



PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
OCT 14 2005		

RACIAL INTEGRATION HISTORY AND EGO-IDENTITY STATUS:
PREDICTING STUDENT RACIAL ATTITUDES

By

Douglas M. Neil

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology
and Special Education

2002

Abstract

RACIAL INTEGRATION HISTORY AND EGO-IDENTITY STATUS: PREDICTING STUDENT RACIAL ATTITUDES

By

Douglas M. Neil

Despite the importance of skill, awareness, and knowledge acquisition for multicultural sensitivity, there are no studies which attempt to explain the development of and role of racial attitudes among undergraduate students. The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which gender, ego-identity status, racial integration history and the interaction between ego-identity and racial integration history predict Black and White students' racial identity attitudes. The variables were operationalized using a demographic questionnaire (gender, age, and racial integration history), The Ego-Identity Scale (EIS), the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS), and the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS). Two independent studies were conducted to determine the impact of the independent variables on Black students' racial identity attitudes (Study 1) (n=64) and White students' racial identity attitudes (Study 2) (n=70).

A review of the similarities and differences between the studies revealed that neither Black racial identity attitudes nor White racial identity attitudes were predicted

by age or gender. Similarly, with the exception of Black racial identity Encounter status, racial integration history was not a significant variable in predicting racial identity attitudes. With these variables not contributing significantly to the models explaining Black or White racial identity development, ego-identity development was left to explain most of the variance observed in both models.

The ego-identity stages of Foreclosure and Achievement were the only stages to predict racial identity attitude development. Among Black students, Foreclosure predicted earlier stages of Black racial identity development (e.g., Pre-encounter and Encounter). Likewise, among White students, Foreclosure predicted earlier stages of White racial identity development (e.g., Disintegration). For White students, Achievement stage of ego-identity development was also predictive of higher statuses of racial identity attitude development. In this case, Achievement was predictive of both Pseudo-independence and Autonomy statuses. Limitations of the study were discussed in addition to implications for future research.

To my parents, Gerald and Ruth Neil, and to my grandmother,
Azalia Benjamin.

Acknowledgments

Understanding that this project did not reach completion without the assistance of many individuals, the author wishes to express gratitude to those that helped in many different ways. First, I want to thank my advisor and mentor, Dr. Robbie Steward, for her support, hours of editing, and suggestions that made this a better manuscript. She is an example of one who loves science and is able to share this appreciation with her students in a constructive and edifying manner.

I also wish to thank my committee members, Dr. Alfiee Breland, Dr. Lee June, and Dr. Anna Ortiz, for their thoughtful input during the data collection and writing stages of this dissertation. I believe that I am a better professional for having associated with these individuals.

I acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Dorothy Reed and the Charles Drew Science Laboratory in the collection of data. Dr. Reed's logistical assistance in coordinating data collection with her students was invaluable.

Finally, I wish to thank my family for their efforts. A special thanks to my parents, Gerald and Ruth Neil, for providing work space, support and encouragement. I thank my grandmother, Azalia Benjamin, for her persistent encouragement to complete this project in a timely manner.

I also want to thank my siblings, Steve, Kathy, Jeff, Tim,
and Ashley, for their words of encouragement.

List of Tables

Table 1	Intercorrelations between predictors of Black Racial Identity Attitudes (BRIAS) and subscales of the BRIAS.....	70
Table 2	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Preencounter Status on the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63).....	73
Table 3	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Encounter Status on the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63).....	76
Table 4	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Immersion Status on the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63).....	79
Table 5	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Integration Status on the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63).....	81
Table 6	Intercorrelations between predictors of White Racial Identity Attitudes (WRIAS) and subscales of the WRIAS.....	83
Table 7	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Contact Status on the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70)...	86
Table 8	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Disintegration Status on the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70).....	88
Table 9	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Reintegration Status on the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70).....	92

Table 10	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Pseudo-Independence Status on the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70)	94
Table 11	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Autonomy Status on the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale(WRIAS) (N=70)	97

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	vii
Chapter 1	
Introduction.....	1
Tripartite Model.....	7
Multicultural Training.....	9
Racial Attitudes in Training Programs.....	12
Summary and Problem Statement.....	15
Chapter 2	
Literature Review.....	17
Racial Attitudes and Racial Identity.....	21
Ego-identity.....	24
Ego-identity, Race, and Racial Attitudes.....	28
Racial Integration.....	30
Pilot Study Results.....	34
Summary.....	38
Research Questions.....	40
Hypotheses for Black Students.....	40
Hypotheses for White Students.....	41
Chapter 3	
Methods.....	42
Study 1 (Black Students).....	46
Participants.....	48
Demographics of the University.....	48
Measures.....	48
Procedure.....	53
Analysis.....	53
Testing of Statistical Assumptions.....	55
Study 2 (White Students).....	57
Participants.....	57
Demographics of the University.....	58
Measures.....	59
Procedure.....	63
Analysis.....	63
Testing of Statistical Assumptions.....	65

Chapter 4	
Results.....	67
Study 1 (Black Students).....	68
Pre-encounter.....	69
Encounter.....	74
Immersion.....	78
Integration.....	80
Study 2 (White students).....	82
Contact.....	82
Disintegration.....	87
Reintegration.....	90
Pseudo-independence.....	91
Autonomy.....	96
Chapter 5	
Discussion.....	99
Study 1.....	99
Implications for Further Research.....	109
Study 2.....	113
Implications for Further Research.....	122
Summary and Comparison of Study Findings.....	124
Limitations.....	125
Appendices	
Appendix A: Results of Pilot Study.....	128
Appendix B: Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale....	137
Appendix C: Ego-identity attitude Scale.....	141
Appendix D: Demographics Form.....	147
Appendix E: Consent Form.....	149
Appendix F: White Racial Identity Attitude Scale....	151
References.....	155

Chapter One

Introduction

Understanding the nature of cross-cultural relationships in the field of counseling psychology has been the focus of substantial investigative inquiry in recent decades. With the burgeoning civil-rights movement in the middle of the twentieth century and a shift in ideology, concerning segregation, among liberal middle-class Whites¹, a climate was created to begin inquiries into the implications of racism on various segments of American society (Katz, 1985). In response to this shift in socio-political climate, Black² psychologists were the first to initiate investigations into the effects of racism on Blacks in the United States.

¹The racial designation of "White(s)" will be used throughout the text in reference to people(s) that hold majority status in the United States. The author recognizes that the current political climate may call for the designation of "European-American"; however, use of a term other than "White" in this text would detract from the historical significance of racial oppression and racism in the United States. Secondly, use of the designation "White" will promote consistency in terminology when linking the literature to specific research methodology.

²The racial designation of "Black" will be used throughout the text to reference people(s) that identify themselves as having identities rooted in the history of African slavery in America. Again, the current political climate often calls for the designation of "African American" for this group of people; however, use of a term other than "Black", in American "White-Black" racial dynamics, would minimize the symbolic, multi-layered meanings behind the use of color to designate race versus a point-of-origin designation. Secondly, consistently using the "Black" designation will promote ease of reference when linking the literature with research methodology.

Initially, studies focused on separating the processes of individual identity development from the effects of ethnicity on development in a racist environment (Helms, 1990; Cross, 1971). After separating these constructs, Black racial identity development became known as the process by which a person becomes Black and is defined in terms of how the person thinks about oneself and one's reference group (Helms, 1990). Recognizing that Blacks do not develop identities in an environment where skin color is a non-issue, subsequent racial identity³ models were developed to incorporate the effects of racism on identity development.

The first models describing Black Racial Identity Development (BRID) began to appear in 1971 (Cross, 1971; Dizzard, 1971; Thomas, 1971; Vontress, 1971) and continued to emerge for nearly two decades (Gibbs, 1974; Gay, 1974; Jackson, 1975; Toldson & Pasteur, 1975; Akbar, 1979; Milliones, 1980; Banks, 1981; Helms, 1990). During this time, BRID theorists attempted to describe the process and direction of healthy Black identity development; most

³Many authors writing on the topic of racial identity development will use the terms "racial identity", "racial attitudes" and "racial identity attitudes" interchangeably. For the purpose of representing their ideas accurately, this author will use the terms that they used when presenting their work. Throughout the introductory and literature review portions of this text, the distinction between racial identity and racial attitudes will be delineated.

hypothesized that unhealthy identity was characterized by over identification with 'whiteness' and that healthy identity included a self-defined racial integration (Helms, 1990).

In a summary of BRID models preceding her own, Helms (1990) commented on the striking similarities between models. Most notable was the proposition that racial identity occurs in stages, with exception of the models by Akbar (1979) and Gibbs (1974), and that individuals generally progress from idealization of 'whiteness' (unhealthy) to internalization of Black culture (healthy). Helms (1990) further commented that although the BRID models appeared in the literature around the same time, few authors engaged in cross-referencing of others' research material. She explained the multiplicity of models as follows:

Anyone who takes the time to interview some of the key actors will readily discover each was working independently of the other, and the similarity in their writings is not the product of a "copy-cat" phenomena, but the reflection of the fact that whether observed in Watts (Charles Thomas), Chicago (William Cross), Albany, New York (Bailey Jackson), New Orleans (Ivory Toldson and Albert Pasteur) or Pittsburgh (Jake Milliones), the dynamics of Black identity change were basically the same all across America. The similarity, then, is not so much with the models, but in the phenomena being observed. (p. 18)

Although our understanding of Black racial identity has increased over the past three decades, the same cannot be said for the duration of White racial identity theory. To

the contrary, White racial identity theory did not emerge until Janet Helms proposed the White Racial Identity Theory and scale in 1984 (Helms, 1984; Helms, 1990; Helms & Carter, 1990).

During the 1990 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Mio and Iwamasa (1993) provided an overview of racism within the profession of psychology and the role of minority and majority researchers in multicultural research. As a result of the symposium, two primary perspectives emerged: majority and minority roles in multicultural research. Majority researchers highlighted the need to reduce research bias (Donald Atkinson), foster mentoring relationships with minority students, recognize the myriad cross-cultural issues in counseling psychology (Paul Pedersen), and the need to engage in multicultural research (Joseph Ponterotto).

Conversely, Thomas Parham highlighted a minority perspective during the symposium (Mio & Iwamasa, 1993). He shared feelings of resentment from the minority community within the profession. He posed the question: What are Whites doing studying minorities? Parham suggested that the answer to the question was that White researchers get tenure, research grants, and otherwise improve their standing within their research communities as a result of conducting these studies. Additional resentment followed

feelings that minority communities were exploited for White researchers' purposes, that multicultural research was not respected until Whites gave their approval, and that White researchers generally failed to recognize minority research (past and present).

