perceptions of one's ethnic group membership.

Helms (1996) described the differences between racial identity models and ethnic identity models as:

> "…racial" models if they describe reactions to societal dynamics of "racial" oppression (i.e., domination or subjugation based on racial or ethnic physical characteristics commonly *assumed* [emphasis in original] to be racial or genetic in nature)…[and] be considered "ethnic" models if acquisition or maintenance of cultural characteristics (e.g., language, religious expression) are defining principles. (p.144)

According to Helms' description, the significant difference between racial and ethnicity identity models does not lie in the use of the term race and ethnicity but what is being described in relation to these terms. Models that attempt to describe the psychological impact and strategies used in reaction to one's racial or ethnic identity are considered racial identity models, while models that attempt to describe or understand the behaviors of acquiring or maintaining the cultural characteristics of a racial or ethnic group are considered ethnic models. Although the terminology is misleading at times, this way of distinguishing between racial identity models and ethnic identity models is helpful and will be used throughout this study.

In addition, instead of conceptualizing racial models and ethnicity models to be two separate categories that are exclusive of each other, they are conceptualized as a continuum. It is theoretically possible that a given model may address both the

oppression based on racial or ethnic features and the acquisition or maintenance of cultural characteristics.

Overview of the Racial and Ethnic Identity Models and Measures

Different theorists have proposed different models to explain the racial and ethnic identity development of various groups. For the purpose of this study, the racial and ethnic identity models of racial and ethnic minorities in the United States are reviewed.

Black identity models and measures. Black identity models began to emerge between the 1960s and 1970s. Cross (1971) first proposed a four-stage model to describe Black people's racial identity development. In addition to Cross's model, two five-stage models were proposed by Thomas (1971) and Jackson (1975) although these models have not been further revised nor researched.

Parham and Helms continued to elaborate and expand on Cross's model (Helms, 1990; Parham, 1989; Parham & Helms, 1981). They began to consider parental attitudes and societal influences on individuals' racial identity development and the interrelations between racial identity and one's emotional well-being (Parham & Helms, 1981, 1985a, 1985b). They developed the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Parham & Helms, 1981) and the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale, Form B (Helms, 1990). Lemon and Waehler (1996) examined the psychometric properties of the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS-B) and recommended more work to establish the test-retest reliability of the instrument. Their study also suggested that ethnic and racial identity may be similar constructs for Blacks but separate constructs for Whites.

Cross' model was later revised (Cross, 1991) and a Cross Racial Identity Scale was developed (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2000). The revised model

(Vandiver et al., 2002) consists of three stages instead of four. They are Pre-encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. Because of the potentially different attitudes associated with each stage, these differences are further delineated within each stage in order to capture the different dimensions of the identity stage.

In reviewing the African American identity models, it is observed that African American identity models are similar as they all described identity development in stages. In addition, the primary focus of African American identity models is on the psychological impact of one's racial identity in a social-relational context. Thus, they all fit close to Helms' definition of racial identity (Helms, 1996).

Asian American identity models and measures. There are several Asian American identity models in the existing literature. Sue and Sue (1971) developed a conceptual framework for understanding Chinese-Americans' experience. They identified three ways of resolving culture conflicts: 1) retaining traditional Asian values, 2) rejecting traditional Asian values and overly identifying with western culture, and 3) integrating both the traditional Asian values and western values. No instrument based on their model has been developed.

In her study of Asian-American women, Chow (1982) identified two dimensions in ethnic identity development and developed an Ethnic Identity Scale. The two dimensions are: the Asian identity and the American identity. These dimensions are further differentiated into four groups (i.e., high Asian identity and high American identity, high Asian identity and low American identity, low Asian identity and low American identity, and low Asian identity and high American identity). Chow's model is one of the very few racial identity models that does not suggest a sequential development.

Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, and Vigil (1987) developed an acculturation scale for Asian Americans. Their model is similar to Chow's, except that acculturation is conceptualized on a single continuum with American identity on one end and Asian identity on the other. Bicultural identity falls somewhere between the American identity and Asian identity. Their model focused more on cultural aspects, such as the use of language, food preferences, friendship preferences, but not on awareness of oppression and racism.

Kwan and Sodowsky (1997) developed an Internal-External Ethnic Identity Measure for Chinese American ethnic identity. Although they did not propose a model, the scope of their measurement has clearly expanded to not only the cognitive, but also the affective dimension of ethnic identity development. Social behaviors and cultural behaviors are measured in Kwan and Sodowsky's instrument as well.

As can be seen, Asian identity models focus more on the maintenance and rejection of cultural values. Over all, Asian identity models do not specifically address the sociopolitical dimension as most African American identity models do. Thus, Asian identity models fit closer to Helms' definition of an ethnic model (Helms, 1996).

Latino/Hispanic identity models. A few theorists have proposed different identity models for Latino/Hispanic populations (Bernal & Knight, 1993; Casas & Pytluk, 1995; Lega, 1979). Similar to the earlier Asian identity models, the Latino/Hispanic identity development is conceptualized as a continuum by most theorists and fits closer to Helms' ethnic model definition (Helms, 1996). Contrary to most theorists who study Latino/Hispanic identity, Ruiz (1990) proposed a five-stage model that described how an individual becomes aware of one's cultural heritage and how one reacts based on the

awareness. Ruiz's model is similar to most Black racial identity models, given that it is a stage model and addresses the sociopolitical aspect of one's racial identity. His model may be viewed as closer to Helms' racial identity model definition (Helms, 1996).

Native American identity models. The literature is replete with Native American Identity models. Choney, Berryhill-Paapke, and Robbins (1995) cautioned that the application of racial identity to Native American populations may perpetuate the myth that Native Americans are a homogeneous group. They proposed an acculturation model to describe the levels of Native American people's acceptance of their culture and the predominant culture. Using the Native American medicine wheel as the bases for conceptualizing acculturation, the model differentiates five levels of acculturation with four major domains. Choney and her associates stressed that the movement between the levels and domains is fluid and flexible, not subject to a linear fashion of movement or a fixed category. Given that this model primarily describes the acquisition of cultural values and practices, it is viewed to fit Helms' ethnic model definition (Helms, 1996).

Multigroup ethnic identity. As the multiculturalism movement evolved, themes common to ethnic minorities' experience began to emerge. Some researchers began to develop models that captured these experiences shared by all minorities. Based on their clinical experience, Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1989) proposed a five-stage model to comprehensively describe the experience of racial minority groups. This model was later expanded by Sue and Sue (1990) and renamed the Racial/Cultural Identity Development Model (Sue & Sue, 1999). Given that the Racial/Cultural Identity Development Model describes one's behaviors and psychological well-being in relation to one's perception of

his/her racial/cultural group, it is conceptualized to be a racial identity model according to Helms' (1996) definition.

Phinney (1993) proposed a three-stage model that aimed at describing the common characteristics of adolescent ethnic identity development for diverse ethnic groups. Phinney stated that these three stages are clearly distinguished and proceed in sequence. Although her model does not explicitly address the sociopolitical dynamics as a result of the differences between the dominant culture and one's culture, acquisition or maintenance of cultural characteristics is not a salient defining principle of this model. Thus, Phinney's model is considered to fit closer to a racial model.

In addition to the theoretical model, Phinney developed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) to assess ethnic identity development, targeting diverse ethnic groups, including Asian Americans, Blacks, European Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans (Phinney, 1992). The psychometric properties of the MEIM were examined and revised by Roberts et al. (1999).

People of color racial identity model. Helms (1995) expanded the theory of Black racial identity development to include Native Americans, Blacks, Asians and Latino/as of color and developed the People of Color Racial Identity Model. Key constructs from the models developed by Cross (1971) and by Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1989) were borrowed to describe the five statuses in the People of Color Racial Identity Model, namely, Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion-Emersion, Internationalization, and Integrative Awareness.

In the Conformity status, the person of color, who values the dominant culture, may denigrate his or her racial group and conform to the existing stereotypes of one's

group. Individuals who primarily operate from this status may selectively screen information that is consistent with the dominant culture's values and be unaware of sociopolitical concerns. In the Dissonance status, the person of color is confused and ambivalent about his/her group membership and has conflicting attitudes toward the minority group and the dominant culture. The person begins to question the previously held stereotypes about minority groups and their allegiance to the dominant group. In the Immersion/Emersion status, the person of color idealizes his or her own group and rejects the dominant group. He/she may feel anger and hostility toward the dominant group and may feel shame and guilt about their previous attitudes toward their reference group. In the Internalization status, the person of color views both their own group and the dominant group in a more objective way. The idealization of their own group and the denigration of the dominant group are subdued. In the Integrative Awareness status, the person of color develops a personally meaningful racial identity and integrates other aspects, such as gender, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status into one's identity. They may collaborate with other oppressed groups to eliminate oppression.

In addition, Helms (1995) stated that according to her racial identity theory, "all socioracial groups, regardless of specific racial or ethnic group classification, are assumed to experience a racial identity developmental process that can be described by several statuses" (p.183). Essentially, Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Model attempts to describe how people of color manage race-related encounters and overcome negative stereotypes imposed by the dominant culture. For example, individuals who operate from the Conformity Status are theorized to possess a less sophisticated style in dealing with racial materials; as a result, they tend to embrace the dominant culture's

values and may conform to the stereotypes the dominant culture has about their group(s) without question. On the other hand, individuals who operate from the most sophisticated status, the Integrative Awareness Status, are theorized to have the ability to recognize the negative stereotypes about one's group and manage to express a positive racial self nevertheless. Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale was subsequently developed to capture the different statuses described in her model.

Finally, Helms (1995) explained the rationale for using the term *statuses* in place of the term *stages* in her People of Color Racial Identity Model. She stated that her initial conceptualization of racial identity development was one of a mutually interactive process that describes an individual's behaviors in response to racial stimuli. However, she argued that the initial term *stage* implies a linear process in which later stages are built on earlier stages. Since the "stages" in her original conceptualization were meant to be permeable and interactive, she decided to change the term *stage* to *status* to avoid the general assumptions associated with the term stage.

Summary of Racial and Ethnic Identity Models

In reviewing the literature on racial identity models, similarities and differences were noted and will be briefly summarized as follows. First, Asian and Hispanic American identity models are more ethnic specific, interested in specific ethnic identity such as Chinese-American identity or Cuban-American identity. There is more focus on languages, immigration history, generational status, and allegiance to traditional customs for the Asian and Hispanic populations in conceptualizing their identity. Black identity models, on the other hand, are more racially focused, do not differentiate one particular subculture from another and do not emphasize the languages and generational status. In

addition, there is a general concern about categorizing a heterogeneous group as a homogeneous one for the Asian, Hispanic, and Native American populations. This concern, however, is generally not raised in the study of Black populations. Third, Black identity models focus primarily on the sociopolitical aspect of racial identity, such as discrimination and oppression, whereas Asian, Hispanic, and Native American identity models focus more on the acquisition and maintenance of cultural characteristics and practices. This is changing, however, as some Asian and Hispanic American identity theorists have attempted to integrate sociopolitical aspects into their models.

While some models remain at the theoretical level, others have developed psychometric instruments in an attempt to validate the models. Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale has been increasingly receiving attention and is frequently used in multicultural studies. However, for a measurement to be widely used with confidence, it is crucial to examine the psychometric properties of this measurement.

Overview of Issues with Racial Identity Development and its Measurement

The study of racial identity development is a recent phenomenon and there are several challenges in attempting to capture the nature of racial identity development. For theorists who proposed a stage model, there has not been a consensus regarding whether the stages are continuous or independent of one another. This differentiation is important especially when analyzing the data. If the stages are continuous, care needs to be exercised in the statistical analysis by selecting strategies that inherently support continuity of the data, such as cluster analysis and multiple regression (Helms, 1989). Helms (1989) further cautioned that researchers need to be aware of the possible existence of a non-linear rather than a linear relationship when analyzing the data.

Helms (1989) further cautioned that the POCRIAS should not be used in isolation, just like any psychological assessment would not rely solely on one single psychometric measurement because of the potentially continuous nature of racial identity development. Helms (1986) also recommended using profile analysis instead of assigning individuals to a particular stage. An important research question would be identifying other instruments that could be used with the POCRIAS to better understand an individual's racial identity development.

Finally, Helms (1989) made an important observation regarding the influence of environment on racial identity development. She suggests that an individual from a predominantly White rural area will be more likely to be at the Encounter stage than an individual from a predominantly Black urban area. Although her statement needs further empirical support, it lends insight into methodological considerations for this study. Gathering information regarding the individual's environment, such as the percentage of minority people in the neighborhood and the geographic location, will be pertinent.

Review of Measures Relevant to Racial Identity Scales

One of the purposes of this study is to examine the construct validity of POCRIAS. Therefore, this section will review instruments that may be potentially helpful in the validation process.

Measures of ethnicity-related stress. Contrada et al. (2001) defined ethnicity-related stress as "the outcome of a person –situation interaction in which perception of features of the social environment, in the light of knowledge of one's ethnicity, leads either to the anticipation of psychological or physical harm, or to the belief that such harm has already occurred" (p.177). They developed three scales to measure ethnicity-

related stress: the Perceived Ethnicity Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ), the Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale (SCCS), and the Own-Group Conformity Pressure Scale (OGCPS), while the Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire (EGMQ) was developed to assess ethnic identity.

For the purpose of this study, the PEDQ and the SCCS were used to examine the construct validity of the POCRIAS for the following reasons. First, the relationship of race and ethnicity is conceptualized differently by researchers. Presumably, ethnicity is conceptualized as one dimension of race in the People of Color Racial Identity Model and some POCRIAS items address ethnicity related concerns. Second, both the PEDQ and the SCCS measure constructs that are aspects (i.e., perception of differential societal treatment and stereotypes stemming from one's ethnicity) of the different statuses of Helms' model. Third, according to Helms' distinction between racial identity and ethnic identity models, one can be subjected to "racial" oppression because of one's ethnic characteristics. Thus, it is appropriate to examine one's experience with discrimination as a result of their ethnicity. Fourth, rather than assessing the acquisition or maintenance of their ethnic practice, the purpose of the PEDQ and the SCCS is to assess the individual's experience with discrimination related to ones' ethnicity and concerns of confirming ethnic stereotypes (i.e., societal dynamics), which fits with Helms' racial identity model definition. Given these reasons, the PEDQ and the SCCS were used in this study to examine how participants' experiences related to their ethnicity as reflected in the POCRIAS subscales.

The PEDQ is a scale that measures an individual's perception of the frequency of discrimination attributed to their ethnicity. According to the People of Color Racial

Identity Model, individuals at the Conformity status tend to be oblivious to the sociopolitical implications of their race or ethnicity. Thus, it is hypothesized that the frequency of perceived ethnic discrimination may be low for these individuals. Individuals at the Dissonance and Immersion-Emersion status may perceive a higher frequency of ethnic discrimination as they become increasingly aware of the salience of their ethnicity in the societal dynamics. The frequency may decrease as the individuals move to the Internalization and Integrative Awareness statuses as they are able to objectively evaluate their interaction with others.

The SCCS is a scale that measures the degree to which individuals are concerned about whether their behaviors fit into the stereotypes associated with their group. Given the evidence that minorities are aware of the existing stereotypes associated with their groups (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998), this scale may offer insight into the validity of the POCRIAS subscales. Hypothetically, individuals at the Conformity status may be concerned about being perceived as confirming certain stereotypes because they are eager to conform to the dominant culture. This concern may decrease in the Dissonance and Immersion-Emersion statuses as they become more ambivalent about conforming to the dominant culture. Individuals at the Internalization and Integrative Awareness statuses may be the least concerned about confirming stereotypes associated with their group because they have developed a more balanced view of the strengths and weaknesses of their ethnic group.

The EGMQ is a measure of individuals' attitudes toward their ethnic group. The EGMQ consists of three aspects: individuals' private feelings about their group, their beliefs about the public's regard for their group, and the importance of ethnicity to their

identity. Since the EGMQ is a scale regarding one's attitudes regarding their group, this scale is appropriate to use in validating the POCRIAS subscales. Individuals at the Conformity status may endorse the least positive attitudes toward their ethnic group whereas individuals at the Immersion-Emersion status may endorse the most positive attitudes. Individuals at the Dissonance, Internalization and Integrative Awareness statuses may fall somewhere in between.

Measures of social desirability. Any self-report instrument is subject to response bias, which is a commonly held concern in psychological assessment. Social desirability, one type of response bias, can potentially affect how individuals respond to items, especially when the subject matter is conducive to social approval (Paulhus, 1991). Since the POCRIAS is a self-report measure and racial attitudes are still a rather sensitive topic, it is important that this variable is measured to ensure that the research participants are not responding to the POCRIAS items because of a higher need for social approval. Thus, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) was used to measure socially desirable responding (SDR).

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Participants

The study was an instrument validation study. In this study, criterion sampling was utilized. Individuals who self-identified as African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic American, or Native American over 18 years old were recruited to participate in this study. Organizations of racial and ethnic minority groups were contacted via email and a message soliciting participation was sent to the contact person, who then forwarded the message to the group members. All participants were provided a link to the website where the survey was located. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study, confidentiality, and the risks and benefits of participation.

