ABSTRACT

STEREOTYPE THREAT AND RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDES

by Regina McCormick

This study expanded Massey & Fischer’s (2001) conceptualization of stereotype threat to determine why some African-American college students internalize stereotypes, whereas others externalize stereotypes and to examine the relationship between racial identity attitudes and their tendency either to internalize or externalize stereotypes. This study also examined in-group identity and social distance to whites, as additional factors that may be related to internalization and externalization of stereotypes and racial identity attitudes. A sample of 100 African-American college students, attending a predominantly white institution, were administered the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshman (NLSF) and Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS-B). African-American college students internalized stereotypes more than externalized stereotypes, and adopted more preencounter attitudes compared to other racial identity attitudes. Correlation analyses suggested that African-American college students’ immersion-emersion attitudes were negatively related to internalization of stereotypes, and no significant relationships were found between racial identity attitudes and externalization. In-group identity and social distance to whites yielded some significant relationships with racial identity attitudes, but no relationships with internalization and externalization of stereotypes.
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Stereotype Threat and Racial Identity Attitudes

“The lion’s story will never be told as long as the hunter is telling the story.”

African Proverb (Stangor & Swim, 1998)

This African proverb depicts the power differential among various groups in American society today. It is not uncommon for oppressed and stigmatized groups’ stories to be ignored. However, the oppressors’ accounts take precedence with minimal, or no consideration for the thoughts, emotions, and the lives of the oppressed. This study will focus on the experiences of the oppressed. African-American college students’ thoughts and experiences as these pertain to academic achievement, and their racial identity attitudes will be explored against the background of being negatively stereotyped in contemporary American society.

College is a stressful experience for most students in the United States. Generally, it is a time when young adults struggle with newfound freedom, negotiate developmental tasks, focus on interpersonal relationships and academic concerns (Beard, Elmore, & Lange, 1982). However, African-American students at predominantly white universities experience more stress than their white counterparts owing to intrapsychic factors such as emotions, perceptions, aspirations, and expectations, and interpsychic factors such as institutional climate and faculty and student attitudes (Kemp, 1990; Fleming, 1984; and Nettles, 1988). Unfortunately, some of these factors may have a profound impact on the academic achievement of African-American college students.

African-Americans and Higher Education

The advent of the Civil Right Movement marked the beginning of desegregation in education. With selective colleges and universities preparing to recruit minorities through affirmative action, there was an expectation that African-American college students would have the opportunities to learn and perform at educational levels equal to those of white college students. However, differences in academic achievement between African-American and White students have been noted consistently. Research indicates that though African-American and Caucasian students may enter college with comparable skills, African-American students earn
lower grades, are less likely to graduate, or take longer to graduate compared to their white counterparts (Kemp, 1990). Despite special programs (e.g., academic assistance programs and mentoring programs), at some predominantly white institutions, a high percentage of African-American students still experience academic underachievement. Recently, a report from the U.S. Department of Education (2000) stated that out of one million and one hundred and eighty four thousand bachelors degrees conferred during the 1997-1998 academic year, only 8 % were awarded to African-American students, while 80% were awarded to White students. Some researchers posit that this disturbing difference may be reflective of ongoing socioeconomic disadvantages, lack of preparation, and discrimination (Steele, 1995). Steele attributes this difference in academic performance to “stereotype threat,” a phenomenon defined as a social-psychological predicament that arises when well-known negative stereotypes exist about members of a stigmatized group.

*Stereotype Threat and Intellectual Underperformance*

“Stereotype threat” occurs when negative stereotypes exist, and members of stigmatized groups are cautious not to behave in ways or demonstrate any features that will confirm the negative stereotype about their group. Steele argues that even when members of a stigmatized group disbelieve the negative stereotypes, they still recognize that these negative stereotypes exist about them. This recognition is threatening if the individual identifies with the domain that is relevant to the stereotype. If an individual is not identified with the domain of the stereotype, the stereotype is less threatening. Steele further argues that stereotype threat is not cued by internalized anxiety or expectancy and usually affects individuals in a stereotyped group who are confident about their abilities and perceive good prospects for themselves in the domain.

Steele conducted several studies with African-American and Caucasian college students at Stanford University, a prestigious, predominantly white institution. He hypothesized that any test measuring intellectual ability may activate stereotype threat and influence test performance of African-American students. African-American and Caucasian students were randomly assigned to three experimental conditions. For the diagnostic condition, participants encountered a difficult test measuring intellectual ability (activating the stereotypical notions about African-American intellectual ability and the threat that they might be viewed stereotypically). In the non-diagnostic condition, participants encountered a test described as a laboratory problem
solving task unrelated to ability (de-activating stereotypical notions about African-Americans’ intellectual ability and the threat that they might be viewed stereotypically). In the non-diagnostic challenge condition, participants encountered a test described as a challenge in an effort to keep them motivated. African-American students underperformed compared to their Caucasian counterparts in both the diagnostic and non-diagnostic challenge conditions. In the non-diagnostic condition, there was no difference in performance between African-American and Caucasian participants. In addition, no relationships were observed between self-report measures of academic competence, personal worth, and anxiety, and African-American students’ underperformance.

Conceptualization of Stereotype Threat in the Real World

In a related study, Massey & Fischer (2001) conducted a study across 28 predominantly White institutions measuring stereotype threat. They suggested that the natural variations in one’s psychological state are best determined using a survey approach. Their study was designed to test the theory of stereotype threat and provided a conceptualization of how stereotype threat operates in the real world, outside of a laboratory setting. Also, it was designed to identify some of African-American college students’ thoughts and experiences that may be involved in stereotype threat.

According to Massey & Fischer (2001), stereotype threat derives from the existence of societal stereotypes of various racial and ethnic groups. For example, the well known societal stereotype about African-Americans is that they are intellectually inferior to whites. They believe that the extent to which African-Americans have absorbed negative stereotypes about their intellectual abilities is dependent on their position in society (Massey & Fischer, 2001). That is, some African-Americans who have a weak racial identity, a weak in-group identity, and have frequent contact with whites are more susceptible to the adoption of negative stereotypes than are other African-Americans. These researchers further theorize that members of stigmatized groups manifest stereotypical notions through processes of externalization and internalization.

Externalization and Internalization of Stereotypes

Although internalization and externalization of stereotypes are important areas of study, few research studies have investigated these processes, particularly among African-Americans. Historically, African-Americans have contended with negative images and beliefs about them.
Therefore, they may internalize negative stereotypes wholly, or partly and incorporate them into their social cognition (Fiske & Taylor, 1991).

Clark & Clark’s (1947) study on racial identification and preference in Negro children demonstrated that African-American children internalize stereotypes of inferiority/self-hatred. The results suggest that the majority of African-American children identified their preference for White dolls over Black dolls, indicating a decreased preference for dolls that were similar to themselves. Taylor & Zhang (1990) examined cultural identity in maritally distressed and nondistressed African-American couples. They found that cultural identity is more negative/less valued in maritally distressed couples, and that these couples are more likely to internalize negative stereotypes that impact marital satisfaction than nondistressed couples. According to the authors, some African-Americans affirm racist stereotypes because of the pervasiveness of the stereotype, while others internalize stereotypes for personal or political reasons. In other words, an individual may be motivated to identify with white culture to elevate his or her self-esteem, or share in the distribution of power. It is therefore difficult to determine if some African-Americans internalize stereotypes because of feelings of inadequacy, or because of a motivation to assume a particular position within the majority culture.