As an invited symposium participant, for her contributions to the field of racial identity theory, Janet Helms explained, "I did not start out wanting to become an expert on White identity-but I seem to have become one!" (Mio & Iwamasa, 1993, p.200) Furthermore, she stated that many majority researchers were afraid to study the area of White racial identity and often found themselves in the position of asking minority researchers about their level of White racial identity development.

In response to Helms' comments, Wayne Rowe, Sandra Bennett, and Donald Atkinson (1994) proposed a new model for assessing White racial consciousness: The Oklahoma Racial Attitude Scale. They challenged Helms' model as being based on oppression-adaptation minority development models, focusing White racial attitudes on racial/ethnic out-groups instead of White identity attitudes, and depicting the process as developmental in nature. Although their criticisms of Helms' model (Helms, 1984, 1990) were numerous, their own instrument (ORAS-P) lacks published

evidence to support sufficient statements of reliability and validity for the constructs they claim to measure.

The continuing evolution of Black and White racial identity theories (Helms, 1984, 1990, 1995; Rowe et. al, 1994), has moved the profession forward by establishing a preliminary foundation for understanding the dynamic cross-cultural relationship. Furthermore, as the counseling profession becomes more sensitive to issues of culture, it makes continuing efforts to educate its students and members. Training manuals typically focus on three basic concepts: (a) understanding the diverse experiences of members from other cultural groups; (b) understanding how differences in culture potentially limit communication and; (c) acquiring a specific set of abilities that increase the probability that a professional will be culturally skilled (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995). In short, at this point in the development of our professional community, we believe we know multicultural sensitivity and insensitivity when we see it, but, we have a difficult time defining what specific characteristics or configurations of student characteristics (e.g., racial identity attitudes) constitute these distinctions.

Tripartite Model

Responding to the increasing interest and need for an organizational position on multicultural issues, Division 17 of the American Psychological Association (1980), summarized the organization's standing on diversity issues in training and practice. Sue and Sue (1990) condensed this position statement into the well known tripartite model for multicultural training, practice and research: personal awareness (self and other), cultural knowledge, and cross-cultural skills. This model often guides the development of multicultural training courses, training program diversity statements, and criteria for assessing general multicultural sensitivity. Because the components of the model are broad and open to subjective interpretation, training programs and members of the profession still seek clarification of what constitutes a multiculturally sensitive student or professional.

Attempting to describe the culturally sensitive student, theorists develop sometimes expansive descriptions. Ponterotto (1998) commented on a new wave of qualitative research dealing with behavioral and attitudinal characteristics of sensitive students in training programs. According to him, a culturally sensitive student demonstrates the following characteristics: (1) openness and

curiosity with relation to training activities; (2) willingness to examine their own socialization history-family and community environment, schooling, church, friendships, etc; (3) courage to self-disclose their own views, opinions, feelings, and questions during group discussions; (4) non-defensiveness in their interpersonal interactions and can absorb and consider feedback regarding their own sexist, racist, and homophobic attitudes and expectations; (5) high levels of resiliency, psychological hardiness, and cognitive complexity; (6) commitment to developing multicultural sensitivity in spite of the many challenges that are involved in the process. This commitment extends to social justice issues and to the general appreciation for the culturally different; and, (7) makes active effort to learn more about multicultural issues through additional course work, conferences and workshops, and independent reading and research. These students also commit to increasing their personal contact across cultures. Indeed, the preceding description of students appears to be a rational accounting of characteristics necessary in cross-cultural relationships. Unfortunately, the profession is still in need of empirical evidence linking these seemingly rational ideals to predictors of multicultural sensitivity outcomes.

Multicultural Training

Within the profession and society in general, most would agree that the principles of autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, justice, fidelity and veracity (list not exhaustive) are necessary and critical in the maintenance of civilized human interactions. However, when placed at the juncture of integrating theory with practice, many, in the profession and society, find the transfer of knowledge from theory to behavior difficult at best.

To make the assumption that all students and professionals share the same concern for matters involving cross-cultural sensitivity would be in error. Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, and Weeks (1998) found that students' completion of or participation in multicultural counseling coursework did not necessarily result in their acceptance or valuing of multicultural counseling issues or related literature. One-third of the students in their study reported that exposure to content of multicultural literature was meaningless. In addition, students who did and did not value issues of diversity perceived each other as culturally sensitive in service delivery activities; an interesting finding given that some students found the attitudes and response styles of their less interested counterparts to be disrespectful and inappropriate. The authors of the study cited the concept of camouflaging

(Brown, Parham, & Yonder, 1996) as a possible explanation for the acceptance of inappropriate behavior. Camouflaging may indeed serve as a defense mechanism among White trainees experiencing anxiety related to their own unique life experiences as they relate to the effects of racism among racial and ethnic minority groups.

Prior to the Steward et al. study (1998) D'Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (1991) identified relationships among multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skill, and formal instructional strategies. Using the procedure of pre-testing and post-testing, the authors were able to establish a significant improvement in students' perception of cultural sensitivity after exposure to a standardized curriculum. The findings of Neville et al. (1996) may reconcile the findings of the previous two studies. Neville et al. (1996) found that although completion of multicultural training seemed to increase cross-cultural sensitivity, lower levels of White racial identity development were not affected by the training experience. This being the case, then it would seem that multicultural training would have little or no bearing on the abandonment of racist ideology for those inclined to maintain biased attitudes and/or behaviors.

Adding an additional perspective, Robinson (1988) proposed that traditional training was not necessarily the

only effective method whereby students learn counseling skills and cultural sensitivity. She found that students using a self-instructional style also learned basic counseling skills when compared to students that learned through traditional methods. Traditional training methods may not be the only source of counseling skill acquisition; some students may begin training programs already having acquired fundamental skills and/or experiences that predispose them to seek out and develop effective cross-cultural counseling relationships (Steward, Neil, Jo, Hill, & Baden, 1998).

Ever increasing studies investigating relationships among student populations and training models suggests that more empirically supported understanding is needed. Helms (1984) extended this discussion by proposing that cultural sensitivity may be linked to attitudinal predispositions. Specifically, she suggested that cultural sensitivity might be related to factors including race, racial attitude, and the perceived racial attitudes of the other person, or client. This suggestion, may, in part, explain differences between culturally sensitive and culturally insensitive students as well as why some students respond more positively to training than others.

Considering the initial tenets of multicultural sensitivity (i.e., understanding the diverse experiences of

members from other cultural groups; understanding how differences in culture potentially limit communication and; possessing a specific set of abilities that increase the probability that a student will be culturally skilled), the responsibility for producing sensitive cross-cultural students may not rest entirely with training programs: Students may bring with them attitudes which predispose them to be more effective in cross-cultural settings.

Racial Attitudes in Training Programs

Addressing the issue of multicultural training among students in counselor training programs, Steward, Neil, and Miller (2000) suggested that in many cases, students enter training programs with very different backgrounds, worldviews and predispositions for training outcomes. They suggested that this was to be expected when the profession and society encourages diversity in university environments. They observed that within diverse cohorts of students, two groups form shortly after admission: students who actively engage in activities that promote cultural sensitivity and students that have difficulty interacting with individuals with alternative worldviews. It is the latter group that often evokes the greatest concern.

Addressing the issue of cultural insensitivity, Steward, Neil, and Miller (2000) described a typical case:

This is the student that does very well with academic aspects of the training program. Success with coursework is generally viewed by the student and faculty to be a strength; therefore, there is no early indication that the student will have difficulty completing the requirements of the program. Distinct problems emerge when the student begins to engage in the applied aspects of the program (e.g., an applied diversity course). At this point in time it is observed that the student is unable to successfully engage clients during a cross-cultural role-play. Often these breakdowns occur when the student is dealing with a minority client who is having a difficult time in a predominantly White university setting. Instead of addressing issues of race (including institutional racism and prejudice) as they relate to the client's experience, the student automatically offers an intervention meant to address the client's inability to refer to an internalized locus of control (such an intervention might include assertiveness training). Although such an intervention would be culturally appropriate for a White client, it would not be appropriate for a minority client experiencing racism; furthermore, repeated miscalculations are an indication that the student is not adequately addressing the needs of their minority clientele.

Because it is assumed that all students will make miscalculations when assessing client needs and suitable interventions, early "cultural collisions" in the counseling relationship are not uncommon among many students (Steward, Gimenez, & Jackson, 1995). Distinctions between groups of culturally sensitive students and insensitive students emerge when miscalculations continue to occur after receiving feedback from the instructor and peers. In extreme cases, students have been known to maintain the position that racism (or any other race related issue) is not an issue and objective opinions or literature suggesting otherwise are biased.

In the literature discussing problems and impairment of trainees, Lamb and his colleagues (1987) discussed criteria to consider when evaluating a student and his/her degree of problem behavior:

(a) the [student] does not acknowledge, understand, or address the problem when it is identified; (b) the problem is not merely a reflection of a skill deficit that can be rectified by academic or didactic training; (c) the quality of services delivered by the [student] is consistently negatively affected; (d) the problem is not restricted to one area of professional functioning; (e) a disproportionate amount of attention by training personnel is required, and/or (f) the [student's] behavior does not change as a function of feedback, remediation efforts, and/or time. (p.599)

Clearly, some students bring with them attitudes which predispose them to be less effective in cross-cultural

interactions. Likewise, it must be noted that some students bring with them positive racial attitudes which predispose them to be effective in multicultural interactions. In addition to the characteristics proposed by Ponterotto (1998) earlier, these students seem to possess qualitative differences (including but not limited to attitudes) which allow them to listen, intuit, and empathize with individuals of different cultural backgrounds. Given that we know very little about students that possess these qualities, it will be important to identify predictors of this predisposition.

Summary and Problem Statement

Multicultural counseling theory provides a framework for sensitive cross-cultural relationships during and after training. Previous research indicates that the profession has conceptually formulated a definition of what it means to be a sensitive cross-cultural student (i.e., the tripartite model). Although it appears that students' attitudes play a significant role in the acquisition of multicultural sensitivity, it remains unclear what personal characteristics predispose some students to endorse positive racial attitudes and to voluntarily engage in positive cross-cultural behaviors (skills).

To address this unanswered question, the author will investigate predictors related to student racial attitudes;

specifically, what demographic, personality characteristics and experiences may assist in predicting racial attitudes? In organizing a rationale for the proposed study of racial attitude development, the author will review the current literature related to development of racial attitudes. At the conclusion of the literature review, the author will propose specific research questions with hypotheses for anticipated study outcomes.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

The purpose of this literature review will be to provide a context from which to develop specific questions and hypotheses concerning the constructs which contribute to positive forms of racial attitudes. It will be my argument that the variables of ego-identity development and racial integration history contribute in large degree to the racial attitudes of post-secondary students. Through a process of discussing organizational and individual definitions of multicultural sensitivity (and the lack of continuity among definitions), developing operational definitions of the variables, and reviewing current research findings that integrate these variables, it is hoped that a clear rationale for this study will emerge. Specific questions and hypotheses will follow the review and will be guided by findings from a previous pilot study.

