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ABSTRACT

Racial discrimination continues to influence the lives of minorities, and society as a whole. Racial inequality has been linked to negative social, physical, and mental outcomes for many African Americans. As a result, researchers have begun to explore the protective power of racial socialization and other culture practices of African Americans that may aid them in overcoming adversity (i.e., resilience). The present study examined whether racial socialization moderated the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency. Measures of racial discrimination, racial socialization, resiliency, and socially, desirable responding were administered to 304 African American adults affiliated with a large Midwestern university. Using hierarchical moderated regression, it was found that racial socialization buffered the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency. For participants low in racial socialization messages perceived racist events were negatively related to resiliency. However, for individuals high in racial socialization messages, perceived racist events were not related to resiliency. Additionally, factor analyses were conducted on Stevenson and colleagues (2002) Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization scale to examine the validity of its factor structure with an adult population. These results are discussed in detail herein.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Though we have made progress since the era of slavery, through the efforts of the civil rights movement, prejudice and discrimination in this country continues to affect various aspects of the lives of African Americans. Racism serves as a barrier between them and the American dream. From the kinds of jobs they attain to the quality of the schools their children attend, both subtle and overt discrimination has depreciated their status and opportunities (Peters, 1985). African Americans have faced decades of inequality. Unfortunately, the generations of African American children born after the end of slavery still face a great deal of oppression. African American children are forced to deal with obstacles such as poverty, incarceration, unemployment, crime-ridden streets, poor health care, and poor education (Edelman, 1985).

Many have questioned why African Americans continue to face these societal challenges (Stevenson, 1994). Stevenson (1994) argued that race relations continue to be strained due to the continued silence of various sectors in society regarding the problems that exist in interracial interactions (Stevenson, 1994). He stated that the silence stems from fear. First, there is the fear of misrepresentation. Conversations about the topic of race can be heated. Often individuals fear that expressing their views could result in
them be labeled as “racist”, “liberal”, “hostile”, or “militant” (Stevenson, 1994). Another fear is that of extinction. It is possible that some fear that their cultural beliefs and identity will not survive if the cultural beliefs of others coexist (Stevenson, 1994). Additionally, Stevenson (1994) stated that having race-related debates without some type of advantage can make many feel vulnerable. Williams and Williams-Morris (2000) conducted an overview of United States-based research on the ways that racism can affect mental health. They found that despite increased commitment on the part of Whites to equality they are decidedly less supportive of policies that would implement equality. The third fear is that our ignorance about race relations will be discovered. Stevenson (1994) stated that even some individuals in the helping profession pretend that racism does not exist. Overall, Stevenson (1994) argued that the fear of dialogue allows racial tension to continue.

Raising minority children in a society that fears dialogue about race related issues can be especially difficult for parents (Stevenson, 1994). African American adolescents not only have the challenge of dealing with the lives they have been dealt, but they must do this while hearing implicit and explicit messages from society identifying them as inferior (Stevenson & Renard, 1993). Williams and Williams-Morris (2000) compared how White participants viewed African Americans in comparison to other minority groups (i.e., Asian Americans and Latinos) and whites. They found that Whites were more likely to view most African Americans as unintelligent, lazy, prone to violence, and preferring to live on welfare. African Americans were viewed more negatively than any other minority group (Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). Stevenson, Reed, Bodison, and Bishop (1997) noted that adolescents tend to simultaneously internalize and reject
messages and experiences received from society and then react accordingly. This is a dualistic process by which both the fitting and mismatched experiences co-exist.

Unfortunately, society has historically had mixed feelings of racial hatred, ambivalence, and civility towards African Americans (Stevenson et al., 1997). Egalitarian attitudes are coexisting with a desire to maintain some social distance from blacks and a lack of desire to commit to policies that would eradicate inequalities (William & Williams-Morris, 2000). This has caused the development of African American children’s racial identity, to be difficult and stressful (Stevenson et al. 1997).

Unfortunately racism is embedded in almost every structure of American society (i.e., social, psychological, cultural and institutional) thus there is little chance of escaping its detrimental consequences (Utsey, 1998). Considering this fact, researchers have been speculating about the effects of racial discrimination on the mental health of African Americans (e.g., Fischer & Shaw, 1999; Miller & Randall, 1999). A growing number of researchers have argued that racism has adverse influences on the health of minority populations in the United States (Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). Studies have found that African Americans experience discrimination in a broad range of contexts in society, and that these occurrences can induce distress (Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). Thompson (1996) found that African Americans experienced more discrimination than other groups, and this discrimination may be a significant stressor in their lives. Fischer and Shaw (1999) noted that community and epidemiological studies have suggested that racism contributes to the poor mental health of African Americans. Some psychologists have also argued that racism and discrimination may affect the self-esteem of African Americans (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002). Belief in a biological or
cultural inferiority can attack the self worth of some members of stigmatized racial
groups and “undermine the importance of their very existence” (Williams & Williams-

Research about the impact of racism on the mental and physical health of African
Americans is steadily growing. Many researchers have additionally begun to examine
what steps can be taken to prevent the negative outcomes African American adolescents
experience as a result of continued racial discrimination. Miller (1999) posited that it
might be beneficial to look at this problem using a resiliency approach. While African
Americans are at risk for poor developmental outcomes, there are many African
American adolescents who do not succumb to the negative influences of their
environments (Miller & MacIntosh, 1999). However, there has been limited research
published focusing on the resiliency of minority youth. More importantly, many studies
have failed to take into consideration elements that may serve as important protective
factors for African American adolescents (Miller, 1999). Though African Americans are
facing great adversity, some individuals are able to withstand the effects of racism and
experience successful outcomes.

Miller (1999) and Miller and MacIntosh (1999) suggested that one protective
factor might be racial socialization. Peters (1985) defined this concept as the “tasks
Black parents share with all parents—providing for and raising children…but include the
responsibility for raising physically and emotionally health children who are Black in a
society in which being Black has negative connotations” (p.161). Thus, this process
involves preparing children to deal with the hostile world that awaits them (Peters, 1985).
Many authors have acknowledged the importance of racial socialization to the successful development of youth racial identity (Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2002). Additionally, authors have argued that racial socialization may serve as a psychological buffer for the stress and distress that may result from racial discrimination (Bynum, Burton, & Best, 2007; Neblett, Philip, Cogburn, & Sellers, 2006). Racial socialization often results in the development and reinforcement of racial/cultural pride and coping mechanisms that allow African Americans to adequately handle racist experiences (Bynum et al., 2007; Neblett et al., 2006; Stevenson, Reed, & Bodison, 1997; Stevenson et al., 2002). Fisher and Shaw (1999) found that college students who did not receive many intentional racial socialization messages internalized the negative messages they had heard from others. Racial socialization messages promote positive feelings about oneself and group which are linked to resiliency and positive behavior. It is apparent in the literature that racial socialization is a protective factor for African Americans (Stevenson et al., 2002).

Thus, racial socialization may be a key component in the lives of resilient African Americans. The present study seeks to examine the potential moderating effects of racial socialization on the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency in the lives of college-aged African American adults.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is divided into three sections. First, a review of the literature on racial stress, or racial discrimination, is presented. The review will examine investigations on the effects of racial stress on African Americans and will provide supportive evidence for negative effects of racial stress on their mental health. Second, resiliency is addressed. This brief review of the literature focuses on the construct of resiliency and the lack of research regarding the resiliency of African Americans. Third, racial socialization is presented. The definition of racial socialization and the characteristics of this concept are outlined. Additionally, empirical studies dealing with the protective power of racial socialization are reviewed.

2.1 Racial Discrimination

Clark, Anderson, Clark and Williams (1999) define racism as “beliefs, attitudes, institutional arrangements, and acts that tend to denigrate individuals or groups because of phenotypic characteristics or ethnic group affiliation” (p. 805). Although racism is an ideology, it informs action. Racism has been used to justify harmful and discriminatory
treatment of individuals seen as inferior (Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005). Racist ideology was utilized by European Americans to dehumanize African slaves and justify their enslavement, which lasted over a 250-year period (Allen, 1996). Allen (1996) noted that 19th century scholars such as Thomas Jefferson attributed the characteristics of Africans to low intelligence, low morality, incapacity for human relationships, and incapacity for independence. It was these words and attributions that not only allowed the enslavement of African captives, but also numbed European Americans to the true suffering of Africans and several generations of African Americans who were born and continue to be brought into this society (Allen, 1996). Though slavery ended formally with the Civil War, racism formed the basis for the senseless lynching of African Americans many of which are undocumented with perpetrators unpunished (Allen, 1996). Allen (1996) noted that “the ‘badness of blackness’ became and remains a unifying and organizing theme or principle in the psychic live of Americans of European decent” (p. 223).

Though individuals in the media and politics have commented on the progress that has been made since the era of slavery, many ethnic minorities’ experiences do not reflect this optimism. Additionally, many Whites fail to recognize that the current issues plaguing African Americans and their communities are symptomatic of societal problems that have come from generations of oppression (Bowen-Reid & Harrell, 2002).

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission reported that in 1992 and 2002 claims of racial discrimination in the work place represented more than one third of total complaints (Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005). This number may be low considering that the Commission tends to define racism as overt discrimination excluding racial or
ethnic harassment, which includes verbal threats or exclusionary behavior (Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005). Various social science disciplines find that African Americans are discriminated against in a variety of domains ranging from face-to-face interactions to discrimination in social services (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).

“Racist discrimination takes a variety of forms, and includes being called racist names; being discriminated against by people in various professions; being discriminated against by strangers; being accused or suspected of wrongdoing (stealing, cheating); being discriminated against by institutions such as banks and schools in loans, scholarships, and admittance, and so on” (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996, p. 145).

Racial discrimination can be intentional or unintentional, overt or ambiguous and can be carried out by an individual, institution, or by cultural hegemony (Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005). Bryant-Davis and Ocampo (2005) defined these racist incidences as “cognitive/affective assaults on one’s ethnic self-identification” (p. 480). They argued that these assaults can have a traumatic effect on the lives of the victims. Feagin (1992) conducted a qualitative study of the experiences of African American students at predominantly White colleges and universities. Through interviews with 24 African college students, administrators, and faculty member across 14 cities he described the discriminatory barriers African American students face in such an environment. He noted that African Americans students were often subjected to a constant series of blatant and subtle acts of discriminatory treatment (e.g., racist jokes and comments, stereotyping, lack of feedback and reinforcement, and insensitivity from White counterparts) which can have a “severely oppressive impact” (p. 575). Feagin (1992) argued that while these
instances may seem minor to White observers when considered one at a time, the cumulation of these experiences can have detrimental effects on the lives of African American students who may enter and matriculate through these environments.

Bowen-Reid and Harrell (2002) argued that racism and cultural hegemony have played a fundamental role in the health disparities that exist between African Americans and their White counterparts. African Americans suffer disproportionately from stress-related diseases such as high blood pressure, stroke, and coronary heart disease (Bowen-Reid and Harrell, 2002).