A total of 311 participants (247 female and 64 male) completed the on-line survey. As shown in Table 1, 31% percent were between age 19 to 24, 44% were between age 25 to 34, and 25% were over the age of 35. In terms of racial identification, 17% of the participants identified as Black, 29% as Asian/Pacific islander, 8% as Native American or Alaska Native, and 39% as Other. In terms of ethnic group, 19% identified as African-American, 30% identified as Asian/Asian-American, 37% identified as Hispanic/Hispanic American, 7% identified as Native American, and 7% identified as Other. Over half of participants reported that they were bi-lingual (52%), while 35% were mono-lingual and 14% were multi-lingual. Eighty-five percent reported that they preferred speaking English. In terms of immigration history, 24% reported that they were the first generation to come to the United States, 36% reported they were first generation non-U.S. born, and 23% were the fourth or more generation. Eighty-seven percent have

lived in the United States for over 11 years. Thirty-two percent reported an annual family income between $10,000 and $34,999; 33% between $35,000 and $74,999; and 28% over $75,000. Fifty-one percent reported living in urban areas, 42% reported living in suburban areas, and 6% reported living in rural areas. In addition, about half of the subjects reported less than 20% of racial/ethnic minorities in their neighborhood, work, and/or school setting.

Instruments

Demographic sheet. A demographic sheet was completed by all participants. It was designed to gather the following information: (a) gender, (b) age, (c) race, (d) highest level of education completed, (e) parental education, (f) family income, (g) type of neighborhood lived in over the last year, (h) the percentage of the people in the participant's work setting that are of the participant's race, and (i) current socioeconomic status.

People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS). The POCRIAS (Helms, 1995) is a 50-item self-report measure of participants' racial identity attitudes. Participants endorsed items based on their level of agreement with each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Although the People of Color Racial Identity model postulates five statuses, results of previous data suggested four subscales: Conformity (10 items), Dissonance (15 items), Immersion/Resistance (13 items), and Internalization (10 items). Items that tapped into the Internalization status and Integrative Awareness status were combined into the Internalization subscale (personal communication, July 15, 2004). Subscale scores may be obtained by computing the mean of the items assigned to each subscale. Kohatsu (1992) reported

reliabilities, using Cronbach's alphas, ranging from .67 (Internalization) to .76 (Dissonance). Liu (2002) reported reliabilities ranging from .72 (Dissonance) to .86 (Internalization). Samples of Asian Americans were used in both studies. Miville et al. (2000) reported Cronbach's alphas of .65 (Internalization) to .83 (Immersion), using Mexican Americans as a sample. Cronbach's alphas in the present study were: .74 (Conformity), .74 (Dissonance), .86 (Immersion), and .71 (Internalization). No study has been conducted to test the validity of the POCRIAS.

Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ). The PEDQ (Contrada et al., 2001) is a 22-item self-report measure of perceived ethnic discrimination. Participants responded to the items on a 7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = very often). Four subscales, Verbal Rejection, Avoidance, Threat/Aggression, and Disvaluation, were constructed as a result of factor analysis. A sample item of Verbal Rejection is "How often have you been subjected to offensive ethnic comments aimed directly at you, spoken either in your presence or behind your back?" A sample item of Avoidance is "How often have others outside your ethnic group made you feel as though you do not fit in because of your dress, speech, or other characteristics related to your ethnicity?" A sample of Threat/Aggression is "How often have others threatened to hurt you because of your ethnicity?" A sample item of Disvaluation is "How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be unintelligent?" Subscale scores were obtained by computing the mean of item responses. A total score was obtained by computing the mean of the four subscale scores. Higher scores indicate higher frequency of perceived ethnic discrimination.

Contrada et al. (2001) reported the following Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the four scales for their non-White research participants: .90 (Disvaluation), .85 (Threat/Aggression), .77 (Verbal Rejection), and .73 (Avoidance). In addition, to examine the convergent and discriminant validity, Contrada et al. (2001) found high correlations within the PEDQ subscales and significant positive correlations between the PEDQ and depressive symptoms, negative mood, and physical symptoms. They also found significant negative correlations between the PEDQ and life satisfaction. Cronbach's alphas in the present study were: .94 (Disvaluation), .88 (Threat/Aggression), .84 (Verbal Rejection), .94 (Avoidance).

Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale (SCCS). The SCCS (Contrada et al., 2001) contains 11 items that measure participants' concern that they might be confirming a stereotype about their ethnic group. A sample item is "How often have you been concerned that by *taking your studies too seriously* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?" Items were scored using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = never; 7 = always). All 11 items had substantial loadings on one factor as a result of repeated extraction. Therefore, scores were calculated by computing the mean of all the 11 items. Higher scores indicate more endorsement of stereotype confirmation concern.

Contrada et al. (2001) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91 for this scale and found significant positive correlations between the SCCS and negative mood. The current study obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .92.

Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire (EGMQ). The EGMQ (Contrada et al., 2001) is a 12-item self-report measure of participants' feelings about being a member of their ethnic group. Three subscales, Private Feelings, Public Regard, and Identity

Centrality, were constructed as a result of factor analysis. Participants responded to the items on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sample items of the subscales include: "I often regret that I belong to the ethnic group that I do" (Private Feelings), "Overall, my ethnic group is viewed positively by others" (Public Regard), and "Overall, my ethnic group has very little to do with how I feel about myself" (Identity Centrality). Subscale scores were obtained by computing the mean of item responses. A total score was computed as the mean of the three subscale scores. Higher scores indicate a more positive feeling about being a member of their ethnic group.

Contrada et al. (2001) found significant negative correlations between the Public Regard subscale and negative mood and significant positive correlations between the Public Regard subscale and life satisfaction. The following Cronbach's alpha coefficients were reported: .80 (Public Regard), .77 (Identity Centrality), and .77 (Private Feelings) in Contrada et al. (2001). The current study obtained the following Cronbach's alphas: .81 (Public Regard), .73 (Identity Centrality), .73 (Identity Centrality), and .70 (Private Feelings).

Social desirability scale: Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS). The MCSDS (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) is a 33-item instrument measuring social desirability responding. A sample item is "I have never intensely disliked anyone." Respondents endorsed either "true" or "false" to each item. Scores range from 0 to 33 (no social desirability to high social desirability). Jome (2000) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .79 while Merydith et al. (2003) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .85. The one-month test-retest correlation was .88 (Crowne & Marlowe,

1964). Significant positive correlations were found between the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale and the MMPI Lie Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Paulhus, 1984; Robinette, 1991). The present study obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .84.

Data Analysis Procedures

To test the first hypothesis, a factor analysis via varimax rotation was conducted to confirm or disconfirm whether a four-factor model produced a better fit with the data as the theory claims. To test the second hypothesis, a MANOVA was conducted to examine whether there were significant differences among the different racial groups in their responses to the items. To test the third hypothesis, a correlation analysis was conducted to determine whether significant relationships existed between the POCRIAS subscales and perceived discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern, and group membership. To test the fourth hypothesis, a correlation analysis was conducted to determine whether significant relationships exist between the POCRIAS subscales and social desirability.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The first hypothesis was based on the premise that the POCRIAS items for a given status would load on the same factor. Principal Components Analysis was conducted. Squared multiple correlations as estimates of commonalities were used. The appropriateness of factor analysis for the data was determined by the following: the correlation matrix, Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954), and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (Kaiser, 1970, 1974). An inspection of the correlation matrix revealed that coefficients greater than .3 were present, the Bartlett's test of sphericity value was significant [$\chi^2(1225) = 5051.006$, $p < .000$], and the KMO value was .834. Therefore, principal component factor analysis was deemed appropriate.

Initial factor analysis yielded 13 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 that accounted for 60.78% of the variance. An examination of the screeplot revealed a clear break after the fourth component, which suggested retention of three factors based on Catell's scree test (Catell, 1966). However, because the POCRIAS has four subscales and the theory proposed five statuses, a four-factor and a five-factor solution were also investigated.

To assist in the interpretation of the pattern of the factor loadings, varimax rotation of three and four factors was conducted. Items with loadings above $|.30|$ were retained for interpretation. The three-factor solution accounted for 33.40% of variance while the four-factor and five-factor solutions accounted for 37.57% and 40.97% of variance, respectively.

In the three-factor solution, only one item did not load on any factor (i.e., Item 30). As presented in Table 2, the first factor consisted of 16 items (i.e., Items 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 29, 39, 41, 42, 45, and 47-49). Eleven of these items (i.e., Items 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, and 47-49) were from the Immersion/Resistance subscale. Items 29, 39, 41, and 42, originally from the Dissonance subscale, loaded on the first factor along with the majority of the Immersion/Resistance subscale items. Item 45, which originally did not load on any factor according to the preliminary scoring key provided by Helms, loaded on the first factor in this study.

The second factor consisted of 21 items (i.e., Items 1-9, 31-33, 35-38, 40, 43, 44, 46, and 50.) A review of these items revealed that 9 out of 21 items (i.e., Items 31-33, 35-38, 40, and 43) were originally items from the Dissonance subscale, while 10 others (i.e. Items 1-9, and 44) were from the original Conformity subscale. Item 50 was from the Internalization subscale. Item 46, which according to Helms' preliminary scoring key did not belong to any subscale, loaded on the second factor in this study.

The third factor consisted of 12 items (i.e., Items 12, 16, 20, 21-28, and 34). Nine items were originally from the Internalization subscale (i.e., Items 20, and 21-28); two of these items (Items 12 and 16) were originally from the Immersion subscale; and item 34 was originally from the Dissonance subscale.

In the four-factor solution (See Table 4), one item did not load on any factors (i.e., Item 30). The first factor consisted of 15 items (i.e., Items 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 29, 41, 42, 45, and 47-49). Eleven of these items were originally from the Immersion subscale (i.e., Items 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, and 47-49); 3 of them were from the Dissonance subscale (i.e., Items 29, 41, and 42); and one item, Item 45, did not load on any factor

according to Helms' preliminary scoring key. It is noted that Item 29 has a negative loading on this factor.

The second factor consisted of 15 items (i.e., Items 1-9, 35-37, 44, 46, and 50.) A review of these items revealed that all of them were from the original Conformity subscale, except for items 35-37, 46, and 50. Items 35-37 were original items from the Dissonance subscale and item 50, which has a negative loading on this factor, was from the Internalization subscale. Item 46 did not belong to any subscale in Helms' preliminary scoring key.

The third factor consisted of 11 items (i.e., Items 12, 20- 28, and 34). All these items were from the original Internalization subscale, except for Items 12 and 34. Item 12 was previously from the Immersion/Resistance subscale and Item 34 was from the Dissonance subscale.

The fourth factor consisted of 8 items (i.e., Items 16, 31-33, 38-40, and 43). All of the items (i.e., Items 31-33, 38-40, and 43) were original items from the Dissonance subscale, except for Item 16 which was initially from the Immersion/Resistance subscale.

In the five-factor solution, one item did not load on any factors (i.e., Item 30). As Table 6 indicated, the first factor consisted of 15 items (i.e., Items 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 29, 41, 42, 45, 47-49). Eleven of these items were originally from the Immersion subscale (i.e., Items 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, and 47-49) while 3 of them were from the Dissonance subscale (i.e., Items 29, 41, and 42). Item 29 is also noted to have a negative loading on this factor. Item 45, previously not loaded on any factor, loaded on this factor in this study.

The second factor consisted of 15 items as well (i.e., Items 1-9, 16, 34-36, 46, and 50). A review of these items revealed that all of them were from the original Conformity subscale, except for items 16, 34-36, 46, and 50. Item 16 previously loaded on the Immersion/Resistance subscale; items 34, 35, and 36 were original items from the Dissonance subscale; and item 46 did not belong to any subscale in Helms' preliminary scoring key. Item 50 previously loaded on Internalization had a negative loading on this factor. Items 16 and 34 are noted to have a negative loading on this factor as well.

The third factor consisted of 10 items (i.e., Items 12, and 20-28). All of the items (i.e., Items 20-28) were original items from the Internalization subscale, except for Item 12, which were initially from the Immersion/Resistance subscale. The fourth factor consisted of 4 items (i.e., Items 32, 33, 39, and 40). All these items were from the original items from the Dissonance subscale. The fifth factor consisted of 5 items (i.e., Items 31, 37, 38, 43, and 44). All these items (i.e., Items 31, 37, 38, and 43) were originally from the Dissonance subscale, except for Item 44, which was initially from the Conformity subscale.

From these results, it appeared that the four-factor solution in this study resembled Helms' preliminary scoring key. Therefore, the four-factor solution was used to further test the following hypotheses. New values based on the four-factor solution were calculated for each subscale.

Cronbach's alpha coefficients were computed separately for each subscale derived from the results of the four-factor solution. Overall, the POCRIAS subscales showed good internal consistency. The Immersion subscale had the highest internal consistency (alpha = .87), while the Dissonance subscale had the lowest (alpha = .78).

As evidence of convergent and discriminant validity, items within subscales generally have stronger correlations with one another than they have with other subscales. Table 8 presents the correlations of items within and between subscales.

Correlations of the four subscales are presented in Table 9. Among the subscales only Conformity and Dissonance were strongly related as they had the highest positive correlations (r = .49). This suggests that these subscales may be measuring constructs that are not distinctively different from each other. Correlations for all of the other subscales were low suggesting that they measure constructs that are different from each other.

The second hypothesis attempted to examine whether there was a significant difference in how different minority groups respond to the POCRIAS items. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to investigate ethnic group differences in participants' responses to the POCRIAS subscales. The independent variable was ethnicity and the dependent variables were the POCRIAS subscales. The results of the one-way MANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference among ethnic groups on the combined dependent variables: [$F(3,278) = 2.88$; $p = .001$; Wilks' Lambda = .88; $\eta_p^2 = .04$]. A further inspection of separate analyses of the dependent variables indicated that the Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion subscale reached statistical significance (See Table 10). Table 11 shows the Estimated Marginal Means of all ethnic groups. For the Conformity subscale, Asian/Asian American group reported highest scores (M=1.974, SD=.049), followed by the Native American group (M=1.870, SD=.099), the African/African American group (M=1.827, SD=.049), and the Hispanic/Hispanic American group (M=1.785, SD=.044). For the Dissonance subscale, the Asian/Asian American group reported higher scores (M=2.565, SD=.069), followed

by Native American (M=.2.432, SD=.141), African/African American (M=2.300, SD=.089), and Hispanic/Hispanic American (M=2.432, SD=.063). For the Immersion subscale, the Native American group reported highest scores (M=2.724, SD=.132), followed by African/African American group (M=2.361, SD=.084), Asian/Asian American group (M=2.323, SD=.065), and Hispanic/Hispanic American (M=2.28, SD=.059).

A second MANOVA was conducted to investigate possible gender differences in participants' responses to the POCRIAS subscales. The independent variable was gender and the dependent variables were the POCRIAS subscales. The results of the one-way MANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference between males and females on the combined dependent variables: [$F(4, 275) = 3.17$, $p = .014$, Wilks' Lambda = .966, $\eta_p^2 = .04$]. However, a further inspection of the separate analyses detected no significant between-group difference (See Table 12). The examination of Table 13 suggests that the significant difference on the combined dependent variables may be due to the differences between dependent variables rather than differences within dependent variables.

The third hypothesis attempted to investigate whether there were significant correlations between the POCRIAS subscales and perceived discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern, and group membership. There were three subsets of hypotheses and Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to test each hypothesis.

The first sub-hypothesis predicted that the scores on the POCRIAS subscales would be significantly correlated with scores on a measure of perceived discrimination (PEDQ) containing four dimensions: Disvaluation, Threat/Aggression, Verbal Rejection, and Avoidance. Mixed results were found (see Table 14). The Pearson correlations

reached significant levels between the Immersion subscale of the POCRIAS and the PEDQ subscales of Disvaluation ($r = .257$, $p < .001$), Threat/Aggression ($r = .275$, $p < .001$), Verbal Rejection ($r = .297$, $p < .001$), and Avoidance ($r = .322$, $p < .001$). The correlation between the Immersion subscale and the total PEDQ score was also significant ($r = .337$, $p < .001$). It is noted that despite this pattern of significance, the strength of the relationships was relatively weak, as the Pearson correlations ranged from .26 to .34. No significant relationship was found between any of the perceived discrimination dimensions and the Conformity, Dissonance, or Internalization subscales.

The second sub-hypothesis predicted that scores on the POCRIAS subscales would be significantly correlated with scores on a measure of stereotype confirmation concern (SCCS). The Pearson correlations reached significant levels between the SCCS and the Conformity subscale ($r = .197$, $p < .01$), the Dissonance subscale ($r = .366$, $p < .01$), and the Immersion subscale ($r = .291$, $p < .01$). Again, although a pattern of significance was achieved, the Pearson correlation values were moderate to low, ranging from .38 to .20. No significant relationship was found between the Internalization subscale and the SCCS (See Table 15).

The third sub-hypothesis predicted that scores on the POCRIAS subscales would be significantly correlated with scores on a measure of group membership (EGMQ). The EGMQ has three subscales including Public Regard, Private Feelings, and Identity Centrality. Mixed results were found (see Table 16). The Conformity subscale was negatively related to Private Feelings ($r = -.469$, $p < .001$), Identity Centrality ($r = -.328$, $p < .001$), and the EGMQ total mean score ($r = -.347$, $p = .000$). The Dissonance subscale was negatively related to Private Feelings ($r = -.352$, $p = .000$), and the EGMQ

total mean score (r = -.169, p = .000). The Immersion Status was negatively related to Public Regard (r = -.246, p = .000) and positively related to Identity Centrality (r = .421, p = .000). The Internalization Status was positively related to Private Feelings (r = .412, p = .000), Identity Centrality (r = .224, p = .000), and the EGMQ total mean score (r = .325, p = .000). Again, although the Pearson coefficient values reached a significant level, the strength of the relationships among these scales ranged from moderate (r = -.47) to low (r = -.22).