Traditionally, when contemplating the admission of students into counselor training programs, admissions committees will consider basic criteria for determining students' probabilities of success (i.e., interview ability, writing style, aptitude scores, and GPA). Seldom does the admissions process require the student to demonstrate multicultural skill before admission. After admission, students make choices concerning the degree to which they

will immerse themselves in multicultural training and development. Some choose to embrace principles of multiculturalism as a means of respecting diversity within the profession and the service population. Some choose to proceed through training with minimal exposure to coursework (meeting minimal program requirements), peer interaction, and critical discussion necessary for the acquisition of multicultural skill, awareness, and knowledge.

Subsequent to recommendations by Division 17, of the American Psychological Association (1980, 1990) to recognize cross-cultural awareness, knowledge and skill as basic multicultural competencies, various other leaders in the field of multicultural counseling have made similar recommendations (Helms, 1990; Ibrahim & Arredondo, 1986; Ponterotto & Casas, 1987; Sabnani et al., 1991; D.W. Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992; D.W. Sue & Sue, 1990; S. Sue & Zane, 1987). Of these recommendations, the tripartite model (Sue & Sue, 1990), which describes multicultural competence, most succinctly states criterion by which to measure personal and professional development of these competencies. Specifically noted are the components of personal awareness, cultural knowledge, and cross-cultural counseling skills, all of which, according to theory, must be integrated in order to facilitate the process of becoming a culturally skilled professional (D. W. Sue & Sue, 1990).

Attempting to expand understanding of the tripartite model, Sadowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, and Wise (1994) proposed that each component of the model represents one of the following domains: behavioral, affective, or cognitive. They identified cross-cultural skill as a behavioral domain. Furthermore, they suggest that general counseling skills are not sufficient for cross-cultural counseling relationships (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991). Cultural knowledge was identified within the cognitive domain. This designation suggested that students and professionals were required to know theory, current research findings, and cross-paradigm approaches to effectively participate in cross-cultural interactions. Finally, cultural awareness ('self' and 'other' awareness) was associated with the affective domain. This domain encompassed the counselor's attitude toward their own culture and toward differences in cultural values and biases.

Given that the components of cross-cultural skill, cultural knowledge, and cross-cultural counseling skills are essential to describing competency criterion, I will argue that the component of awareness (with associated attitudes) is the higher-order component in the prevailing tripartite model of multicultural counseling. Although cross-cultural skill (behavioral) and cultural knowledge (knowledge) are essential factors for competent professional behavior, this

knowledge and skill cannot be utilized without positive 'self' and 'other' awareness and subsequent attitudes. Using this conceptualization, awareness (with associated attitudes) is the foundation or template from which skill and knowledge are organized into a configuration of culturally sensitive thinking processes which in turn drive sensitive cross-cultural behaviors.

Although significant time and effort is focused on the affective (or awareness) domain of competence in training programs, this appears to be the component which produces the most resistance from students. This may be explained by the fact that the acquisition of awareness requires students to self-evaluate, identify racial attitudes, and take active measures to adjust their perceptions of 'self' and 'others.' The process is viewed by some students as intrusive and often unnecessary. This assumption is supported by the findings of Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, and Weeks (1998) noted earlier. They found that students' completion of or participation in multicultural counseling coursework did not necessarily result in their acceptance or valuing of multicultural issues or related literature. Given this finding, it seems that something other than traditional training models must be attended to in facilitating the development of preferred race related attitudes. Given the finding that multicultural counseling coursework has little

or no influence on cultural sensitivity among students, then perhaps an investigation of pre-training characteristics or traits would provide a more functional explanation for variation observed; the most basic of these characteristics might be racial identity/racial attitudes, ego-identity development and exposure to multicultural experiences.

Racial Attitudes and Racial Identity

Racial identity theory, as it pertains to student development, proposes that student racial identity status is dependent much upon attitudes toward own and other racial groups. In the United States, Helms (1995) defined the term "people of color" as those persons whose primary ancestry is at least in part African, Asian, Indigenous, and/or combinations of these groups and White European ancestry. A historical review of race relations among Whites and people of color suggested that the latter were subjected to economic and political injustices because they were not perceived to be White (Helms, 1995; Takaki, 1993; Zinn, 1980). The consequence of differential treatment on the basis of race developed societal themes of racism and prejudice based upon group characteristics. In turn, these same characteristics (e.g., poverty and illiteracy) became the racial stereotypes called upon to explain the circumstances of the deprived groups (Helms, 1995; Takaki,

1993; Zinn, 1980). Helms and Cook (1999) suggested that the process of overcoming internalized societal racial stereotypes and negative self- and own-group ideas is a major milestone of racial identity development. Therefore, the primary racial identity development theme of all people of color is to recognize and overcome the psychological manifestations of internalized racism (Helms, 1995). Helms (1995) developed the following status model to describe the developmental process, including Information Processing Strategies (IPS):

Pre-Encounter Status: external self-definition that implies devaluing of own group and allegiance to White standards of merit. Probably is oblivious to socio-racial groups' socio-political histories. IPS: Selective perception and obliviousness to socio-racial concerns. (p. 186)

Encounter Status: ambivalence and confusion concerning own socio-racial group commitment and ambivalent socio-racial self-definition. May be ambivalent about life decisions. IPS: Repression of anxiety-provoking racial information. (p. 186)

Immersion/Emersion Status: idealization of one's socio-racial group and denigration of that which is perceived as White. Use of own-group external standards to self-define, and own-group commitment and loyalty is valued. May make life decisions for the benefit of the group. IPS: Hypervigilance toward racial stimuli and dichotomous thinking. (p. 186)

Internalization Status: positive commitment to one's own socio-racial group, internally defined racial attributes, and capacity to assess and respond objectively to members of the dominant group. Can make life decisions by assessing and integrating socio-racial group requirements and self-assessment. IPS: Flexibility and analytic thinking. (p. 186)

Helms and Piper (1994) defined White people as follows:

"those Americans who self-identify or are commonly identified as belonging exclusively to the White racial group regardless of the continental source (e.g., Europe, Asia) of that racial ancestry." (p.126) Helms (1995) further stated that members of this group are socialized in an environment where members of their group are privileged. Consequently, Whites learn to perceive themselves as entitled to continuing privilege. In order to protect this privilege, members of the White group learn to deny and distort race related reality. Through this distorted sense of protecting privilege, Whites feel justified in aggressing against threats to their privilege in order to preserve the status quo. Therefore, Helms would say that healthy White racial identity development occurs when a White person is able to recognize and abandon the normal strategies that Whites use to cope with racial issues. Helms (1995) offers the following White Racial Identity Attitude Statuses and Information-Processing Strategies:

Contact Status: satisfaction with racial status quo, oblivious to racism and one's participation in it. If racial factors influence life decisions, they do so in a simplistic fashion. Information-Processing Strategy (IPS): Obliviousness. (p. 185)

Disintegration Status: disorientation and anxiety provoked by unresolvable racial moral dilemmas that force one to choose between own-group loyalty and humanism. May be stymied by life situations that arouse racial dilemmas. IPS: Suppression and ambivalence. (p. 185)

Reintegration Status: idealization of one's socio-racial group, denigration and intolerance for other groups. Racial factors may strongly influence life decisions. IPS: Selective perception and negative out-group distortion. (p. 185)

Pseudo-independence Status: intellectualized commitment to one's own socio-racial group and deceptive tolerance of other groups. May make life decisions to "help" other racial groups. IPS: Reshaping reality and selective perception. (p. 185)

Immersion/Emersion Status: search for an understanding of the personal meaning of racism and the ways by which one benefits and a redefinition of whiteness. Life choices may incorporate racial activism. IPS: Hypervigilance and reshaping. (p. 185)

Autonomy Status: informed positive socio-racial-group commitment, use of internal standards for self-definition, capacity to relinquish the privileges of racism. May avoid life options that require participation in racial oppression. IPS: Flexibility and complexity. (p. 185)

Ego-Identity

Through this investigation, I will attempt to identify specific variables that I hypothesize contribute to the

development of racial attitudes. Most significant are the variables of ego-identity status and racial integration history. The formation of an ego identity is a major event in the development of personality regardless of race or ethnic background. Through the combined works of Erikson (1982) and Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, and Orlofsky (1993), it is generally accepted that by late adolescence, the formation of individual identity marks the end of childhood and the beginning of adult life. This transition is marked by the culmination and organization of childhood skills, beliefs, and identifications into an individualized 'self' that gives the young adult a sense of continuity with the past and direction for the future. Identity often refers to how life experiences are handled as well as to what experiences are considered meaningful.

Identity is often thought of in the following ways: structural, phenomenological, and behavioral (Marcia et al., 1993). The structural aspect refers to the consequences identity has for the integration of internal psychological processes. Identity formation is a stage of ego growth, therefore explaining its culmination in late adolescence, strengthening aspects of the personality having to do with judgment and self-efficacy. The phenomenological aspect of identity refers to the individual's experience of having or not having a sense of identity, as well as the experience of

one's particular style of identity formation. Likewise, the behavioral aspect of identity refers to the observable components of the identity-formation process, what others can observe of an individual's identity style.

Through operationalizing the identity constructs of structure, phenomenology, and behavior, individuals are characterized as achieving one of four ego-identity statuses: (a) identity achievement (commitment to a life choice based on exploration of alternatives); (b) moratorium (currently exploring choices but not yet committed, an experience often characterized by "identity crisis"); (c) diffusion (lack of exploration and commitment, characterized by individuals unconcerned with directionlessness); and (d) foreclosure (commitment based on little or no exploration of alternatives) (Marcia, 1966, Marcia et al., 1993).

From a historical perspective, ego identity development precedes, or at the very least, parallels other forms of identity development. The term "internalization" is a concept that emerged out of early psychoanalytic and subsequently psychodynamic theories: drive-oriented psychoanalytic, relationship oriented object relations, and self-psychology (Marcia et al., 1993). The following explains internalization from a psychoanalytic perspective:

This process involves the development of an increasingly stabilized and internalized capacity for ...homeostatic control of internal functioning, particularly in the realms of (1) the regulation of self-esteem, (2) the exercise of self-calming functions and containment of affective fluctuations in response to stress, and (3) the autonomous organization of motives and resources to anticipate and meet adaptive demands. (Blos, 1974, p.389)

Current reviews of identity status research (Marcia, 1980; Matteson, 1975; and Waterman, 1982) indicate that much is known about (a) personality characteristics of the ego-identity status; (b) development of ego-identity; and (c) gender differences among the statuses. However, what is not clearly articulated in the literature is the effect of race or ethnicity on ego-identity development or the effect of ego-identity development on racial identity development and subsequently the effect of ego-identity on racial-attitudes.