Discrimination can also have negative psychological and behavioral repercussions (Neblett et al., 2006; Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003). The National Institute of Mental Health reported that most African Americans in psychotherapy present with depression, tension, and rage about racism (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). In a 2007 study Bynum et al. found that more experiences with racism were associated to higher levels of psychological stress and distress in a sample of African American college freshmen. Wong et al. (2003) studied the impact of ethnic discrimination on African American Adolescents in Maryland. Results indicated that perceived discrimination from teachers and peers was negatively associated with self-esteem, positive mental health, and academic motivation, suggesting the potential threat of these experiences on lives of these adolescents. Additionally, discriminatory experiences increased the likelihood of engaging in problem behavior. Caldwell, Kohn-Wood, Schmeelk-Cone, Chavous, and Zimmerman (2004) examined self-administered questionnaires of urban African American adolescents. The instrument contained questions about drug and alcohol use, violent and sexual behavior, racial discrimination, and racial identity attitudes. Results
indicated that discrimination experiences were the strongest risk factor for violent behavior noted the importance of understanding this behavior as a response to oppression.

Various researchers have studied the deleterious effects of racism. Historically, the effects of racism on the psychological well-being of African Americans has focused on anecdotal accounts of personal experiences with racial discrimination, documenting the impact of social and institutional policy, and studying differential rates of psychological and somatic diseases between African Americans and Whites (Utsey, 1998). As a result, researchers have begun to conceptualize experiences of racism as a source of chronic stress, which has altered the way that researchers approach this field of study (Utsey, 1998).

2.1.1 **Racism and Stress**

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) defined stress as a person-environment interaction appraised by an individual as being related to ones well-being, and exceeds the person’s resources to cope with the situation. The three major components of this definition are the person-environment interaction, primary appraisal, and secondary appraisal. The person-environment interaction reflects an individual’s cognitive appraisal of the relationship between the environment and ones well-being. Primary appraisal is the cognitive process of evaluating a stressors potential threat or harm that has already occurred. Secondary appraisal is the phase of the stress process in which an individual evaluates his or her coping resources and determines if they are adequate for managing the impending stressor.
Outlaw (1993) was the first to apply Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) model to African Americans daily encounters with racism and oppression (Utsey, 1998). Outlaw (1993) argued that when African Americans encounter racism (person-environment interaction), they make an appraisal of the situation as either threatening or not (primary appraisal). After appraising the situation the individual takes an inventory of available coping resources prior to responding (secondary appraisal). Outlaw (1993) proposed that racial discrimination could be assessed by examining an individual’s race-related stress. Various self-report measures designed to assess race-related stress have since been developed based on Outlaw’s (1993) theoretical framework (Utsey, 1998).

Landrine and Klonoff (1996) conceptualized racial discrimination as racist events and viewed racist events as culturally specific stressors. The authors argued that racist events are negative events that happen to African Americans because of their race or culture, thus, racist events could be viewed as culturally specific stressors. Additionally, Landrine and Klonoff (1996) posited that African Americans differed in their appraisal of the racist events.

Landrine and Klonoff (1996) developed the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE), a brief questionnaire to assess racial discrimination in the lives of African Americans. This instrument was constructed to measure the frequency of various racist events and appraises how stressful the event is for the individual. In a preliminary investigation conducted with college-aged African American participants, they hypothesized that racist events have a greater negative impact on physical and mental health of African Americans than generic life events (i.e., losing car keys or being stuck in a traffic jam) when controlling for appraisal, social support and coping style. Data suggested that
racism was very prevalent in the lives of African Americans. Approximately 98% of the sample reported experiencing racist discrimination in the past year. The most common racist events experienced by participants in the past year was being discriminated against by strangers (82.6%) and being discriminated against by people in service jobs, such as waiters, store clerks, and bank tellers (82.6%). Additionally, 100% of the sample experienced racism at some time in their life. Again the most common experience was being discriminated against by strangers (93.7%). Results also indicated that 99.4% of the sample found racist discrimination to be stressful. The authors concluded that racism still has a significant impact on the lives of African Americans.

Klonoff, Landrine, Ullman (1999) examined the role of racial discrimination in the psychological symptoms of African Americans. All participants anonymously completed the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), the Psychiatric Epidemiology Research Interview Life Events Scale (PERI-LES; Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, Dohrenwend, 1978) which assesses the frequency of a variety of stressful events, and the Symptom Checklist-58 (Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Ulenhuth, & Covi, 1994). Results indicated that racial discrimination was a powerful predictor for psychiatric symptoms in African Americans. Racial discrimination accounted for 15% of the variance in total symptom scores. Racial discrimination also accounted for 14% of the variance in somatization scores and 9% of the variance in anxiety scores. Over all, results indicated that racism contributed uniquely to all symptoms above and beyond the contribution of status and generic stressors.

Sanders-Thompson (2002) also examined the impact of racism. They hypothesized that African Americans would report more experiences of daily stress,
racism, and greater perceived impact of experiences of racism than other groups (i.e., Asians, Hispanics, and Whites). Results indicated that African, Asian, and Hispanic Americans reported the highest rates of discrimination in the area of public accommodations and job/employment discrimination, though these results were not significant. The researchers found a significant effect for the impact of discrimination. Scheffe post hoc analyses of means indicated that African Americans reported higher impact of discrimination scores suggesting that African Americans’ experience of discrimination may serve a unique stressor in their lives.

2.1.2 Racial Discrimination and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder

Bryant-Davis and Ocampo (2005) argued that some individuals who are subject to racist incidences may develop post trauma symptoms, and thus clinicians and counselors should acknowledge racism as a possible source of trauma. They stated that while a majority of researchers focus on racism as a stressor that leads to psychophysiological problems, few have examined racism as a form of trauma in African American populations. However, racism has been labeled a risk factor for PTSD diagnoses in Asian Americans (Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005).

Bryant-Davis and Ocampo (2005) proposed a framework for conceptualizing racist incidences as trauma by examining the parallels between racist incidences and other traumas (e.g., childhood sexual abuse, rape and domestic violence). For example, they noted that similar to individuals who have suffered from child sexual abuse, racial incidences can cause feelings of shock, betrayal, and powerlessness. They can also cause a sense of being stigmatized as not being good enough. They also noted that research has found that similar to survivors of other traumas, survivors of racist incidences adopt
“rules” in which they do not allow themselves to have feelings, mistrust themselves and others, and often chose not to talk about the racism with anyone. Overall, the researchers noted, racist incidences produce cognitive, emotional, and physiological symptoms similar to those of more acknowledged trauma. The authors acknowledge that there are difference between racism and other traumatic experiences, still they note the importance of examining the potentially traumatizing impact of racist incidences. They suggested that it is important for counselors and researchers to develop assessment and treatment models that can effectively serve clients who are experiencing trauma as a result of a racist incident.

The deleterious effects of racism have been documented and demonstrated by various research studies. While racial discrimination has been shown to lead to negative consequences for many African Americans, some are able to be resilient, cope with the experience of racism, and have successful outcomes (Miller, 1999).

2.2 Resiliency

Resilience has had varied meanings. Connor and Davidson (2003) stated that “resilience is a multidimensional characteristic that varies with context, time, age, gender, and cultural origin, as well as within an individual subjected to different life circumstances” (p. 76). Though there has not been agreement on a single definition most researchers agree that overall resiliency involves having the ability to form a successful adaptation in the face of obstacle and adversity (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Jew, Green, & Kroger, 1999; Miller, 1999).

Resiliency was designed to reflect the reality that while many children were exposed to dangerous environments they could strive and successfully overcome such
stressors (Garmezy, 1991). Garmezy (1991) noted that studies of children whom had been exposed to familial and environmental deficits showed that a significant proportion of children and adults can adapt to stressors, as evidenced by positive behavior patterns and favorable outcomes in these individuals. Some youth possess qualities that make them resilient while others are nurtured in environments that teach them to be resilient (McCreary, Cunningham, Ingram, & Fife, 2006). Garmezy (1991) indicated that in the literature on resiliency there were three factors that emerged that appeared to correlate with children who had overcome stressful situations: Individual factors, familial factors, and support factors. Individual factors include temperament indicators such as reflectiveness in meeting new situations, activity level, and cognitive skills (Garmezy, 1991). Familial factors are characterized by warmth, cohesion and concern for the well-being of the child by parents or some caring adult (Garmezy, 1991). Supportive factors are individuals outside of the family that provide some type of support, an external support system (Garmezy, 1991).

Garmezy, Masten, and Tellegen (1984) constructed three models of resiliency to describe the impact of stress and personal attributes on the quality of an individual's adaptation (i.e., compensatory, challenge, protective). The compensatory model suggests that the impact of a risk factor can be compensated for or neutralized by personal qualities of strength. In this model both the risk factor and the compensatory factor contribute to the outcome (Zimmerman, Bingenheimer, & Notaro, 2002). The challenge model suggests that a certain level of stress can potentially enhance one's competence if the degree of stress is not excessive. The protective model suggests that there may be factors that modify the relationship between the risk factor and outcome by buffering the
individual from the influences of the risk factor (Brook, Brook, Gordon, & Whiteman, 1990; Garmezy et al., 1984). Protective factors may “impart a kind of immunity against stress.” (Garmezy et al., 1984, p. 102).

2.2.1 Resiliency and African Americans

Though many African American children have to cope with a number of adversities (e.g., poverty, dangerous neighborhoods, and racial hostility), they manage to overcome their circumstances and develop into healthy adults, yet the experiences of resilient African Americans remain understudied (Barbaran, 1993). Given the negative social and mental health outcomes that some African Americans experience, various authors agree that examining the resilience of minority groups, such as African Americans is of great importance (e.g., Barbaran, 1993; Davis & Stevenson, 2006; Garmezy, 1991; Luthar, Doernberger, & Zigler, 1993; Miller, 1999; Utsey, Bolden, Lanier, & Williams 2007). More importantly, attention should be paid to the protective factors that have made it possible for African Americans to overcome the adversity that often exist in their environments (Barbaran, 1993; Garmezy, 1991).

Recently, Utsey et al. (2007) conducted a study with an African American adult sample to assess whether culturally specific types of coping could predict quality of life (i.e., resiliency) above and beyond the risk factors and traditional predictors. Results indicated that both culturally specific factors (e.g., kinship networks and spiritual coping) and traditional factors (e.g., cognitive abilities and social support) were equally important for African American quality of life. Utsey and colleagues concluded that these results were evidence that culturally specific factors were indeed predictive of positive psychosocial functioning and quality of life.
Miller (1999) also noted the lack of studies examining the development of resiliency among racial minorities and sought to further examine the construct of resiliency. He suggested that racial socialization and racial identity must be included in the concept of resiliency due to the protective value these variables provide African American adolescents. Miller proposed that given that the concept of resiliency is premised upon the influence of protective factors then the inclusion of those protective factors unique to African American adolescents, namely racial socialization and racial identity is necessary. Thus, studying the effects of these variables through empirical investigation is important (Miller & MacIntosh, 1999).

2.3 Racial Socialization

Peters (1985) noted that African American families have the difficult challenge of raising children who must be able to survive in a racist society. African Americans are forced to cope with the negative views the dominant society has of them and negotiate the racial barriers that challenge them in various environments. Specifically, African Americans must deal with the consequences of being defined by their race while trying to understand what it means for them to be African American or Black (Coard & Sellers, 2005). Due to this unfortunate reality, African American families, as well as other minority families, have to provide their children with additional socialization to prepare them for the racial discrimination they will face. This process has been referred to as ethnic socialization (Rotheram & Phinney, 1987). Rotheram and Phinney (1987) defined ethnic socialization as the “developmental processes by which children acquire the behaviors, perceptions, values, and attitudes of an ethnic group, and come to see themselves and others as member of such groups” (p.11). Likewise Peters (1985)
referred to this process as racial socialization. Racial socialization is a set of behaviors, communications, and interactions between parents and children that address how African Americans ought to feel about their cultural heritage and how they should respond to the racial hostility or confusion in American society (Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2002). Racial socialization includes specific messages and practices that provide information concerning the nature of one’s racial status as it relates to personal and group identity, intergroup and interindividual relationships, and one's position in the social hierarchy (Thorton, Chatters, Taylor, & Allen, 1990).