The last hypothesis predicted that there would be no significant correlation between the scores on a social desirability measure and the scores on the POCRIAS subscales. The Pearson correlation coefficients between the MCSDS and the POCRIAS subscales were calculated. The Pearson coefficients reached a significant level (see Table 17) between the MCSDS and the Dissonance subscale (r = -.182, p <.01) and Immersion subscale (r = -.144, p < .05). The strength of the relationships was low, however, ranging from -.18 to -.14.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

The results of this study partially support the psychometric properties of the POCRIAS and suggest that the POCRIAS would benefit from further revisions to strengthen its psychometric properties. Specifically, the results yielded a four-factor solution, which is consistent with the current POCRIAS. The examination of the items within each factor revealed resemblance to the original subscales of the POCRIAS, except that 12 items were found to load on different factors. In addition, the internal reliability coefficients of the four subscales were all above .7 (ranging from .86 to .71). This indicates that the POCRIAS subscales have good internal consistency.

When the mean scores between the gender groups were examined, no significant difference was found. This suggests that men and women reported similar scores on all POCRIAS subscales. However, a statistically significant difference among ethnic groups was found in this study. The results suggested that the mean differences among the four ethnic groups are significantly different on Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization subscales. A further review of the different mean scores revealed the Asian/Asian American group consistently scored highest on Conformity and Dissonance subscales, followed by Native American, African/African American, and Hispanic/Hispanic American groups. The Native American group scored the highest on the Immersion/Resistance subscale, followed by the African/African American, Asian/Asian American, and Hispanic/Hispanic American groups. Interpretation as to the meaning of these differences is difficult and suggests the need for further research in this area. If the factor structures for various ethnic groups are indeed different, the mean

differences may be a reflection of the factor structure, which may then suggest that the POCRIAS may not be capturing the universal experience of the four ethnic groups. On the other hand, if the factor structures of all four ethnic groups are similar, the mean difference may be a reflection of the varying degree of a universal experience by these groups. Thus, further investigation of the factor structure for various ethnic groups will be helpful in providing clarification as to the between-group differences.

The first factor resembled the Immersion subscale, as 11 out of 15 items were from the original Immersion Status subscale. This factor had the highest internal reliability (alpha = .86). Item 29 (Minorities should not blame Anglo-Americans (Whites) for all of their social problems), item 41 (White people are difficult to understand), item 42 (I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who are from my culture), and item 45 (When both White people and people of my race are present in a social situation, I prefer to be with my own racial group) were items previously from other subscales but loaded on this factor. Item 29 had a negative loading while item 41, 42, and 45 have positive loadings. Given that the Immersion status is characterized by positive attitudes toward one's own group and negative attitudes toward the mainstream culture, the addition of all these four items seems appropriate and, therefore, is recommended for future revisions.

The results of the correlation coefficient analysis provide initial support for the construct validity of this subscale. The primary descriptions of the Immersion Status include idealizing one's socioracial group, devaluing the mainstream culture, and hypervigilance toward racial dynamics. Significant positive relationships exist between all the subscales of the PEDQ and the Immersion Status subscale, which suggests that

individuals who tend to operate based on the strategies from the Immersion Status reported higher frequency of being devalued, being verbally rejected, being physically threatened, and being avoided by others due to their race or ethnicity. This finding provides evidence as to the racial hypervigilance experienced by individuals who use strategies from the Immersion Status. Additionally, a significant positive relationship between the stereotype confirmation concern measure and the Immersion Status subscale was found. This suggests that the more people operate from the Immersion Status, the more they report being concerned about confirming stereotypes associated with their group. These results indicate that these individuals are not only hypervigilant about racial dynamics but are also concerned about confirming stereotypes. Finally, significant relationships were found between two subscales of the EGMQ. A significant negative relationship was found between the Immersion Status subscale and the Public Regard subscale, which suggests that people who draw more strategies from the Immersion Status reported that their group is less favorably viewed by the public. A significant positive relationship was found between the Immersion Status subscale and Identity Centrality. This suggests that individuals who utilize more strategies from the Immersion status reported that their racial or ethnic group identity is more likely an important part of their self-image. These findings are consistent with the conceptualization of the Immersion Status.

The second factor resembled the Conformity subscale as 10 out of 15 items were from the original Conformity subscale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this subscale was .74 in this study. Item 35 (Anglo-American people can teach me more about surviving in this world than people of my own race can, but people of my race can teach

me more about being human), item 36 (I don't know whether being the race I am is an asset or a deficit), and item 37 (Sometimes I think Anglo-Americans are superior and sometimes I think they're inferior to people of my race) were originally items from the Dissonance subscale but loaded on the factor that primarily consisted of items from the original Conformity subscale. Item 46 (My values and beliefs match those of Anglo-Americans (White) more than they do people of my race) did not load on any subscale previously but in this study loaded on the second factor. Item 50 (I am comfortable being the race I am) was an original item from Internalization but had a negative loading on this factor. Given that the Conformity Status is characterized as strong positive identification with the mainstream culture and denigration toward one's own culture, the inclusion of Items 46 and 50 in the Conformity subscale is recommended. Items 35-37, however, seem counterintuitive. Further investigation of the POCRIAS may help provide a more sensible picture.

The results of the correlation coefficient analysis revealed partial support for the construct validity of this scale. The main theme of the Conformity Status is (a) conformity to the value and practice of the mainstream culture and obliviousness to societal racial dynamics and (b) appreciation of the mainstream culture and depreciation of own group. The significant positive relationship between the measure of stereotype confirmation concern and the Conformity subscale suggests that people who draw strategies primarily from the Conformity Status reported higher frequency of being concerned that they might behave in ways that are confirming a stereotype about their ethnic group. Given that these individuals are eager to identify with the mainstream standard and tend to devalue their own group, the findings of this study support the

notion that these individuals are likely to be concerned about confirming own group stereotypes.

In addition, significant negative relationships exist between the measure of two of the Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire (EGMQ) subscales, Private Feelings and Identity Centrality, and the Conformity subscale. The results indicated the more individuals operated from the Conformity Status, the less positive they feel about their own group and the less important their group is to their sense of self. No significant relationship was found between this subscale and the perceived ethnic discrimination measure, which supports the theoretical claim of the obliviousness to societal racial dynamics of this status. These findings are consistent with the conceptualization of the Conformity Status.

The third factor resembled the Internalization subscale as 9 out of 11 items were from the original Internalization subscale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .71 in this study. Item 12 (I want to know more about my culture) was previously from the Immersion subscale but loaded on this factor. Given that one of the characteristics of the Internalization Status is the ability to view own group and the dominant group in a more objective way, individuals may begin to develop a personally meaningful racial identity; thus, individuals may be more determined to learn about their culture. It is therefore suggested that Item 12 be added to the Internalization subscale in future revisions. Also, Item 34 (Maybe I can learn something from people of my race) loaded on this factor although the description does not appear to strongly capture the essence of the Internalization status. The addition of item 34 to this subscale is questionable and may benefit from further investigation and clarification.

The results of the correlation coefficient analysis revealed partial support for the construct validity of this scale. The salient characteristics of the Internalization status are positive identification with one's racial or ethnic group and objective responses to racial dynamics. Significant positive relationships were found between the measure of group membership and the Internalization Status subscale. A positive relationship between the Internalization Status subscale and the Private Feelings subscale suggests that people who operated more from the Internalization Status reported more positive feelings about one's own group. A positive relationship between the Internalization Status subscale and Identity Centrality suggests that people who primarily operated from this status tend to report that their racial or ethnic group identity is central to their view of self.

No significant relationship was found between the Internalization Status subscale and the perceived discrimination measure and the stereotype confirmation measure. These results are consistent with the conceptualization of this status. These individuals view their racial and ethnic identity as a reflection of who they are and have positive feelings about their group; they do not perceive more or less racial or ethnic discrimination, which may suggest a more objective view of how their group is perceived by the public. In addition, these individuals report no more or no less concern with confirming certain stereotypes that are generally associated with their racial or ethnic group. This may be another piece of evidence for the objective and balanced view of own group and other groups.

The fourth factor resembled the Dissonance subscale as 7 out of 8 were originally from the Dissonance subscale. Item 16 (I am determined to find my cultural identity) previously loaded on the Immersion/Resistance subscale. Given that a main

characteristic of the Dissonance Status is ambivalence and confusion, this item seems to be inconsistent with the description of the Dissonance Status and may need to be examined further in future studies.

The results of the correlation coefficient analysis provided initial support for the construct validity of this scale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .74 in this study. The Dissonance Status is characterized by becoming aware of racial dynamics and feeling confused and disoriented as a result of the awareness. A significant positive relationship was found between the measure of stereotype confirmation concern and the Dissonance Status subscale. This suggests that individuals who tend to rely on strategies from this status report being more concerned about confirming stereotypes. This may be due to their uncertainty regarding their commitment to their group. Additionally, significant negative relationships were found between two subscales of the ethnic group membership measure. There was a significant negative relationship between the Dissonance Status subscale and the Public Regard subscale. This suggests that people who reported higher scores on the Dissonance Status subscale reported that their group is less favorably viewed by the public. A significant negative relationship was found between the Dissonance Status subscale and the Private Feelings subscale. This suggests that individuals who primarily operate from the Dissonance Status reported less positive feelings about their racial or ethnic group identity. These findings are consistent with the descriptions of the Dissonance Status. Finally, individuals who tend to use dissonant schemata did not report more perceived discrimination as hypothesized. Given that these individuals are ambivalent regarding their socioracial self-definition, it is possible that they may be reluctant to label or simply overlook a socioracial discriminatory encounter.

Finally, a review of the three-, four-, and five-factor solutions yielded several interesting observations. First, item 30 (I do not understand why Anglo-Americans (Whites) treat minorities as they do) consistently did not load on any factor. Thus, it is recommended that item 30 be deleted from the POCRIAS. Second, based on the descriptions of the Integrative Awareness status, none of the items specifically and directly tap into this status. The POCRIAS may benefit from the addition of items that capture the nature of the Integrative Awareness status. However, research looking at the potential contribution of these new items should be conducted before modifying the People of Color Racial Identity model into a four-status one.

As hypothesized, the POCRIAS is not contaminated by individuals' motivation to respond in a socially desirable way, which supports the discriminant validity of the POCRIAS. Specifically, no significant relationship was found between the Conformity and Internalization Status subscales and the social desirability measure. This suggests that ways individuals respond to the Conformity and Internalization Status subscales are not influenced by their desire to present in a socially desirable way. A significant negative relationship was, however, found between the social desirability measure and the Dissonance and Immersion Status subscales although the shared variances were quite small (1.8 % and 1.4%, respectively). This suggests that ways individuals respond to the Dissonance and Immersion Status subscales are influenced by individuals' desire to present in a socially desirable way. In both cases, individuals who report higher scores on the Dissonance and Immersion Status subscales tend to report fewer socially desirable behaviors and may be less motivated to present in a socially desirable way.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the sample consisted primarily of female participants and there were an unequal number of participants from different racial and ethnic groups, which may limit generalizability. Even though the results of the MANOVA suggest no violation of assumptions, it is highly recommended that equal numbers of participants from both genders and various racial and ethnic groups be obtained for future study. Second, the participants were self-selective in that the sample consisted of individuals who were members of organizations that primarily consisted of individuals from a certain racial or ethnic group. Thus, it is likely that participants in this study are individuals who identify or have begun to identify with their race and ethnicity and as such are not a representative sample. The highest scores on the Internalization subscale and lowest scores on Conformity Subscale may be due, at least in part, to the self-selection of the participants. Gathering data on the POCRIAS from individuals from various minority populations who are not members of a racial or ethnic organization may be worth investigating.

Conclusion and Future Recommendations

The current study provides initial support for the existence of the four subscales in the POCRIAS, although the instrument could benefit from further revisions of both the scales and the theory for the following reasons. First, thirteen items did not load on the same subscale as indicated in the original POCRIAS. These items need to be re-evaluated in order to determine whether they should be retained, revised, or discarded. Second, according to the People of Color Racial Identity Model, there are five statuses; however, Helms' preliminary scoring key and the current study supports the existence of

four subscales. It appeared that items that were created to measure the Internalization Status and the Integrative Awareness Status did not load on two factors. It is possible that the items did not accurately reflect the unique characteristics of these two statuses, which may offer an explanation as to why the variance explained by the current POCRIAS is small. The addition of new items that will reflect the fifth status may increase the variance explained by the POCRIAS. Thus, revision of existing items and addition of new items is strongly recommended. It is also possible that these two statuses are not as distinctly different as conceptualized. In this case, revision of the theory would be recommended.

Although the results support the existence of the four subscales, it is unclear whether these four subscales measure different dimensions of one construct or four different constructs. At best, the results of this study support four groups of attitudes and beliefs about one's group and the White group. It remains unanswered whether these statuses develop sequentially as Helms (1995) claimed. In reaction to Helms' racial identity model, Rowe et al. (1995) suggested an alternative term "racial consciousness" to replace the term "racial identity." According to Rowe et al. (1995), the term *racial consciousness* describes more accurately the different statuses Helms' proposed. Rather than conceptualizing the different statuses in a developmental context, Rowe et al. further proposed classifying types of racial attitudes people hold at a given time rather than conceptualizing the different statuses in a developmental context. Rowe et al.'s proposal may indeed be worth further investigation.

In addition, the small variance shared between the POCRIAS and the ethnicity related measurement and the small variance explained by the POCRIAS may suggest that

there are multiple aspects that account for one's racial and ethnicity identity and that one's racial and ethnicity identity can not be accounted for by one or two constructs. It is recommended that future studies continue to explore the complexity of racial and ethnicity identity. The identification of related factors (e.g., cultural acquisition and maintenance, stereotype confirmation concerns, perceived discrimination, etc.) and examination of their contribution to one's racial and ethnicity identity development are suggested. Furthermore, it is recommended that future studies include participants from various developmental stages (such as adolescents and older adults) in order to gain a greater understanding of how age plays a role in one's racial identity development.

Contrary to what was predicted, there was some significant ethnic group difference, which could possibly be an indication that the POCRIAS may not be capturing the common experience shared by different ethnic groups. However, the unequal number of participants in each ethnic group may have potentially affected the results and the factor structure for each ethnic group is yet to be examined. It is, therefore, strongly suggested that future research continue to investigate the factor structure and the mean differences among various ethnic groups.

Finally, the results provide initial evidence for the differential relationships among the POCRIAS statuses and social desirability construct. Overall, the findings support that the POCRIAS is not contaminated by social desirability response although the Dissonance and Immersion Status subscales had a negative relationship with the SDR. This does not, however, indicate problems in the construct validity of the POCRIAS.

References

Alvarez, A. N., & Helms, J. E. (2001). Racial identity and reflected appraisals as influences on Asian Americans' racial adjustment. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7(3),* 217-231.

Alvarez, A. N., & Kimura, E. F. (2001). Asian Americans and racial identity: Dealing with racism and snowballs. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23(3),* 192-206.

Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1989). A minority identity development model. In D. R. Atkinson, G. Morten, & D. W. Sue (Eds.), *Counseling American Minorities* (pp. 35-52). Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.

Bernal, M. E., & Knight, G. P. (1993). *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities.* 31-46. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Buriel, R., & Cardoza, D. (1993). Mexican American ethnic labeling: An intrafamilial and intergenerational analysis. In M. E. Bernal, and G. P. Knight (Ed). *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp.197-210). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burlew, K., Neely, D., Johnson, C., Hucks, T. C., Purnell, B., Butler, J., Lovett, M., & Burlew, R. (2000). Drug attitudes, racial identity, and alcohol use among African American adolescents. *Journal of Black Psychology, 26(4),* 402-420.

Casas, J. M., & Pytluk, S. D. (1995). Hispanic identity development: Implications for research and practice. In J. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 155-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Choney, S. K., Berryhill-Paapke, E., & Robbins, R. R. (1995). The Acculturation of American Indians: Developing frameworks for research and practice. In J.G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, and C. M. Alexander (Eds.). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 73-92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chow, E. N. L. (1982). *Acculturation of Asian American professional women.* Washington, DC: NIMH, Department of Health and Human Services.

Cokley, K. O. (2001). Gender differences among African American students in the impact of racial identity on academic psychosocial development. *Journal of College student Development, 42(5),* 480-487.

Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., Ewell, K, Goyal, T. M., & Chasse, V. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31(9),* 1775-1820.

Crocker, J., Major, G., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of social psychology*(4 th ed., pp. 504-553). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Cross, W. E. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Towards a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World, 20,* 13-17.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cross, W. E. Jr., Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E . (1991). The stages of Black identity development: Nigrescence models. In R. L. Jones (Ed.) *Black Psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 319-338). Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Crown, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The Approval Motive.* New Yok: Wiley.

Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Public Health Service (2001), *Mental Health: Culture, race, ethnicity: A supplement to mental health: A report of the surgeon general* http://www.coloradohealthsite.org/CHNReports/mentalhealth_surgeongenrl.html

Fischer, A. R., & Moradi, B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity: Recent developments and needed directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Ed). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 341-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hargrow, A. M. (2001). Racial identity development: the case of Mr. X, an African American. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling Special issue: Counseling Racially Diverse Clients, 23(3),* 222-237.

Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12(4),* 53-165.

Helms, J. E. (1986). Expanding racial identity theory to cover counseling process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33(1),* 62-64.

Helms, J. E. (1989). Considering some methodological issues in racial identity counseling research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17(2),* 227-252.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White Racial Identity Attitudes: Theory, Research, and Practice.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms' White and People of Color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander

(Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 143-192). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.

Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process.* Needham Heights, MA; Allyn & Bacon.

Helms, J. E., & Piper, R. (1994). Implications of racial identity theory for vocational psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*, 124-138.

Helms, J. E., & Talleyrand, R. M. (1997). Race is not ethnicity. *American Psychologist, 52(1),* 1246-1247.

Jackson, B. (1975). Black identity development. *MEFORM: Journal of Educational Diversity and Innovation, 2,* 19-25.

Jefferson, S. D., & Caldwell, R. (2002). An exploration of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and the perception of racial bias. *Journal of Black Psychology, 28(2),* 174-192.

Jome, L. M. (2002). Construct validity of the white racial identity attitude scale. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, Akron). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61(2-B).*

Kwan, K. L. K. (2001). Models of racial and ethnic identity development: Delineation of practice implications. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23(3),* 269-277.

Kwan, K. L. K., & Sodowsky, G. R. (1997). Internal and external ethnic identity and their correlates: A study of Chinese-American immigrants. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 25(1),* 51-67.

Kohats,. E. (1992). The effects of racial identity and acculturation on anxiety, assertiveness, and ascribed identity among Asian American college students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54(2)*.

Kohatsu, E. L., Dulay, M., Lam, C., Concepcion, W., Prez, P., Lopez, C., & Euler, J. (2000). Using racial identity to explore racial mistrust and interracial contact among Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78(3),* 334-342.

Lega, L. I. (1979). Development of a Cuban Ethnic Identity. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1(3),* 247-261.

Lemon, R. L. & Waehler, C. A. (1996). A test of stability and construct validity of the black racial identity attitude scale, Form B. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 29(2),* 77-85.

Liu, W. M. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3(2),* 107-118.

MacEachern, S. (2003). The concept of race in anthropology. In R. Scupin (Ed). *Race and ethnicity: An anthropological focus on the United States and the world.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Miville, M. L., Koonce, D., Darlington, P., & Whitlock, B. (2000). Exploring the relationships between racial/cultural identity and ego identity among African

Americans and Mexican Americans. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 28(4),* 208-224.

Merydith, S. P., Prout, H. T., & Blaha, J. (2003). Social desirability and behavioral rating scales: An exploratory study with the Child Behavior Checklist/4-18. *Psychology in the Schools, 40(2),* 225-235.

Moreland, C. & Leach, M. M. (2001). The relationship between Black racial identity and moral development. *Journal of Black Psychology, 27(3),* 255-271.

Neville, H. A. & Lilly, R. L. (2000). The relationship between racial identity cluster profiles and psychological distress among African American college students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 28(4),* 194-207.

Oboler, S. (1995). *Ethnic labels, Latino lives: Identity and the politics of (re)presentation in the United States* Regents of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Ocampo, K. A., Bernal, M. E., & Knight, G. P. (1993). Gender, race, and ethnicity: The sequencing of social constancies. In M. E. Bernal, and G. P. Knight (Ed). *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological Nigrescence. *Counseling Psychologist, 17(2),* 187-226.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1981). The influence of Black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences for counselor's race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28(3),* 250-257.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985a). Relation of racial identity attitudes to self-actualization and affective states of Black students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32(3),* 431-440.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985b). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem of Black students: an exploratory investigation. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26(2),* 143-147.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes.* (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Phelps, R. E., Taylor, J. D., & Gerard, P. A. (2001). Cultural mistrust, ethnic identity, racial identity, and self-esteem among ethnically diverse Black university students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79(2),* 209-216.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7(2),* 156-176.

Phinney, J. S. (1993). A three-stage model of ethnic identity development in adolescence. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 61-79). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist, 51,* 918-928.

Pope, R. L. (2000). The relationship between psychosocial development and racial identity of college students of color. *Journal of College Student Development, 41(3),* 302-312.

Pulera, D. (2002). *Visible Differences: Why Race Will Matter to Americans in the Twenty-first Century.* Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd: New York, NY.

Richardson, T. Q., & Helms, J. E. (1994). The relationship of the racial identity attitudes of Black men to perceptions of "parallel" counseling dyads. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73,* 172-177.

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19(3),* 301-322.

Robinette, R. L. (1991). The relationship between the Marlowe-Crowne From C and the validity scales of the MMPI. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47(3),* 396-399.

Rowe, W., Behrens, J. T., & Leach, M. M. (1995). Racial/Ethnic Identity and Racial Consciousness. In J. G. Ponterotto and J.M. Casas (Ed). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 218-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ruiz, A. S. (1990). Ethnic identity: crisis and resolution. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 18(1),* 29-42.

Scupin, R. (2003). *Race and Ethnicity: An Anthropological Focus on the United States and the World.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sue, S., Sue, D. W. (1971). Chinese-American personality and mental health. *Amerasia Journal, 1,* 36-49.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, S. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice.* (2nd ed). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, S. (1999). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice.* (3rd ed). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Suinn, R. M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47,* 401-407.

Thomas, A. J . (1999). Racism, racial identity, and racial socialization: A personal reflection. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77(1),* 35-37.

Thomas, C. W. (1971). *Boys no more.* Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press.

Thompson, V. L. S. (1999). Variables affecting racial identity salience among African Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139(6),* 748-761.

Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E. Jr., Worrell. F. C., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2000). The Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Unpublished scale.*

Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E. Jr., Worrell. F. C., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2002). Validating the Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49(1),* 71-85.

Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences: Scientific, social and ethical issues. *American Psychologist, 45(12),* 1297-1303.

Table 1

Demographic Information of the Participants

	Category	Percentage
Age (years):	18-24	31.2%
	25-34	43.7%
	35-44	16.7%
	45-54	5.5%
	55-59	1.0%
	60 and over	1.9%
Gender	Female	79.4%
	Male	20.6%
Race	Black	17.4%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	28.6%
	Native American or Alaska Native	7.4%
	Other	38.9%
Ethnicity	African/African American	19%
	Asian/Asian American	29.9%
	Hispanic American	37.0%
	Native American	6.8%
	Other	7.4%
Linguistic ability	Mono-lingual	34.7%
	Bi-lingual	51.8%
	Multi-lingual	13.5%
Language preference	English	84.6%
	Native language	15.4%
Highest level of education	Less than 9^{th} grade	0.6%
	9^{th} -12^{th} grade, no diploma	0.0%
	High school graduate	1.6%
	Some College, no degree	25.4%
	Associate degree	0.0%
	Bachelor's degree	21.5%
	Graduate or professional Degree	50.8%

Table 1 (Continued)

Demographic Information of the Participants

	Category	Percentage
Family income	Less than $10,000	7.4%
	$10,000-14,999	8.4%
	$15,000-24,999	10.9%
	$25,000-34,999	12.2%
	$35,000-49,999	14.8%
	$50,000-74,999	18.3%
	$75,000-99,999	13.2%
	$100,000 or more	14.8%
Residency in U.S. (years)	Less than one year	4.2%
	1	0.3%
	2	1.0%
	3	0.6%
	4	1.3%
	5	2.3%
	6-10	3.5%
	11-20	20.6%
	over 20	66.2%
First generation of my family to come to the U.S.	Myself	24.4%
	Parents (1st generation, non-u.s. born)	35.7%
	Parents (1st generation, u.s. born)	2.9%
	Grandparents	9.0%
	Great-grandparents	5.5%
	Before great-grandparents	22.5%
Neighborhood	Urban	51.4%
	Suburban	42.4%
	Rural	6.1%
% of racial/ethnic minority in my neighborhood	0-20%	51.8%
	21-40%	16.7%
	41-60%	10.9%
	61-80%	10.9%
	81-100%	9.6%

Table 1 (Continued)

Demographic Information of the Participants

	Category	Percentage
% of racial/ethnic minority of all my friends	0-20%	20.3%
	21-40%	12.2%
	41-60%	20.9%
	61-80%	24.4%
	81-100%	22.2%
% of racial/ethnic minority at my work setting	0-20%	48.6%
	21-40%	16.7%
	41-60%	14.8%
	61-80%	6.4%
	81-100%	6.8%
	not working	6.8%
% of racial/ethnic minority at my school setting	0-20%	54.7%
	21-40%	21.5%
	41-60%	14.8%
	61-80%	5.5%
	81-100%	3.5%

Table 2

Three-Factor Solution Factor Loadings for POCRIAS Items

Subscale and item number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
47. Immersion/Resistance	.675		
11. Immersion/Resistance	.647		
45.	.633		
41. Dissonance	.629		
15. Immersion/Resistance	.614		
18. Immersion/Resistance	.594		
42. Dissonance	.589		
19. Immersion/Resistance	.585		
17. Immersion/Resistance	.578		
14. Immersion/Resistance	.560		
49. Immersion/Resistance	.555		
29. Dissonance	-.543		
10. Immersion/Resistance	.517		
48. Immersion/Resistance	.506		
13. Immersion/Resistance	.468		
39. Dissonance	.352	.335	
31. Dissonance		.616	
40. Dissonance		.605	
37. Dissonance		.605	
38. Dissonance		.577	
43. Dissonance	.404	.565	
6. Conformity		.554	
32. Dissonance		.548	
36. Dissonance		.544	
4. Conformity		.541	
46.		.513	
7. Conformity		.500	
2. Conformity		.471	
5. Conformity		.453	
50. Internalization		-.413	
33. Dissonance		.409	
9. Conformity	-.358	.382	
8. Conformity		.380	-.347
1. Conformity		.374	
35. Dissonance		.357	
3. Conformity		.344	
44.		.323	
25. Internalization			.698
24. Internalization		-.443	.620
22. Internalization			.613
28. Internalization			.610
27. Internalization	-.399		.541
12. Immersion/Resistance			.506
26. Internalization			.485
16. Immersion/Resistance			.484
34. Dissonance			.479
20. Internalization			.476
23. Internalization			.412
21. Internalization		-.324	.355
30. Dissonance			

Note: all loadings greater than |.30| are shown.

Table 3

Total Variance Explained by Three-Factor Solution

	Rotation Sums of Squared Loading		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative%
1	6.537	13.074	13.074
2	5.795	11.591	24.665
3	4.370	8.739	33.404

Table 4

Four-Factor Solution Factor Loadings for POCRIAS Items

Subscale and item number	Factor 1	2	3	4
45.	.662			
47. Immersion/Resistance	.639			
15. Immersion/Resistance	.631			
41. Dissonance	.623			
11. Immersion/Resistance	.619			
14. Immersion/Resistance	.574			
17. Immersion/Resistance	.560			
18. Immersion/Resistance	.578		-.303	
19. Immersion/Resistance	.572			
42. Dissonance	.565			
49. Immersion/Resistance	.559			
48. Immersion/Resistance	.535			
10. Immersion/Resistance	.529			
13. Immersion/Resistance	.506			
29. Dissonance	-.507		.349	
7. Conformity		.652		
9. Conformity		.568		
3. Conformity		.522		
2. Conformity		.517		
8. Conformity		.516		
6. Conformity		.487		
37. Dissonance		.464	.382	
46.		.461		
36. Dissonance		.459	.308	
5. Conformity		.448		
35. Dissonance		.442		
4. Conformity		.436	.338	
1. Conformity		.434		
50. Internalization		-.311		
44.		.303		
25. Internalization			.719	
22. Internalization			.675	
28. Internalization			.653	
24. Internalization		-.450	.578	
27. Internalization	-.357		.571	
26. Internalization			.525	
20. Internalization			.482	
21. Internalization			-.426	-.417
12. Immersion/Resistance			.424	
23. Internalization			.422	
34. Dissonance		-.362	.370	
30. Dissonance				
32. Dissonance				.686
40. Dissonance				.664
33. Dissonance				.639
39. Dissonance				.542
38. Dissonance		.333		.498
43. Dissonance	.401	.332		.463
31. Dissonance		.431		.438
16. Immersion/Resistance		-.321	.356	.359

Note: all loadings greater than |.30| are shown.

Table 5

Total Variance Explained by Four-Factor Solution

	Rotation Sums of Squared Loading		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative%
1	6.245	12.490	12.490
2	4.702	9.404	21.894
3	4.099	8.199	30.092
4	3.737	7.474	37.566

Table 6

Five-Factor Solution Factor Loadings for POCRIAS Items

Subscale and item number	Factor 1	2	3	4	5
15. Immersion/Resistance	.662				
17. Immersion/Resistance	.641				
47. Immersion/Resistance	.636				
14. Immersion/Resistance	.633				
11. Immersion/Resistance	.608				
19. Immersion/Resistance	.605				
18. Immersion/Resistance	.605				
41. Dissonance	.605				
45.	.589				.438
29. Dissonance	-.567				
42. Dissonance	.556				
49. Immersion/Resistance	.518				.309
10. Immersion/Resistance	.492				
48. Immersion/Resistance	.487				.361
13. Immersion/Resistance	.455				.343
7. Conformity		.657			
2. Conformity		.592			
3. Conformity		.537			
8. Conformity		.531			
6. Conformity		.503		.318	
46.		.491		.303	
35. Dissonance		.474			
9. Conformity	-.309	.460			.330
5. Conformity		.441			
34. Dissonance		-.429	.320		
4. Conformity		.417		.340	
36. Dissonance		.388			
1. Conformity		.365			
16. Immersion/Resistance		-.363	.330	.334	
50. Internalization		-.341		-.325	
25. Internalization			.725		
22. Internalization			.690		
28. Internalization			.674		
27. Internalization	-.327		.614		
26. Internalization			.557		
24. Internalization		-.472	.551		
20. Internalization			.500		
21. Internalization			.432	-.411	
23. Internalization			.405		
12. Immersion/Resistance		-.340	.393		
30. Dissonance					
32. Dissonance				.703	
33. Dissonance				.669	
40. Dissonance				.633	
39. Dissonance				.568	
44.					.565
43. Dissonance	.336			.384	.490
31. Dissonance				.362	.486
38. Dissonance				.416	.480
37. Dissonance		.344		.327	.413

Note: all loadings greater than |.30| are shown.

Table 7

Total Variance Explained by Five-Factor Solution

	Rotation Sums of Squared Loading		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative%
1	6.096	12.191	12.191
2	4.363	8.726	20.917
3	3.945	7.890	28.808
4	3.543	7.085	35.893
5	2.538	5.076	40.969

Table 8

Correlations of Items Within-Scale and Between-Scales

Assigned scale and item number	Correlation with own scale	Dissonance	Immersion	Internalization
Conformity				
1.	.41	.13	.06	-.14
2.	.56	.19	-.19	-.16
3.	.45	.10	-.10	-.21
4.	.51	.41	.12	-.21
5.	.46	.27	.25	-.19
6.	.54	.30	-.01	-.15
7.	.56	.20	-.01	-.25
8.	.45	.14	.00	-.24
9.	.45	.02	-.31	-.03
35.	.45	.22	.17	-.08
36.	.54	.36	.05	-.20
37.	.59	.42	.12	-.15
44.	.37	.21	.13	.00
46.	.49	.22	-.23	-.06
50.	.36	-.30	-.01	.24
Dissonance		Conformity	Immersion	Internalization
16.	.42	-.01	.24	.33
31.	.57	.45	-.03	-.10
32.	.68	.34	.19	-.17
33.	.64	.24	.20	-.21
38.	.61	.45	.02	-.15
39.	.58	.15	.31	-.05
40.	.71	.40	.17	-.14
43.	.61	.42	.34	-.08
Immersion		Conformity	Dissonance	Internalization
10.	.55	.02	.17	-.10
11.	.66	-.10	.16	.01
13.	.49	.04	.10	-.08
14.	.60	.13	.10	-.18
15.	.61	.03	.11	.01
17.	.61	.09	.19	-.11
18.	.60	-.05	.13	-.20
19.	.61	-.12	.11	.07
29.	-.52	.03	-.13	.19
41.	-.62	.12	.30	-.02
42.	.57	.12	.35	-.09
45.	.64	-.01	.16	-.02
47.	.68	-.04	.28	-.02
48.	.48	-.07	.20	-.02
49.	.56	-.10	.12	-.01
Internalization		Conformity	Dissonance	Immersion
12.	.50	-.13	.11	.04
20.	.52	-.22	-.10	.22
21.	.50	-.23	-.30	-.04
22.	.53	-.16	-.16	-.04
23.	-.47	-.16	-.09	-.23
24.	-.59	-.47	.21	.12
25.	.68	-.11	.07	.03
26.	.52	.03	.02	-.25
27.	.51	-.05	-.07	-.35
28.	.46	-.06	-.09	-.18
34.	.44	-.22	.09	.09

Table 9

Correlations of POCRIAS Subscales

Scale	Conformity	Dissonance	Immersion	Internalization	*M*	*SD*
Conformity	--	r = .49*** p = .000	r = .02 p = .766	r = -.30*** p = .000	1.88	.48
Dissonance		--	r = .39*** p = .000	r = -.12* p = .045	2.38	.69
Immersion			--	r = -.09 p = .108	2.34	.63
Internalization				--	4.47	.38