Furthering the discussion of individual identity proposed by Erickson (1968) and Marcia (1980, 1993), Turner (1987) suggested the concept of collective identities as part of the overall construction of the self-concept (Schlenker, 1985). Turner (1987) also considered the various components of self-concept to be (a) identity based upon membership in the global community and (b) identity based upon one's unique individuality within the global community.

Ego Identity, Race, and Racial Attitudes

Although Turner did not offer empirical evidence to support the hypothesized relationship between individual and collective identities, the suggestion resulted in several studies testing the assumption (Miville, Koonce, Darlington, and Whitlock, 2000). Miville, et al. (2000) later conducted a two-part study investigating the relationship between ego-identity development (individual identity) and racial identity attitude development (collective/cultural identity) for Black and Hispanic students. The first study focused on Black students at a Historically Black College in the South. The results from that study suggested that racial identity attitude was significantly correlated with ego identity: Specifically, positive racial identity attitude (Autonomy) was related to identity Achievement; ego-identity crisis (moratorium) and confusion (diffusion) were linked to Pre-Encounter racial identity attitudes.

The second study conducted by Miville et al. (2000) reviewed the relationship between Hispanic racial identity attitude and ego identity. Subjects in this study were recruited from several colleges and universities in the Southwest. Again, the results of the second study concluded that significant relationships existed between ego-identity achievement and positive racial identity attitude.

Likewise, negative racial identity attitude was linked to confused ego-identity or ego-identity in crisis. In addition, Miville and Helms (1996) found a similar relationship among Latino individuals of primarily Cuban and Central and South American origin. As before, cultural identity commitment predicted ego-identity commitment and cultural identity conformity to collective values predicted individual conformity to parental values and beliefs.

Conspicuously missing is information about the relationship between White ego-identity development and racial identity attitudes. The reason for the lack of findings in this arena may in part be explained by a study conducted by Phinney and Alipuria (1990). They reported that Whites indicated racial/ethnic identity as the least important of all identities to explore and resolve whereas Blacks and Latinos rated this identity as important or very important. These findings suggest that the relationship between individual identity and collective identity may change based on majority or minority racial/ethnic status. Noting the degree to which ego identity achievement influences racial identity may help in explaining variation among individual demonstrations of multicultural sensitivity among majority and minority individuals.

In short, the literature reviewed thus far suggests that relationships exist between individual and collective

identities for Black and Latino students. Furthermore, this same literature highlights, by omission, the absence of similar research and findings for White student populations. Also missing in the current literature are studies which identify or describe the interaction between individuals as collective groups in a pluralistic society.

Racial Integration

The concept of racial integration has long been considered a means by which racism and prejudice could be addressed in American society. During the civil rights era, social scientists debated and recommended numerous strategies to incorporate racial integration peacefully into mainstream American society (Katz, 1985; Katz & Taylor, 1988). Others have criticized the system explaining that not enough has been done to reduce prejudice and racism. Clark (1992), in a review of the social climate at the time, criticized the educational system, primarily colleges and universities, for not taking a strong enough position on institutional racism. His primary message was one of challenging educators to make major efforts to reduce racism through teaching tolerance and the benefits of racial integration.

Of great importance in this discussion is the distinction between the concepts of racial integration and

social integration. This author makes the distinction by assessing the 'degree of choice' that individuals have in 'being in' or 'being out' of an integrated environment. For example, environmental circumstances may require people with different racial backgrounds to coexist (racial integration); however, the choice to interact and develop social ties requires something much more interpersonal (social integration).

In addressing the issue of tolerance, Chong (1994) found that people are often able to adapt psychologically to changes in social norms and practices; however, it was not always the case that individuals' increases in tolerance were also accompanied by increases in self-restraint, social-restraint, or tension in social settings. His proposed model explaining social tolerance suggested that people are often able to simultaneously adapt to social norms and practices while also maintaining personal attitudes.

Considering the effects of learned tolerance, with residual individual attitudes, may be an important consideration in further discussion about college students' learning experiences. As noted in a study by Pascarella and Terenzini (1976), students with prior interracial experiences typically experienced higher degrees of success in the college environment. Generalizing this finding, it

is suspected that cross-cultural experiences in earlier developmental stages will positively affect later styles for coping with issues of culture and subsequent racial identity and racial attitude development. The argument could also be made that success in a college environment should not be equated with higher levels of racial identity formation, but rather that these individuals are highly skilled at adapting to the demands of their environment. In fact, it may be the case that students of color, with lower levels of racial identity awareness, may be more likely to idealize the White majority educational system, acquiesce to forms of institutional racism, and enjoy success in the face of their own groups' racial denigration. Because the effects of culture are experienced differently based upon minority or majority status, it seems necessary to study the differential effects of racial integration for both White and Black university students.

Minatoya and Sedlacek (1981) found that White students responded, in many cases, negatively to situations involving Black individuals, particularly when they lacked significant prior experience in interacting with Black people. In a study asking White students to imagine how they would respond in a setting in which they were of minority status, students were found to predict a withdrawn interpersonal style (Steward, Davidson, & Borgers, 1993). This finding

was especially interesting given that, in general, the White students had no prior experience of racial minority status; this leading the authors to conclude that perhaps these individuals reported an expectation that they would withdraw to protect themselves from negative perceptions that they project onto minority individuals (Steward et al, 1993). Sodowsky and Taffe (1991) observed that one important, and often overlooked, factor of multicultural sensitivity is the professional's ability to maintain a comfortable, positive relationship with the client. Lack of contact with Blacks may result in poor cross-racial communication skills and anxiety, both of which may hinder the development of a positive cross-cultural relationship.

Contrary to the findings of the Pascarella and Terenzini (1976) study establishing a positive relationship between interracial experience and college adjustment, Allen (1985) found that there was no such effect for Black students in predominantly White schools. Steward, Jackson, and Jackson (1990) found that successful Black students expressed more need for interaction in all-White environments than in all-Black campus environments. Specifically they found that successful Black students tended to be loners who expressed a want to be included and a want for affection from Whites. They further explain that some Whites were perceived to be in authority or perceived

to have information necessary for success. Receiving information seemed to be the primary goal of expressing the need for and desire for interaction with Whites. It appears that cross-racial communication may have opposite effects for White and Black students: White students typically become withdrawn during cross-cultural interactions (Steward, et al., 1993) and Black students typically report increased desires to interact with Whites for the purpose of obtaining information for success in academic environments (Steward, et al, 1990).

I hypothesized that combining the characteristics of ego-identity achievement and history of racial integration would identify individuals that were able to deal with issues of race using pragmatic approaches based in positive racial attitudes. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that individuals with crystalized ego-identities would be in better positions to know and understand the factors involved in racial attitude development and cross-cultural interactions.

Pilot Study Results

In a preliminary review of the relationship between ego-identity and White racial consciousness (Rowe et al, 1994), Neil and Steward (1999) conducted a study (see Appendix A) among White undergraduate students (N=86) on a

predominantly White campus in the Midwest. In general, two noteworthy findings emerged from the study. First, results indicated that the overall model (i.e., demographic information, ego identity, and racial integration history) predicted a significant amount of the variance observed in three of the four Achieved racial attitude statuses. Except in the case of Integrative⁴ status, ego identity, and the degree of interracial experience significantly influenced racial attitudes that evolved from exploration and also reflected some form of commitment. In a study of Blacks and Latinos, Miville et al. (2000) also found a significant relationship between ethnic identity and ego identity. Although Phinney and Alipuria (1990) found that Whites tend to rate race-ethnicity as least important, results from the pilot study suggested that for some White Americans, a significant relationship between their background, interracial experiences, and racial attitudes does exist. The authors noted that they were unclear why the model did

⁴People who hold integrative-type attitudes have a pragmatic view of racial/ethnic minority issues. Although their views are based on a sense of moral responsibility, their outlook is pragmatic in the sense that their actions are tempered by what effect they are likely to have. Those with integrated attitudes appear to have integrated their sense of Whiteness with regard to minorities.

not significantly predict all of the other Achieved statuses (conflictive⁵, dominative⁶, and reactive⁷).

Second, the model did not predict any of the racial attitudes associated with the Unachieved statuses (i.e., Avoidant, Dependent, and Dissonant). Demographic information, racially integrated experiences, nor ego identity were found to predict these racial attitudes. Results from the pilot study shed no light in understanding White individuals who have no interest in exploration and no

⁵People whose racial attitudes resemble conflictive-type attitudes will not ordinarily support obvious discrimination toward racial/ethnic minorities but are usually opposed to programs or procedures intended to reduce the effects of discrimination. The conflict is between two traditional American values: equality and individualism. Persons whose attitudes reflect the conflictive type usually support issues that clearly involve the principle of fairness but are likely to be opposed to any alteration of the status quo designed to remediate any currently inequitable situation caused by past discrimination.

⁶Dominative White racial attitudes are based on the premise that the majority society is entitled to dominate racial/ethnic minority peoples because of an inherent superiority. Persons whose attitudes best represent this type hold an ethnocentric perspective that presumes the cultural correctness of their position and evaluates all others in terms of how close they approach this standard. Persons with such qualities may tolerate relations with minority people if they are in a superior role, but strongly disapprove of close personal relationships with them.

⁷People whose attitudes can best be described as reactive hold quite militant views in reaction to the racism that they recognize in American society. They tend to identify with minority groups and may romanticize the plight or issues relating to minorities. They may sometimes even seem to feel guilty about being White. Those who display reactive attitudes are often sensitive to situations that may involve discrimination. However, they may engage in paternalistic behavior and operate from an essentially White perspective.

commitment (Avoidant⁸); no interest in exploration and commitment (Dependent⁹); and interest in exploration, but not openness to commitment (dissonant¹⁰).

In addition to the discussion of the general results described above, there is also a need to address the findings associated with the unique contribution of racial integration history to the Achieved, Conflictive and Reactive status attitudes. Contrary to what was expected, individuals from highly integrated neighborhoods and communities were conscious of racial discrimination and bias, but did not support interventions for redress; whereas, individuals from less integrated neighborhoods and

⁸Attitudes that indicate avoidance include a lack of consideration of ones' own race as well as an avoidance of concern for racial/ethnic minority issues. For some people, the personal and social concerns related to racial/ethnic differences are somewhat aversive and something to be avoided or ignored. Whether they find these issues inconvenient or actually anxiety arousing, their preferred way of responding is to ignore, minimize, or deny the existence or importance of the problematic issue.

⁹Although people who are best characterized by dependent-type attitudes seem to have developed some kind of White racial consciousness, they have not personally considered alternative perspectives. Some people remain so dependent and unreflective in adulthood that they still look to significant others for what their opinions should be. The White racial attitudes of these people are held superficially and are not "owned" to the degree that these attitudes have been internalized by others.