The forms of racial socialization include specific messages, modeling of behaviors, and exposure to specific context, objects, or environments (e.g., African American museums and African American television shows; Thorton et al., 1990). This process is comprised of “divine, affective-symbolic, and phenomenological strategies that protect youth from discriminatory and psychologically antagonistic environments that mediate racism stress, and are related to closer and more protective family relationships” (Stevenson et al., 2002, p. 85). In an analysis of the National Survey of Black Americans (NSBA) Thorton et al., (1990) found that two out of every three Black parents indicated that they provided their child with some type of racial socialization.

While many parents may see the importance of racially socializing their children, the themes of the messages conveyed may vary. Boykin and Toms (1985) proposed that three major themes characterize the racial socialization process. One theme is the cultural experience. The cultural experience places an emphasis on African American history and traditions and the development of racial pride. The second theme is the minority experience, which emphasizes the recognition of discrimination in society and
an acceptance of being African American. Thorton (1997) found that messages that emphasized the minority experience were more common among African Americans living in urban areas. The last theme is the mainstream experience, which expresses the importance of achievement and includes messages influenced by white and middle class culture. In another study, Hughes and Chen (1997) asked African American parents about the types of messages they conveyed to their children. Three themes were found, the first cultural socialization, involved information parents taught their children about African American history and heritage. This theme was endorsed most frequently by parents. The second most endorsed theme was preparation for bias, which involved messages that prepared children for future encounters with prejudice and racial discrimination. The third theme was promotion of mistrust, which involved messages that encouraged mistrust of Whites. Studies have found that the type and frequency of messages African American youth receive have been related to parental perception of racially discriminatory acts against their children (Hughes & Johnson, 2001) and actual racist experiences family members have had (Stevenson et al. 2002; Stevenson, McNeil, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2005). Additionally, parents may communicate different messages to their sons and daughters (Stevenson et al., 2005; Thomas & Speight, 1999).

2.3.1 Racial Socialization and Gender Differences

Bowman and Howard (1985) found that African American parents gave differing messages to their daughters and sons. Girls were more likely to report receiving messages about racial pride, while boys received more messages about discrimination and racial barriers. Hill (1999) also noted that African American boys and girls receive different socialization messages. She stated that this difference may be a result of the
view that African American males will come under the attack of racism and discrimination more often than females. Hill (1999) stated that many researchers have argued that every institution in America has neglected or failed to respond to the needs and problems of African American males. They have been “miseducated” by the education system, mistreated by the criminal justice system and social welfare system, and mislabeled by the mental health system. Motivated by the concern for the overall safety of young African American men, African American mothers may feel it is more necessary to warn them of the discrimination they will inevitably face from society whether they are involved in positive or negative behaviors (Hill, 1999). This is not a recent occurrence, post-slavery African American men were often the victims of lynching and unjustified imprisonment, causing African Americans families to be extremely protective of African American boys and to remind them of the caution they should take when away from the safety of the family (Harris, 1995).

2.3.2 Measuring racial socialization

Many studies have attempted to define and measure racial socialization for African Americans (Stevenson, 1994). Stevenson (1994) noted that while there are varying definitions of this concept, there is an overarching theme in all definitions of racial socialization that families have a special role in buffering the impact of racism and promoting a sense of cultural pride. Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Stevenson, Johnson, and Spicer (2006) suggested that many measures of ethnic and racial socialization are global measures of the concept, which may be preventing a full understanding of the consequences of racial socialization.
Stevenson (1994) argued for a multidimensional understanding of racial socialization and developed an instrument that could measure this concept. Stevenson (1994) developed the Scale of Racial Socialization for Adolescents (SORS-A), in which adolescents are asked about their beliefs regarding the racial socialization for African American youth. One hundred items were developed from domains cited in relevant literature, 45 were retained for the scale. Inner-city African American adolescents in a summer job preparation program were administered a demographic questionnaire, the 45-item SORS-A scale, and two items from the SORS-A labeled Family Teaching of Racism and Skin Color Concern variables.

A factor analysis indicated that four factors were meaningful and psychometrically sound. The first factor, Spiritual and Religious Coping, contains items about recognizing the benefits of spirituality. Factor two, Extended Family Care, includes items that promote the role of the extended family in caring for and rearing children. Factor three, Cultural Pride Reinforcement, includes items addressing the importance of teaching African American children about their own history and culture. Factor four, consisted of items that expressed the importance of discussing racism openly among family members; this factor was titled Racism Awareness Teaching. Results indicated that for the entire SORS-A (Global Racial Socialization) there was a Cronbach alpha of .75. Higher order analysis indicated that while factors one, two, and three were more proactive (creative) approaches to racial socialization, factor four was more of a protective (reactive) approach. An intercorrelational analysis indicated that, for females Racism Awareness Teaching was positively correlated with Spiritual and Religious Coping, Extended Family Caring and Cultural Pride Reinforcement. However, for males
Racism Awareness Teaching was only negatively correlated with Religious Coping socialization attitudes. This may suggest that, for males, their attitudes about racism in society are separate from their attitudes concerning other racial socialization factors.

2.3.3 **Racial Socialization Empirical Research**

In addition to developing measures that assess racial socialization many studies have attempted to examine the relationship between racial socialization and other concepts such as self-esteem, academic achievement, and psychosocial functioning (Hughes et al., 2006). In a review of ethnic-racial socialization research Hughes et al. (2006) noted that the results of studies using one dimensional measures of racial socialization with various minority groups are mixed. Research consistently suggest positive benefits from racial socialization messages that emphasis racial pride. However, the research that has examined the result of giving African American children messages that emphasize the existence of racism and racial barriers is mixed, suggesting a complex relationship between these types of messages and youth outcomes (Coard & Seller, 2005). Despite the outcome discrepancies found in racial socialization research, the results of these studies suggest that this process has an important impact on the outcomes of minority youth (Hughes et al, 2006). Still, the positive outcomes demonstrated by many studies can not be ignored. For example, Caughy, O’Campo, Randolph, and Nickerson (2002) found that African American homes rich in African American culture had preschool children who had better problem solving skills and greater amounts of factual knowledge. Additionally, children whose parents provided socialization messages that encouraged the children to be proud of their cultural heritage had fewer behavioral problems. Bowman and Howard (1985) found that African American
adolescents who received positive messages about their racial identity were better
prepared academically than those who were not.

In a 1997 study Stevenson, Reed, Bodison, and Bishop examined the relationship
between attitudes about racial socialization and the psychological adjustment of inner city
African American adolescents. Results indicated that for African American girls, higher
levels of global racial socialization were accompanied by higher self-esteem, low
depressed mood, and low instrumental helplessness. The more a participant endorsed
Cultural Pride Reinforcement messages, the less likely the individual was to experience
and express anger without being provoked. Overall, males and females appeared to show
different psycho-emotional responses to both global racial socialization and its individual
components.

Fischer and Shaw (1999) also examined the role the racial socialization in the
mental health of African Americans. The authors examined the role of racial
socialization, self-esteem, and social support networks in moderating the relationship
between African Americans’ perceptions of racist discrimination and their overall mental
health. Results indicated that for African Americans who reported low levels of racial
socialization messages, perceived racial discrimination was associated with poorer
overall mental health. In addition to exploring the effects of racial socialization on
mental health, researchers have also examined its effects on self-esteem and coping
strategies.

Constantine and Blackmon (2002) argued that racial socialization messages may
be linked to African Americans global self-esteem. They examined the relationship
between racial socialization messages from parents and area specific self-esteem (i.e.,
home, school, and peer self-esteem) among Black (African American, West Indian American and bi-ethnic) middle school students attending a predominantly Black parochial school. Results suggested that cultural pride messages were significantly related to higher peer self-esteem in this sample.

Scott (2003) sought to explore the relationship of racial identity and racial socialization to the strategies used by African American adolescents to cope with discriminatory experiences. Helms (1990) defines racial identity as “a sense of group or collective identity based on one’s perception that he or she shares a common racial heritage with a particular group” (p. 3). Results indicated that racial socialization was significantly related to using approach coping strategies to deal with discriminatory experiences. African Americans who received racial socialization messages were more likely to use approach coping strategies. Approach coping involves strategies that directly confront and attempt to solve problems, which is related to positive adjustment outcomes (Scott, 2003).

Thus, this body of research suggests that the process of racially socializing African American youth appears to be important for their healthy development. Racial socialization has served as a buffer against societal discrimination and it encourages community and self respect (Stevenson, 1994). Racial socialization promotes resiliency by providing African Americans with the resources for coping with stress caused by racial discrimination (Belgrave, Chase-Vaughn, Gray, Addison, & Cherry, 2000; McCreary et al., 2006). Considering the oppressive environments in which African Americans are placed, examining the various aspects that may promote their resilience is of great importance. Knowledge and understanding of the benefits of racial socialization
and the effects of racial discrimination may be especially important for the field of Counseling Psychology in its efforts to be produce culturally competent providers of mental health service. Thus, paying special attention to the factors that may facilitate positive outcomes for African Americans is essential (Miller, 1999). Additionally, employing these cultural strengths in the context of individual and family psychotherapy would be beneficial, and in some cases essential, to a clinicians work with African American clients (Stevenson, 1994).

2.4 Present Study

Currently there have not been any published studies that have empirically examined the effects of racial socialization on resiliency using a direct measure of resiliency. The present study sought to expand upon the current literature on the benefits of racial socialization by utilizing a direct measure of resiliency to demonstrate the positive effects of racial socialization. This study examined the moderating effects of racial socialization messages on the perceived relationship between resiliency and racial discrimination in African Americans.

The hypotheses were as follows:

1. Racial socialization messages (e.g., You should be proud to be Black) will moderate the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency, such that individuals who report receiving a low frequency of racial socialization messages will be less resilient than those who report receiving a high frequency of racial socialization messages.

2. Cultural pride messages (e.g., Never be ashamed of your color) alone will moderate the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency, such
that individuals who report receiving a high frequency of only cultural pride messages will be more resilient than those who report a low frequency of cultural pride messages.

3. Cultural pride messages will produce larger incremental variance (i.e., change in $R^2$) than other types of racial socialization messages that participants report receiving (e.g., *Having large families can help many Black families survive life struggles*).
3.1 **Participants and Procedure**

Prior to recruitment of participants, the study was reviewed by the Institutional Review Board for research with human subjects. Following this approval, all instruments were placed on-line in an internet survey. The questionnaire was hosted online by SurveyMonkey, an Internet survey software company. *SurveyMonkey* provided the URL and server space for the data to be stored temporarily until administration was completed. There are strengths to collecting data via the Internet. One can test large numbers of participants very quickly, recruit large heterogeneous samples, and the method is more cost-effective in time, space, and labor in comparison with lab research (Birnbaum, 2004). Many researchers have described the potential advantages of collecting data via the Internet (e.g. Joinson, 1999; Schmidt, 1997).