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 10

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Ethnic Group Difference

Source	*MS*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Conformity	.621	3	2.89	.036	.031
Dissonance	1.774	3	4.05	.008	.042
Immersion	1.211	3	3.16	.025	.033
Internalization	.305	3	2.24	.084	.024

MS = mean squares; *df* = degrees of freedom

Table 11

Estimated Marginal Means of Ethnic Groups

Dependent Variable	Ethnic Group	Mean	Standard Error
Conformity	African/African American	1.827	.062
	Asian/Asian American	1.974	.049
	Hispanic/Hispanic American	1.785	.044
	Native American	1.870	.099
Dissonance	African/African American	2.300	.089
	Asian/Asian American	2.565	.069
	Hispanic/Hispanic American	2.252	.063
	Native American	2.432	.141
Immersion/Resistance	African/African American	2.361	.084
	Asian/Asian American	2.323	.065
	Hispanic/Hispanic American	2.284	.059
	Native American	2.724	.132
Internalization	African/African American	4.364	.050
	Asian/Asian American	4.500	.039
	Hispanic/Hispanic American	4.490	.035
	Native American	4.558	.079

Table 12

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Gender Difference

Source	*MS*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Conformity	.794	1	3.656	.057	.013
Dissonance	1.234	1	2.748	.098	.010
Immersion	.160	1	.406	.525	.001
Internalization	.012	1	.089	.766	.000

MS = mean squares; *df* = degrees of freedom

Table 13

Estimated Marginal Means of Gender Groups

Dependent Variable	Gender Group	Mean	Standard Error
Conformity	Female	1.782	.033
	Male	1.917	.064
Dissonance	Female	2.156	.045
	Male	2.015	.087
Immersion/Resistance	Female	2.359	.042
	Male	2.288	.082
Internalization	Female	4.444	.026
	Male	4.358	.051

Table 14

Pearson Correlations among PEDQ and POCRIAS Subscales (N = 259)

POCRIAS	Conformity	Dissonance	Immersion	Internalization
Disvaluation	r = .005 p = .932	r = .068 p = .276	r = .257** p = .000	r = -.004 p = .951
Threat/Aggression	r = -.010 p = .868	r = .026 p = .681	r = .275** p = .000	r = .041 p = .514
Verbal Rejection	r = -.030 p = .628	r = .053 p = .392	r = .297** p = .000	r = .029 p = .646
Avoidance	r = .038 p = .540	r = .085 p = .172	r = .322** p = .000	r = -.021 p = .733
PEDQ total	r = .002 p = .980	r = .071 p = .252	r = .337** p = .000	r = .010 p = .870

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

Table 15

Pearson Correlations among SCCS and POCRIAS Subscales (N = 259)

POCRIAS	Conformity	Dissonance	Immersion	Internalization
SCCS	$r = .197^{**}$ $p = .001$	$r = .378^{**}$ $p = .000$	$r = .291^{**}$ $p = .000$	$r = .029$ $p = .647$

$^{**}p < .01$

Table 16

Pearson Correlations among EGMQ and POCRIAS Subscales (N = 258)

POCRIAS	Conformity	Dissonance	Immersion	Internalization
Public Regard	r = .036 p = .570	r = -.101 p = .106	r = -.246** p = .000	r = .060 p = .336
Private Feelings	r = -.469** p = .000	r = -.352** p = .000	r = .078 p = .211	r = .412** p = .000
Identity Centrality	r = -.328** p = .000	r = .049 p = .431	r = .421** p = .000	r = .224** p = .000
EGMQ total mean score	r = -.347** p = .000	r = -.169** p = .007	r = .122 p = .051	r = .325** p = .000

*p < .05, **p < .01

Table 17

Pearson Correlations among MCSDS and POCRIAS Subscales (N=253)

POCRIAS	Conformity	Dissonance	Immersion	Internalization
MCSDS	r = .001 p = .982	r = -.182** p = .004	r = -.144* p = .022	r = -.086 p = .172

* p<.05, ** p<.01

APPENDIX A Prospectus

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Given the immigration rates and differential birthrates in the United States, it is estimated that over 50% of the U.S. population will be composed of visible racial minorities by the year of 2050 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992; Sue and Sue, 1999). With the increasing diversification of the United States, there exist different worldviews, value systems, and customs. Conflict and clashes are to be expected due to these differences. As a result, the promotion of multiculturalism has become important and has received increasing attention in educational, economic, social and political systems. In addition, President Clinton formed a Race Advisory Board in 1997 to address racial issues, which highlights the importance of enhancing racial relations in the United States.

As mental health providers, psychologists inevitably are faced with the challenge of meeting the needs of the racial minority populations. Since racial diversification is a recent phenomenon, more knowledge about racial minorities is needed for psychologists to provide adequate care and to conduct culturally responsive research. According to a report released by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS, 2001), racial minorities have less access to mental health services and are less likely to receive mental health services when needed. Moreover, this study reveals that when racial minorities do seek mental health services, they receive poorer quality of care. Finally, the report states that racial minorities are underrepresented in mental health research. Given the results from the report, it is important that mental health professionals provide

better quality services to racial minorities and that researchers conduct studies to investigate the complex cultural factors that influence mental health.

Racial identity theories have increasingly received attention in psychology as tools to aid in understanding the experience of racial minorities in the U.S. Numerous racial identity models have been proposed and studied (Chow, 1982; Cross, 1971; Helms, 1984, 1990; Jackson, 1975; Ruiz, 1990; Sue & Sue, 1999; Thomas, 1971). Racial identity measurements have been developed and scrutinized (Fischer & Moradi, 2001; Kwan, 2001). Empirically, the relationships between racial identity and psychological well-being (Cokley, 2001; Kohatsu et al., 2000; Miville, Koonce, Darlington, & Whitlock, 2000; Neville & Lilly, 2000; Pope, 2000), moral development (Moreland & Leach, 2001), gender role conflict (Liu, 2002), career inspiration (Helms & Piper, 1994), client-counselor relationship (Richardson & Helms, 1994), substance use (Burlew et al., 2000), perception of racial bias (Alvarez & Kimura, 2001; Jefferson & Caldwell, 2002; Thomas, 1999; Thompson, 1999), and self-esteem (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Hargrow, 2001; Phelps, Taylor, & Gerard, 2001) have been investigated. As the supportive evidence of the importance of racial identity increases, the need for a well-articulated theory and a psychometrically sound instrument to assess racial identity increases as well.

Helms (1995) proposed a racial identity theory for racial minorities and subsequently developed a People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (POCRIAS). The POCRIAS is one of the few measurements available that attempts to capture the racial identity development of all racial minorities. The POCRIAS, however, experiences several psychometric problems. For example, there has not been much empirical evidence to support the construct validity of this measure. It remains unclear whether the

POCRIAS measures what it claims to measure. Thus, it is prudent to examine the validity of the POCRIAS. Given the major contribution of Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Model, it is important to establish the validity of the POCRIAS in order to support the theoretical model. If the POCRIAS is found to be a valid and reliable instrument, it will not only lend support to the theoretical model but also provide researchers, trainers, and practitioners with an additional tool to study and learn about the effects of racial identity development.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine the psychometric properties of the People of Color Racial Attitude Scale (POCRIAS). Specifically, this study attempts to examine how well the POCRIAS measures what it claims to measure by exploring the construct validity of the POCRIAS. To do so, an exploratory factor analysis will be conducted and convergent and discriminant validity will be examined.

Research Question

Several research questions will guide this study:

1. Do the POCRIAS items cluster into five factors according to the descriptions of the five stages as the People of Color Racial Identity model proposed?
2. Are there significant racial/cultural differences in how participants respond to the instrument?
3. Are there significant relationships between the POCRIAS subscales and perceived discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern, and group membership?
4. Are there significant relationships between the POCRIAS subscales and social desirability?

Hypotheses

Hypotheses for this study are described following the order of the research question.

The first research question attempts to find out whether the POCRIAS items will load on the five factors as predicted. That is, items representing each stage will load on the same factor in the factor analysis. Thus, the first hypothesis is:

H1: Items will yield five factors as predicted according to the People of Color Racial Identity model.

The second research question attempts to find out whether there is a significant difference in how different racial minority groups respond. Since the model claims to describe the experience of Asians, Blacks, Latino/as of color and Native Americans, there should be no significant differences across these groups. Therefore, the second hypothesis states:

H2: There is no significant difference among the four groups in the scores on the POCRIAS subscales.

The third research question attempts to find out whether there are significant correlations between the POCRIAS subscales and perceived discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern, and group membership.

H3a: Scores on the POCRIAS subscales are significantly correlated with scores on a measure of perceived discrimination.

H3b: Scores on the POCRIAS subscales are significantly correlated with scores on a measure of stereotype confirmation concern.

H3c: Scores on the POCRIAS subscales are significantly correlated with scores on a measure of group membership.

The fourth research question attempts to find out whether participants are responding to the items in a socially desirable way. Paulhus (1991) stated that to ensure that social desirability is not contaminating item responses, social desirability is often measured to provide discriminant validity of a measurement. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis states:

H4: There is no significant correlation between the scores on a social desirability measure and the scores on the POCRIAS subscales.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Definition of terms:

The term *race* and *ethnicity* have been used interchangeably in the literature. It is important to have a brief discussion of the definition of *race, ethnicity, racial minority, ethnic minority, racial identity and ethnic identity.*

Race and ethnicity. There are numerous definitions for the term *race,* depending on the disciplines and perspectives of the researchers. For example, cultural anthropologists describe race in terms of customs, food, and languages while physical anthropologists study the unique physical features of different races, according to their hair color and texture, facial features, skin color, and the proportions of limbs. Nevertheless, race is generally defined as "an inbreeding group of individuals with a specific geographic locus" (Zuckerman, 1990). Human populations were originally categorized based on the geographic regions they resided in, such as Negroids who occupied Africa, Caucasoids who occupied Eurasia, and Mongoloids who occupied Asia (MacEachern, 2003). It was believed that the unique physical features and cultures of these races were a result of evolution in order to adapt to the climate and environment (MacEachern, 2003).

Some biologists debate on whether race exists because the range of differences within the so-called racial groups is wider than that of between-groups (Zuckerman, 1990). Although the wide range with-in group differences need not annihilate the existence of the term race, this brings attention to the fluid nature of the elements that are used to define race. For example, physical features, such as skin color and hair texture,

vary on a continuum, which leads to the question of where the "cut-off" line should be drawn. Without a doubt, the definition of race differs throughout history and across cultures. Individuals with any Black ancestry were considered as Black prior to the Civil war in North America whereas, in Brazil, anyone with any Caucasian physical features was considered White (Zuckerman, 1990). In addition, geographic territory is subject to the changes ranging from natural forces to political dynamics. Furthermore, interracial marriage and immigration are also reasons that complicate the classification of human races based on physical features or geographical location.

Although the definitions vary, the overall agreement is that race is genetically transmitted and physical features remain the core of the definition of race (Ocampo, et al., 1993; Pulera, 2002; MacEachern, 2003).

Similar to the term *race*, *ethnicity* has various definitions, but less controversy. It is generally acknowledged that ethnicity is transmitted through socialization, in contrast to the genetic transmission of race (Buriel & Cardoza, 1993; Scupin, 2003) and is based on a collection of cultural characteristics, such as languages, foods, clothing, music, values, and customs (Scupin, 2003). In addition, Oboler (1995) offered an interesting perspective and asserted that ethnicity was used to understand immigrants' assimilation process. This may offer a plausible explanation of the frequent use of ethnicity when examining Asian and Hispanic populations in the United States as they comprise the largest recent immigrant populations, but not Black populations in the United States as they are not generally perceived as recent immigrants.

Phinney (1996) proposed that ethnicity is a multidimensional construct and examined ethnicity from three aspects: cultural values and practices (culture), subjective

sense of belonging (identity), and the experiences within a society (minority versus majority status). Acknowledging the importance of the use of categories in research, Phinney (1996) suggested that researchers go beyond using ethnicity as a categorical variable to be controlled or manipulated as a way of understanding the experience of ethnic groups. It is recommended that all three dimensions be assessed in order to understand the influence of ethnicity on any phenomenon in question.

Given the available definitions in the literature, the differences between race and ethnicity seem to be clear, although these two terms have been used ambiguously and inconsistently in the field of psychology. In her effort to provide a solution, Phinney (1996) contended that these two terms be combined into one construct and proposed the term *ethnicity* be used as a broader term that encompasses race. Phinney's proposition has received opposing opinion. Helms and Talleyrand (1997) strongly argued that race does exist and encouraged the continual effort in defining and distinguishing these terms. They contended that, despite the difficulty in accurately categorizing human races, race remains a salient feature that affects access of education, social, and political resources, especially in a racially diverse community as people continue to be denied or granted membership because of their physical features. Race, an initially biological based category, has evolved into a social construct with significant psychological implications and is well worth further investigation.

One last observation in reviewing the literature is that Black people (the Negroids) and White people (the Caucasoids) are generally the focus when racial issues are examined and individuals of Hispanic or Asian (The Mongoloids) descent are the focus when ethnic issues are examined. The ethnicity of Africans and Caucasians is

generally overlooked even though different ethnic groups exist within each racial group. On the other hand, the racial aspect of Asians and Hispanics is mostly neglected despite the fact that these individuals are racial beings as well. No plausible explanation of the different foci in the studies of these groups is available in the literature.

So far, according to the review of the definition of *race* and *ethnicity*, it seems quite clear that they are two different constructs. Different theorists have different conceptualizations of how these two constructs are related to each other. Specifically, some perceive ethnicity to encompass race while others perceive it as an aspect of race. Still, others use these two terms interchangeably.

Racial and ethnic minority. The term *racial minority* and *ethnic minority* have been used either jointly or interchangeably in the United States. According to the U.S. Census 2000, there are six mono-racial categories: White, Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, and Other race. The White group consists of 75.1% of the U.S. population and therefore is the majority racial group. Subsequently, the "racial" minority groups consist of Blacks (12.3%), American Indians and Alaska Natives (0.9%), Asians (3.6%), Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander (0.1%), and others (5.5%). It should be noted that American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, and native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander are all Mongoloids. Even though they are generally perceived as "racial" groups, the differences between these groups are due to ethnicity rather than race.

A commonly used label "Hispanic," a minority group that consists of 12.5% (35 million) of the U.S. population according to the U.S. Census 2000, is not included in the racial categories but listed separately. Oboler (1995) contended the term Hispanic

initially referred to Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans about twenty years ago and has become widely used nowadays to refer to individuals who are Spanish speaking or from Latin America. However, the so-called Hispanic populations vary tremendously in their races, cultures, countries of origins, religions, and immigration history. As a result, the term Hispanic is nebulous and confusing at times. For example, the Portuguese-speaking Italian or Japanese immigrants in South America generally do not identify themselves as "Hispanic" but may receive such a label once they come to the United States. Despite the problems in defining it with precision, the term Hispanic continues to be used and people who are perceived as "Hispanic" continue to experience differential treatments; therefore, the impact of this labeling on individuals' psychological functioning warrants examination.

There are several speculations as to why these two terms are used interchangeably or jointly, particularly when examining the racial and ethnic minorities in the United States. For one thing, given the conventional usage of race in examining Black people and ethnicity in examining Asian and Hispanic people, jointly or interchangeably using the term race and ethnicity allows investigators to capture the discrimination experienced by individuals of African, Asian, and Hispanic descent. For another, race and ethnicity are highly related for some individuals. Individuals of Chinese descent are usually racial minorities as well and experience discrimination because of their minority status. It is difficult to discern whether a particular discriminatory incident is due to the racial features or ethnic characteristics. For the purpose of this study, the issue does not lie in whether race and ethnicity are two different constructs, as it is quite clear that they are.

The intention of this study is to study how these individuals' psychological functioning is affected due to their minority racial or ethnic status.

In this study, racial minorities are defined as individuals who self-identify as Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Black. Individuals who self-identify as Hispanic will be included in this study for analysis because of their minority status even though they generally are not considered as a racial group. People who self-identify as biracial or multi-racial are not included in this study even though they are considered racial minorities as well. The rationale for exclusion is that the theoretical basis of the instrument being investigated does not specifically address the racial identity development of biracial or multi-racial individuals. It is unclear whether these individuals experience racial identity development the way uni-racial individuals do. To avoid inappropriate overgeneralization of their experience, they are not included in this study.

Racial and ethnic identity. Parham and Helms (1981) defined *racial identity* as a "person's beliefs or attitudes about her or his own race" (pp. 250). Helms and Cook (1999) further expand on this definition and describe *racial identity* as an individual's identification with one's racial group, emphasizing the process in which one recognizes and overcomes the psychological effects of the internalized racial oppression.

Bernal and Knight (1993) defined *ethnic identity* as a multi-dimensional psychological construct that consists of a collection of self-perception of one's ethnic group membership. The dimensions they proposed include: (a) one's self-label in relation to one's ethnic group membership; (b) knowledge about one's ethnic culture; and (c) one's preferences regarding individuals from one's ethnic group or values embraced

by one's ethnic group. Sodowsky, Kway, & Pannu (1995) defined *ethnic identity* as one's identification with one's culture of origin based on shared values, languages, and customs.