¹⁰People whose attitudes can be described as dissonant are clearly uncertain about what to think about issues dealing with racial/ethnic minorities. They lack commitment to attitudes they may express and are open to new information because of the confusion that they experience. They may be in this situation because of a lack of experience or information, but it frequently is the result of the lack of congruence between their previously held racial attitudes and recent personal or vicarious experience. Dissonant attitudes are often held by people who are in transition from one set of racial attitudes to another.

communities tended to be militant in activity to combat racism and acts of discrimination. One possible explanation for this outcome was that those with racially integrated origins had heightened awareness of being in direct competition for resources and positive attention with racial ethnic minorities. Consequently, these individuals, though aware of discrimination against minorities, may have experienced conflicting feelings about systemic efforts for correction, given the personal loss that might result. On the other hand, those from less integrated communities would not have had this experience. Developing a better understanding of the potential positive and negative outcomes of White individuals' racial contact with racial/ethnic minority populations seems imperative.

Finally, findings indicated that older, White women tended to report more attitudes associated with militancy in combating racism (Achieved Reactive status) and younger individuals, in general, tended to report more attitudes associated with the Conflictive status. Such results support the continued inclusion of demographic information in studies that increase the profession's understanding of the development of racial attitudes.

Summary

Given the findings of previous research of the relationship between ego-identity and racial identity and

racial attitudes, along with the pilot study of White students' racial consciousness, there is an increased need for understanding of White and Black student demographic information, ego-identity characteristics and racial integration history. In addition, the literature indicates that the profession has conceptually formulated a definition of what it means to be a culturally sensitive student (i.e., the tripartite model). Although it appears that attitudes play a significant role in the acquisition of multicultural sensitivity, it remains unclear what personal characteristics predispose some individuals to endorse positive racial attitudes and voluntarily engage in positive cross-cultural behaviors (skills).

To test my hypothesis that the variables of ego-identity development and racial-integration history will significantly account for the variation observed among White and Black undergraduate students' racial identity attitudes¹¹ formation, I will attempt to demonstrate that the developmental process required for multicultural sensitivity (higher levels of racial identity attitude formation) is dependent upon one's ability to question social norms (ego-independence) and the presence or absence of opportunity to interact outside the boundaries of one's

¹¹The term "Racial Identity Attitudes" will be used throughout the remainder of this text to identify the variable construct to be measured.

familiar cultural experience (racial integration history). To highlight the specific relationships between the independent variables (age and gender, ego identity, and racial integration history) and the dependent variables (racial identity attitude statuses), I asked the following research questions for White and Black undergraduate students:

Research Questions

1. What effects do age and gender have on positive racial identity attitudes for both White and Black students?
2. Is the level of integrated racial experience predictive of student racial identity attitude?
3. Is ego identity status predictive of racial identity attitude?
4. Is there an interaction between students' ego-identity status and history of racial integration that mediates the relationship between the independent variables and racial identity attitudes?

Hypotheses for Black Students

1. Although gender is not predicted to account for a significant portion of the variance observed among Black students, age is predicted to be positively related to higher levels of racial identity attitudes.
2. Racial integration history is predicted to account for a significant portion of the variance observed among Black students; this relationship is predicted to be positive.
3. Higher levels of ego-identity (achievement) are predicted to be positively related to higher levels of racial identity attitudes and to account for a significant amount of the variance observed in racial identity attitudes.

4. The interaction between ego-identity stage and racial integration history will mediate the relationship between the independent variables and racial identity attitudes. It is believed that higher levels of ego-identity and integration history will predict higher levels of racial identity attitudes.

Hypotheses for White Students

1. Gender and age are predicted to account for a significant portion of the variance observed among White students. Based on past research, it is believed that White women will be more likely to engage in pseudo-independent and integrated racial identity attitudes as their age increases.
2. Racial integration history is predicted to account for a significant portion of the variance observed among White students; this relationship is predicted to be positive.
3. Higher levels of ego-identity (achievement) are predicted to be positively related to higher levels of racial identity attitudes and to account for a significant amount of the variance observed in racial identity attitudes.
4. The interaction between ego-identity stage and racial integration history will mediate the relationship between the independent variables and racial identity attitudes. It is believed that higher levels of ego-identity and integration history will predict higher levels of racial identity attitudes.

It is hoped that through the implementation of this study, these questions will be answered.

Chapter 3

Method

In review of the Introduction and Literature Review, observation suggests that individuals entering counselor training programs often do so without first demonstrating multicultural sensitivity. Furthermore, research indicates that traditional methods (including but not limited to didactic) often have little or no effect on changing individual trainee interest in or perception of others' multicultural sensitivity (Steward et al., 1998). These findings, in addition to the theoretical notion that racial identity attitudes are related to the psychological process of ego identity development, suggest that a line of inquiry focused on personality and environmental characteristics which predispose individuals to develop sensitivity may be most useful at this time.

The timing of data collection in the developmental process seems critical. Opinions on the matter vary. Some believe that didactic and experiential training methods are effective and have some influence on students in general. Others believe that traditional methods have little impact on students with little or no racial identity attitude awareness, as noted above, and that the process of implementing a training course serves to provide information but in many cases does not facilitate or require the

integration of knowledge into practice. In fact, in many cases, a course in multicultural theory only serves to teach the language of multicultural sensitivity that students are allowed to hide behind while continuing to maintain attitudes inconsistent with the values and principles of pluralism. In addition, many applicants to counselor education and counseling psychology programs are savvy to the professions' ideological positions on multiculturalism. With this knowledge, applicants have been observed to present themselves as interested in and respectful of the tenets of multiculturalism for the purpose of gaining admission to training programs; however, once admitted they abandon their proclaimed interest and related behaviors.

The shift in ideological orientation, from interest in multiculturalism before admission to training programs to disinterest after admission, is both perplexing and confusing to student peers and counselor educators. Furthermore, the behavior described above is both inconsistent and consistent with behavior observed in a study of White students who were asked how they would respond if they were a minority individual in an educational environment (Steward, et al., 1993); White students in this study were found to report that they would withdraw when placed in a situation in which they were a minority. This finding led the authors to conclude that White students may

be identifying with the negative perceptions that they have of people of minority status. In addition, this perception may be experienced as a form of projective identification in which White students behave in ways they anticipate people of color would behave under similar circumstances. Relating this finding back to the experience of White students shifting reported interest in multicultural issues: White students desiring to enter the mental health professions, of counseling and counseling psychology, may be tempted or coerced into reporting multicultural interest.

Given the current 21st Century zeitgeist of multicultural sensitivity, which guards admission portals to many programs, success in the counseling professions depends on one's willingness to entertain values and beliefs supporting pluralism; failure to appear interested in multiculturalism, in many cases, may end a potential professional career before it begins. Furthermore, the shift in interest observed after admission may be a shift back to withdrawal from the cross-cultural interface necessary for academic success (Steward et al., 1993) in the domain of multicultural competence.

For these reasons, I proposed a study of undergraduate students who were pursuing diverse academic programs to develop a baseline for undergraduate students in general. By developing a baseline with the general population of

undergraduate students, I will be able to isolate the effects of what hopeful trainee applicants anticipate, in terms of multicultural interest, and potential for development of authentic multicultural sensitivity. With the completion of this study, I recognize the need to continue a line of research to investigate the predictors of racial identity attitudes of graduate level counselor trainees. This line of research will investigate the characteristics and cultural sensitivity of counselor applicants and counselor trainees before, during and after multicultural training.

The method of this research will consist of two independent studies. The first study will investigate the independent variables contributing to the variance observed among Black student racial identity attitude development. The independent variables include: age and gender; ego-identity stages (Foreclosure, Moratorium, Diffusion, and Achievement); racial integration history, and the interaction effect of ego-identity and racial integration history. The dependent variables for the first study include the statuses of Helms's Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (1990): Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization.

The second study will investigate the same independent variables and their contribution to the variance observed

among White student racial identity attitude development: age and gender; ego-identity stages (Foreclosure, Moratorium, Diffusion, and Achievement); racial integration history, and the interaction effect of ego-identity and racial integration history. The dependent variables for the second study include the statuses of Helms's White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (1990): Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-independence, and Autonomy. Considering the widely held belief that racism in the United States affects these groups discretely, no attempt will be made to make cross-group statistical comparisons. However, in light of the fact that each group experiences racial identity formation in discrete ways, a discussion of the different ways in which each group develops racial identity attitudes will occur in the discussion chapter.

Study 1

Participants

Seventy-six Black undergraduate students (sample size based on Cohen's (1992) estimate for medium effect size, $\alpha=.05$, 4 variable regression model, $n=74$) were recruited from a lower level undergraduate course at a large predominantly White, mid-western state university. The course attended to professional development, retention, and academic enrichment concerns of minority students in the

College of Natural Sciences. Of the seventy-six students who submitted data packets, sixty-four submitted packets that could be used in this study. All participants identified their race/ethnicity to be Black or African American. Seventeen of the participants were male (26.6%) and forty-seven were female (73.4%). The age distribution of the participants was positively skewed: Thirty-seven (57.8%) reported that they were eighteen years old; twenty-two (34.4%) reported that they were nineteen years old; three (4.7%) reported that they were twenty years old; and two (3.2%) reported that they were twenty-one years old. Students reported a variety of majors: Twenty-nine (45.3%) individuals reported majors in practitioner related human science fields (e.g., pre-medicine, nursing, and physical therapy); eleven (17.2%) students reported majors in non-practitioner related human science fields (e.g., human physiology and biochemistry); three (4.7%) students reported biology as their major; one student (1.6%) reported a social science major; two (3.1%) reported education as their major; one (1.6%) reported a business major; three (4.7%) students reported math majors; one (1.6%) student reported a physics major; eight (12.5%) students reported majors in the animal sciences; and five (7.8%) students reported no-preference as their major.

Demographics of the University

The university's Office of the Registrar provided the following student body information for the university during Spring Semester 2000: At that time, total student enrollment was 41,118 students with a total undergraduate enrollment of 31,597 (76%) students. The total undergraduate student body was made up of 16,992 (41%) women and 14,605 (35.8%) men. Although age breakdown was not available for the undergraduate population, there were 10,089 (24.7%) students over the age of 24 and 30,677 (75.3%) students 24 years of age and younger at the university. The Office of the Registrar reported the following statistics on student body ethnic origin: Caucasian/Non-Hispanic (77.8%), African American/Non-Hispanic (8.1%), Chicano/Mexican-American (.9%), Hispanic (1.6%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (.6%), Asian/Pacific Islander (Asian American) (4.0%), Not Known (.7%), and International students (6.4%).