However, researchers have found disadvantages to this type of data collection such as higher rates of drop out and of repeated participation (Birnbaum, 2004; Schmidt, 1997). Therefore, several strategies were incorporated to reduce the likelihood of
obtaining duplicate, invalid, and incomplete surveys. As recommended by Birnbaum (2004), individuals were told to participate only once. Surveys were screened for duplicate surveys by examining the origin of submission (i.e., IP addresses), email addresses, and assigned code numbers, as well. No duplicate surveys were found. Additionally, in order to protect the integrity of the data a demographic questionnaire was included to screen out those who did not identify as Black or African American.

Three hundred and twenty-two (N = 322) Black/African Americans were recruited in two different manners. A portion (61.5%) of the participants were students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a large Midwestern university (N = 198). Participation for this subsample was voluntary. Students were able to chose from a variety of studies or write a paper in lieu of study participation. Participants were asked to contact the investigator in order to receive a code number, the website address, and directions for completing the study on-line. Students received course credit for their participation.

In an effort to obtain a sufficiently large sample an email solicitation (see Appendix A) was sent to African American student organizations at the same university as the previous subsample. The email explained the purpose and nature of the study and included a request that the advertisement for the study be distributed to eligible individuals. The participants recruited in this manner made up 38.5% of the sample (N = 124). The email solicitation directed interested participants to click on the provided link which routed them directly to the World Wide Web where they could access and complete the questionnaire. For their participation, these individuals were given the option of including their e-mail address if they wished to be entered into a lottery.
drawing to win fifty dollars. Participants were informed that those who participated more 
than once would be removed from the drawing. E-mail addresses were carefully screened 
to ensure that the same individual did not submit the survey more than once. No duplicate 
surveys were found. In order to ensure anonymity, the participants’ email addresses were 
collected and stored separately from their responses.

Prior to completing the questionnaire, all participants viewed a brief description 
of the study (see Appendix B), and an informed consent page (see Appendix C) which 
explained the security limitations of Internet data collection. Participants were informed 
that every precaution would be taken to ensure the security of their responses. Following 
completion of the questionnaire, participants were redirected to a debriefing form that 
described the purpose of the research, provided resources for counseling services, and 
listed contact information for the investigators (see Appendix D). Aside from the students 
who took part in the drawing, no identifying information was collected. Data was 
collected between the months of September and February.

Of the 322 original participants, nine \( (N = 9) \) were removed due to their 
questionnaires being less than 75% complete. Additionally, in order to control for 
inattentiveness and random responding, several items were placed throughout the survey 
that instructed the participants to choose a specific response choice (e.g., “Please choose 
‘Never’ for this question”). As a result of failing one or more validity checks an 
additional eight \( (N = 8) \) participants were removed. In addition, one participant \( (N = 1) \) 
who was considered to be an outlier was removed. This left an effective \( N \) of 304.

The final sample consisted of 304 participants. Of these participants 195 (142 
women and 53 men) were students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a
large Midwestern university ranging in age from 17 to 46 ($M = 19.57$, $SD = 3.27$). The remaining 109 participants (94 women and 15 men) were recruited student organizations ranging in age from 18 to 53 ($M = 25.39$, $SD = 7.26$). The large difference between the number of female and male participants reflects the two to one ratio for African American females compared to African American males enrolled at the Midwestern university. An examination of all participants ($N = 304$) indicated that the majority of the participants identified solely as Black/African American (92.1%). Other individuals self identified as Bi-racial (African American/ another ethnicity; 5.6%), African American/White (1%), African American/Latino (1%), and Black/Caribbean/West Indian (.3%). Participants classified themselves as freshmen (42.8%), sophomores (19.1%), juniors (8.6%), seniors (8.2%), post-baccalaureate (2%), and graduate/professional school students (14.5%). The remaining participants (4.9%) classified themselves as belonging to one of the following categories: college graduate, law student, post graduate degree, working professional, full-time employee, professional student, Jurist Doctorate Candidate, non-degree resident fellow, staff member-Medicine, and academy student.

Additionally, most of the participants (70.4%) did not include a student organization affiliation. Other individuals listed that they were involved in Black student organizations (16.4%), academically focused organizations (2.6%), religious organizations (1%), fraternities/sororities (1%), and minority student organizations (.3%). The remaining participants (8.2%) indicated that they belonged to one of the following organizations: equestrian team, men’s track and field, leadership collaborative, Bridge, PSL, F.R.E.E. committee, band, Allies for Diversity, UA/FYE, 8th Floor Improv Comedy group, HSS, Council of Graduate Students, Undergraduate Student Government, Folklore
student association, Karate association. PRSSA, and the Ohio Union Activities Board (OUAB).

3.2 **Instruments**

Four instruments were administered in the following fixed order: a demographic questionnaire, the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale (TERS; Stevenson, Cameron, & Herrero-Taylor, 2002), Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC; Connor & Davidson, 2003), and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1988). Due to the constraints of the survey software instruments were administered in this fixed order with the instruments of greatest interest given first.

3.2.1 **Demographic Questionnaire**

A brief questionnaire was included requesting personal information including age, ethnic identification, gender, college rank, date of birth, and student organization affiliation (see Appendix E).

3.2.2 **Predictor Variable**

The predictor variable was perceived racist events. Perceived racist events were assessed by the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).

3.2.2.1 **Racial Discrimination**

The Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; see Appendix F) is an 18-item self-report inventory designed to assess the frequency with which African Americans encountered racial discrimination in the past year and over their entire lifetime. Additionally, the SRE assesses the degree to which a racist event is appraised as stressful. For example, participants are asked: *How many times have you been treated*
unfairly by strangers because you are Black? The SRE uses a 6-point Likert scale ranging from Not at all (1) to Extremely (6). For each item the participants indicate the frequency with which they have (a) experienced the racist event within the past year (SRE-Recent), (b) experienced the racist event over their lifetime (SRE-Lifetime), and (c) the degree to which they found the racist event to be stressful (SRE-Appraisal). The ratings given for each item are added to obtain subscale scores ranging from 18-108 for SRE-Recent and SRE-Lifetime. However, the SRE-Appraisal subscale only consists of 17 items, thus, the scores for SRE-Appraisal range from 17-102. Higher scores on these subscales are indicative of greater frequency or stressfulness of perceived racist events. The SRE was theoretically conceptualized according to framework based on life events (Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, & Dohrenwend, 1978) and daily hassles (Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981). The authors viewed racism as culturally specific stressful life events.

Landrine and Klonoff (1996) found the scale to be both a reliable and valid measure. They reported internal consistency reliability coefficients of .95 for racist events within the past year, .95 for lifetime racist events, and .94 for appraised racist events. Additionally, split-half reliability coefficients were reported for the three subscales (.93, .91, and .92 respectively). The SRE also demonstrated concurrent validity. A correlational analysis with the SRE and the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL-58; Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974) indicated that SRE subscales were positively and significantly correlated with all psychiatric symptoms among African Americans. For example, there was a significant positive correlation
between the anxiety subscale and recent racist events ($r = .34, p < .0005$), lifetime racist events ($r = .33, p < .0005$), and appraised racist events ($r = .37, p < .0005$).

For the purpose of this study only the SRE-Recent scores were examined. This decision was based on Landrine & Klonoff’s (1996) finding that racist events that had taken place in the past year (SRE-Recent) were a more salient predictor of stress related psychiatric symptoms. Additional empirical support for the use of this subscale was demonstrated by Fischer and Shaw (1999) who found the SRE-Recent and SRE-Life to be highly correlated. In the present study, the coefficient alpha for the SRE-Recent was .92.

### 3.2.3 Moderator Variable

The moderator variable was racial socialization. Racial socialization was assessed by the Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale (TERS; Stevenson, Cameron, & Herrero-Taylor, 2002).

#### 3.2.3.1 Racial Socialization

The Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization scale (TERS; Stevenson et al, 2002; see Appendix G) is a 40-item scale designed to measure actual behavioral examples of racial socialization messages that participants have heard from parents or caregivers and the frequency of such messages.

A factor analysis of the scale yielded a five-factor solution. The first factor, Cultural Coping with Antagonism (CCA), contains 13 items that represent messages about the importance of struggling successfully through racial hostilities and the role of spirituality and religion in that coping (e.g. *Only God can protect against racism*). The second factor, Cultural Pride Reinforcement (CPR), consist of nine items that endorse the
teaching of pride and knowledge of African American culture to children (e.g., \textit{You should be proud to be Black}). Cultural Appreciation of Legacy (CLA), factor three, includes five items about cultural heritage issues such as enslavement and knowing historical issues for African Americans (e.g., \textit{Knowing African culture is important}). Factor four, Cultural Alertness to Discrimination (CAD), contains six items focused on teaching youth to be aware of the barriers of racism in society and the multiple race relation challenges between African Americans and Whites (e.g., \textit{Whites have more opportunities than Blacks}). Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream (CEM), factor five, consist of six items and represents messages about the relative importance of majority culture institutions and values and the affective and educational benefits that African Americans can receive by being involved in those institutions. This factor also addresses the irrelevance of discussing racism and the irrelevance of aspects of African American culture (e.g., \textit{Black children feel better in White schools}). The TERS uses a 3-point Likert scale response, ranging from \textit{Never} (1) to \textit{Lots of times} (3). Each subscale score is the total of the items within that subscale.

Stevenson, Cameron, & Herrero-Taylor (2002) reported internal consistency reliability coefficients of .85 (CCA), .83 (CPR), .74 (CLA), .76 (CAD), and .71 (CEM) for the subscales. Evidence for divergent validity was demonstrated by the low correlation between the TERS and the SORS-A (Stevenson, 1994), suggesting that they are not measuring the same construct. Additionally, this instrument has demonstrated moderate internal consistency reliability with college-aged populations. Brown (2005) reported coefficient alphas for the five factors found in the TERS, as well as the full 40-item scale with a college-aged population. Brown (2005) reported internal consistency
reliability coefficients of .85 (CCA), .67 (CPR), .70 (CLA), .85 (CAD), .62 (CEM), and .90 (Full TERS). The present study examined the full 40-item scale, as well as the five subscales (CCA, CPR, CLA, CAD, and CEM). In the current study, the coefficient alphas were .86 (CCA), .66 (CPR), .74 (CLA), .89 (CAD), .62 (CEM), and .91 (TERS).

Further investigation of the item-total correlations for the CPR subscale (cultural pride reinforcement) suggested that the alpha could be increased to .67 with the deletion of poorly correlated items (i.e., If you work hard you can overcome barriers in life, Getting a good education is still the best way for you to get ahead, and Racism is not as bad today as it used to be before the 1960’s).

3.2.4 Criterion Variable

The criterion variable examined in the current study was resiliency. Resiliency was assessed by the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC; Connor & Davidson, 2003).