Further, Helms (1996) described the differences between racial identity models and ethnic identity models as:

> "racial" models if they describe reactions to societal dynamics of "racial" oppression (i.e., domination or subjugation based on racial or ethnic physical characteristics commonly *assumed* [emphasis in original] to be racial or genetic in nature)…[and] be considered "ethnic" models if acquisition or maintenance of cultural characteristics (e.g., language, religious expression) are defining principles (p. 144).

It should be noted that according to Helms' description, the significant difference between racial and ethnic identity models is not the "what" but the "how." In other words, it is not race or ethnicity that is the focus of these models but individuals' behaviors and beliefs in reaction to their race and ethnicity. If a model attempts to describe the psychological impact and strategies used in reaction to one's racial or ethnic identity, it is considered as a racial identity model. If a model attempts to describe or understand the behaviors of acquiring or maintaining the cultural characteristics of a racial or ethnic group, it is considered as an ethnic model. Although the terminology is misleading at times, this way of distinguishing racial identity models and ethnic identity models is helpful and will be used throughout this study.

In addition, instead of conceptualizing racial models and ethnic models to be two separate categories that are exclusive of each other, they are conceptualized as a continuum, with racial identity model on one end and ethnic identity model on the other.

It is theoretically possible that a given model may address both the oppression based on racial or ethnic features and the acquisition or maintenance of cultural characteristics.

Overview of the Racial and Ethnic Identity Models and Measures

Different theorists have proposed different models to explain the racial and ethnic identity development of various groups. For the purpose of this study, the racial and ethnic identity models of racial and ethnic minorities in the United States are reviewed.

Black Identity Models and Measures. Beginning in late 1960s, Black identity models began to emerge. Different Black identity models have been proposed by Cross (1971), Thomas (1971), and Jackson (1975) and empirical studies focusing on Black identity have followed. Cross first proposed a four-stage model to describe Black people's racial identity development in 1971. The four stages are: Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. In the Pre-encounter stage, Black individuals consciously or unconsciously depreciate their Blackness and conform to the White values. In the Encounter stage, Black individuals come to reinterpret their experiences after encountering a significant event that is of a racial nature. Subsequently, a shift of their worldview takes place. In the Immersion-Emersion stage, Black individuals immerse themselves in their Blackness and withdraw from the dominant culture. Their feelings of anger and guilt begin to disappear and are gradually replaced by feelings of pride. In the final stage, Internalization, Black individuals have worked through their anger and guilt in the Immersion-Emersion stage and come to accept their Blackness by appreciating both Blackness and Whiteness.

Cross's model was later revised (Cross, 1991) and a Cross Racial Identity Scale was developed (Vandiver et al., 2000). In the revised model (Vandiver et al., 2002),

three stages are presented instead of four as in previous model. They are Pre-encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. Because of the potentially different attitudes with each stage, these differences are further delineated within each stage in order to capture the different dimensions of the identity stage. The two identity clusters within the Pre-counter stage are Assimilation and Anti-Black. The two identity clusters within the Immersion-Emersion stage are Intense Black Involvement and Anti-White Attitudes. Finally, the two identity clusters within the Internationalization stage are Black Nationalist and Multiculturalist.

The model proposed by Thomas (1971) identified five stages in Black people's racial identity development: Withdrawal, Testifying, Information Procession, Activity and Transcendental. The development of a Black individual's racial identity was described as ranging from withdrawing into their group, to connecting with other racial minority groups to viewing themselves as productive members of the society. This model has not been further revised nor researched and therefore, has lost its favor in the field throughout the years.

The model proposed by Jackson (1975) contained five stages: Naivete, Acceptance, Resistance, Redefinition, and Internalization. This model is similar to Cross's model in the sense that the Black racial identity development begins with accepting and trying to assimilate into the dominant culture, followed by feeling resistant as a result of being rejected by the dominant culture. In the redefinition stage, Black individuals attempt to search their Black values and standards. After working through the anger and guilt, Black individuals no longer view the Black values and White values as in conflict. They gradually develop an inner sense of pride and accept both the Black values

and the White values. Due to a lack of empirical scrutiny, this model was not furthered developed and did not gain popularity in the field.

Parham and Helms continued to elaborate and expand on Cross's model (Helms, 1990; Parham, 1989; Parham & Helms, 1981). They began to consider parental attitudes and societal influences on individuals' racial identity development and the interrelations between racial identity and one's emotional well-being (Parham & Helms, 1981, 1985a, 1985b). They developed the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (Parham & Helms, 1981) and the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale, Form B (Helms, 1990). Lemon and Waehler (1996) examined the psychometric properties of the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS-B) and recommended more work to establish the test-retest reliability of the instrument. Lemon and Waehler (1996) also found that, for their Black subjects, ethnic identity was related to the subscales, but not for their White counterparts. They concluded that ethnic and racial identity may be similar constructs for Blacks but separate constructs for Whites.

In reviewing the African American identity models, it is observed that African American identity models are similar in the sense that they all described identity development in stages and all attempted to capture the nature and tasks within each stage. They fit close to Helms' definition of racial identity model (Helms, 1996). However, neither one of the models addressed the factors or conditions that formulate racial identity development, nor did they describe how racial identity development moved from one stage to the next stage.

Asian American Identity Models and Measures. At the same time that researchers were invested in developing Black identity models, other researchers were interested in

the identity development of Asian Americans. Sue and Sue (1971) developed a conceptual framework for understanding Chinese-Americans' experience and identified three ways of resolving culture conflicts: 1) retaining traditional Asian values, 2) rejecting traditional Asian values and overly identifying with western culture, and 3) integrating both the traditional Asian values and western values. No instrument based on Sue and Sue's model has been developed.

In her study of Asian-American women, Chow (1982) identified two dimensions in ethnic identity development and developed an Ethnic Identity Scale. The two dimensions are: the Asian identity and the American identity, which is further differentiated into four groups (i.e., high Asian identity and high American identity, high Asian identity and low American identity, low Asian identity and low American identity, and low Asian identity and high American identity). Chow's model is one of the very few racial identity models that does not suggest a sequential development.

Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, and Vigil (1987) developed an acculturation scale for Asian Americans. Their model is similar to Chow's, except that acculturation is conceptualized on a single continuum with American identity on one end and Asian identity on the other. Bicultural identity falls somewhere between the American identity and Asian identity. Their model focused more on the cultural aspect, such as the use of language, food preferences, friendship preferences, but not the political aspect, such as awareness of oppression and racism.

The most recent Asian identity development study is the one by Kwan and Sodowsky (1997), who developed an Internal-External Ethnic Identity Measure for Chinese American ethnic identity. Although they did not propose a model, the scope of

their measurement has clearly expanded to not only the cognitive, but also the affective dimension of racial identity development. Social behaviors and cultural behaviors are measured in Kwan and Sodowsky's instrument as well.

As can be seen, most Asian identity models fit closer to Helms' definition of ethnic model (Helms, 1996) as they mostly focus on the maintenance and rejection of cultural values.

Latino/Hispanic Identity Models. A few theorists have proposed different identity models for Latino/Hispanic populations (Bernal & Knight, 1993; Casas & Pytluk, 1995; Lega, 1979). They mostly conceptualized the Latino/Hispanic identity development as on a continuum, which is similar to the earlier Asian identity models. They seem to fit closer to the Helms' ethnic model definition (Helms, 1996).

Ruiz (1990) proposed a stage model that is similar to most Black racial identity models, given that Ruiz's model described how an individual becomes aware of one's cultural heritage and how one reacts based on the awareness. Ruiz's model may be viewed as closer to Helms' racial identity model definition (Helms, 1996). Ruiz's model consists of five stages, Causal, Cognitive, Consequence, Working Through and Successful Resolution stage. The Causal stage is characterized as a stage in which one's ethnic identity is ignored or denigrated. The Cognitive stage is a stage in which individuals hold false beliefs about one's ethnic group as a result of the erroneous message in their environment. In the Consequence stage, individuals become aware of their distinctive cultural heritage and feel embarrassed or ashamed. As a result, they actively reject their cultural heritage. As the psychological distress increases, individuals no longer desire to assimilate into the dominant culture by denying their cultural heritage,

which is characteristic of the Working Through stage. They begin to reclaim their cultural heritage. In the Successful Resolution stage, individuals accept their culture and their ethnic identity is enhanced and is considered as a resource and strength.

Native American Identity Models. The literature is replete with Native American Identity models. Choney and her associates (1995) stated that due to the diverse worldviews among the tribes, it is extremely difficult to determine what a Native American identity or "Indianness" is. Therefore, they cautioned that the application of racial identity to Native American populations may perpetuate the myth that Native Americans are a homogeneous group. Instead, they proposed an acculturation model to describe the levels of Native American people's acceptance of their culture and the predominant culture. Using the Native American medicine wheel as the bases for conceptualizing acculturation, the model differentiates five levels of acculturation with four major domains. The five levels of acculturation include traditional, transitional, bicultural, assimilated, and marginal. The four domains include cognitive, behavioral, affective/spiritual, and social/environmental. Choney and her associates emphasized that the model is based on a health perspective, rather than a deficit perspective, and does not place any judgments on the levels of acculturation and domains. They also stressed that the movement between the levels and domains is fluid and flexible, not subject to a linear fashion of movement nor a fixed category. Given that this model primarily describes the acquisition of cultural values and practices, it is viewed to fit Helms' definition of ethnic model (Helms, 1996).

Multigroup Ethnic Identity. As the multiculturalism movement evolved, themes that are common to ethnic minorities' experience began to emerge. Some researchers

began to develop models that best capture these experiences shared by all minorities. Based on their clinical experience, Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1989) proposed a five-stage model to comprehensively describe the experience of racial minority groups. This model was later expanded by Sue and Sue (1990) and renamed the Racial/Cultural Identity Development Model (Sue & Sue, 1999). The five stages are: Conformity, Dissonance, Resistance and Immersion, Introspection, and Integrative Awareness. Individuals in the Conformity stage prefer the dominant cultural values and devalue their own. They not only strive to identify with the dominant culture but also hold discriminatory views toward other racial minorities. In the Dissonance stage, individuals encounter experiences that are inconsistent with values and beliefs prescribed by the dominant culture, which leads to questioning their values at the previous stage. As a result, individuals experience a great deal of confusion and begin to challenge the discriminatory views they held against other racial minority groups. In the Resistance and Immersion stage, individuals tend to identify with their own racial groups and reject the dominant culture. They are likely to experience anger towards the dominant culture and feel shame and guilt for their conformity in the past. In the Introspection stage, individuals attempt to sort through the differences between the dominant culture's values and their own. In the Integrative Awareness stage, individuals are able to appreciate the positive features of their culture and the dominant culture and develop an inner sense of security. Given the descriptions of this model, it is conceptualized to be a racial identity model according to Helms' (1996) definition.

Phinney (1993) proposed a three-stage model that aims at describing the common characteristics of adolescent ethnic identity development for diverse ethnic groups. The

first stage, Unexamined Ethnic Identity, is characterized by a lack of interest in exploring one's ethnicity. Individuals at this stage usually do not view their ethnicity as a salient aspect of their life. The second stage, Ethnic Identity Search/Moratorium, is characterized by awareness that the dominant culture's values may not be beneficial to all ethnic minorities. This awareness leads one to explore and understand one's culture. The third stage, Ethnic Identity Achievement, is characterized by an achieved ethnic identity. Individuals internalize and accept their ethnicity. They have resolved the conflicting values between their culture and the dominant culture and feel comfortable and confident with themselves. Phinney stated that these three stages are clearly distinguished and proceed in sequence. Although contextual factors, such as parental influence and ethnically homogeneous environment are not specifically described, their importance is emphasized in the development of ethnic identity. Although Phinney's model does not explicitly address the sociopolitical dynamics as a result of the differences between the dominant culture and one's culture, acquisition or maintenance of cultural characteristics is not a salient defining principle of this model. Thus, Phinney's model is considered to fit closer to a racial model.

In addition to the theoretical model, Phinney developed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) to assess ethnic identity development, targeting diverse ethnic groups, including Asian Americans, Blacks, European Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans (Phinney, 1992). Interestingly, although Phinney proposed a three-stage model, the MEIM does not tap into the three stages. Rather, ethnic identity is conceptualized on a single bi-polar continuum, ranging from low to high, according to the MEIM. The psychometric properties of the MEIM were examined by Roberts et al.

(1999). When examining the structure of the measurement, Roberts and his associates borrowed the concepts from Tajfel and Turner's social identity theory and Erikson's developmental theory to strengthen the theoretical foundation of the revised MEIM (Roberts et al., 1999). These two theoretical approaches are reflected in the revised MEIM's two-factor structure: affirmation and belonging, and ethnic identity achievement. When compared to other measurements that attempt to incorporate multiethnic groups, the revised MEIM is unique in its ability to measure European Americans' ethnic identity and is relatively short as it contains only 12 items. In addition, while the revised MEIM is an indicator of one's commitment to one's ethnic identity, it does not offer information such as the individual's relation with others from the same or different ethnic groups and how ethnic identity conflicts affect them.

Umana-Taylor and Fine (2001) raised the issue of the appropriateness of combining subgroups into one big group, treating a heterogeneous group as a homogeneous one. Umana-Taylor and Fine (2001) examined Latino/a adolescents as a sample and found significant subgroup differences in ethnic identity achievement. They discussed the possible reasons that contributed to the subgroup differences, such as immigration history and generational status, and concluded that there is a need to examine individual nationalities instead of the pan-ethnic group. While subgroup differences are perceived as a result of methodological inappropriateness, it can also be argued that the differences are a result of the differences of contextual factors, as emphasized in Phinney's model.

People of Color Racial Identity Model. Helms (1995) further expanded the theory of Black racial identity development to include Native Americans, Blacks, Asians and

Latino/as of color and developed the People of Color Racial Identity Model. Key constructs from the models developed by Cross (1971) and by Atkinson et al. (1989) were borrowed to describe the five statuses in the People of Color Racial Identity model; namely, Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion-Emersion, Internationalization, and Integrative Awareness.

In the Conformity status, the person of color values the dominant culture. The person may denigrate his or her racial group and may conform to the existing stereotypes of one's group. Individuals who primarily operate from this status may selectively screen information that is consistent with the dominant culture's values and, therefore, be unaware of sociopolitical concerns. In the Dissonance status, the person of color is confused and ambivalent about his/her group membership and has conflicting attitudes toward the minority group and the dominant culture. The person begins to question the previously held stereotypes about minority groups and their allegiance to the dominant group. In the Immersion/Emersion status, the person of color comes to idealize his or her own group and rejects the dominant group. They may feel anger and hostility toward the dominant group and feel shame and guilt toward their own group. In the Internationalization status, the person of color views both their own group and the dominant group in a more objective way. The idealization of their own group and the denigration of the dominant group are subdued. In the Integrative Awareness status, the person of color develops a personally meaningful racial identity and integrates other aspects, such as gender, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status, into one's identity and may collaborate with other oppressed groups to eliminate oppression.

In addition, Helms (1995) stated that according to her racial identity theory, "all socioracial groups, regardless of specific racial or ethnic group classification, are assumed to experience a racial identity developmental process that can be described by several statuses" (p.183). She acknowledged the power differences among socioracial groups in the United States and theorized that the content of the racial identity development varies for different groups.

Essentially, Helms' People of Color Racial Identity model attempts to describe how people of color manage race-related encounters and overcome negative stereotypes imposed by the dominant culture. Individuals who operate from the Conformity Status are theorized to possess a less sophisticated style in dealing racial materials; as a result, they tend to embrace the dominant culture's values and may conform to the stereotypes the dominant culture has about their group(s) without question. On the other hand, individuals who operate from the most sophisticated status, the Integrative Awareness Status, are theorized to have the ability to recognize the negative stereotypes about one's group and manage to express a positive racial self nevertheless. Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale was subsequently developed to capture the different styles described in her model.

Summary of Racial and Ethnic Identity Models

In reviewing the literature on racial identity models, it is evident that researchers have devoted significant effort to developing and revising racial and ethnic identity models. The similarities and differences will be briefly summarized as follows. First, it appears that most of the racial and ethnic identity models are gradually moving toward using a stage model to conceptualize racial or ethnic identity development. Second,

Asian and Hispanic American identity models are more ethnic specific, interested in specific ethnic identity such as Chinese-American identity or Cuban-American identity. There is more focus on languages, immigration history, generational status, and allegiance to traditional customs for the Asian and Hispanic populations in conceptualizing their identity. Black identity models, on the other hand, are more racially focused, do not differentiate one particular subculture from another and do not emphasize the languages and generational status. In addition, there is a general concern about categorizing a heterogeneous group as a homogeneous one for the Asian and Hispanic populations, which is also a concern shared by Native American researchers. This concern is generally not mentioned in the study of Black populations. Third, Black identity models focus primarily on the sociopolitical aspect of racial identity, such as discrimination and oppression, whereas Asian and Hispanic American identity models focus more on the acquisition and maintenance of cultural characteristics and practices. This is changing, however, as some Asian and Hispanic American identity theorists have attempted to integrate sociopolitical aspects into their models.

While some models remain at the theoretical level, others have developed psychometric instruments in an attempt to validate the models. Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale has been increasingly receiving attention and is frequently used in multicultural studies. The reason is evident: It is the only measurement that attempts to measure the common experiences shared by all racial and ethnic minorities. However, for a measurement to be widely used with confidence, it is crucial to examine the psychometric properties of this measurement. The validation of the People of Color

Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS) will further the understanding of racial minorities' identity development and, therefore, is warranted.