Measures

Racial attitudes were operationalized through use of the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (Helms & Parham, 1990). The BRIAS (see Appendix B) consists of 50 self-report items developed to assess four racial identity attitude levels proposed by Cross (1971): Preencounter (level 1), Encounter (level 2), Immersion/Emersion (level

3), and Internalization (level 4). To describe Black Americans' racial identity attitudes, each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Individual subscale scores resulted from adding the items specific to each subscale. Each subject received a scale score for each level (Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emmersion, and Internalization). According to Helms (1990) the purpose of the BRIAS is to determine the degree to which individuals endorse attitudes representative of each of the subscales. Therefore, it is possible for one individual to endorse both Preencounter attitudes in addition to Internalization attitudes.

Attending to age distribution skewness (positive) and its possible impact on reporting of racial identity attitude statuses, a brief review of BRIAS descriptive statistics occurred. Plots of Black racial identity attitude statuses revealed that in spite of skewness of age, the resulting distributions appeared normal.

The following statements are items used on the BRIAS (Helms & Parham, 1990) to assess Black racial identity attitudes: "I feel that Black people do not have as much to be proud of as White people do" (Preencounter); "I feel guilty and/or anxious about some of the things I believe about Black people" (Encounter); "I believe that everything

Black is good, and consequently, I limit myself to Black activities" (Immersion/Emersion); and "A person's race has little to do with whether or not he/she is a good person" (Integration).

Coefficient alpha reliabilities for this study ranged from .76 on the Preencounter subscale, .33 on the Encounter subscale, .57 on the Immersion/Emersion subscale, and .61 on the Integration subscale. Alpha reliabilities by Parham and Helms (1990) ranged from .76 on the Preencounter subscale, .51 on the Encounter subscale, .69 on the Immersion/Emersion subscale, and .80 on the Integration subscale. Parham and Helms (1990) indicated that their norming sample was representative of a diverse undergraduate population: This diversity is reflected in terms of students' age (ranging from 17 to 72 years), gender (approximately balanced), geographic regions (North, South, East, and West), type of educational institution (private colleges as well as public institutions), and racial composition of respondents' environments (predominantly White versus predominantly Black).

Ego-identity status was measured using the Ego Identity Scale (EIS) (Bennion & Adams, 1986). The EIS (see Appendix C) was developed to measure ego identity status in ideological domains (occupation, politics, religion, and philosophical lifestyle) and in interpersonal domains

(friendship, dating, sex roles, and recreation). Subjects self-reported on a six point Likert scale. Each of the eight domains was measured by eight items, including two items for each identity status originally developed by Marcia (1966), (achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion). There are 64 total items on this scale.

The following statements are used on the Ego-Identity Scale (Bennion & Adams, 1986) to assess level of ego identity achievement: "My ideas about men's and women's roles are identical to my parents'. What has worked for them will obviously work for me." (Identity Foreclosure); "There are a lot of different kinds of people. I'm still exploring the many possibilities to find the right kind of friends for me". (Moratorium); "There's no single "life style" which appeals to me more than another." (Identity Diffusion); and "Based on past experiences, I've chosen the type of dating relationship I want now." (Identity Achievement).

Alpha coefficients for this study ranged from .90 (Foreclosure), .72 (Moratorium), .71 (Diffusion), and .41 (Achievement). Bennion and Adams (1986) reported Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the ego-identity statuses: .62 (Achievement), .75 (Moratorium), .75 (Foreclosure), and .62 (Diffusion). Bennion and Adams (1986) reported that subjects used in their sample consisted of one hundred six

undergraduate volunteers from general psychology and human development courses. The researchers did not report the race/ethnicity of their subjects. The subjects' ages ranged from 18 to 45 years with the average age of 22.6.

Demographics were assessed through a self-report information form (see Appendix D). Subjects were asked to report their age, level of education (year in undergraduate program), major, levels of perceived social class, actual social class (determined by parents' combined household income), gender, education level of father, and education level of mother. In addition to general demographic information, students were asked to report their level of interracial experience throughout their childhood and adolescence.

Students' racial integration history was measured through a series of questions on the demographics form developed by the author. The questions assessed the subjects' self-reported racial composition of neighborhood and school settings (assessed independently) during different developmental periods: Ages 1-5 (pre-school), 6-10 (elementary school), 11-14 (middle school), and 15-19 (high school). There were a total of five neighborhood scales and five school scales for a total of ten scales. Participants reported racial integration history using a 5 point Likert scale, high scale representing predominantly White and low

scale representing predominantly non-White. Each of the scales were associated with a statement similar to the following: "Your neighborhood/community during your pre-school years was: (predominantly non-White/White). The five points on the Likert Scale were assigned recommended values (i.e., #5 had the value 100% (approximately) White; #4 had the value 75% White; #3 had the value of 50% White; #2 had the value of 25% White; and #1 had the value of 0% (approximately) White. Full scale scores could range from 5 (low integration) to 50 (high integration). Analysis of reliability for this instrument yielded an alpha coefficient of .90 for overall racial integration history.

Procedure

Black students who were recruited met with a research assistant who explained the procedures of the study. After completing the informed consent form (see Appendix E), the students were asked to complete the demographics form including racial integration history, the EIS, and the BRIAS. After completion of the measures, participants were debriefed and received experimental credit.

Analysis

Analysis of the data was conducted through hierarchical regression. This analysis was selected to allow the researcher to determine the degree to which each variable

contributed to the overall variance observed in the dependent variable, after controlling for each preceding independent variable. In addition to progressively attributing additional explained variance in the dependent variable to each new independent variable, the model accounted for the collective variance explained in the dependent variable explained by the group of independent variables as a whole.

Age, gender, ego-identity status, racial integration history and the interaction of ego-identity status and racial interaction history were identified as independent variables. The four racial identity attitude(s) statuses (Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion, and Internalization) were used as dependent variables. Gender and age were predicted to be moderating variables. After controlling for the effects of age and gender on the outcomes of racial identity attitudes, the variables of ego-identity status and racial integration history were predicted to contribute to the overall variance observed in racial identity attitude. In addition, it was predicted that there would be an interaction between racial integration history and ego identity attitude status that would mediate the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable(s). Therefore, the order that variables were entered into the regression model was as follows: gender and

age (demographics), racial integration history, ego-identity status, and the interaction variable (racial integration status x ego-identity status). Racial identity attitude statuses served as the dependent variables. Data for the ego-identity, racial integration history, and racial identity attitude variables were entered in blocks. In order to protect against the possibility of Type II error, a Bonferonni adjustment was made to accommodate four independent tests. After the adjustment, significant $p \leq .0125$.

Testing of Statistical Assumptions

Attending to questions regarding the validity of the methods used to measure and predict the development of Black racial identity attitudes among Black undergraduate students, tests of the statistical assumptions necessary for hypothesis testing were conducted for each of the regressions. Histograms of the standardized residuals for each of the independent regressions revealed "peaks" in the center of the distributions, with no outlying data, suggesting normalcy in the distributions. Probability plots of the standardized residuals formed straight lines for each of the regressions. This finding further suggested that the data for this study was from a normal distribution.

The assumption of constancy of variance between the dependent variables (racial identity attitudes) and each of the independent variables (age and gender, racial integration history, ego-identity, and the interactions between ego-identity and racial integration history) was checked by creating a scatterplot of standardized residuals versus the predicted values for each of the regressions. Each of the scatterplots indicated that the residuals were randomly scattered around a horizontal line through zero. These findings suggested that the assumption of constant variance was met.

Tests of the strength of linear relationships among the independent variables suggested the possibility of collinearity. This was particularly the case among the predictors that identified the interactions between ego-identity stages and racial integration history. The tolerance statistics for these variables in each of the models was near .14. What can be concluded from this finding is that the interaction variables in this model produced very little explanation of variance for the prediction of racial attitudes among Black undergraduate students. The appropriate course of action in future studies of this model would be to consider the removal of these interaction variables from the model.

Statistical analysis of the validity and reliability (noted with the presentation of each of the variables) of this model suggest that the findings can be appropriately used to make inferences to the larger population of Black undergraduate students at predominantly White universities in the mid-western region of the United States.

Study 2

Participants

seventy-six white undergraduate students (sample size based on Cohen's (1992) estimate for medium effect size, $\alpha=.05$, 4 variable regression model, $n=74$) were recruited from a lower level undergraduate course at a large predominantly White, mid-western state university. The course attended to concerns of personal adjustment and enrichment among undergraduate students at the university. The course was titled *Dynamics of Personal Adjustment* and was offered through the College of Education. Of the seventy-six students who submitted data packets, seventy submitted packets that could be used in this study. All participants identified their race/ethnicity to be White or Caucasian. Nineteen of the participants were male (22.1%) and sixty-seven were female (77.9%). The age distribution of the participants was normal: Three (3.5%) reported that they were eighteen years old; fourteen (16.3%) reported that

they were nineteen years old; twenty-four (27.9%) reported that they were twenty years old; twenty-one (24.4%) reported that they were twenty-one years old; eight (9.3%) reported that they were twenty-two years old; and five (5.8%) reported that they were twenty-three years old.

Demographics of the University

The university's Office of the Registrar provided the following student body information for the university during Spring Semester 2000: At that time, total student enrollment was 41,118 students with a total undergraduate enrollment of 31,597 (76%) students. The total undergraduate student body was made up of 16,992 (41%) women and 14,605 (35.8%) men. Although age breakdown was not available for the undergraduate population, there were 10,089 (24.7%) students over the age of 24 and 30,677 (75.3%) students 24 years of age and younger at the university. The Office of the Registrar reported the following statistics on student body ethnic origin: Caucasian/Non-Hispanic (77.8%), African American/Non-Hispanic (8.1%), Chicano/Mexican-American (.9%), Hispanic (1.6%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (.6%), Asian/Pacific Islander (Asian American) (4.0%), Not Known (.7%), and International students (6.4%).

Measures

White racial identity attitudes were operationalized through use of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (Helms & Carter, 1990). The WRIAS (see Appendix F) consists of 50 self-report items developed to assess five racial identity attitude levels proposed by Helms (1984): Contact (level 1), Disintegration (level 2), Reintegration (level 3), Pseudo-independence (level 4), and Autonomy (level 5). To describe White Americans' racial attitudes toward Black Americans, each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Subscale scores result from adding the 10 items specific to each subscale.

The following statements are items used on the WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990) to assess White racial attitudes: "Society may have been unjust to Blacks, but it has also been unjust to Whites" (Contact); "I think that it's okay for Black people and White people to date each other as long as they don't marry each other" (Disintegration); "White people have bent over backwards trying to make up for their ancestors' mistreatment of Blacks, now it is time to stop" (Reintegration); "I was raised to believe that people are people regardless of their race" (Pseudo-independence); "I involve myself in causes regardless of the race of the

people involved in them" (Immersion/Emersion); "Blacks and Whites have much to learn from each other" (Autonomy).