3.2.4.1 Resiliency

The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC; Connor & Davidson, 2003; see Appendix H) is a 25-item scale designed to assess an individual’s level of resiliency in the face of adversity. This scale was developed using a sample consisting of individuals from the general public (i.e. non-help seeking), primary care outpatients, psychiatric outpatients being seen in a private practice, individuals involved in generalized anxiety (GAD) study, and participants involved in a posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) study. The CD-RISC uses a 5-point Likert scale response, ranging from Rarely true (0) to Nearly true all of the time (4). Total scores can range from 0 to 100. However, the internet program, SurveyMonke,y will not allow for rating scores of (0),
thus due to the technical constraints of the SurveyMonkey site, the Likert scale for this instrument ranged from (1) *Rarely true* to (5) *Nearly true all of the time*. Thus, total scores could range from 25 to 125. Higher scores reflect greater resilience. Examples of items are *I am able to adapt to change*, *I am not easily discouraged by failure*, and *Sometimes fate or God can help*. Connor and Davidson (2003) reported that evidence for convergent validity was demonstrated by the positive relationship between the CD-RISC and the Kobasa (1979) hardiness measure. The CD-RISC also demonstrated a negative relationship with the Sheehan Stress Vulnerability Scale (SVS; Sheehan, 1983). The measure also yielded an internal consistency reliability coefficient of .89. Additionally, test-retest reliability was assessed using 24 participants from the GAD and PTSD studies. A coefficient of .87 was obtained after two consecutive clinical visits. In the present study, the coefficient alpha for the CD-RISC was .92.

### 3.2.5 Social Desirability

The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1988; see Appendix I) was designed to assess an individual’s tendency to give self-reports that are honest but positively biased (self-deceptive positivity) and the individuals deliberate self-presentation to an audience (impression management). The Self-Deceptive Positivity subscale (SDE) consists of 20-items designed to assess and individuals exaggeration of positive cognitive attributes (e.g., *I always know why I like things*). The Impression Management subscale (IM) consists of 20-items designed to assess an individual’s tendency to over report desirable behaviors and underreport undesirable behaviors (e.g., *I never swear*). For both subscales each item is based on a 7-point Likert type scale ranging from (1) *Not True* to (7) *Very True*. 
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In a sample of 433 college students Paulhus (1988) reported an internal consistency reliability of .80 for the SDE subscale, .86 for the IM subscale, and .83 for the total BIDR. For the present study the total BIDR score was examined. In the current study the coefficient alpha for this scale was .83.

Refer to Figure 3.1 for an illustration of the variables examined and the measures utilized in the current study.

3.3 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed for the sample. A correlational analysis was conducted to assess the relationship between the study variables. Additionally, a 2 x 2 MANOVA was conducted to assess the impact of gender and type of recruitment (i.e., introductory psychology vs. student organizations) on the measures. Subsequent univariate ANOVA’s were conducted based on a significant MANOVA finding.

Hierarchical moderated regression (HMR) was used to determine whether the proposed moderating variables (i.e., CULTRS, CCA, CPR, CLA, CAD, and CEM) weaken the relationship of racial discrimination to resiliency. HMR has been identified as one of the best techniques for detecting moderating effects (Aiken & West, 1991; Frazer, Tix, & Barron, 2004). Following the HMR procedure discussed by Aiken and West (1991), the BIDR and the type of recruitment was entered at Step 1 of the analysis. The predictor variable (i.e., SRE-Recent) and proposed moderator variable (e.g., CULTRS) were entered at Step 2 of the analysis. Finally, at Step 3, the interaction term reflecting the product of the predictor and moderator (e.g., SRE-Recent × CULTRS) was entered. Evidence for a moderator effect is noted at Step 3 by a statistically significant increment in $R^2$ (i.e., $\Delta R^2$) and beta weight. A moderator effect will be supported, at Step 3, where a
A statistically significant increment in $R^2$ is evidenced with an effect size of at least .02. In addition to the HMR, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on Stevenson et. al.’s (2002) TERS scale. This analysis was conducted to further examine the factor structure of the measure and the validity of the subscales the authors reported in the original study.
Figure 3.1. Nomological Network Illustrating Predictor, Proposed Moderator and Criterion Variable, and Measures Used.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.1 provides the correlations between the measures of resiliency, racial discrimination, racial socialization, and socially desirable responding. As shown in the table, the measure of racial socialization and its subscales were all positively correlated with one another at the .01 and .05 alpha levels. In addition, resiliency was positively associated with socially desirable responding \( (r = .38, p < .01) \) as well as racial socialization \( (r = .19, p < .01) \). Specifically, resiliency was positively associated with pride reinforcement messages \( (r = .29, p < .01) \), coping with antagonism messages \( (r = .18, p < .01) \), and appreciation of legacy messages \( (r = .16, p < .01) \). Socially desirable responding was not significantly correlated with any of the measures of racial socialization.

Recent racism was positively associated with the racial socialization \( (r = .32, p < .01) \). Specifically, recent racism was positively associated with alertness to discrimination messages \( (r = .47, p < .01) \), coping with antagonism messages \( (r = .27, p < .01) \).
<.01), appreciation of legacy messages \((r = .29, p <.01)\), and pride reinforcement messages \((r = .15, p <.05)\). Additionally, recent racism was negatively associated with socially desirable responding \((r = -.16, p <.01)\). While these relationships were statistically significant, Walsh & Betz (2001) suggested that \(r\) values at or above .20 are considered practically significant.

### 4.2 Multivariate Analysis of Variance

In order to assess the impact of gender and recruitment type (Introductory Psychology vs. Student organizations) a 2 x 2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed. Results indicated that the intersection of gender and recruitment type did not have a significant impact on the variables \(F (9, 292) = .87, \text{ns.}\) Gender also did not have a significant impact on the variables \(F (9, 292) = .71, \text{ns.}\) However, a significant multivariate effect did occur for recruitment type \(F (9, 292) = 3.50, p < .01\), based on Pillai’s trace = .10. Table 4.2 presents the means, standard deviations, and results of ANOVA’s by recruitment type for all measures. Three scales were significant in this comparison. Participants recruited from student organization solicitations had higher means on two of the TERS subscales, Cultural Alertness to Discrimination (CAD), \(F (1, 300) = 6.33, p < .05, d = .30\) and Cultural Appreciation of Legacy (CLA), \(F (1, 300) = 5.56, p < .05, d = .27\). Thus, this subsample reported receiving more messages concerning the importance of knowing African American history and messages concerning the barriers that one will face because of racism. In contrast, introductory psychology students reported hearing more messages concerning irrelevance of talking about racism and the importance of White institutions, \(F (1, 300) = \)
5.33, \( p < .05, d = .32 \). Based on Cohen’s (1988) criteria effect sizes for differences were small (.20 -.50).

4.3 **Hierarchical Moderated Regression**

As specified by Aiken and West (1991) hierarchical moderated regression (HMR) analyses were employed to test whether racial socialization moderated the perceived relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency. This is the preferred statistical method for identifying the presence or absence of moderating effects (Aiken & West, 1991; Frazier, Barron, & Tix, 2004). Moderators may or may not be related to the predictor or the criterion, and the predictor may or may not be related to the criterion (Frazier et al., 2004).

Prior to conducting the tests for moderation scale scores for the predictor and each proposed moderator were centered in order to reduce multicollinearity between the main effect and interaction terms, as recommended by Frazier et al. (2004). The significant difference between the two recruitment subsamples was controlled for by dummy coding (0 = Introductory psychology, 1 = Student organizations) and entered at Step 1 of each analysis along with the BIDR, based on the high correlation with resiliency. The predictor variable (i.e., SRE-Recent) and proposed moderator variable (e.g., TERS) were entered at Step 2 of the analysis. Finally, at Step 3, the interaction term reflecting the product of the predictor and moderator (e.g., SRE-Recent \( \times \) TERS) was entered. Evidence for a moderator effect is noted at Step 3 by a statistically significant increment in \( R^2 \) (i.e., \( \Delta R^2 \)) and beta weight. Because statistically significant interactions are notoriously difficult to detect in nonexperimental designs, the use of liberal alphas (e.g., .10 or .25) has been recommended (McClelland & Judd, 1993). Due to the number of
hierarchical moderated regressions performed in the present study (i.e., 6), an alpha of .017 (.10/6) was set. Additionally, statistical significance is only one measure of a variable’s contribution to the criterion (McClelland & Judd, 1993), thus, effect size also was considered. Following the recommendations of Cohen (1992), it was determined that \( \Delta R^2 \) values of .02 or above would signify unique and meaningful contributions to the criterion. All regressions are presented in Table 4.3.

4.3.1 **Hypothesis 1**

As hypothesized, racial socialization buffered the relationship between perceived racial discrimination and resiliency, \( \beta = .128, t (303) = 2.75, p < .017 \). This interaction accounted for 2.0% of the variance in resiliency beyond the variance accounted for by social desirability, recruitment type, and the individual predictor and moderator variables (\( \Delta R^2 \) of Step 3 = .020).

Figure 4.1 represents the corresponding regression slope graphed for this significant interaction. This regression slope was obtained by using predicted values for the criterion (i.e., resiliency) calculated from representative groups 1 standard deviation (SD) above the mean and 1 SD below the mean on the predictor (i.e., recent racism) and proposed moderator (i.e., racial socialization). These predicted values were obtained via the procedure outlined by Aiken and West (1991): the respective unstandardized regression coefficients for each centered variable were multiplied by its appropriate value (i.e., 1 SD or –1 SD of the predictor for the first term, 1 SD or –1 SD of the moderator for the second term, and the product of the standard deviations of the predictor and moderator for the interaction term), summing these products, and then adding the
constant value. An analysis of the simple slopes (Aiken & West, 1991) showed that perceived recent racism did not predict resiliency, $\beta = .07$, $t (303) = .96$, $ns$ for participants high (1 $SD$ above the mean) on racial socialization; whereas, perceived recent racism negatively predicted resiliency for participants low (1 $SD$ below the mean) on racial socialization, $\beta = -.28$, $t (303) = -2.90$, $p < .01$.

4.3.2 **Hypothesis 2**

Contrary to the hypothesis, cultural pride messages (CPR) were not found to interact with racial discrimination (SRE-Recent) predicting resiliency, $\beta = .62$, $t (303) = .18$, $ns$. Thus, the hypothesis that cultural pride messages alone would moderate the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency was not supported. However, it is noteworthy that CPR, as an independent predictor was found to positively predict resiliency $\beta = .28$, $t (303) = 5.40$, $p < .017$, where as SRE-Recent did not predict resiliency $\beta = .03$, $t (303) = .48$, $ns$. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.3.

4.3.3 **Hypothesis 3**

Additionally, the hypothesis that cultural pride messages would produce larger incremental variance (i.e., change in $R^2$) than other types of racial socialization messages (i.e., CCA, CLA, CAD, CEM) was not supported. However, in addition to the CPR subscale, the CCA subscale $\beta = .19$, $t (303) = 3.57$, $p < .017$, and the CLA subscale $\beta = .80$, $t (303) = 2.94$, $p < .017$, both served as independent predictors, positively predicting resiliency.
4.4 **Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

A confirmatory factory analysis (CFA) was employed to further examine the validity of the five factor structure that Stevenson et al. (2002) proposed for the TERS. Stevenson et al.’s (2002) factor solution was created based on a teenage sample, thus the CFA in the present study was conducted to assess whether these same factors would appear with a college sample. As specified by Thompson (2004) a CFA can be utilized to directly test the fit of a factor model. Mplus version 2.12 (Muthén & Muthén, 2001) with maximum likelihood (ML) estimation was used to perform the confirmatory factor analysis. Stevenson et al. (2002) found that 39 of the 40 items in the TERS loaded on latent factors. Thus, the 39 TERS items served as indicators of their respective first-order latent factors (i.e., CCA, CPR, CLA, CAD, and CEM). The adequacy of fit was determined by the four indices calculated by Mplus and recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999): the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) – also known as the nonnormed fit index (NNFI) – the standardized root-mean square residual (SRMR), and the root-mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). The fit statistics ranged from poor (i.e., CFI = .72, TLI = .70) to fair (RMSEA = .08; SRMR = .09) as determined by criteria specified for model fit adequacy (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1999). This model was not found to provide a good overall fit to the data.