In another study, Taylor (1990) investigated the relationship between internalized racism and marital satisfaction among African-American couples. He found that husbands and wives who reported more internalized racism also tended to report less marital satisfaction. This study also established a tendency for African-American couples to internalize stereotypes that impact on marital satisfaction.

In a recent study, Kelly & Floyd (2001) investigated the relationship between negative racial stereotypes, afrocentricity, dyadic trust and adjustment in African-American couple relationships. They concluded that husbands’ afrocentricity and high levels of internalized negative stereotypes were associated with decreased perceptions of partner dependability. Therefore, despite the fact that high afrocentricity is related to high self-esteem, the behavior of some highly afrocentric individuals would suggest internalization of negative views about African Americans. As a result, one cannot assume that a stigmatized member/group with high self-esteem will not have a tendency to internalize negative stereotypes. Some African-Americans recognize a consensual group stereotype that they do not believe, but will react to the negative stereotype. For example, results of Steele’s (1995) study revealed that during stereotype
threat, African-American college students who had high self esteem/confidence in their abilities recognized and disbelieved negative stereotypes about African-Americans, but they disidentified with the academic domain. In order to explain the inconsistency in self-concept and better understand the nature of race relations from the perspective of minority group members, Kelly & Floyd (2001) suggest focusing not only on issues of self-concept or self-esteem, but on the concept of racial group identity.

Cokley (2002) describes the process of African-Americans internalizing White stereotypes about African-Americans as internalized racialism. The term is often used interchangeably with internalized racism. Internalized racialism is identifying with the positive and negative stereotypes about one’s ethnic group that is based on the belief that racial categories are immutable (Cokley, 2002). Internalization of racism is the internalization of negative stereotypes about one’s group. Cokley (2002) investigated the relationship between racial identity and internalized racialism. He found that particular racial identity attitudes (i.e., preencounter, immersion-emersion, internalization) were related to stereotypical notions of African-Americans. In other words, some African-Americans have a tendency to internalize negative stereotypes depending upon their racial identity. According to Taylor (1990), African-Americans are at a greater risk of internalization of stereotypes when they feel estranged from their cultural origin. As a result, they may succumb to the negative societal stereotypes and begin to think of themselves as the majority culture. Cultural identity therefore plays an important role in determining if stigmatized groups internalize stereotypes or are less susceptible to internalized stereotypes. Members who do not have a tendency to internalize stereotypes may be more inclined to externalize stereotypes.

Crocker & Major (1989) proposed that (a) members of stigmatized groups attribute the negative feedback they receive to prejudice against their group and (b) stigmatized groups compare negative outcomes with their in-group rather than the out-group in an effort to protect their self-esteem. In other words, some members of stigmatized groups have a tendency to choose external causes to protect their self-esteem when they encounter a negative event. For example, if a woman is denied a job position or undergoes some negative evaluation, she may be uncertain as to whether she was denied the position because she was unqualified (personal inadequacies), or because the interviewer was sexist (Crocker& Major, 1989). The ambiguity of the cause may influence stigmatized groups’ attributions of negative events to external causes in
order to protect their self-esteem. However, some stigmatized groups may attribute negative and/or ambiguous events to internal causes (e.g., lack of ability) that lower self-esteem (Crocker & Major, 1989). In Jensen, White, & Galliher’s (1982) study of minority adolescents and self-esteem, they found that students who were insulted because of their physical characteristics, speech and intellectual ability, had lower self-esteem (internalization of stereotypes) than students who were insulted because of their race, nationality, or residence (externalization of stereotypes).

Furthermore, Crocker & Major (1989) posit that stigmatized individuals who have high self-esteem are more inclined to attribute negative outcomes to prejudice against their group. For example, African-American students who were aware of being evaluated by a white evaluator attributed negative outcomes to prejudice against their group and characterized themselves as having high self-esteem. On the other hand, African-American students who were unaware that they were being evaluated by a white evaluator were less inclined to attribute negative outcomes to prejudice against their group and characterized themselves as having low self esteem.

In contrast to Crocker & Major’s (1989) findings that stigmatized groups may attribute negative outcomes to prejudice to protect their self-esteem, some researchers suggest that making attributions to prejudice has negative effects on one’s personal and collective well-being. Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey (1999) examined the effects of making stable attributions to prejudice on the well-being of African-Americans. They found that making a stable attribution of prejudice across various situations had harmful effects on personal well-being, an increase in hostility toward whites, but an indirect and positive effect on minority group identification (collective well-being). In other words, one can experience the negative effects of being a victim of discrimination, but negative effects are alleviated through group identification. Therefore, one may wonder if an attribution to prejudice is only external. According to Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey (1999), “The presence of an external cause (the other’s prejudice) does not lead the stigmatized individual to discount all internal causes. Both the stigmatized person’s group membership (an internal cause) and the other’s prejudice are necessary pre-conditions for discrimination to occur, although neither is sufficient.” (p.144). Moreover, the authors suspect that when attributions are plausible but unstable, stigmatized individuals protect their self-esteem by attributing negative outcomes to prejudice. When attributions are stable, stigmatized
individuals experience negative effects that are alleviated through group identification. The effects of attributing negative outcomes to prejudice may be positive and/or negative.

Whether stigmatized groups protect their self-esteem by attributing prejudice to the outgroup by making ingroup comparisons, or are unable to attribute prejudice to an outgroup, the construction or maintenance of a stable and coherent identity may be a difficult and an uncertain process for the individual with a stigmatizing condition (Jones, Farina, Hastorf, Miller, & Scott, 1984). Jones et al. (1984) suggest self-concept will reflect the negativity produced by a stigma depending on the nature of the stigma and on the reactions of others in the social environment.

Massey & Fischer (2001) indicated that the process of internalization of stereotypes can be conscious or unconscious. However, they focus on the explicit internalization of stereotypes that is considered a conscious process. Explicit internalization of stereotypes is the degree to which an individual consciously subscribes to negative beliefs about their group. Over time this leads to disidentification with the academic domain. This is manifested in minimized academic effort and lowered levels of academic achievement.

Externalization of stereotypes is the extent to which individuals of a stigmatized group expect other individuals outside their racial/ethnic group to act on the basis of negative stereotypes when they are being evaluated. For example, it is not illogical to assume that African Americans may expect to be evaluated according to a negative stereotype when they perform, given the pervasiveness of negative stereotypes about African-Americans in American society (Massey & Fischer, 2001). If members of stigmatized group externalize stereotypes over time, it leads to a performance burden, an increased anxiety that undermines performance. Members of the stigmatized group may feel psychological pressures to perform adequately in order that they not only let down themselves, but their entire race. Internalization and externalization of stereotypes are both psychological mechanisms that have been hypothesized to undermine academic performance. In an attempt to determine the background characteristics that predict internalization and externalization of stereotypes, Massey & Fischer (2001) used a structural model linking the following variables: demographic characteristics (DEM), socioeconomic indicators (SES), prior interracial experience (REX), and racial-ethnic identity (REI) that was based upon skin color, social distance to whites, and ingroup identity. Skin color is defined in terms of a lighter or darker complexion. Social distance to whites is the degree to which an individual perceive closeness to different target groups based upon race, gender, and class.
Ingroup identity is the degree to which an individual identifies and supports other ingroup members in various social and political areas and the impact their ingroup affiliation has on their lives. It is based upon Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory that suggests that a person’s identity is formed and shaped by a number of experiences (i.e., successes, failures, challenges, critical events, and relationships). Part of the identity that is created and maintained through these experiences is an identity associated with social categories and human groups. A natural consequence of social categories is that one distinguishes between those within the group that contains the self, or one’s in-group, and others labeled as the out-group. Our understanding of social categories of people has direct implications for how we see ourselves in relation to others (Tajfel, 1978). Massey & Fischer (2001) also attempt to determine whether internalization (INT) and externalization (EXT) of stereotypes, demographic characteristics (DEM), socioeconomic indicators (SES), and degree of academic preparation (DAP) predict disidentification-academic effort (AEF) and psychological performance burden (PPB). The researchers also attempt to determine the extent to which the afore-mentioned variables predict academic performance (GPA) with the following models:

\[ \text{AEF} = f(-\text{INT, DEM, SES, DAP}) \]
\[ \text{PPB} = f(+\text{EXT, DEM, SES, DAP}) \]
\[ \text{GPA} = f(+\text{AEP, - PPB, DEM, SES, DAP}) \]

After surveying 4,573 college students (998 white, 959 Asian, 916 Latino, and 1,051 African-American), Massey & Fischer (2001) concluded that African-Americans and Latinos who have a weak racial/ethnic identity have a tendency to internalize stereotypes, leading to disidentification and a significant reduction in academic effort and hence, academic underachievement. African-Americans who had a strong ingroup identity and a perceived high distance from whites externalized stereotypes more than Latinos, leading them to higher performance burden and academic underachievement. The presence of minority faculty in the classroom lowered performance burden experienced by minorities. If minority faculty were scarce or underrepresented, performance burden inhibited academic performance. Overall, Massey & Fischer’s (2001) findings indicate that by virtue of their experiences in society, African-American and Latino students either internalize or externalize negative stereotypes about their intellectual abilities. This, in turn, results in lowered academic achievement. The results of Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study not only support Steele’s findings, but also reveal some of the specific cognitions that
minority students experience in a stereotype threat situation. Although the researchers identified
differences in the internalization and externalization of stereotypes between African-American and
Latino college students and made reference to racial/ethnic identity, they neglected to investigate if
there is potential a relationship between the constructs. Stigmatized groups may respond to
discrimination, racial prejudice, and negative stereotypes based upon their own racial identity
attitudes. According to Baldwin (1987), racial identity is extremely important in accurately
assessing and understanding African-American behavior and psychological functioning in general.
There are several models of racial identity, but Cross’s (1971) model of Racial Identity will be
focused on in this paper.

Racial Identity

“Achieving identity congruence in the face of racist and oppressive elements represents a
significant challenge for most African-Americans (White & Parham, 1990, p. 53).”

According to Jones (1991), a substantial amount of research on racial identity assumes that
Black identity is strongly related to personal self-esteem, group self-concept, and group identity.
However, there is no consensus about the definition of Black identity. African-Americans’ sense of
identity is usually reflective of adaptation to pervasive racism and negative stereotyping in the
larger society. As a result, there is a continual struggle for African-Americans to positively view
themselves and others in their ingroup. Therefore, it is important that African-Americans achieve a
personal identity (self-knowledge) that helps to dictate behaviors that will hopefully support,
sustain, and enhance African-Americans individually or/and collectively. It is also through
personal identity that one may be less susceptible to negative social and environmental conditions
that are internalized and become psychological maladaptation or dysfunction (Nobles, 1986). Cross
(1971, 1978, 1991) suggests that there are four stages that African-Americans go through to
achieve racial identity. His model of racial identity is one of the most influential (Yanico,
Swanson, & Tokar, 1994).

Cross’s model of Racial Identity outlines the following four “stages” of Nigrescence (or
becoming Black): Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization that an
individual goes through in developing his or her Black racial identity. The stages also represent an
individual’s ability to understand, adapt and perhaps change the dominant society’s definition of
the African-American. Each stage of racial consciousness is considered to represent a different set
of complex attitudes, cognitions, feelings, behaviors, and race-related world views. Individuals
may not always experience these stages in a linear progression, nor do the stages always occur independently. Unfortunately, research has not detailed some of these variations. However, research has documented that African-Americans in their college years (late adolescence/early adulthood) develop a Black racial identity as described by the stages in Cross’ model (Parham & Helms, 1985; Parham & Helms, 1981).

The first stage, Preencounter, is characterized by an adoption of Euro-centric world views and behaviors, and a denigration of Black culture and attitudes. It is a steady state that is characterized by attempts to “escape” being Black or African-American.

In the second stage, an individual’s worldview is challenged by a critical event or encounter that causes him or her to question their group identity and to be receptive to a new interpretation of their identity. In the process of trying to validate new perceptions, the individual eventually absorbs enough information and social support to determine that the old identity is inappropriate and that there is the need for a new black identity (Jones, 1991). In the search for a new black identity, the individual goes through the third stage, Immersion-Emersion, characterized by a psychological withdrawal and immersion into Black experiences. “Racial pride” is idealized and “Whiteness” is denigrated. That is, an individual is focused on developing a different understanding of his/her race. In other words, the individual has evolved from an old identity to a new one and recognizes that any attitudes and behavior equated with the old identity are generally not well received by the larger society.

The fourth stage, Internalization, is characterized by the development of a stable sense of self and a secure Black identity that transcends a defensive idealization associated with the Immersion-Emersion stage. At this stage, racial identity conflicts have been resolved while negative attitudes toward other groups have been replaced by an overall concern for humanity. That is, anti-white feelings have declined and friendship with Whites fostered. Also, individuals recognize that racism is pervasive and actively engage in the development of coping strategies to protect themselves against the negative impact of racism, stereotypes, and discrimination. At the same time, these individuals develop a sense of personal efficacy that helps to deflect negative outcomes and prejudicial acts from their self-concept (Murrell, 1998). Cross’s four stage model of racial identity development is often operationalized by the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) (Parham & Helms, 1981; Helms, 1990).
Overall, Cross’s model of racial identity development provides an understanding of how African-Americans recognize, comprehend, interpret, and internalize and externalize race-related situations. Unfortunately, there is only one empirical study that has investigated the relationship between the constructs of racial identity and the impact of racism among African-Americans. Cokley (2002) is the first researcher to examine the relationship between racial identity and internalized racialism among African-American college students at a historically Black college. Within the framework of Cross’ revised racial identity model, Cokley’s (2002) study indicated that immersion-emersion anti-white attitudes and pre-encounter attitudes of miseducation and self-hatred were positively related to beliefs in African-American mental and genetic deficiencies and sexual prowess. Also, internalization of Afrocentric attitudes was positively related to beliefs that African-Americans had natural abilities, while pre-encounter assimilation attitudes were negatively related.