Overview of Issues with Racial Identity Development and its Measurement

The study of racial identity development is a recent phenomenon and there are several challenges in attempting to capture the nature of racial identity development. For theorists who proposed a stage model, there has not been a consensus regarding whether the stages are continuous or independent of one another. This differentiation is important especially when analyzing the data. If the stages are continuous, care needs to be exercised in the statistical analysis by selecting strategies that inherently support continuity of the data, such as cluster analysis and multiple regression (Helms, 1989). Helms (1989) further cautioned that the researchers need to be aware of the possible existence of a non-linear rather than a linear relationship when analyzing the data.

In terms of the progression of the racial identity development, it is hypothesized that not everyone progresses through all the stages. Parham asserted that there are at least three different ways that racial identity development can take place (Cross, Parham, and Helms, 1991). One may move from one identity stage to the next in a linear fashion (Linear) or fail to move beyond a particular stage (Stagnation). One may also move from one stage to the next in a reverse order (Recycling).

Because of the potentially continuous nature of racial identity development, Helms (1986) recommended using profile analysis instead of assigning individuals to a particular stage. Helms further cautioned that the POCRIAS should not be used in isolation, just like any psychological assessment would not rely solely on one single psychometric measurement. An important research question would be what other

instruments could better assist POCRIAS in understanding an individual's racial identity development.

Helms (1989) made a very important observation regarding the influence of environment on racial identity development. She stated that an individual from a predominantly White rural area will be more likely to be at the Encounter stage than an individual from a predominantly Black urban area. Although her statement needs further empirical support, it lends insight into methodological considerations for this study. Gathering information regarding the individual's environment, such as the percentage of minority people in the neighborhood and the geographic location, will be pertinent.

Review of Measures Relevant to Racial Identity Scales

One of the purposes of this study is to examine the construct validity of POCRIAS. Therefore, this section will review instruments that may be potentially helpful in the validation process.

Measures of Ethnicity-Related Stress. Contrada et al. (2001) defined ethnicity-related stress as "the outcome of a person –situation interaction in which perception of features of the social environment, in the light of knowledge of one's ethnicity, leads either to the anticipation of psychological or physical harm, or to the belief that such harm has already occurred (p.1777)." They developed three scales to measure ethnicity-related stress. Specifically, the Perceived Ethnicity Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ), the Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale (SCCS), and the Own-Group Conformity Pressure Scale (OGCPS) were developed to assess ethnicity-related stress. Additionally, the Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire (EGMQ) was developed to assess ethnicity identity.

For the purpose of this study, the PEDQ and the SCCS are used to examine the construct validity of POCRIAS for the following reasons. First, as mentioned in a previous section, the relationship of race and ethnicity is conceptualized differently by researchers. Presumably, ethnicity is conceptualized as one dimension of race in the People of Color Racial Identity Model as some items address ethnicity related concerns. Second, both the PEDQ and the SCCS measure constructs that are aspects (i.e., perception of differential societal treatment and stereotypes stemming from one's ethnicity) of the different statuses of Helms' model. Third, according to Helms' distinction of racial identity model and ethnic identity model, one can be subjected to "racial" oppression because of one's ethnic characteristics. Thus, it is appropriate to examine one's experience with discrimination as a result of their ethnicity. Fourth, the purpose of the PEDQ and the SCCS is to assess individual's experience with discrimination related to ones' ethnicity and concerns of confirming ethnic stereotypes (i.e. societal dynamics), not the acquisition or maintenance of their ethnic practice. Given all these reasons, the PEDQ and the SCCS are used to examine how one's experience related to his/her ethnicity is reflected in POCRIAS subscales.

The PEDQ is a scale that measures the individual's perception of the frequency of discrimination attributed to their ethnicity. According to the People of Color Racial Identity Model, individuals at the Conformity status tend to be oblivious to the sociopolitical implication of their race or ethnicity. It is then speculated that the frequency of perceived ethnic discrimination may be low for these individuals. Individuals at the Dissonance and Immersion-Emersion status may perceive a higher frequency of ethnic discrimination as they become increasingly aware of the salience of

their ethnicity in the societal dynamics. The frequency may decrease as the individuals move to the Internalization and Integrative Awareness statuses as they are able to objectively evaluate their interaction with others.

The SCCS is a scale that measures the degree to which the individuals are concerned about whether their behaviors fit into the stereotypes associated with their group. Given the evidence that minorities are aware of the existing stereotypes associated with their groups (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998), this scale may offer insight into the validity of POCRIAS subscales. Hypothetically, individuals at the Conformity status may be concerned about being perceived as confirming certain stereotypes because they are eager to conform to the dominant culture. This concern may decrease as they move to the Dissonance and Immersion-Emersion statuses as they become more ambivalent about conforming to the dominant culture. Individuals at the Internalization and Integrative Awareness statuses may be least concerned about confirming stereotypes associated with their group because they have developed a more balanced view of the strengths and weaknesses of their ethnic group.

The EGMQ is a measure of individuals' attitudes toward their ethnic group. The EGMQ consists of three aspects: individuals' private feelings about their group, their beliefs about the public's regard for their group, and the importance of ethnicity to their identity. Since the EGMQ is a scale regarding one's attitudes regarding their group, this scale is appropriate to use in validating the POCRIAS subscales. Individuals at the Conformity status may endorse the least positive attitudes toward their ethnic group whereas individuals at the Immersion-Emersion status may endorse the most positive

attitudes. Individuals at the Dissonance, Internalization and Integrative Awareness statuses may fall somewhere in between.

Measures of Social Desirability. Any self-report instrument is subject to response bias and is a commonly held concern in psychological assessment. Social desirability, one type of response bias, can potentially affect how individuals respond to items, especially when the subject matter is conducive to social approval (Paulhus, 1991). Since the POCRIAS is a self-report measure and racial attitudes are still a rather sensitive topic, it is important that this variable is measured to ensure that the research participants are not responding to the POCRIAS items because of a higher need for social approval. Thus, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) was used to measure socially desirable response (SDR).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The study is an instrument validation study. In this study, criterion sampling will be utilized. Individuals who self-identify as African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic American, or Native American over 18 years old will be recruited to participate. Eighty individuals from each ethnic group (a total of three hundred and twenty) will be recruited. The sample size is set as such to achieve statistical power for factor analysis. Organizations of ethnic minority groups will be contacted, such as American Psychological Association Division 45, Asian American Psychological Association, Black Psychological Association, Hispanic American Psychological Association, Native American Psychological Association, and minority student organizations at OU campus. An email message soliciting participation will be sent to the contact person, who will then forward the message to the group members. It will be specified in the email message that the participants' family members or friends who meet the criteria are also welcome to participate. All participants will be provided a link to the website where the survey is located. Participants will be informed of the purpose of the study, confidentiality, and the risks and benefits of participation.

Instruments

A demographic sheet will be completed by all participants. It is designed to gather the following information: (a) gender, (b) age, (c) race, (d) highest level of education completed, (e) parental education, (f) family income, (g) type of neighborhood

lived in over the last year, (h) the percentage of the people in the participant's work setting that are of the participant's race, and (i) current socioeconomic status.

People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS). The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms, 1995) is a 50 -item self-report measure of participants' racial identity attitudes. Participants endorse items based on their level of agreement with each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). The POCRIAS contains four subscales (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion and Resistance, and Internalization). Subscale scores may be obtained by computing the mean of the items assigned to each subscale. Kohatsu (1992) reported reliabilities, using Cronbach alphas, ranging from .67 (Integration) to .76 (Dissonance). Liu (2002) reported reliabilities ranging from .72 (Dissonance) to .86 (Internalization). Samples of Asian Americans were used in both studies. Miville et al. (2000) reported Cronbach alphas of .65 (Awareness) to .83 (Immersion) using Mexican Americans as a sample. No study has been conducted to test the validity of the POCRIAS.

Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ). The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (Contrada et al., 2001) is a 22-item self-report measure of perceived ethnic discrimination. Participants respond to the items on a 7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = very often). Four subscales, Verbal Rejection, Avoidance, Threat/Aggression, and Disvaluation, were constructed as a result of factor analysis. A sample item of Verbal Rejection is "How often have you been subjected to offensive ethnic comments aimed directly at you, spoken either in your presence or behind your back?" A sample item of Avoidance is "How often have others outside your ethnic group made you feel as though you do not fit in because of your dress, speech, or other characteristics related to

your ethnicity?" A sample of Threat/Aggression is "How often have others threatened to hurt you because of your ethnicity?" A sample item of Disvaluation is "How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be unintelligent?" Subscale scores are obtained by computing the mean of item responses. A total score is obtained by computing the mean of the four subscale scores. Higher scores indicate higher frequency of perceived ethnic discrimination.

Contrada et al. (2001) reported the following Cronbach alpha coefficients for the four scales for their non-White research participants: .90 (Disvaluation), .85 (Threat/aggression), .77 (Verbal rejection), and .73 (Avoidance). In addition, to examine the convergent and discriminant validity, Contrada et al. (2001) found high correlations within the PEDQ subscales and significant positive correlations between the PEDQ and depressive symptoms, negative mood, and physical symptoms. They also found significant negative correlations between the PEDQ and life satisfaction.

Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale (SCCS). The Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale (Contrada et al., 2001) contains 11 items that measure participants' concern that they might be confirming a stereotype about their ethnic group. A sample item is "How often have you been concerned that by *taking your studies too seriously* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?" Items are scored using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = never; 7 = always). All 11 items had substantial loadings on one factor as a result of repeated extraction. Therefore, scores are calculated by computing the mean of all the 11 items. Higher scores indicate more endorsement of stereotype confirmation concern. Contrada et al. (2001) reported a

Cronbach alpha coefficient of .91 for this scale. Significant positive correlations were found between the SCCS and negative mood.

Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire (EGMQ). The Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire (Contrada et al., 2001) is a 12-item self-report measure of participants' feelings about being a member of their ethnic group. Three subscales, Private Feelings, Public Regard, and Identity Centrality, were constructed as a result of factor analysis. Participants respond to the items on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree)to 7 (strongly agree). Sample items of the subscales include: "I often regret that I belong to the ethnic group that I do" (Private Feelings), "Overall, my ethnic group is viewed positively by others" (Public Regard), and " Overall, my ethnic group has very little to do with how I feel about myself" (Identity Centrality). Subscale scores are obtained by computing the mean of item responses. A total score is computed as the mean of the three subscale scores. Higher scores indicate a more positive feeling about being a member of their ethnic group.

Contrada et al. (2001) found significant negative correlations between the Public Regard subscale and negative mood and significant positive correlations between the Public Regard subscale and life satisfaction. The following Cronbach alpha coefficients were reported: .80 (Public Regard), .77 (Identity Centrality), and .77 (Private Feelings) in Contrada et al. (2001).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD). The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) is a 33-item instrument measuring social desirability responding. It will be used to examine the patterns of participants' responses to the instruments. A sample item is " I have never intensely disliked anyone."

Respondents endorse either "true" or "false" to each item. Scores range from 0 to 33 (no social desirability to high social desirability). Jome (2000) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .79 while Merydith, Prout, & Blaha (2003) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .85. The one-month test-retest correlation was .88 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Significant positive correlations were found between the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale and the MMPI Lie Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Paulhus, 1984; Robinette, 1991).

Data Analysis Procedures

To test the first hypothesis, two strategies will be employed. The first one is to explore correlations among the POCRIAS subscales to see if the results are consistent with the theory. The second strategy is to conduct a factor analysis, via varimax rotation, to confirm or disconfirm whether a five-factor model produces a better fit with the data as the theory claims.

To test the second hypothesis, a MANOVA will be conducted to examine whether there are significant differences among the different racial groups in their responses to the items.

To test the third hypothesis, a correlation analysis will be conducted to determine whether relationships exist between the POCRIAS subscales and perceived discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern, and group membership.

To test the fourth hypothesis, a correlation analysis will be conducted to determine whether relationships exist between the POCRIAS subscales and social desirability.

Ethics and Human Relations

All participants will be informed by the researcher as to the purpose of the study, the procedures, and the risks and benefits involved in the study. All surveys will be anonymous and confidentiality will be ensured. Participants will have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Consent for the study will be obtained prior to participation. No potential risks are foreseeable.

References

Alvarez, A. N., & Helms, J. E. (2001). Racial identity and reflected appraisals as influences on Asian Americans' racial adjustment. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7(3),* 217-231.

Alvarez, A. N., & Kimura, E. F. (2001). Asian Americans and racial identity: Dealing with racism and snowballs. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23(3),* 192-206.

Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1989). A minority identity development model. In D. R.Atkinson, G. Morten, & D. W. Sue (Eds.), *Counseling American minorities* (pp. 35-52). Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.

Bernal, M. E. & Knight, G. P. (1993). *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities.* (pp. 31-46). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Buriel, R., & Cardoza, D. (1993). Mexican American ethnic labeling: An intrafamilial and intergenerational analysis. In M. E. Bernal, and G. P. Knight (Ed). *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 197-210). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burlew, K., Neely, D., Johnson, C., Hucks, T.C., Purnell, B., Butler, J., Lovett, M., and Burlew, R. (2000). Drug attitudes, racial identity, and alcohol use among African American adolescents. *Journal of Black Psychology, 26(4),* 402-420.

Casas, J. M. & Pytluk, S. D. (1995). Hispanic identity development: Implications for research and practice. In J. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 155-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Choney, S. K., Berryhill-Paapke, E., and Robbins, R. R. (1995). The acculturation of American Indians: Developing frameworks for research and practice. In J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, and C.M. Alexander (Eds.) G. *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 73-92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chow, E. N. L. (1982). *Acculturation of Asian American professional women.* Washington, DC: NIMH, Department of Health and Human Services.

Cokley, K. O. (2001). Gender differences among African American students in the impact of racial identity on academic psychosocial development. *Journal of College Student Development, 42(5),* 480-487.

Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., Ewell, K, Goyal, T. M., & Chasse, V. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31(9),* 1775-1820.

Crocker, J., Major, G., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology,* (4th ed., pp. 504-553). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Cross, W. E. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Towards a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World, 20,* 13-17.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cross, W. E., Jr., Parham, T. A., and Helms, J. E. (1991). The stages of Black identity development: Nigrescence models. In R. L. Jones (Ed.) *Black psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 319-338). Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Crown, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive.* New York: Wiley.

Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Public Health Service (2001), *Mental health: Culture, race, ethnicity: A supplement to mental health: A report of the Surgeon General* http://www.coloradohealthsite.org/CHNReports/mentalhealth_surgeongenrl.html

Fischer, A. R., & Moradi, B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity: Recent developments and needed directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Ed). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 341-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hargrow, A. M. (2001). Racial identity development: The case of Mr. X, an African American. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling Speical issue: Counseling Racially Diverse Clients, 23(3),* 222-237.

Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12(4),* 53-165.

Helms, J. E. (1986). Expanding racial identity theory to cover counseling process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33(1),* 62-64.

Helms, J. E. (1989). Considering some methodological issues in racial identity counseling research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17(2),* 227-252.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity attitudes: Theory, research, and practice.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and People of Color racial identity models. In J. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G.R. Sodowsky & J.C. Impara (Eds), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 143-192). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.

Helms, J. E. & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process.* Needham Heights, MA; Allyn & Bacon.

Helms, J. E., & Piper, R. (1994). Implications of racial identity theory for vocational psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*, 124-138.

Helms, J. E. & Talleyrand, R. M. (1997). Race is not ethnicity. *American Psychologist, 52(1),* 1246-1247.

Jackson, B. (1975). Black identity development. *MEFORM: Journal of Educational Diversity and Innovation, 2,* 19-25.

Jefferson, S. D., & Caldwell, R. (2002). An exploration of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and the perception of racial bias. *Journal of Black Psychology, 28(2),* 174-192.

Jome, L. M. (2002). Construct validity of the white racial identity attitude scale. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, Akron). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61(2-B).*

Kwan, K. L. K. (2001). Models of racial and ethnic identity development: Delineation of practice implications. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23(3),* 269-277.

Kwan, K. L. K., & Sodowsky, G.R. (1997). Internal and external ethnic identity and their correlates: A study of Chinese-American immigrants. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 25(1),* 51-67.

Kohatsu. E. (1992). The effects of racial identity and acculturation on anxiety, assertiveness, and ascribed identity among Asian American college students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54(2)*.

Kohatsu, E. L., Dulay, M., Lam, C., Concepcion, W., Prez, P. Lopez, C., & Euler, J. (2000). Using racial identity to explore racial mistrust and interracial contact among Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78(3),* 334-342.

Lega, L. I. (1979). Development of a Cuban ethnic identity. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1(3),* 247-261.

Lemon, R. L. & Waehler, C. A. (1996). A test of stability and construct validity of the black racial identity attitude scale, Form B. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 29(2),* 77-85.

Liu, W. M. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3(2),* 107-118.

MacEachern, S. (2003). The concept of race in anthropology. In R. Scupin (Ed). *Race and ethnicity: An anthropological focus on the United States and the world.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Merydith, S. P., Prout, H. T., & Blaha, J. (2003). Social desirability and behavior rating scales: An exploratory study with the child behavior checklist/4-18. *Psychology in the School, 40(2),* 225-235.

Miville, M. L., Koonce, D., Darlington, P., & Whitlock, B. (2000). Exploring the relationships between racial/cultural identity and ego identity among African Americans and Mexican Americans. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 28(4),* 208-224.