Coefficient alpha reliabilities for this study were .39 (Contact), .83 (Disintegration), .81 (Reintegration), .76 (Pseudo-independence), and .59 (Autonomy). Helms and Carter (1990) reported ranges from .55 on the Contact subscale to .74 for the Disintegration subscale when used on a sample of White undergraduate students on the east coast. Helms and Carter (1990) reported that their sample of White students was collected from predominantly White universities in the Eastern region of the United States. Coefficient alpha reliabilities found by Ottavi et al. (1994) in a study of counselor-trainees were .68, .65, .62, .75, . and .59 for the Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-independence, and Autonomy subscales, respectively.

Ego-identity status was measured using the Ego Identity Scale (EIS) (Bennion & Adams, 1986). The EIS was developed to measure ego identity status in ideological domains (occupation, politics, religion, and philosophical lifestyle) and in interpersonal domains (friendship, dating, sex roles, and recreation). Subjects self-reported on a six point Likert scale. Each of the eight domains was measured by eight items, including two items for each identity status originally developed by Marcia (1966), (achievement,

moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion). There are 64 total items on this scale.

The following statements are used on the Ego-Identity Scale (Bennion & Adams, 1986) to assess level of ego identity achievement: "My ideas about men's and women's roles are identical to my parents'. What has worked for them will obviously work for me." (Identity Foreclosure); "There are a lot of different kinds of people. I'm still exploring the many possibilities to find the right kind of friends for me". (Moratorium); "There's no single "life style" which appeals to me more than another." (Identity Diffusion); and "Based on past experiences, I've chosen the type of dating relationship I want now." (Identity Achievement).

Coefficient alphas from this study were .88 (Foreclosure), .71 (Moratorium), .69 (Moratorium), and .72 (Achievement). Bennion and Adams (1986) reported Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the identity statuses as follows: .62 (Achievement), .75 (Moratorium), .75 (Foreclosure); and .62 (Diffusion). Bennion and Adams (1986) reported that subjects used in their sample consisted of one hundred six undergraduate volunteers from general psychology and human development courses. The researchers did not report the race/ethnicity of their subjects. The subjects' ages ranged from 18 to 45 years with the average age of 22.6.

Demographics were assessed through a self-report information form. Subjects were asked to report their age, level of education (year in undergraduate program), levels of perceived social class, actual social class (determined by parents' combined household income), gender, education level of father, and education level of mother. In addition to general demographic information, students were asked to report their level of interracial experience throughout their childhood and adolescence. Students' racial integration history was measured through a series of questions on the demographics form developed by the author. The questions assessed the subjects' self-reported racial composition of neighborhood and school settings (assessed independently) during different developmental periods: Ages 1-5 (pre-school), 6-10 (elementary school), 11-14 (middle school), and 15-19 (high school). There were a total of five neighborhood scales and five school scales for a total of ten scales. Participants reported racial integration history using a 5 point Likert scale, high scale representing predominantly non-White and low scale representing predominantly White. Each of the scales were associated with a statement similar to the following: "Your neighborhood/community during your pre-school years was: (predominantly non-White/White). The five points on the Likert Scale were assigned recommended values (i.e., #1 had

the value 100% (approximately) White; #2 had the value 75% White; #3 had the value of 50% White; #4 had the value of 25% White; and #5 had the value of 0% (approximately) White. Full scale scores could range from 5 (low integration) to 50 (high integration). Analysis of reliability for this instrument yielded an alpha coefficient of .94 for overall racial integration history.

Procedure

White students who were recruited met with a research assistant who explained the procedures of the study. After completing the informed consent form, the students were asked to complete the demographics form including racial integration history, the EIS, and the WRIAS. After completion of the measures, participants were debriefed and received experimental credit.

Analysis

Analysis of the data was conducted through hierarchical regression. This analysis was selected to allow the researcher to determine the degree to which each variable contributed to the overall variance observed, in the dependent variable, after controlling for each preceding independent variable. In addition to progressively attributing additional explained variance in the dependent variable to each new independent variable, the model

accounted for the collective variance explained in the dependent variable accounted for by the group of independent variables as a whole.

Age, gender, ego-identity status, racial integration history and the interaction of ego-identity status and racial interaction history were identified as independent variables. The five racial identity attitude(s) statuses (Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-independence, and Autonomy) were used as dependent variables. Gender and age were predicted to be moderating variables. After controlling for the effects of age and gender on the outcomes of racial identity attitudes, the variables of ego-identity status and racial integration history were predicted to contribute to the overall variance observed in racial identity attitude. In addition, it was predicted that there would be an interaction between racial integration history and ego identity attitude status that would mediate the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable(s). Therefore, the order that variables were entered into the regression model was as follows: gender and age (demographics), racial integration history, ego-identity status, and the interaction variable (racial integration status x ego-identity status). Racial identity attitude statuses served as the dependent variables. Data for the ego-identity,

racial integration history, and racial identity attitude variables were entered in blocks. In order to protect against the possibility of Type II error, a Bonferonni adjustment was made to accommodate five independent tests. After the adjustment, significant $p \leq .01$.

Testing of Statistical Assumptions

Attending to questions regarding the validity of the methods used to measure and predict the development of White racial identity attitudes among White undergraduate students, tests of the statistical assumptions necessary for hypothesis testing were conducted for each of the regressions. Histograms of the standardized residuals for each of the independent regressions revealed "peaks" in the center of the distributions, with no outlying data, suggesting normalcy in the distributions. Probability plots of the standardized residuals formed straight lines for each of the regressions. This finding further suggested that the data for this study was from a normal distribution.

The assumption of constancy of variance between the dependent variables (racial identity attitudes) and each of the independent variables (age and gender, racial integration history, ego-identity, and the interactions between ego-identity and racial integration history) was checked by creating a scatterplot of standardized residuals

versus the predicted values for each of the regressions. Each of the scatterplots indicated that the residuals were randomly scattered around a horizontal line through zero. These findings suggested that the assumption of constant variance was met.

Tests of the strength of linear relationships among the independent variables suggested the possibility of collinearity. This was particularly the case among the predictors that identified the interactions between ego-identity stages and racial integration history. The tolerance statistics for these variables in each of the models was between .00 and .1. What can be concluded from this finding is that the interaction variables in this model produced very little explanation of variance for the prediction of racial attitudes among White undergraduate students. The appropriate course of action in future studies of this model would be to consider the removal of these interaction variables from the model.

Statistical analysis of the validity and reliability (noted with the presentation of each of the variables) of this model suggest that the findings can be appropriately used to make inferences to the larger population of White undergraduate students at predominantly White universities in the mid-western region of the United States.

Chapter 4

Results

Previous research indicates that the profession has conceptually formulated a definition of what it means to be a competent cross-cultural counselor (i.e., the tripartite model). Although it appears that attitudes play a significant role in the acquisition of multicultural competency, it remains unclear what personal characteristics predispose some individuals to endorse positive racial attitudes and voluntarily engage in positive cross-cultural behaviors (skills).

To address this unanswered question, I investigated predictors related to students' racial attitudes and personal characteristics. Restating the general research question presented earlier: What demographic, social integration, and ego-identity factors assist in predicting racial identity attitudes among undergraduate students? To test my hypothesis that the variables of ego-identity development and racial-integration/socialization history will significantly account for the variation observed among White and Black undergraduate student racial identity attitude formation, I attempted to demonstrate that the developmental process required for multicultural sensitivity

(higher levels of racial identity attitude formation) is dependent upon one's ability to question social norms (ego-independence) and the presence or absence of opportunity to interact outside the boundaries of one's familiar cultural experience (racial integration). The remainder of this chapter will be organized according to the process of answering the following research questions:

1. What effect do age and gender have on positive racial identity attitudes for both White and Black students?
2. Is the level of integrated racial experience predictive of student racial identity attitude?
3. Is ego identity status predictive of racial attitude?
4. Is there an interaction between students' ego-identity status and history of racial integration which mediates the relationship between the independent variables and racial identity attitude?

Each of these questions will be answered in relation to both studies; Study 1, Black students, will be presented first and Study 2, White students, will follow accordingly.

Study 1

In order to determine the existence of relationships between demographic (age and gender), racial integration history, ego-identity status, and interaction (racial integration history and ego-identity) variables and the dependent variables (BRIAS: Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion, and Integration), Pearson Product Correlations

were calculated and are presented in Table 1 along with descriptive statistics. Specific correlation coefficients and hierarchical regression results will be presented by dependent variable.

Pre-encounter

Pre-encounter scores for Black students were found to be correlated with Foreclosure ($r=.483$, $p=.000$) and Diffusion ($r=.324$, $p=.010$) stages of ego-identity development (see Table 1). Students functioning in a state of Foreclosure also tend to endorse Pre-encounter racial attitudes. This relationship suggested that Students who develop racial identity attitudes that are self and group depreciating in order to maintain allegiance to White standards (Pre-encounter) also tend to make individual identity commitments based on little or no exploration of possible alternatives (Foreclosure). Likewise, students functioning in a state of Diffusion also tend to endorse Pre-encounter racial identity attitudes: Students who develop racial identity attitudes that are self and group depreciating in order to maintain allegiance to White standards (Pre-encounter) also tend to lack commitment to exploration of identity options and typically are unconcerned by directionlessness.

Table 1

Intercorrelations Between Predictors of Black Racial Identity Attitudes (BRIAS) and Subscales of the BRIAS (n=63)

Predictor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mean	18.46	1.73	18.32	34.95	50.59	43.72	68.89
SD	.69	.44	8.88	12.65	9.88	9.42	9.21
Range	17-21	1-2	8-39	11-68	26-76	19-63	51-91
1. Age	-	.050	-.161	.079	.124	.084	.081
2. Gender		-	-.082	.144	.109	-.041	.059
3. Integration History			-	.206	.036	.215	-.202
4. EIS Foreclosure				-	.339**	.453**	.290*
5. EIS Moratorium					-	.591**	.056
6. EIS Diffusion						-	-.305*
7. EIS Achievement							-
8. Int X Foreclosure							
9. Int X Moratorium							
10. Int X Diffusion							
11. Int X Achievement							
12. BRIAS Preencounter							
13. BRIAS Encounter							
14. BRIAS Immersion							
15. BRIAS Integration							

Note. EIS = Ego Identity Scale; BRIAS = Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale; *p<.05; **p<.01; Table 1 continued on following page.