Cokley’s (2002) research illustrates the need to understand how African-American college students construct their racial identities. Internalized racism was a useful construct that provided a potential explanation of why some students would internalize stereotypes in light of their racial identity. However, there was no potential explanation of the reasons why some students would externalize stereotypes in light of their racial identity. This leaves one to wonder about the various attributions African-American college students make when faced with interpersonally and academically stressful situations that involve racial stimuli in various environments.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

African-American students at predominantly white institutions experience more stress and academic underperformance compared to their white counterparts. It is not illogical to assume that African-American students contend with stress and negative stereotypes about their intellectual ability. This study was to expand Massey & Fischer’s (2001) conceptualization of stereotype threat and examine the relationship between African-American college students’ racial identity attitudes and their tendency either to internalize or externalize stereotypes. Attitudes were determined by performance on the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale – Form B (RIAS-B), and the externalization and internalization of stereotypes, social distance to whites, and in-group identity were determined in terms of performance on the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshman (NLSF).
Hypotheses

The hypotheses in the study were:

Hypothesis 1: Pre-encounter attitudes and Internalization/externalization of stereotypes:
It was predicted that African-American students who have pre-encounter attitudes would be more likely to internalize, rather than externalize stereotypes. This is based on an underlying assumption that pre-encounter African-American students evaluate themselves in terms of the norms and values of the dominant culture, and they are more inclined to view themselves and their entire race in accordance with negative societal stereotypes.

Hypothesis 2: Encounter and Internalization/externalization of stereotypes:
It was predicted that African-American students who have encounter attitudes would be more likely to externalize, rather than internalize stereotypes.

Hypothesis 3: Immersion-emersion attitudes and Internalization/externalization of stereotypes:
It was predicted that African-American students who have immersion-emersion attitudes would both externalize and internalize stereotypes. After experiencing an encounter or a critical event that prompts re-examination of racial identity, immersion-emersion individuals become more sensitive to being treated or viewed through negative stereotypical lenses by dominant society. But, Immersion-emersion African-Americans may also become more vulnerable to believing societal stereotypes about themselves as an ethnic group because of the search for a new identity that is often characterized by uncertainty.

Hypothesis 4: Internalization vs. Internalization/externalization of stereotypes:
It was predicted that African-American students who have internalization attitudes would neither internalize nor externalize stereotypes.

Hypothesis 5: Pre-encounter – Social distance to whites and In-group identity:
African-American students who have a racial attitude of pre-encounter would have a low social distance to whites and a weak in-group identity. Pre-encounter is characteristic of individuals who have a strong affiliation with white culture and do not evaluate themselves in terms of perceptions/stereotypical notions held by the dominant society.

Hypothesis 6: Encounter - Social distance to whites and In-group identity:
It was predicted that African-American students who have encounter attitudes would have a high social distance to whites and a weak in-group identity. Encounter describes individuals who
have experienced a critical event that has resulted in feelings of ambivalence and confusion where their self-definition and the dominant culture are concerned.

Hypothesis 7: Immersion-Emersion - Social distance to whites and In-group identity: It was predicted that African-American students who have immersion-emersion attitudes would have a high social distance to whites and a strong in-group identity, given the strong affinity toward African-American culture and the converse for the dominant culture. Immersion-emersion is characteristic of individuals who are highly identified with African-American culture and have an attitude of indifference toward the dominant culture.

Hypothesis 8: Internalization - Social distance to whites and In-group identity: It was predicted that African-American students who have internalization attitudes would have a low social distance to whites and a strong in-group identity because they recognize the benefit and importance of a multi-ethnic co-existence. Internalization characterizes individuals have a stable sense of their Black identity and appreciation for all humanity. As a result, they are able to resist forms of oppression and accept individual differences.
Table 1

*Racial Identity Attitude Scales (RIAS) and Internalization/Externalization of Stereotypes (I-E)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Stereotypes</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-encounter</td>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>African-American students with pre-encounter attitudes would be more likely to internalize rather than externalize stereotypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>Externalization</td>
<td>African-American students with encounter attitudes would be more likely to externalize, rather than internalize stereotypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
<td>Internal/external</td>
<td>African-American students with immersion-emersion attitudes would externalize and internalize stereotypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>No internal/external</td>
<td>African-American students with internalization attitudes would neither internalize, or externalize stereotypes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Racial Identity Attitude Scales and Social distance to Whites and In-group Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Social distance to whites</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-encounter</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>African-American students who have a racial attitude of pre-encounter would have a low social distance to whites and a weak in-group identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>African-American students who have a racial attitude of encounter would have a high social distance to whites and a weak in-group identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>African-American students who have a racial attitude of Immersion-emersion would have a high social distance to whites and a strong in-group identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>African-American students who have a racial attitude of internalization would have a low social distance to whites and a strong in-group identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* A strong in-group identity indicates a higher level of attachment and commitment to one's racial or cultural group.
Method

Participants

Participants were 100 African-American sophomores and juniors at Miami University. In a recent investigation, it was found that stereotype threat not only affects African-American students who attend very selective institutions, but also those who attend less selective, predominantly White institutions (Rangel, 2001). Therefore, it was suggested that stereotype threat is not dependent upon the selectivity of the institution, but rooted in the social-psychological predicament that arises when an individual is aware of negative stereotypes about their group and is identified with their academic domain. Given the mixed heritage that exists among some African-Americans, participants who identified themselves as African-American and half African-American were included in the study. Participants who identified themselves as Africans were not included in the study due to cultural differences.

Materials

Demographic Information Form.

All participants completed a demographic information form that includes sex, age, race, education, and family income.

National Longitudinal Survey of Freshman (NLSF) Stereotype Threat Scale.

All participants completed the questionnaire in a paper and pencil format. To assess the degree of stereotype threat, the National measure was used (Massey & Fischer, 2001). The NLSF contains a Stereotype Threat Scale that assessed the extent to which individuals experience stereotype threat. The stereotype threat scale is a 28-item scale that contains five sub-scales: (a) Stereotype Internalization is based on the ratings of three items that measure the degree an individual subscribes to negative beliefs about their group’s abilities, for example, whether their group is intelligent or unintelligent, hardworking or lazy, and whether their group sticks with it or gives up easily (Massey & Fischer, 2001). Each item was rated on a continuum (0 = strongly disagree to 10 = strongly agree; (b) Stereotype Externalization is composed of four items that measure the degree an individual expects others outside their racial/ethnic group will draw on negative stereotypes in making evaluations that eventually over time leads to performance burden. The first two items were rated on a 0-10 scale asking participants to determine whether certain groups treat other groups equally or not (0 = treat equally and 10 = discriminate against others).
The last two items also were rated on a 0-10 scale, but participants were asked to respond on a scale from 0 = complete disagreement to 10 = complete agreement; (c) Social Distance to Whites scale is composed of five items that measure the degree to which individuals perceive closeness (0 = very distant to 10 = very close) to different target groups: young white women, young white men, rich whites, middle class whites, and whites in general; (d) Ingroup Identity scale is composed of seven items that measure the degree to which an individual identifies and supports other group members in various social and political arenas and the impact their ingroup affiliation has on their lives, using a 0-10 rating scale (0 = complete disagreement to 0 = complete agreement) for five items, a 0-2 rating scale (0 = American, 1 = both, and 2 = Ingroup), a 0-4 rating scale (0 = will not affect me at all to 4 = will affect me a lot); and (e) Performance Burden is composed of nine-items that measure the degree of psychological pressure that arises when one expects others outside of their racial/ethnic group to draw upon negative stereotypes about one’s group performance. Individuals feel they must adequately perform so they will not only let down themselves, but their entire race, for example, “If I excel academically it reflects positively on my group.” The first six items were rated using a 0-10 rating scale (0 = complete disagreement to 10 = complete agreement). The last three items were rated using a 0-10 rating scale (0 = not conscious at all to 10 = extremely sensitive).

The reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha) for a college sample on the stereotype threat scales were reported as follows: .61 for the Stereotype Internalization; .59 for the Stereotype Externalization; .88 for Social Distance to Whites; .75 for the Ingroup Identity; and .71 for Performance Burden. The NSLF stereotype scale has established construct validity based upon pilot research and its use across 28 academic institutions. Overall, the NLSF stereotype threat scale is a newly constructed measure that has good reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) and construct validity.

The Relational Identity Attitude Scale – Form B (RIAS-B).

All participants completed the questionnaire in a paper and pencil format. To assess racial attitudes, feelings, behaviors, and race-related world views, the Racial Identity Attitude Scale – Form B (RIAS-B) was used (Helms & Parham, 1990). It consists of 30 statements organized into four subscales corresponding to Cross’ five stages of Racial Identity Development: Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. Each statement was rated on a Likert-type scale (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). The Preencounter stage is indexed by of nine
statements, the Encounter stage is indexed by of four statements, the Immersion/Emersion stage is indexed by eight statements, and Internalization stage is indexed by nine statements. Some of the statements included the following: “I am determined to find my Black identity,” “I have changed my lifestyle to fit my beliefs about Black people,” and “People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.”

The internal consistency coefficients (alpha) for college students (N= 293) have been reported as follows: $\alpha = .69$ for Preencounter; $\alpha = .50$ for Encounter; $\alpha = .67$ for Immersion-Emersion; and $\alpha = .79$ for Internalization. Test-retest reliabilities have not been reported, but the Racial Identity Attitude Scale – Form B (RIAS-B) has good reliability. It has been used in most published research relating African-Americans’ racial identity attitudes to a variety of variables, including academic achievement (Hood, 1998), decision-making styles (Helms & Parham, 1990), perceptions of racism in organizations (Watts & Carter, 1991), student involvement (Taylor & Howard-Hamilton, 1995), and student preference for counselor race (Ponterotto, Alexander, & Hinkston, 1988).

Procedure

Professors of psychology and African-American studies departments, African-American fraternities and sororities, a Black church, and the Black Culture Center for Learning were contacted by the principal researcher and an appointment scheduled to meet with the designated persons to discuss the study and the recruitment of African-American students. After the initial contact and scheduling of dates for conducting the study, the principal researcher and research assistants administered the consent form, demographic information form, the NLSF stereotype threat scale, and the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS-B) respectively, to groups of African-American students. All participants were told that the study was interested in examining group interactions; their participation was voluntary and all responses would be anonymous except for those individuals that consented to be contacted for a follow-up interview. All questionnaires were collected and then participants were debriefed. All information was stored in a secure place.
Results

The purpose of this present study was to attempt to understand why African-American students internalize stereotypes, while others externalize stereotypes as well as to determine factors related to internalization or externalization of stereotypes.

Descriptive statistics were analyzed for all demographic and study variables. The means, standard deviations, and ranges were presented for demographic and study variables in Tables 3-6.

Participants were 100 self-identified African-American college students attending Miami University, a predominantly white institution in Oxford, Ohio, which is similar to the samples obtained in previous research examining racial identity and internalization of stereotypes (Parham & Helms, 1981). They were recruited from various domains, and the sample consisted of 59 females and 41 males who ranged in age from 18-25 years (M = 20.39, SD = 4.66). High school GPAs ranged from 2.4-4.0 (M = 3.5), and college GPAs ranged from 1.9-3.4 (M = 2.4). African-American students’ academic performance was higher in high school than in college in this study. On the demographic form addressing parents’ education and income, mother’s and father’s highest level of education completed was 2 years of college, and average household income ranged from $35,000-$49,000 a year.

The first hypothesis was African-American students who have pre-encounter attitudes would be more likely to internalize rather than externalize stereotypes. There was no significant correlation between pre-encounter attitudes and internalization of stereotypes (n = 100, r = .07, p > .05) and pre-encounter attitudes and externalization of stereotypes (n = 100, r = .01, p >.05). There was also no significant difference between these two correlations (n = 100, t = 1.45, p > .05).

The second hypothesis was African-American students who have encounter attitudes will be more likely to externalize, rather than internalize stereotypes. There was no significant correlation between encounter attitudes and externalization of stereotypes (n = 100, r = .01, p >.05) and encounter attitudes and internalization of stereotypes (n = 100, r = .02, p >.05) (refer to Table 7). There was also no significant difference between these two correlations (n = 100, t = -.053, p > .05).
The third hypothesis was African-American students who have immersion-emersion attitudes would both externalize and internalize stereotypes. There was a significant correlation between immersion and emersion attitudes and internalization of stereotypes \( n = 100, r = -.27, p < .01; n = 100, r = -.26, p < .05, \) respectively), and no significant correlation between immersion and emersion attitudes and externalization of stereotypes \( n = 100, r = -.07, p > .05; n = 100, r = .01, p > .05, \) respectively \) (refer to Table 7). There was also no significant difference between these two correlations \( n = 100, t = 1.46, p > .05; n = 100, t = 1.95, p > .05, \) respectively.

The fourth hypothesis was African-American students who have internalization attitudes would neither internalize nor externalize stereotypes. There was no significant correlation between internalization attitudes and externalization of stereotypes \( n = 100, r = .04, p > .05 \), nor between internalization attitudes and internalization of stereotypes \( n = 100, r = -.18, p > .05 \) \) (refer to Table 7). There was no significant difference between these two correlations \( n = 100, t = -1.18, p > .05 \).

The fifth hypothesis was African-American students who have pre-encounter attitudes would have a low social distance to whites and a weak in-group identity. There was a significant correlation between pre-encounter and social distance to whites \( n = 100, r = -.32, p < .01 \) and no significant difference between preencounter and in-group identity \( n = 100, r = -.04, p > .05 \) \) (refer to Table 8).

The sixth hypothesis was African-American who have encounter attitudes would have a high social distance to whites and a weak in-group identity. There was no significant correlation between encounter and a social distance to whites \( n = 100, r = .12, p > .05 \), but a significant difference between encounter and in-group identity \( n = 100, r = -.42, p < .01 \) (refer to Table 8).

The seventh hypothesis was African-American who have immersion-emersion attitudes would have a high social distance to whites and a strong in-group identity. There was a significant correlation between immersion and emersion attitudes and in-group identity \( n = 100, r = -.55, p < .05; n = 100, r = -.21, p < .05, \) respectively), and a significant correlation between emersion and social distance to whites \( n = 100, r = .37, p < .01 \), but no significant difference between immersion and social distance to whites emersion and in-group identity \( n = 100, r = .14, p > .05 \). (refer to Table 8)
The eighth hypothesis was that African-American students who have internalization attitudes would have a low social distance to whites and a strong in-group identity. There was no significant correlation between internalization and social distance to whites (n = 100, r = .04, p > .05), or between internalization and in-group identity (n = 100, r = .04, p > .05) (refer to Table 8).