Moreland, C. & Leach, M. M. (2001). The relationship between Black racial identity and moral development. *Journal of Black Psychology, 27(3),* 255-271.

Neville, H. A. & Lilly, R. L. (2000). The relationship between racial identity cluster profiles and psychological distress among African American college students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 28(4),* 194-207.

Oboler, S. (1995). *Ethnic labels, Latino lives: Identity and the politics of (re)presentation in the United States*. Regents of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Ocampo, K. A., Bernal, M. E., & Knight, G. P. (1993). Gender, race, and ethnicity: The sequencing of social constancies. In M. E. Bernal, and G. P. Knight (Ed). *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological Nigrescence. *Counseling Psychologist, 17(2),* 187-226.

Parham, T. A. & Helms, J. E. (1981). The influence of Black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences for counselor's race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28(3),* 250-257.

Parham, T. A. & Helms, J. E. (1985a). Relation of racial identity attitudes to self-actualization and affective states of Black students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32(3),* 431-440.

Parham, T. A. & Helms, J. E. (1985b). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem of Black students: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26(2),* 143-147.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 46, *598-609.*

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J.P. Robinson, & P.R. Shaver (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes.* (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Phelps, R. E., Taylor, J. D., & Gerard, P. A. (2001). Cultural mistrust, ethnic identity, racial identity, and self-esteem among ethnically diverse Black university students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79(2),* 209-216.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7(2),* 156-176.

Phinney, J. S. (1993). A three-stage model of ethnic identity development in adolescence. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 61-79). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist, 51,* 918-928.

Pope, R. L. (2000). The relationship between psychosocial development and racial identity of college students of color. *Journal of College Student Development, 41(3),* 302-312.

Pulera, D. (2002). *Visible Differences: Why Race Will Matter to Americans in the Twenty-first Century.* Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd: New York, NY.

Richardson, T. Q. & Helms, J. E. (1994). The relationship of the racial identity attitudes of Black men to perceptions of "parallel" counseling dyads. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73,* 172-177.

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., and Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19(3),* 301-322.

Robinette, R. L. (1991). The relationship between the Marlowe-Crowne Form C and the validity and the validity scales of the MMPI. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47,* 396-397.

Ruiz, A. S. (1990). Ethnic identity: crisis and resolution. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 18(1),* 29-42.

Scupin, R. (2003). *Race and Ethnicity: An Anthropological Focus on the United States and the World.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sodowsky, G. R. Kway, K. L. K., & Pannu, R. (1995). Ethnic identity of Asians in the United States. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds)., *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 123-154). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sue, S. and Sue, D. W. (1971). Chinese-American personality and mental health. *Amerasia Journal, 1,* 36-49.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, S. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice.* (2nd ed). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, S. (1999). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice.* (3rd ed). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, S. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice.* (4th ed). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Suinn, R. M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S. and Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47,* 401-407.

Thomas, A. J. (1999). Racism, racial identity, and racial socialization: A personal reflection. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77(1),* 35-37.

Thomas, C. W. (1971). *Boys no more.* Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press.

Thompson, V. L. S. (1999). Variables affecting racial identity salience among African Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139(6),* 748-761.

Umana-Taylor, A. J., & Fine, M. A. (2001). Methodological implications of grouping Latino adolescents into one collective ethnic group. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23(4),* 347-362.

U.S. Census Bureau. (1992). *Statistical abstract of the United States: The national data book* (112th ed.). Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.

Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E. Jr., Worrell. F. C., and Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2000). The Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Unpublished scale.*

Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E. Jr., Worrell. F. C., and Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2002). Validating the Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49(1),* 71-85.

Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences: Scientific, social and ethical issues. *American Psychologist, 45(12),* 1297-1303.

APPENDIX B Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA-NORMAN CAMPUS

INTRODUCTION: This study is entitled "Construct Validity of the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale." The persons directing this project are Hsiao-wen Lo, M.A. and Denise Beesley, Ph.D. This document defines the terms and conditions for consenting to participate in this study.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY: The purpose of the study is to examine the validity of the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale. This study is important because it will help us better understand the experience of the racial/ethnic minority people in the United States. You will be asked to fill out a survey over the internet. It will take about 25-30 minutes to complete the survey.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There will be no direct benefits to the participants. However, your participation in this project will enhance the understanding of the development of racial identity and provide guidance for mental health providers, educators and policy makers. No risks beyond those experienced in every day life are anticipated.

CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION: Participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled. Furthermore, the participant may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which the participant is otherwise entitled.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Findings will be presented in aggregate form with no identifying information to ensure confidentiality.

CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY: Participants may contact Hsiao-wen Lo at lohs@ou.edu , or Dr. Denise Beesley at denise.beesley-1@ou.edu with questions about the study.

For inquires about rights as a research participant, contact the University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405/325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

PARTICIPANT ASSURANCE: I have read and understand the terms and conditions of this study and I hereby agree to participate in the above-described research study. I understand my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time without penalty.

By clicking on the "I agree" button below, I hereby freely agree to take part in this research project.

Click "I agree" or "I decline."

APPENDIX C Recruitment Letter

Dear Prospective Participant:

I am a graduate student in counseling psychology at the University of Oklahoma. Under the direction of Denise Beesley, assistant professor of educational psychology at the University of Oklahoma, I am working on my doctoral dissertation, examining the validity of an instrument measuring racial/cultural identity called the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale.

If you are over 18 years of age and identify yourself as African/African American, Asian/Asian American, Hispanic/Hispanic American, or Native American, you are invited to participate in a research study for my dissertation, the goal of which is to create a better understanding of the experience of racial/ethnic minorities in the United States.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire on the Web that will take about 25 minutes to complete. The informed consent form and the survey can be found at the following link:

http://elearning.ou.edu/hsiao

Your participation is voluntary and confidential. There is no foreseeable risk associated with your involvement in this project. There will be no penalty should you decide not to participate in this study. You may withdraw at any time.

If you would like more information concerning this study, please feel free to contact me at (734) 764-8312 or lohs@ou.edu or my adviser, Denise Beesley, at (405) 325-0984 or denise.beesley-1@ou.edu. Additionally, you may contact the University of Oklahoma Norman campus Institutional Review Board at (405) 325-8110 with questions about your rights as a research participant.

Thank you for considering participation in this project.

Sincerely,

Hsiao-wen Lo, M.A.
Principal Investigator
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Oklahoma
820 Van Vleet Oval
Norman, OK 73019

Denise Beesley, Ph.D.
Advisor/Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Oklahoma
820 Van Vleet Oval
Norman, OK 73019

APPENDIX D Demographics Sheet

1. My age is:
   ___ 18-24 years
   ___ 25-34 years
   ___ 35-44 years
   ___ 45-54 years
   ___ 55-59 years
   ___ 60 years and over

2. My gender identification is: Male ___ Female ___

3. My racial identification is:
   ___ Black ___ Asian/Pacific Islander
   ___ Native American or Alaska Native
   ___ Other (Specify ____)

4. The ethnic group I **most** identify with is: (Check one of the groups listed below)
   ___ African-American ___ Asian-American ___ Hispanic American
   ___ Native American ___ Other (specify_____)

5. I am mono-lingual _____ Bi-lingual _____ Multi-lingual _____

6. I prefer speaking English _____ my native language _____

7. My highest level of education is:
   ___ Less than 9th grade

   ___ 9th grade to 12th grade, no diploma
   ___ High School graduate (includes equivalency)
   ___ Some college, no degree
   ___ Associate degree
   ___ Bachelor's degree
   ___ Graduate or professional degree

8. My total family income before taxes in 2002 is:

___ Less than $10,000 ___ $10,000-$14,999 ___ $15,000-$24,999

___ $25,000-$34,999 ___ $35,000-$49,999 ___ $50,000-$74,999

___ $75,000 to $99,999 ___ $100,000 or more

9. I have lived in the United States for _____ years
10. The first generation of my family to come to the U.S. was: (check one)

___ myself (non-U.S.-born)

___ parents (1st generation U.S.-born)

___ parents (1st generation non-U.S.-born)

___ grandparents (2nd generation U.S. –born)

___ great-grandparents (3rd generation U.S. –born)

___ before great-grandparents (4th or more generation U.S.-born)

11. I live in an urban ____ suburban _____ rural ____ area.

12. In my neighborhood, the percentage of racial/ethnic minority population is:
0%-20% 21%-40% 41%-60% 61%-80% 81%-100%

13. Of all my friends, the percentage of racial/ethnic minority population is:
0%-20% 21%-40% 41%-60% 61%-80% 81%-100%

14. At my work setting, the percentage of racial/ethnic minority population is:
0%-20% 21%-40% 41%-60% 61%-80% 81%-100% not working

15. At my school setting, the percentage of racial/ethnic minority population is (was):
0%-20% 21%-40% 41%-60% 61%-80% 81%-100%

APPENDIX E People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to measure people's social and political attitudes concerning race and ethnicity. Since different people have different opinions, there are no right or wrong answers. Use the scale below to respond to each statement according to the way you see things. Be as honest as you can. Beside each item number, circle the number that best describes how **you** feel.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree

1.	In general, I believe that Anglo-Americans (Whites) are superior to other racial groups.	1 2 3 4 5
2.	I feel more comfortable being around Anglo-Americans (Whites) than I do being around people of my own race.	1 2 3 4 5
3.	In general, people of my race have not contributed very much to American society.	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Sometimes, I am embarrassed to be the race I am.	1 2 3 4 5
5.	I would have accomplished more in life if I had been born an Anglo-American (White).	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Anglo-Americans (Whites) are more attractive than people of my race.	1 2 3 4 5
7.	People of my race should learn to think and act like Anglo-Americans (Whites).	1 2 3 4 5
8.	I limit myself to White activities.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	I think racial minorities blame Anglo-Americans (Whites) too much for their problems.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	I feel unable to involve myself in Anglo-Americans' (Whites') experiences, and am increasing my involvement in experiences involving people of my race.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	When I think about how Anglo-Americans (Whites)have treated people of my race, I feel an overwhelming anger.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	I want to know more about my culture.	1 2 3 4 5
13.	I limit myself to activities involving people of my own race.	1 2 3 4 5
14.	Most Anglo-Americans (Whites) are untrustworthy.	1 2 3 4 5
15.	American society would be better off if it were based on the cultural values of my people.	1 2 3 4 5
16.	I am determined to find my cultural identity.	1 2 3 4 5
17.	Most Anglo-Americans (Whites) are insensitive.	1 2 3 4 5
18.	I reject all Anglo-Americans (Whites) values.	1 2 3 4 5
19.	My most important goal in life is to fight the oppression of my people.	1 2 3 4 5
20.	I believe that being from my cultural background has caused me to have many strengths.	1 2 3 4 5
21.	I am comfortable where I am.	1 2 3 4 5

22.	People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.	1 2 3 4 5
23.	I think people of my culture and the White culture differ from each other in some ways, but neither group is superior.	1 2 3 4 5
24.	My cultural background is a source of pride to me.	1 2 3 4 5
25.	People of my culture and White culture have much to learn from each other.	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Anglo-Americans (Whites) have some customs that I enjoy.	1 2 3 4 5
27.	I enjoy being around people regardless of their race.	1 2 3 4 5
28.	Every racial group has some good people and some bad people.	1 2 3 4 5
29.	Minorities should not blame Anglo-Americans (Whites) for all of their social problems.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	I do not understand why Anglo-Americans (Whites) treat minorities as they do.	1 2 3 4 5
31.	I am embarrassed about some of the things I feel about my people.	1 2 3 4 5
32.	I'm not sure where I really belong.	1 2 3 4 5
33.	I have begun to question my beliefs.	1 2 3 4 5
34.	Maybe I can learn something from people of my race.	1 2 3 4 5
35.	Anglo-American (White) people can teach me more about surviving in this world than people of my own race can, but people of my race can teach me more about being human.	1 2 3 4 5
36.	I don't know whether being the race I am is an asset or a deficit.	1 2 3 4 5
37.	Sometimes I think Anglo-Americans (Whites) are superior and sometimes I think they're inferior to people of my race.	1 2 3 4 5
38.	Sometimes I am proud of the racial group to which I belong and sometimes I am ashamed of it.	1 2 3 4 5
39.	Thinking about my values and beliefs takes up a lot of my time.	1 2 3 4 5
40.	I'm not sure how I feel about myself.	1 2 3 4 5
41.	White people are difficult to understand.	1 2 3 4 5
42.	I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who are from my culture.	1 2 3 4 5
43.	I feel anxious about some of the things I feel about people of my race.	1 2 3 4 5
44.	When someone of my race does something embarrassing in public, I feel embarrassed.	1 2 3 4 5
45.	When both White people and people of my race are present in a social situation, I prefer to be with my own racial group.	1 2 3 4 5
46.	My values and believes match those of Anglo-Americans (Whites) more than they do people of my race.	1 2 3 4 5
47.	The way Anglo-Americans (Whites) treat people of my race makes me angry.	1 2 3 4 5
48.	I only follow the traditions and customs of people of my racial group.	1 2 3 4 5
49.	When people of my race act like Anglo-Americans (Whites) I feel angry.	1 2 3 4 5
50.	I am comfortable being the race I am.	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX F Perceived Ethnicity Discrimination Questionnaire

Please think back ***over the past three months*** and then, unless instructed otherwise, for each item below indicate how often the event occurred using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
never			sometimes			very often

We would like to know about acts of discrimination that have been directed against or toward you personally during the past two months. Please respond to the following questions using the 7-point scale above.

1. ___ How often have you been subjected to offensive ethnic comments aimed directly at you, spoken either in your presence or behind your back?
2. ___ How often have you been exposed to offensive comments about your ethnic group (e.g. stereotypic statements, offensive jokes), spoken either in your presence or behind your back?
3. ___ How often have you been subjected to ethnic name calling (e.g. "wop", "nigger")?
4. ___ How often have others avoided physical contact with you because of your ethnicity?
5. ___ How often have others avoided social contact with you because of your ethnicity?
6. ___ How often have others outside of your ethnic group made you feel as though you don't fit in because of your dress, speech, or other characteristics related to your ethnicity?
7. ___ How often have you been denied access to a public facility or organization because of your ethnicity?
8. ___ How often have you felt that certain places were off limits or that barriers were erected to keep you out of certain places because of your ethnicity?
9. ___ How often have you received unfair treatment from school officials because of your ethnicity?
10. ___ How often have you received unfair treatment from service people (e.g., waiters, bank tellers, security guards) because of your ethnicity?
11. ___ How often have you received unfair treatment from your superiors at a job (e.g. boss, supervisor) because of your ethnicity?
12. ___ How often have others had low expectations of you because of your ethnicity?
13. ___ How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be unintelligent?
14. ___ How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be dishonest?
15. ___ How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be violent or dangerous?

16. ___ How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be dirty?
17. ___ How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be lazy?
18. ___ How often have others threatened to hurt you because of your ethnicity?
19. ___ How often have others threatened to damage your property because of your ethnicity?
20. ___ How often have others physically hurt you or intended to physically hurt you because of your ethnicity?
21. ___ How often have others damaged your property because of your ethnicity?
22. ___ How often have you been subjected to nonverbal harassment because of your ethnicity (e.g. being framed/set up, being given "the finger")?

APPENDIX G Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale

Often times, members of an ethnic group are concerned that their behaviors or the things they do appear to confirm stereotypes about their ethnic group. Think back ***over the past three months*** and tell us how often you have been concerned about appearing to confirm a stereotype about your ethnic group. Select a response from the choices below.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never			Sometimes			Always

1. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *eating certain foods* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
2. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *talking a certain way* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
3. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *dressing a certain way* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
4. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *playing certain sports* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
5. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *attending or participating in certain social activities* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
6. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *taking your studies too seriously* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
7. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *owning certain things* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
8. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *shopping in certain stores or eating at certain restaurants* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
9. ___ How often have you been concerned that *the way you look* (your physical appearance) might appear to confirm a stereotype about your ethnic group?
10. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *doing certain household tasks* you might appear to be confirming a stereotype about your ethnic group?
11. ___ How often have you been concerned that by *revealing your socioeconomic status* you might appear to confirm a stereotype about your ethnic group?

APPENDIX H Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire

We are all members of different (various) social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to *gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity,* and *socioeconomic class.* We would like you to consider your membership in your ETHNIC GROUP and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about your ETHNIC GROUP and your membership in it. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. ___ I often regret that I belong to the ethnic group that I do.
2. ___ Overall, my ethnic group is viewed positively by others.
3. ___ Overall, my ethnic group has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
4. ___ Most people consider my ethnic group to be more effective than other ethnic groups.
5. ___ The ethnic group that I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.
6. ___ Overall, I often feel that being a member of my ethnic group is not beneficial.
7. ___ In general, others respect my ethnic group.
8. ___ The ethnic group that I belong to is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.
9. ___ I feel good about my ethnic group.
10. ___ In general, others think that my ethnic group is unworthy.
11. ___ In general, belonging to my ethnic group is an important part of my self-image.
12. ___ In general, I'm glad to be a member of my ethnic group.

APPENDIX I Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you. Please click on either T or F (T = True, F = False).

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability
11. I like to gossip at times
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
17. I always try to practice what I preach.
18. I don't' find it particularly difficult to get along with loudmouthed, obnoxious people
19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
20. When I don't' know something, I don't at all mind admitting it.
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.