Consequently, factor loadings for this model were evaluated to determine whether certain items did not load strongly on their hypothesized latent factor and whether the deletion of such items would enhance the fit of the model to the data. Other researchers (e.g., Phillips, Szymanski, Ozegovic, & Briggs-Phillips, 2004) have discarded items that load below .45 on their hypothesized factor; thus, it was decided to delete eight items...
(Items 1, 6, 11, 12, 22, 23, 39, and 40) that loaded .39, .36, .20, .44, .26, .22, .44, and .25, respectively, on their hypothesized latent factor. A second confirmatory factor analysis then was conducted using the remaining 31 items as indicators of their respective first-order latent factor. The fit statistics for the revised model ranged from poor (i.e., CFI = .81, TLI = .79) to fair (RMSEA = .08; SRMR = .08) as determined by criteria specified for model fit adequacy (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1999). As with the first model, this revised model did not provide good overall fit to the data.

4.5 Exploratory Factor Analysis

As a result of the failed CFA an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted on the TERS. An EFA can be used to detect any underlying factors or constructs that may be present in a scale (Thompson, 2004). An initial EFA was conducted with all 40 items of the TERS. The significance of Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 [780] = 5044.61, p < .001$) and the size of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO = .90) revealed that the set of TERS items had adequate common variance for factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). To evaluate the structure of the TERS, a common factor analysis was used with principal axis factoring and varimax rotation. The number of factors was determined by factor eigenvalues above 1.0 and a noticeable change in the slope within the scree plot (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The rotated factor matrix was examined to pinpoint items that loaded on these factors. Criteria for factor loadings included item values $\geq .40$ on the primary factor and values $\leq .30$ on other factors. Although a common guideline is to interpret loadings of .32 or higher (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), the minimum loading cutoff was set at .40 in order to maximize confidence in the factors derived from the solution.
Nine factors had eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Initial eigenvalues and percentage of variance accounted for by each of these factors were 9.85 and 24.62% for Factor 1, 3.50 and 8.75% for Factor 2, 2.57 and 6.43% for Factor 3, 1.95 and 4.87% for Factor 4, 1.85 and 4.61% for Factor 5, 1.15 and 2.87% for Factor 6, 1.12 and 2.79% for Factor 7, 1.08 and 2.70% for Factor 8, and 1.04 and 2.60% for Factor 9. Together, they accounted for 60.25% of the variance. After inspecting the scree plot, a notable difference in the slope of the first five factors from that of subsequent factors was observed. Therefore, the factor solution of only these five factors was examined.

Twelve items that had either factor loadings less than .40 or cross-loadings greater than or equal to .30 were eliminated. This procedure resulted in 28 items, with Factor 1 containing seven items, Factor 2 containing seven items, Factor 3 containing three items, Factor 4 containing seven items, and Factor 5 containing four items. Next, these 28 items were factor analyzed using a principal-axis factor analysis, five factors, and a varimax rotation.

Ten additional items that had either factor loadings less than .40 or cross-loadings greater than or equal to .30 were eliminated. This procedure resulted in 18 items and four factors. Factor 1 contained eight items, Factor 2 contained four items, Factor 3 contained four items, and Factor 4 contained two items. Next, these 18 items were factor analyzed using a principal-axis factor analysis, four factors, and a varimax rotation. All items loaded greater than .40 on their respective factor and less than .30 on any other factor. This four-factor solution accounted for 56.84% of the variance of the data. Table 4.4 demonstrates these factor loadings.
The first factor, labeled African American Families and History, (eigenvalue = 5.42) accounted for 30.10% of the variance; its factor loadings ranged from .51 to .73. This factor/subscale contained items from the CCA, CPR, and CLA subscales of the original scale developed by Stevenson et al. (2002). The second factor, Discrimination Awareness, (eigenvalue = 1.88) accounted for 10.44% of the variance; its factor loadings ranged from .59 to .85. This factor/subscale contained items from the CAD subscale of Stevenson et al.’s (2002) scale. The third factor, Mainstream Influence, (eigenvalue = 1.59) accounted for 8.86% of the variance; its factor loadings ranged from .45 to .54. This factor/subscale contained items from the CEM subscale of Stevenson et al.’s (2002) scale. The fourth factor, African American Pride, (eigenvalue = 1.34) accounted for 7.44% of the variance; its factor loadings ranged from .45 to .74. This factor/subscale contained items from the CPR subscale of Stevenson et al.’s (2002) original scale. Thus, this analysis uncovered a four factor structure with a college sample. Of these four factors two demonstrated excellent internal consistency reliability: African American Families and History (α = .86) and Discrimination Awareness (α = .85). The remaining factors, Mainstream Influence (α = .56) and African American Pride (α = .45), were not found to demonstrate adequate internal consistency based on Walsh and Betz’s (2001) criteria for the minimum level of internal consistency reliability necessary for research purposes.
Figure 4.1. The Interaction of Perceived Racist Events with Racial Socialization in Predicting Resiliency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CD-RISC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SRE-Recent</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TERS</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CCA</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CPR</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CLA</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CAD</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CEM</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BIDR</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CD-RISC = Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale. SRE-Recent = Schedule of Racist Events, Recent Subscale. TERS = Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale. CCA = Cultural Coping with Antagonism. CPR = Cultural Pride Reinforcement. CLA = Cultural Appreciation of Legacy. CAD = Cultural Alertness to Discrimination. CEM = Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream. BIDR = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding.  
* p < .05  
** p < .01  

Table 4.1

Overall Correlations Between Measures of Resiliency, Perceived Racist Events, Racial Socialization, and Social Desirability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Introductory Psychology (N = 195)</th>
<th>Student Organizations (N = 109)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Effect Size (Cohen’s d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRE- Recent</td>
<td>34.17, 14.27</td>
<td>36.16, 14.11</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERS</td>
<td>88.91, 12.65</td>
<td>89.82, 13.07</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Coping with Antagonism</td>
<td>29.01, 5.61</td>
<td>29.21, 6.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pride Reinforcement</td>
<td>16.08, 1.99</td>
<td>16.35, 2.05</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Appreciation of Legacy</td>
<td>11.35, 2.42</td>
<td>12.01, 2.49</td>
<td>5.56*</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream</td>
<td>9.13, 2.31</td>
<td>8.41, 2.05</td>
<td>5.33*</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>11.94, 6.59</td>
<td>11.78, 6.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale</td>
<td>100.36, 14.12</td>
<td>103.02, 10.76</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* SRE-Recent = Schedule of Racist Events, Recent Subscale. TERS = Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale. BIDR = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding

*p < .05

Table 4.2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Recruitment Type Comparisons (ANOVA) for Measures of Perceived Racist Events, Racial Socialization, Social Desirability, and Resiliency.
Table 4.3
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Resiliency From Perceived Racist Events, Racial Socializations, and Their Interactions (N = 304).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Incremental R²</th>
<th>t (303)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment Type</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE-Recent x TERS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment Type</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE-Recent</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SRE-Recent x CPR</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment Type</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE-Recent</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SRE-Recent x CPR</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment Type</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE-Recent</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SRE-Recent x CPR</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment Type</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE-Recent</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SRE-Recent x CAD</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment Type</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE-Recent</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEM</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SRE-Recent x CEM</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  SRE-Recent = Schedule of Racist Events, Recent Subscale. TERS = Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale. CCA = Cultural Coping with Antagonism. CPR = Cultural Pride Reinforcement. CLA = Cultural Appreciation of Legacy. CAD = Cultural Alertness to Discrimination. CEM = Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream. BIDR = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding.

*p < .017
Table 4.4

Item Factor Loadings and Corrected Item-Total Correlations for Each Teenager

Experience of Racial Socialization Factor.
5.1 Main Analyses

Both theoretical and empirical research studies of African American populations have noted the inherent role racial socialization has in the lives of African Americans and the protective power of such socialization (e.g., Bowman & Howard, 1985; Bynum et al., 2007; Fischer & Shaw 1999; Murray & Mandara, 2002; Scott, 2003; Stevenson, 1994; Stevenson et al., 2002). The present study examined the buffering effects of racial socialization on the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency. A hierarchical moderated regression was utilized to test the moderating effect of racial socialization. As hypothesized, racial socialization served as a buffer weakening the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency. Specifically, it was found that individuals who reported receiving a low frequency of racial socialization messages perceived racist events as negatively related to resiliency. In contrast, for individuals who reported receiving a high frequency of racial socialization messages, perceived racist events were not related to resiliency. The magnitude of this moderator effect was
consistent with the magnitudes typically found for interactions (McClelland & Judd, 1993).

However, results suggested that receiving pride reinforcement messages alone did not weaken the relationship between racial discrimination and resiliency. Thus, the hypothesis that cultural pride messages alone would buffer the relation between racial discrimination and resiliency was not supported. Additionally, the hypothesis that cultural pride messages would produce larger incremental variance than other types of messages was not supported.

The results of the test on cultural pride messages in the present study differ from those of earlier studies that have consistently found that messages simply emphasizing cultural pride tend to result in positive outcomes. One possible explanation may be the age of the participants. Many studies that reported positive outcomes from cultural pride messages have consisted of samples of children and adolescents (e.g., Caughy et al., 2002; Constintine & Blackmon 2002; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Scott, 2003; Stevenson, 1994; Stevenson et al., 2002). Hughes et al., 2006 noted that racial socialization often shifts as an individual gets older based on their cognitive ability and experiences. Parents may be less likely to discuss topics such as discrimination and prejudice with their younger children. As children get older they begin to develop an adult understanding of race and issues such as discrimination. Unfortunately, no longitudinal studies have been conducted to fully examine this phenomenon, (Hughes et al, 2006). Possibly, as African American children get older and move into academic and employment environments they may be more likely to face racial discrimination issues, and thus, cultural pride messages alone are not sufficient to buffer the negative effects of
racial discrimination. Landrine and Klonoff (1996) found that more than half of the African American participants in their study reported experiencing discrimination at work and from colleagues, and close to half of the sample reported experiencing discrimination from teachers and professors. Based on the results of the current study it is possible that for African American adults a combination of the various types of racial socialization messages as may have more of an impact than any one type of message alone. Thus, hearing messages concerning having pride in one’s culture, awareness of discrimination issues, preparation for how to negotiate discriminatory environments, a deeper understanding of ones heritage, and an understanding of mainstream institutions may be essential for their resiliency.