Discussion

The present study examined Massey & Fischer’s (2001) conceptualization of stereotype threat and explored the relationship between African-American college students’ Racial Identity Attitudes and their tendency to internalize or externalize stereotypes. Results from this study provide partial support for Massey & Fischer’s (2001) conceptualization of stereotype threat and reveal that some racial identity attitudes are important in understanding African-American college students’ tendency to internalize stereotypes. Consistent with previous research (Clark & Clark, 1947; Cokley, 2002; Kelly & Floyd, 2001; Taylor & Zhang, 1990), participants in this study did internalize stereotypes. However, there was no evidence to suggest that Racial Identity Attitudes contribute to our understanding of these students’ tendency to externalize stereotypes, although they both externalize (M = 10.01, SD = 4.27) and internalize stereotypes (M = 18.30, SD = 3.45). In Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study, African-American students tended to externalize stereotypes (M = 22.72, SD = 6.5) more than internalize stereotypes (M = 6.59, SD = 2.3), whereas the converse was true for participants in this study. The mean differences in externalization and internalization of stereotypes between these studies may be attributable to demographic and environmental factors.

The students in this study had an average family income of approximately $42,499, their parents completed some college (associates degree), and they reported a 3.5 GPA (high school). In Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study, students indicated an average family income of $43,000, the majority of their parents completed college and obtained advanced degrees, and reported a 3.5 GPA (high school). Thus, Massey & Fischer’s (2001) participants who internalized and externalized stereotypes tended to be from better educated families compared to students, in this study. It is uncertain whether there is an association between parents’ education and internalization/externalization of stereotypes. Also, the association between environmental factors and internalization/externalization of stereotypes is important to consider.
In this study, African-American students internalize stereotypes more, compared to those students in Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study. Is there an association between internalization of stereotypes and attendance at a predominantly white institution such as Miami University versus the more heterogenous institutions attended by participants in the Massey & Fisher study? Further research is needed to investigate these potential relationships.

In the current study, immersion-emersion attitudes were inversely related to internalization of stereotypes: the higher immersion-emersion attitudes, the weaker tendency to internalize stereotypes. Immersion-emersion attitudes are characterized by the acquisition of Black knowledge and culture, establishment of a new world view that is incongruent with societal negative stereotypes of African-Americans, and the development of Black pride and a strong Black identity. The establishment of a strong Black identity may decrease African-American students’ tendency to internalize stereotypes. Massey & Fischer (2001) suggest that having a strong Black identity provides some immunity against societal stereotypes. Other researchers posit that Black consciousness and/or racial identity are important in understanding African-Americans’ behavior and psychological functioning (Baldwin, 1987; Milliones, 1980; Okech & Harrington, 2002).

There were no relationships between internalization attitudes and either internalization or externalization of stereotypes. According to Plummer (1996), African-American students with internalization attitudes have an inner peace and a security in their Black identity, and an appreciation for other ethnic heritages. This might suggest that because African-American students with internalization attitudes are secure and confident in themselves, they are more aware of the insidious nature of negative stereotypes, and their potential impact on their psychological well-being. Carter (1991) argued that African-American students with internalization attitudes function better psychologically than students with other racial identity attitudes.

Massey & Fischer (2001) suggested that in-group identity and social distance to whites are additional constructs that contribute to our understanding of racial identity attitudes and internalization and externalization of stereotypes. In this study, immersion-emersion attitudes were inversely related to in-group identity: the higher immersion-emersion attitudes, the weaker in-group identity. Such a finding is surprising given immersion-emersion attitudes are often associated with an affinity toward Black culture. Thus, support for in-group members in various
social and political arenas would be an expectation. According to Carter (1991), immersion-emersion attitudes are associated with high anxiety and hostility toward Whites. African-American students may feel anxious about their new identity, and apprehensive about participating in new activities related to their new Black identity.

Preencounter attitudes were inversely related to social distance to whites, indicating the higher pre-encounter attitudes, the less social distance to whites. The characteristics of pre-encounter attitudes are the absence of race as a salient aspect of identity and the adoption of pro-white attitudes. Given these characteristics, one might expect African-American students with pre-encounter attitudes to have less social distance from whites. Thus, the pattern observed in this study was consistent with expectations.

Encounter attitudes were inversely related to in-group identity, indicating the higher participants’ encounter attitudes, the weaker their in-group identity. This finding is consistent with the characteristics of encounter attitudes. Encounter attitudes are associated with a series of race-related situations that challenge strongly held beliefs (pro-white, anti-black). Encounter attitudes reflect a state of psychological confusion and emotional turmoil (Carter, 1991). Such states are not associated with a strong identification and solidarity with a group.

Emersion attitudes were positively related to social distance to whites. Emersion attitudes involve having a stable Black identity, an awareness of the sociopolitical implication of being Black, and a hypervigilence toward racial stimuli.

In-group identity and social distance to whites were important constructs in understanding racial identity attitudes but they did not contribute to understanding participants’ tendency to internalize or externalize stereotypes. There were no associations between either in-group identity or social distance to whites and either internalization or externalization of stereotypes. The reason(s) for such findings are uncertain. Perhaps, the measures used were too insensitive to detect associations between these constructs. In-group identity and social distance to whites are constructs that have been minimally investigated in the literature (Massey & Fischer, 2001). Future research should continue examining potential relationships between both in-group identity and social distance to whites and internalization and externalization of stereotypes.

There were difference in means for in-group identity and social distance to whites between this study and Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study (see Table 4). Participants in this study
displayed stronger in-group identity (M = 30.01, SD = 7.43) compared to students in Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study (M = 13.01, SD = None given). In this study, participants reported less social distance to whites (M = 19.10, SD = 7.43) than participants in Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study (M = 26.07, SD = None given). That is, participants in this study tended to identify and support in-group members in various activities that impact their lives more than students in Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study. They also felt closer to Whites compared to students in Massey & Fischer’s (2001) study. Data indicate that participants in this study display more pre-encounter attitudes (M = 3.95, SD = .48) compared to any other racial identity attitude, followed by immersion attitudes (M = 3.32, SD = .54), encounter attitudes (M = 3.07, SD = .65), emersion attitudes (M = 2.08, SD = .84), and internalization attitudes (M = 1.92, SD = .41). Although participants in this study feel close to whites, there may be potential confusion or dissonance between their attitudes/beliefs about their racial identity and their interactions with both Blacks and Whites based upon their endorsement of preencounter attitudes and a strong in-group identity. One potential explanation may be related to the orientation practices of some predominantly white institutions like Miami University. Special student orientations for minority students are organized to help these students learn about various support services that are sensitive toward their concerns and interests. Those new students who enter with preencounter attitudes and attend these orientations may engage in more in-group activities and explore their Black identity in the context of this new institutionally sanctioned in-group. With this new opportunity to explore or reevaluate their racial identity, it may not be uncommon for these students to experience confusion about their interactions with both Blacks and Whites. Also, one may wonder what racial socialization messages these students receive from their parents that may contribute to their dissonance or confusion. Previous research indicates that African-American students attending predominantly white institutions experience more stress compared to white counterparts (Kemp, 1990; Fleming, 1984; and Nettles, 1988).

This study’s findings diverged from Cokley’s (2002) that found a relationship between racial identity attitudes and internalized racialism. Cokley (2002) found that African-American students immersion-emersion attitudes were positively related to internalized racialism. In this study, immersion-emersion attitudes were inversely related to internalization of stereotypes. These directional differences in these relationships may be due to unique characteristics of racial
immersion-emersion attitudes, or differences in the sensitivity of the measures used or again, to sample differences. Further research is needed to investigate these directional differences.

Participants in this study display more preencounter attitudes, compared to any other racial identity attitude, tend to internalize stereotypes more than externalize stereotypes, have less social distance to whites, a strong in-group identity, come from less educated families compared to samples used in previous research (Massey & Fischer, 2001).

These results are not generalizable to all African-American college students attending predominantly white institutions. Although the NSLF stereotype threat scale is a newly constructed measure with good reliability and construct validity in large scale survey studies, It may not be a sensitive enough measure for smaller scale studies such as this investigation. It is possible that participants misinterpreted instructions on the NSLF stereotype threat internalization scale. Some participants may have responded to items based upon general societal attitudes toward African-Americans rather than their personal attitudes. Research studies investigating stigmatized groups’ attitudes toward stereotypes about themselves, or other stigmatized groups should clearly emphasize from whose perspective questions should be answered.

One future direction for this research could be to replicate this study with a larger, diverse sample of African-American college students from predominantly white institutions, heterogeneous, and historically Black institutions, gathering environmental (i.e., race-related experiences, racial socialization, in-group and out-group friends, and racial composition of neighborhoods/primary schools) and more demographic information. Parham (1993) conducted a research study investigating the relationship between racial identity attitudes and demographic and background factors and found that where one was born and the geographic region where one lived were significant factors in understanding African-American adults’ racial identity attitudes, but there were no associations between background factors (i.e., parental socialization practices) and racial identity attitudes. However, demographic and environmental factors are influential factors in understanding whether African-American college students internalize or externalize stereotypes (Massey & Fischer, 2001). They contributed to our understanding of African-American students tendency to internalize and externalize stereotypes, and could increase our understanding of the relationship between African-American students’ racial identity attitudes and internalization and externalization of stereotypes.
With a consistent concern about attrition and retention rates of African-American college students, understanding African-American students’ tendency to internalize stereotypes is important. Knowledge that these students internalize stereotypes may help dismantle beliefs that they are incapable of high academic achievement. Demographic data, in this study, indicate that African-American students attending Miami University entered with an acceptable high school 3.5 GPA, an indicator of their ability to succeed academically in college. However, these students’ academic performance does not continue on such a positive trajectory as they attend Miami University. It is uncertain what the major contributing factor is to this decline in academic performance, but it would benefit administrators and professors to contemplate the influence of negative societal stereotypes (internalization of stereotypes) on African-American students’ underachievement. Within these lines, they should be careful not to instigate, accentuate, or perpetuate negative societal stereotypes that are pervasive throughout American society (Massey & Fischer, 2001). With heightened emphasis on cultural sensitivity and knowledge among faculty and staff, African-American students may decrease internalization of stereotypes, leading to higher academic achievement and less attrition. As the results in this study indicate, African-American students at Miami University feel close to whites, have a preponderance of pre-encounter attitudes, have a strong in-group identity, but there appears to be cultural dissonance, confusion, and stress among these students.
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Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>18 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA (college)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>1.9 - 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA (high school)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>2.4 - 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (mother)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (father)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Year in college coded as 1 = sophomore, 2 = junior, 3 = senior. Education coded as 1 = 8th, 2 = 10th, 3 = 11th or 12th (No diploma), 4 = high school graduate, 5 = some college but no degree, 6 = Associate degree, 7 = Bachelor’s degree, 8 = Master’s degree, 9 = Professional degree, 10 = Doctoral degree, 1 = < 5,000, 2 = 5,000-9,999, 3 = 10,000-14,999, 4 = 15,000-24,999, 5 = 25,000-34,999, 6 = 35,000-49,999, 7 = 50,000-74,000, 8 = 75,000-99,999, 9 = 100,000 or more.
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.06 - 4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.67 - 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.70 - 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.14 - 3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDW</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>5.00 - 43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGID</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>9.00 - 51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>11.00 - 27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.00 - 22.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SDW = Social distance to whites. INGID = Ingroup identity. INT = Internalization of stereotypes. EXT = Externalization of stereotypes.
Table 5

*Descriptive Statistics for High Preencounter, High Encounter, High Immersion, High Emersion, and High Internalization Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>3.67-4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.00-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>3.40-4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2.50-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.71-3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics for Social Distance to Whites and In-group Identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Distance to Whites</th>
<th>In-group Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 15</td>
<td>M = 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter (n= 21)</td>
<td>SD = 5.51</td>
<td>SD = 9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter (n= 16)</td>
<td>M = 21</td>
<td>M = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion (n= 21)</td>
<td>SD = 10.68</td>
<td>SD = 7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion (n= 20)</td>
<td>M = 21</td>
<td>M = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization (n= 22)</td>
<td>SD = 5.90</td>
<td>SD = 9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 22</td>
<td>M = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 6.66</td>
<td>SD = 8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 17</td>
<td>M = 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 6.34</td>
<td>SD = 7.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**Pearson Correlation: RIAS and NLSF (internalization and externalization of stereotypes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internalization of stereotypes</th>
<th>Externalization of stereotypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * correlation is significant at the .05 level  
** correlation is significant at the .01 level
### Table 8

**Pearson Correlation: RIAS and NLSF (Social Distance to Whites and In-group identity)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Distance to Whites</th>
<th>In-group Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter (n=100)</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter (n=100)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion (n=100)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion (n=100)</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization (n=100)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * correlation is significant at the .05 level
**correlation is significant at the .01 level
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Consent Form

I understand that I am selecting to participate in a survey study entitled “Group Interactions.” The research is being conducted by Regina McCormick and her trained research assistants under the supervision of Karen Schilling, Ph.D., of the Department of Psychology at Miami University.

The research session lasts 30 minutes and will include the following: Demographic Information Form, the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshman (NLSF) to assess group interactions, and the Racial Identity Attitude Scale – Form B (RIAS-B) to assess racial attitudes.

I understand that this test will be administered at no charge to me, and I am free to withdraw from testing at any time without penalty. The purpose of this study is to survey the thoughts of individuals when interacting with different groups. I will be tested in a group, or private session, where I will complete the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshman and Racial Identity Attitude Scale – Form B (RIAS-B). Also, I will be required to complete a demographic information form. I understand that there are no foreseeable risks from my participation in the study. I also understand that I will be provided with the results of the study, if I so desire.

I understand that any information about me obtained from the tests administered will be kept strictly confidential.

Questions regarding the project should be directed to the following persons:

Regina McCormick, M.S. (Principal Investigator) at (513) 524-2400

Karen Schilling, Ph.D. (Committee Chairperson) at (513) 524-2400

If you are willing to participate in follow-up interview, please check the box and provide your phone number below.
☐ Phone #: _______________________

I have read the above material and hereby voluntarily agree to participate in the study under the terms and conditions stated above.

Name – Signature: __________________________

Date: ____________________________________

Name - Printed: __________________________

Date: ____________________________________

Witnessed by: _____________________________

Date: ____________________________________
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DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Subject Code Number: _____

1. Sex (Check one): ____Male  ____Female  2. Age: _____

1. Race (check one): ____White
    ____African-American
    ____Hispanic
    ____Asian
    ____Indian (Alaskan, Native American, Middle-Eastern, etc.)

4. College Year (check one): ____Freshman
    ____Sophomore
    ____Junior
    ____Senior
    ____Other (please explain)
    ______________________
    ______________________

5. College Major: ___________________

6. Current Cumulative College Grade Point Average: _______
   (Please report your high school GPA if you are in your first semester of college)

7. Cumulative College Grade Point Average (2001-2002 year) _____

8. High school GPA ___
Please respond to the following questions regarding your family and household. Try to answer them to the best of your knowledge? Be assured that all your responses will be STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL, and will not be shared with anyone.