Results indicated that messages that emphasize the role of spirituality and religion in coping with racial hostility (CCA) were significantly related to participants’ resiliency. This result supports the studies that have found that spirituality and religion, which is rooted in the values of many African American communities, has served as a buffer against the negative psychological consequences of racism (Bowen-Reid & Harrell, 2002). African American spirituality is rooted in African tradition and may be involved in every aspect of an African American’s life (Boyd-Franklin, 2003). Additionally, messages emphasizing the teaching of pride and knowledge of African American culture (CPR); and messages containing information about cultural heritage issues such as enslavement and knowing historical issues for African Americans (CLA) were significantly related to how resilient participants were. This was not surprising. Many researchers have found that teaching African Americans to have pride and knowledge about their culture is imperative to their development and resilience in an often
Overall, these results suggest that racial socialization may serve as an important protective factor for African Americans in environments in which they are subjected to blatant and subtle types of racial discrimination. This finding supports studies that have suggested the positive impact of racial socialization on the lives of African Americans (e.g., Bowman & Howard, 1985; Bynum et al. 2007; Caughy et al., 2002; Fischer & Shaw, 1999; Scott, 2003; Stevenson, 1994). More specifically it supports research that has demonstrated that racial socialization can weaken the negative effect of racial discrimination (e.g., Bynum et al., 2007; Fischer & Shaw 1999).

5.2 **Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

In addition to the main analyses, tests were conducted on the Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization (TERS; Stevenson et. al 2002) scale to explore the use of this scale with an adult population. Stevenson et al.’s (2002) racial socialization scale (TERS) has been employed in various studies to assess behavioral examples of racial socialization messages that teenagers have heard from parents or other caregivers. Though this scale was developed for use with adolescents, various studies (e.g., Fisher & Shaw, 1999) have used this measure with samples of African American adults (i.e., college students and older) as a retrospective assessment of racial socialization. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the TERS in order to determine the overall fit of the data from the present study to the scale model and whether items loaded on the five latent factors found by Stevenson et al. (2002). Results indicated that the five factor structure proposed by Stevenson et al. (2002) may not be adequate for use with
adult African American populations. As a result of the inability to fit the variables into Stevenson et al.’s (2002) five-factor structure, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to detect the presence of any underlying factors.

5.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis

An exploration of the TERS’s factor structure revealed that 18 of its items could be formed into four conceptually meaningful factors, which accounted for approximately 57% of its variance. The first factor consisted of eight items. These items included messages that expressed the importance of knowing about African American history and culture and the protective power of these two aspects. The second factor contained four items which focused on messages concerning teaching youth to be aware of racial barriers and the race relation challenges between African Americans and Whites. The third factor consisted of four items that contained messages that may be expressed by mainstream culture such as avoiding discussions of racism and discussions of African history. The last factor consisted of two items which focused on African American pride. However, results indicated that only the first two factors demonstrated adequate reliability. Reliabilities greater than .70 are considered the minimum for research purposes (Walsh & Betz, 2001). It is possible that items that may have contributed to the distinction of racial socializations messages assessed in the TERS were eliminated during the factor analysis process in an attempt to obtain adequate factor loadings. Items that are good may get eliminated because of the number of factors specified, or the rotation method. Therefore, this scale may be limited in that it did not converge on the purported factor structure.
Results of the confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses may provide an additional explanation for the inability to find a moderating effect with the individual subscales of the TERS. With an adult population the items of each subscale may not have tapped into those specific types of messages proposed by Stevenson et al (2002). However, it still may be useful to utilize the total scale score of the TERS in a retrospective analysis of racial socialization with a college sample. In the present study Stevenson and colleagues (2002) TERS scale demonstrated excellent reliability with the college sample. Therefore, the moderating effect found in the main analysis should not be disregarded.

5.4 Implications

The results of the current study have interesting implications for families, mental health providers, and research. Through the process of racial socialization families can shape a child’s beliefs and attitudes of race and how they fit into this context (Murray & Mandara, 2002). African American families must prepare children for the race conscious world without immobilizing the development of their identity and authentic self (Lipford-Sander, 2002). Racial socialization may provide African American youth with the tools necessary to experience health identity development and cope with racial barriers, thus, aiding them in becoming resilient adults.

These finding also have implications for mental health providers who work with African American populations. Paying special attention to the factors that may facilitate positive outcomes for African American is essential (Miller, 1999). Having knowledge of this process can help a counselor to establish report with an African American client,
aid in the information gathering process and help the counselor in formulating meaningful intervention strategies that are culturally relevant (Lipford-Sander, 2002).

Findings may also provide more insight into the understanding of the risk and resilience in African American populations. Having a thorough understanding of the risk and resilience of minority populations is necessary for having a model of resiliency that is empirically reliable and culturally fitting for all individuals (Utsey et al., 2007). Additionally this research lends to the understanding of risk and resilience in adult African American populations. Many of the previous studies examining resiliency have focused on children and adolescent samples (Utsey et al, 2007). If we are to have complete understanding of resilience and an individual’s ability to over come any type of adversity we must begin to explore this process across cultures and the developmental life span.

5.5 Limitations

Caution should be taken when considering the implications of these results. The results of this study are cross-sectional, thus, the causal direction of the relationships cannot be confirmed. In addition, this study involved a convenience sample of African Americans affiliated with a Midwestern university. Therefore, this sample may differ from African Americans in the larger community. There may also be important regional differences that were not reflected in this sample. Consequently, readers are cautioned about making generalizations to the African American community as a whole.

There are also limitations with in the TERS (Stevenson et al., 2002). The small number of levels for the response continuum of this scale (i.e., ranging from Never (1) to Lots of times (3)) reduces the variability of responses, resulting in range restriction.
Range restriction can result in lower correlation coefficients (Guilford & Fruchter, 1978). The smaller correlation coefficients also could have impacted the results of the CFA and EFA. Factor analysis is based on the associations between variables (i.e., correlations; Thompson, 2004). Thus, the small response continuum of the TERS could have ultimately caused the failed CFA and the poor results of the EFA. However, for the purposes of this research the TERS was the most suitable and widely used measure of African American racial socialization

Lastly, all measures utilized in the present study were self-report. Thus, participant’s responses were based on their memory of events and their individual perceptions of their behavior and the behavior of others. Ambiguity is possible when making inferences about the motives (i.e., racism) of others. However, participant’s recollection of their experiences has value in understanding how they are affected by racist events and how they have processed the racial socialization messages they have received.

5.6 Future Research

While this research provides some insight into the effect of racism and racial socialization more empirical studies are needed. Though various studies have noted the impact of racism and racial disparities on the physical health of African Americans (Utsey et al., 2007), research on the psychosocial impact of racism is still in the beginning stages (Stevenson et al., 2005). Future studies should further examine the relationship between racial discrimination and psychological symptoms. Additionally, further examination of other cultural factors (e.g., racial identity, social support networks) that may serve to protect African Americans from the effects of racism is necessary.
Research has shown that factors such as social support and racial identity development can have an important impact on outcomes for African Americans (Dressler, 1985; Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk-Cone, & Zimmerman, 2003). Thus, further exploration of these cultural factors and their interaction with aspects such as environment (e.g., neighborhoods), gender, age, and social economic status may provide more information on ways to promote resiliency and a higher quality of life for African Americans.

More research is needed in the area of racial socialization as well. Hughes et al. (2006) noted that the relationship between racial socialization and outcome is complex. Perhaps we may begin to understand this complexity through longitudinal studies. Longitudinal studies may provide a more thorough understanding of how African American children process the racial socialization messages they receive and construct them into their own understanding of race as adolescents and adults.

Lastly, further exploratory analysis of the TERS with adult populations is necessary. Though the scale has been used to retrospectively assess racial socialization experiences, modifications may be necessary for use with college age and adult samples. It is also possible that a new racial socialization scale should be developed. An updated scale of racial socialization that has a larger response continuum, includes gender specific messages, and contains items that address issues pertinent to African American community and college populations would be a great asset to this area of research.

5.7 Conclusion

The present study has empirically demonstrated the protective power that racial socialization can provide for African Americans. As long as racism and discrimination continue to exist, African American families will have the task of combating the negative
messages that their children receive from the broader society. This process is both a
direct and indirect part of African American culture and may be essential to mental and
physical health of African Americans. If we are to understand what can be done to
prevent the negative consequences of racial inequality for our African American youth,
we will need to further explore what has contributed to the positive outcomes of resilient
African Americans.
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APPENDIX A
E-MAIL ADVERTISEMENT SENT TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS
Hello!
My name is Danice Brown, and I am a graduate student in the Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Program in the Department of Psychology at The Ohio State University. Along with my advisor, Pamela Highlen, I am conducting a research study exploring African American's cultural experiences and experiences with discrimination. The only requirement for participation is that you identify as an African American and you are 18 years of age or older.

The general purpose of this study is to better understand your experience with racial discrimination and how it may have impacted your life. By participating and sharing your experiences, you will be contributing invaluable information that will inform counselors and others in helping professions which may help them to better understand and attend to the needs of individuals in the African American community.

If you choose to participate in this study, please click on the link below. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. If you choose to participate, you will have the option to enter a lottery drawing in which four individuals will be selected to win $50. If you decide to withdraw from the study at anytime you will still be eligible for the lottery drawing. At the end of the survey, you will be asked to enter your e-mail address if you would like to participate in the lottery drawing. You are only required to provide this information if you choose to enter the drawing.

Due to the nature of Internet research, the security of the survey data during transmission cannot be guaranteed; however, no identifying information is required. Security is guaranteed once the researchers receive the data. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. If you would like further information about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at brown.1912@osu.edu. You may also contact my advisor Dr. Pamela Highlen at highlen.1@osu.edu.

The methods of this research and the plan for protection of rights of participants have been reviewed and approved by the Office of Responsible Research Practices (http://www.orrp.ohio-state.edu/), which oversees all research activities conducted at The Ohio State University. This plan received Institutional Review Board approval on (enter date of approval here).

Please feel free to forward this email and link to other African American students who may be interested in participating.
If you have read this email and would like to take the survey, please click on the URL below: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=73812723806
Thank you very much for your time and participation!

Sincerely,
Danice L. Brown, M. A.
Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University
APPENDIX B

SCRIPT- FIRST PAGE OF STUDY
SURVEY OF AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

African Americans Only!

These questionnaires ask you question about your experiences within culture, experiences with discrimination and racial socialization. Racial socialization involves messages that you may have received about your race and culture.

Although the confidentiality of on-line responses cannot be guaranteed, no identifying information is required. Furthermore, your responses will be kept strictly confidential once the researchers receive the data—so-

***Please try to answer all items in the survey, as a complete survey would benefit this research.

***You may skip any of the items at anytime.

***Please answer all items honestly

By completing this survey completely and honestly you will be contributing to much needed knowledge about the concerns and strengths of the African American community.

Thank you for your participation!
APPENDIX C

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION
The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose:

The general purpose of this study is to better understand your experience with racial discrimination and how it has impacted your life. By participating and sharing your experiences, you will provide valuable information that will supply counselors and those in the helping profession with a better understanding of the needs of African Americans.

Procedures/Tasks:

The entire survey will be completed on-line. For this study you will first be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. You will be asked to indicated whether you are enrolled in Psychology 100, your age, race/ethnicity, school rank, social economic status, and date of birth. Please be aware that you will not be asked for your name in any portion of the survey. You will then be asked to answer questions regarding your experiences with racial discrimination; messages that you have received about race and interactions between individuals of different races/ethnicities; questions regarding how you may respond to certain events in life, and questions about how you may view yourself and others.

This survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes. You may discontinue the study at any time by simply closing your internet browser. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled or Research Experience Program (REP) credit. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

Risks and Benefits:

Due to the nature of Internet research, the security of the survey data during transmission cannot be guaranteed; however no identifying information is required. Security is guaranteed once the researchers receive the data.

Additionally, because the questionnaires are personal in nature and deal with a sensitive topic, it is possible that you may develop some concerns during the course of the study. If this is the case, please feel free to contact the researchers (brown.1912@osu.edu, highlen.1@osu.edu) or a local counseling center. In addition, Counseling and Consultation Services (4th floor of the Younkin Success Center; 292-5766), provides psychological services to OSU students at the university.
Still, by participating in this study, you will provide information that will help counselors and others in helping professions to better understand and attend to the needs of diverse individuals.

Confidentiality:
Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Students enrolled in Psychology 100 and participating in this study through the Research Experience Program (REP) will receive 1.0 hour of REP credit. Participants not involved in REP will have the option to enter a lottery drawing in which one to two individuals will be selected to win $100. If you decide to withdraw from the study at anytime you will still be eligible for the lottery drawing. At the end of the survey, you will be asked to enter your e-mail address if you would like to participate in the lottery drawing. You are only required to provide this information if you choose to enter the drawing.

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:
For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact brown.1912@osu.edu; highlen.1@osu.edu.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.
If you are injured as a result of participating in this study or for questions about a study-related injury, you may contact brown.1912@osu.edu; highlen.1@osu.edu.

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by consenting to take part in this study.

In order to continue with the survey, you must indicate your agreement here. If you agree with the above, please indicate your agreement by clicking "yes" below.

☐ Yes  ☐ No
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DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Thank you for participating in this study! You have completed a study composed of several questionnaires which assess your experiences with discrimination and racial socialization, messages that you may have received about your race and culture.

The primary purpose of this study is to expand and enhance the existing research findings regarding African American’s experience with racism, racial socialization, resiliency—the ability to overcome adversity. The results of this research will hopefully lead to a better understanding of how racial socialization may serve as a protective factor against racial discrimination and promote resiliency in African American communities.

Because the questionnaires are personal in nature and deals with a sensitive topic, it is possible that you may have developed some concerns during the course of the study. If this is the case, please feel free to contact the researchers (brown.1912@osu.edu, highlen.1@osu.edu) or a local counseling center. In addition, Counseling and Consultation Services (4th floor of the Youkin Success Center; 292-5766), provides psychological services to OSU students at the university.

If you have any further questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact the researchers.

Again, thank you for assisting with this research. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Danice L. Brown, M.A. (brown.1912@osu.edu)

Pamela Highlen, Ph.D. (highlen.1@osu.edu)
APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
In the following items, please enter the information that best describes you.

1. I am currently enrolled in Psychology 100 at The Ohio State University and am completing this study for course credit.
   Yes ________  No________
   If you answered yes to the above question please enter your code number provided to you by the researcher here: __________

2. Please enter your age: __________

3. Ethnic identification:
   African American ___
   Biracial _____
   White____
   Hispanic____
   Asian/Asian American_____
   Other (please specify) ________________________

4. Gender:
   Male ______
   Female ______

5. School Rank:
   Freshman ___
   Sophomore ______
   Junior ______
   Senior ______
   Post-bac ____
   Graduate student ____
   Other (please specify) ________________________

6. Date of birth ______

7. Student organization with which you are affiliated (if any):
   ________________________________
APPENDIX F

SCHEDULE OF RACIST EVENTS
We are interested in your experiences with racism. As you answer the questions below, please think about your ENTIRE LIFE, from when you were a child to the present. For each question, please indicate the number that best captures the things that have happened to you. Answer each question TWICE, once for what has happened to you IN THE PAST YEAR, and once for what YOUR ENTIRE LIFE HAS BEEN LIKE. Use these numbers:

1 = If this has NEVER happened to you
2 = If this has happened ONCE IN A WHILE (less than 10% of the time)
3 = If this has happened SOMETIMES (10%-25% of the time)
4 = If this has happened A LOT (26%-49% of the time)
5 = If this has happened MOST OF THE TIME (50%-70% of the time)
6 = If this has happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70% of the time)

1. How many times have you been treated unfairly by teachers or professors because you are Black?
   a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss, or supervisors because you are Black?
   a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your co-workers, fellow students or colleagues because you are Black?
   a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (by store clerks, waiters, bartenders, waitresses, bank tellers, mechanics, and others) because you are Black?

   a. How many times **IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times **IN THE PAST YEAR**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
      Not at all  Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are Black?

   a. How many times **IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times **IN THE PAST YEAR**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
      Not at all  Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs (by doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, pediatricians, school principals, gynecologists, and others) because you are Black?

   a. How many times **IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times **IN THE PAST YEAR**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
      Not at all  Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. How many times have you been treated unfairly by neighbors because you are Black?

   a. How many times **IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times **IN THE PAST YEAR**? 1 2 3 4 5 6
      Not at all  Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. How many times have you been treated unfairly by institutions (schools, universities, law firms, the police, the courts, the Department of Social Services, the Unemployment Office and others) because you are Black?
9. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people you thought were your friends because you are Black?

   a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
      Not at all          Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. How many times have you been accused or suspected of doing something wrong (such as stealing, cheating, not doing your share of the work, or breaking the law) because you are Black?

   a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
      Not at all          Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. How many times have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because you are Black?

   a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
      Not at all          Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. How many times have you wanted to tell someone off for being racist but didn’t say anything?
13. How many times have you been really angry about something racist that was done to you?

| a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. How stressful was this for you?    |   |   |   |   |   |   |

14. How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some racist thing that was done to you?

| a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. How stressful was this for you?    |   |   |   |   |   |   |

15. How many times have you been called a racist name like n____, coon, jungle bunny, or other names?

| a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. How stressful was this for you?    |   |   |   |   |   |   |

16. How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something racist that was done to you or done to somebody else?

| a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
17. How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because you are Black?

   a. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1  2  3  4  5  6
   b. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1  2  3  4  5  6
      Not at all  Extremely
   c. How stressful was this for you?  1  2  3  4  5  6

18. How different would your life have been now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in a racist and unfair way?

   A. THROUGHOUT YOUR ENTIRE LIFE:
      1  2  3  4  5  6
      Same as  Little  Different in  Different in  Different in  Totally
      now  different  many ways  a lot of ways  most ways  different

   B. IN THE PAST YEAR:
      1  2  3  4  5  6
      Same as  Little  Different in  Different in  Different in  Totally
      now  different  many ways  a lot of ways  most ways  different
APPENDIX G

TEENAGERS EXPERIENCE OF RACIAL SOCIALIZATION SCALE
**Instructions:** Do your parents or any of your caregivers say to you any of the following statements now or when you were younger? Circle the number on the line depending on how often you remember hearing any of these messages: 1- Never, 2- A Few Times, 3- Lots of Times. Circle only one number per question.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> American society is fair toward Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Black children will feel better about themselves if they go to a school with mostly white children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Families who go to a church or mosque will be close and stay together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Black slavery is important never to forget.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Relatives can help Black parents raise their children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Religion is an important part of a person's life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Racism and discrimination are the hardest things a Black child has to face.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Having large families can help many Black families survive life struggles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> You should be proud to be Black.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> All races are equal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> If you work hard then you can overcome barriers in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> A belief in God can help a person deal with tough life struggles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> Black children will learn more if they go to a mostly white school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> Knowing your African heritage is important for your survival.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> Racism is real, and you have to understand it or it will hurt you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong> You are connected to a history that goes back to African royalty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong> Too much talk about racism will keep you from reaching your goals in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong> Schools should be required to teach all children about Black history.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong> Depending on religion and God will help you live a good life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong> Families who talk openly about religion or God will help each other to grow.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong> Teachers can help Black children grow by showing signs of Black culture in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong> Only people who are blood-related to you should be called your &quot;Family&quot;.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong> Getting a good education is still the best way for you to get ahead.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong> &quot;Don't forget who your people are because you may need them someday.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong> Spiritual battles that people fight are more important than the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>physical battles.</strong></td>
<td><strong>26. You should know about Black history so that you will be a better person.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27. “Train up a child in the way he should go, and he will not turn away from it.”</strong></td>
<td><strong>28. You have to work twice as hard as whites in order to get ahead in this world.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29. Whites make it hard for people to get ahead in this world.</strong></td>
<td><strong>30. Be proud of who you are.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31. Going to a Black school will help Black children feel better about themselves.</strong></td>
<td><strong>32. You need to learn how to live in a White world and a Black world.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33. Never be ashamed of your color.</strong></td>
<td><strong>34. Whites have more opportunities than Blacks.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35. A Black child or teenager will be harassed just because s/he is Black.</strong></td>
<td><strong>36. More job opportunities would be open to African Americans if people were not racist.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37. Black children should be taught early that God can protect them from racial hatred.</strong></td>
<td><strong>38. Blacks don’t always have the same opportunities as whites.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39. Black children don’t have to know about Africa in order to survive life in America.</strong></td>
<td><strong>40. Racism is not as bad today as it used to be before the 1960’s.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

CONNOR-DAVIDSON RESILIENCE SCALE
**Instructions:** Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements as they apply to you over the last **month**. If a particular situation has not occurred recently, answer according to how you think you would have felt.

Circle the “1” if it is **Not true at all**  
Circle the “2” if it is **Rarely true**  
Circle the “3” if it is **Sometimes true**  
Circle the “4” if it is **Often true**  
Circle the “5” if it is **True nearly all of the time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not true at all</th>
<th>Rarely true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>True nearly all the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to adapt when changes occur.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have at least one close and secure relationship which helps me when</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When there are no clear solutions to my problems, sometimes fate or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can deal with whatever comes my way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Past successes give me confidence in dealing with new challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I try to see the humorous side of things when I am faced with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having to cope with stress can make me stronger.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or other hardships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Good or bad, I believe that most things happen for a reason.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I give my best effort, no matter what the outcome may be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I believe I can achieve my goals, even if there are obstacles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Even when things look hopeless, I don’t give up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. During times of stress/crisis, I know where to turn for help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Under pressure, I stay focused and think clearly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I prefer to take the lead in solving problems, rather than letting others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am not easily discouraged by failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I think of myself as a strong person when dealing with life’s challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I can make unpopular or difficult decisions that affect other people, if</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am able to handle unpleasant or painful feelings like sadness, fear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In dealing with life’s problems, sometimes you have to act on a hunch,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I have a strong sense of purpose in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I feel in control of my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I like challenges.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I work to attain my goals, no matter what roadblocks I encounter along</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I take pride in my achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING
Instructions: Please respond to the following items in terms of how true the statements are for you. Circle the number that most accurately reflects your experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Very True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I don’t care to know what other people really think of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have not always been honest with myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I always know why I like things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Once I’ve made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am fully in control of my own fate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It’s hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I never regret my decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can’t make up my mind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am a completely rational person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I rarely appreciate criticism.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am very confident of my judgments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It’s all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I don’t always know the reasons why I do the things I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I never cover my mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I never swear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I always obey laws, even if I’m unlikely to get caught.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I always declare everything at customs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have never dropped litter on the street.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I never read sexy books or magazines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I have done things that I don’t tell other people about</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I never take things that don’t belong to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn’t sick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I have some pretty awful habit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I don’t gossip about other people’s business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>