7. What was the highest level of education completed by your father (or primary male guardian)? If no primary male guardian was present in your household, please proceed to question # 8 below.

___ 8th grade or less
___ 10th grade
___ 11th grade or 12th grade, NO DIPLOMA
___ HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE – high school diploma or equivalent (for example, GED)
___ Some college but no degree
___ Associate degree in college (for example, a 2-year academic or technical degree)
___ Bachelor’s degree (for example, BA, AB, BS, etc.)
___ Master’s degree (for example, MA, MS, ME eng, ME ed, MSW, MB, etc.)
___ Professional school degree (for example, MD, DDS, JD)
___ Doctoral degree (for example, Ph.D., Ed.D.)

8. What was the highest level of education completed by your mother (or primary female guardian)? If no primary female guardian was present in your household, please proceed to question # 9 below.

___ 8th grade or less
___ 10th grade
___ 11th grade or 12th grade, NO DIPLOMA
___ HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE – high school diploma or equivalent (for example, GED)
___ Some college but no degree
____ Associate degree in college (for example, a 2-year academic or technical degree)
____ Bachelor’s degree (for example, BA, AB, BS, etc.)
____ Master’s degree (for example, MA, MS, ME eng, ME ed, MSW, MB, etc.)
____ Professional school degree (for example, MD, DDS, JD)
____ Doctoral degree (for example, PhD., EdD.)

9. What was your family (including parental earnings) income for the previous (past) year?

____ Less than $5,000  ____ $35,000 to $49,999
____ $5,000 to $9,999  ____ $50,000 to $74,999
____ $10,000 to $14,999  ____ $75,000 to $99,999
____ $15,000 to $24,999  ____ $100,000 or more
____ $25,000 to $34,999
Appendix C.

1  = Strongly Agree
2  = Agree
3  = Undecided
4  = Disagree
5  = Strongly Disagree

1. I believe that being Black is a positive experience.

   _____

2. I know through experience what being Black in America means.

   _____

3. I feel unable to involve myself in White experiences and am increasing my involvement in Black experiences.

   _____

4. I believe that a large number of Blacks are trustworthy.

   _____

5. I feel an overwhelming attachment to Black people.

   _____

6. I involve myself in causes that will help all oppressed people.

   _____

7. I feel comfortable wherever I am.

   _____

8. I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks.

   _____

9. I feel very uncomfortable around Black people.

   _____

10. I feel good about being Black, but do not limit myself to Black activities.
11. I often find myself referring to White people as honkies, devils, pigs.

12. I believe that to be Black is not necessarily good.

13. I believe that certain aspects of the Black experience apply to me, and others do not.

14. I frequently confront the system and the man.

15. I constantly involve myself in Black political and social activities (art shows, political meetings).

16. I involve myself in social action and political groups even if there are no other Blacks involved.

17. I believe that Black people should learn to think and experience life in ways which are similar to White people.

18. I believe the world should be interpreted from a Black perspective.

19. I have changed my style of life to fit my beliefs about Black people.

20. I feel excitement and joy in Black surroundings.
21. I believe that Black people came from a strange, dark, and uncivilized continent.

22. People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.

23. I find myself reading a lot of Black literature and thinking about being Black.

24. I feel guilty/anxious about some of the things I believe about Black people.

25. I believe that a Black person’s most effective weapon for solving problems is to become a part of the White person’s world.

26. I speak my mind regardless of the consequences (e.g., being kicked out of school, being imprisoned).

27. I believe that everything Black is good and consequently I limit myself to Black activities.

28. I am determined to find my Black identity.

29. I believe White people are intellectually superior to Blacks.

30. I believe because I am Black, I have many strengths.
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Now I have some questions about different racial and ethnic groups in our society. I want you to rate each group on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means that no one in the group displays the characteristic or trait in question and 10 means that everyone does. A score of 5 would mean that half do and half don’t share the trait.

Suppose, for example, that I ask you to judge how poor or rich a group is, where 0 indicates that all are poor and 10 indicates that all are rich. A score of 5 means that the group is half rich and half poor. In the United States, how rich would you say:

0 poor ............................................. 10 rich

Whites are?
Blacks are?
Latinos are?
Asians are?

The second set of characteristics ask if people in the group tend to be lazy or if they tend to be hardworking. On this scale, where would you generally place:

0 lazy ............................................. 10 hard-working

Whites?
Blacks?
Latinos?
Asians?

Do you think people in these groups tend to be unintelligent or intelligent? How about:

0 unintelligent .........................10 intelligent

Whites?
Blacks?
Latinos?
Asians?

How about the characteristic of persistence, where people either give up easily or stick with a task until the end? In general, how persistent are:

0 give up easily ........................................... 10 stick with it

Whites?
Blacks?
Latinos?
Asians?
Finally, think of a scale of discrimination. For each group I want to know if you think its members tend to treat members of other groups equally, or whether they tend to discriminate against people who aren’t in their group. On this scale, how would you rate:

0 treat equally ................................. 10 discriminate against others

Whites?
Blacks?
Latinos?
Asians?

Using the same scale, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0..................10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If instructors hold negative stereotypes about certain groups, it will not affect their evaluations of individual students from that group.
If other students hold negative stereotypes about certain groups, it will not affect their evaluations of individual students from that group.

For each category, on a scale of 0 to 10 tell me how close you feel to the people in terms of your ideas and feelings about things.

0 Very Distant .............................. 10 Very Close

Young white men
Young white women
Middle class whites
Rich whites
Whites in general

What do you think should be more important to blacks/Latinos in the United States, being black, being American, or should both identities be equally important?

To what extent do you think that what happens to each of the following groups will affect what happens to you in your life:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will not affect me at all</td>
<td>Will affect me a little</td>
<td>Will affect me somewhat</td>
<td>Will affect me a lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blacks?
On a scale of 0 to 10, please indicate the extent you agree with each of the following statements, where 0 means total disagreement and 10 indicates total agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total disagreement</th>
<th>Total agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0..........................10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blacks should always vote for black candidates
Blacks should marry other blacks
Black consumers should shop in black-owned stores
Black parents should give their children African names
Black students should attend predominantly black schools
Black families should live in predominantly black neighborhoods

Using the same 0-10 scale, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0...............................10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If I let my instructors know that I am having difficulty in class, they will think less of me.
If I let other students know that I am having difficulty in class, they will think less of me.
If I excel academically, it reflects positively on my racial or ethnic group.
If I do poorly academically, it reflects negatively on my racial or ethnic group.
I don’t want to look foolish or stupid in class
If I don’t do well, people will look down on others like me.

How self-conscious were you about the way that white students perceived you, with 0 meaning you were not conscious at all and 10 meaning that you were extremely sensitive to what they thought? 0 Not conscious at all ............................. 10 Extremely sensitive
How self-conscious were you about the way that Asian students perceived you, with 0 meaning you were not conscious at all and 10 meaning that you were extremely sensitive to what they thought? 0 Not conscious at all ............................. 10 Extremely sensitive
How self-conscious were you about the way that your teachers perceived you, with 0 meaning you were not conscious at all and 10 meaning that you were extremely sensitive to what they thought? 0 Not conscious at all ............................. 10 Extremely sensitive