Table 1 (continued)

Intercorrelations Between Predictors of Black Racial Identity Attitudes (BRIAS) and Subscales of the BRIAS (n=63)

Predictor	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Mean	673.4	936.5	823.7	1248.3	23.0	11.96	17.45	48.48
SD	452.7	501.3	470.4	588.4	5.52	2.66	3.74	5.44
Range	88-2584	312-2546	208-2394	432-2736	14-36	5-18	10-28	36-59
1. Age	-.056	.071	-.089	-.157	-.004	.212	.236	.258*
2. Gender	.034	.022	-.047	-.030	-.020	.144	-.018	-.056
3. Integration History	.828**	.913**	.924**	.955**	.076	-.33**	-.187	-.067
4. EIS Foreclosure	.648**	.277**	.312*	.304*	.483**	.400**	.354**	.127
5. EIS Moratorium	.154	.394**	.228	.055	.233	.124	.028	.228
6. EIS Diffusion	.353**	.395**	.525**	.129	.324*	.079	.118	.030
7. EIS Achievement	.012	-.161	-.281*	.069	.047	.344**	.243	.212
8. Int X Foreclosure	-	.811**	.856**	.859**	.361**	-.009	-.018	.063
9. Int X Moratorium	-	-	.939**	.885**	.137	-.279*	-.217	-.006
10. Int X Diffusion	-	-	-	-.281*	.189	-.272*	-.174	-.053
11. Int X Achievement	-	-	-	-	1.03	-.233	-.130	.014
12. BRIAS Preencounter	-	-	-	-	-	.349**	.208	-.089
13. BRIAS Encounter	-	-	-	-	-	-	.478**	.053
14. BRIAS Immersion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.199
15. BRIAS Integration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note. EIS = Ego Identity Scale; BRIAS = Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale; *p<.05; **p<.01

Although Pre-encounter status was not significantly correlated with the overall history of racial integration for Black students, the interaction between Foreclosed ego-identity and Integration was significantly related to Pre-encounter status ($r=.361$, $p=.005$). Because the relationship between Pre-encounter status and Integration was minimal ($r=.076$, $p=.562$), the significance of the interaction is most likely attributable to the correlation between Foreclosure and Pre-encounter.

Table 2 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with Pre-encounter status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration, ego-identity, and interactions among racial integration and ego-identity stages as independent variables. According to the hierarchical analysis, each of the variable sets were added to the overall model in four successive steps beginning with demographics (age and gender) in step 1. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Pre-encounter status, $F(2,57)=.028$, $p=.97$, $\Delta R^2=.001$, $p=.973$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed,

Table 2

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Preencounter Status on the Black Racial Identity
Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	-.010	.186	-.008
Gender	.068	.299	.031
Step 2			
Age	.007	.190	.005
Gender	.083	.302	.037
Racial Integration	.007	.132	.080
Step 3			
Age	-.059	.168	-.042
Gender	-.114	.274	-.050
Racial Integration	-.081	.124	-.083
Foreclosure	.548	.155	.548**
Moratorium	.027	.150	.027
Diffusion	.046	.190	.045
Achievment	-.114	.148	-.118
Step 4			
Age	-.090	.181	-.064
Gender	-.076	.297	-.078
Racial Integration	-.783	1.436	-.801
Foreclosure	.224	.373	.225
Moratorium	.088	.371	.088
Diffusion	-.030	.488	-.030
Achievment	-.175	.370	-.180
Int X Foreclosure	.652	.720	.667
Int X Moratorium	-.099	1.026	-.102
Int X Diffusion	.164	1.361	.167
Int X Achievement	.170	1.353	.174

Note. R^2 = .001 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .006 for Step 2, ΔR^2 = .283 for Step 3; ΔR^2 = .041 for Step 4. * p < .01. ** p < .002.

$F(3,56)=.136$, $p=.938$, $\Delta R^2=.006$, $p=.555$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 produced significant explanation of the variance observed in Pre-encounter status, $F(7,52)=3.031$, $p=.009$, $\Delta R^2=.283$, $p=.001$. Of the ego-identity stages, Foreclosure was the only one observed at a significant level ($t=3.534$, $p=.001$). The final addition of interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages did not produce a significant model or contribute significantly to the overall predictive model for Pre-encounter, $F(11,48)=2.152$, $p=.034$, $\Delta R^2=.041$, $p=.578$, $\sum R^2=.330$

Overall, model three (including steps 1-3) was the only model to produce significant explanation of the variation observed in Pre-encounter. Of all of the variables entered into the model, Foreclosure stage of ego-identity was the only variable to significantly account for variation observed.

Encounter

Encounter scores for Black students were found to be correlated with racial integration history ($r=-.333$, $p=.009$) suggesting that students with confused and ambivalent socio-racial self-definitions are also less likely to have histories with high levels of racial integration. The ego-

identity stages of Foreclosure ($r=.400$, $p=.001$) and Achievement ($r=.344$, $p=.006$) were also significantly related to Encounter status. It appears that students with no commitment or desire to pursue self-identity questions (Diffusion) along with individuals who have made self-identity commitments after exploration all have identity characteristics consistent with confused and ambivalent socio-racial self-definitions. The interaction between racial integration history and Moratorium stage of ego-identity was significant ($r=-.279$, $p=.031$) as well as the relationship between integration history and Diffusion ($r=-.272$, $p=.035$). Because the relationship between Encounter status and Moratorium ($r=.124$, $p=.336$) and Diffusion ($r=.079$, $p=.539$) were not significant, the significance of the interactions were likely due, in large part, to the absence of racial integration history.

Table 3 represents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with Encounter status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration, ego-identity, and interactions among racial integration and ego-identity stages as independent variables. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Encounter status,

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Encounter Status on the Black Racial Identity
Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.262	.177	.192
Gender	.197	.284	.090
Step 2			
Age	.198	.172	.145
Gender	.143	.273	.065
Racial Integration	-.289	.120	-.305*
Step 3			
Age	.170	.155	.124
Gender	-.012	.254	-.006
Racial Integration	-.353	.115	-.371*
Foreclosure	.460	.143	.474**
Moratorium	-.066	.139	-.068
Diffusion	-.099	.176	-.098
Achievment	.089	.137	.095
Step 4			
Age	.132	.169	.097
Gender	-.090	.276	-.041
Racial Integration	-1.080	1.336	-1.13
Foreclosure	.232	.347	.239
Moratorium	-.139	.345	-.142
Diffusion	-.134	.454	-.132
Achievment	.039	.345	.042
Int X Foreclosure	.492	.670	.518
Int X Moratorium	.267	.955	.282
Int X Diffusion	.013	1.266	.014
Int X Achievement	.106	1.259	.112

Note. R^2 = .046 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .090 for Step 2, ΔR^2 = .220 for Step 3; ΔR^2 = .029 for Step 4. * p < .01. ** p < .002.

$F(2,57)=1.373$, $p=.262$, $\Delta R^2=.046$, $p=.262$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,56)=2.936$, $p=.041$, $\Delta R^2=.090$, $p=.019$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 produced significant explanation of the variance observed in Encounter status, $F(7,52)=4.113$, $p=.001$, $\Delta R^2=.220$, $p=.004$. With the inclusion of the ego-identity stages, racial integration history increased in significance ($t=-3.074$, $p=.003$). Of the ego-identity stages, Foreclosure was the only one observed at a significant level ($t=3.210$, $p=.002$). The final addition of interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages produced a significant model, $F(11,48)=2.733$, $p<.008$, $\Delta R^2=.029$, $p=.693$, $\sum R^2=.385$.

Overall, models 3 and 4 (including steps 1-4) produced significant explanation of the variation observed in Encounter status. Of all the variables entered into the model, racial integration history and Foreclosure stage of ego-identity were the only variables to significantly account for variation observed.

Immersion

Immersion scores for Black students were found to be correlated with Foreclosure ($r=.354$, $p=.005$). Students functioning in a state of Foreclosure also tended to endorse Immersion status racial attitudes: Students that develop racial identities that are an idealization of the Black racial group and denigration of that which is perceived as White (Immersion) also tend to make individual identity commitments based on little or no exploration of possible alternatives (Foreclosure).

Table 4 represents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with Immersion status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration, ego-identity, and interactions among racial integration and ego-identity stages as independent variables. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Immersion status, $F(2,57)=1.429$, $p=.248$, $\Delta R^2=.048$, $p=.248$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,56)=1.467$, $p=.233$, $\Delta R^2=.025$, $p=.223$. The addition of ego-identity in step 3 did not produce a significant

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Immersion Status on the Black Racial Identity
Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.306	.183	.216
Gender	-.084	.293	-.037
Step 2			
Age	.270	.184	.191
Gender	-.115	.293	-.050
Racial Integration	-.158	.129	-.161
Step 3			
Age	.244	.176	.173
Gender	-.195	.287	-.086
Racial Integration	-.223	.130	-.227
Foreclosure	.356	.162	.355
Moratorium	-.183	.157	-.180
Diffusion	.072	.199	.069
Achievment	.113	.155	.116
Step 4			
Age	.337	.189	.238
Gender	-.095	.309	-.042
Racial Integration	.213	1.494	.217
Foreclosure	.645	.388	.643
Moratorium	.186	.386	.183
Diffusion	-.051	.508	-.049
Achievment	-.013	.386	-.014
Int X Foreclosure	-.708	.749	.721
Int X Moratorium	-1.153	1.068	-1.173
Int X Diffusion	.545	1.416	.553
Int X Achievement	.671	1.408	.683

Note. R^2 =.048 for Step 1; ΔR^2 =.025 for Step 2, ΔR^2 =.157 for Step 3; ΔR^2 =.052 for Step 4. * p <.01. ** p <.002.

explanation of variance observed in Immersion status, $F(7,52)=2.218$, $p=.047$, $\Delta R^2=.157$, $p=.043$. The final addition of interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages did not produce a significant model or contribute significantly to the overall predictive model for Immersion status, $F(11,48)=1.717$, $p=.098$, $\Delta R^2=.052$, $p=.485$, $\Sigma R^2=.282$.

Integration

Integration scores for Black students were found to be correlated with age ($r=.258$, $p=.043$). Students functioning with Integrated racial attitudes tend to be older.

Table 5 represents the results of hierarchical regression analysis with Integration status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration history, and ego-identity stages as independent variables. Age and gender, in step 1, did not account for significant variation observed in Integration status.

$F(2,57)=1.917$, $p=.156$, $\Delta R^2=.063$, $p=.156$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,56)=1.283$, $p=.289$, $\Delta R^2=.001$, $p=.781$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 did not produce a significant

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Integration Status on the Black Racial Identity
Attitude Scale (BRIAS) (N=63)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.342	.182	.241
Gender	-.175	.292	-.077
Step 2			
Age	.334	.186	.235
Gender	-.181	.295	-.080
Racial Integration	-.036	.130	-.037
Step 3			
Age	.314	.186	.221
Gender	-.312	.303	-.137
Racial Integration	-.002	.137	-.002
Foreclosure	.057	.171	.057
Moratorium	.274	.166	.270
Diffusion	-.210	.211	-.200
Achievment	.105	.164	.107
Step 4			
Age	.405	.186	.286
Gender	-.457	.304	-.200
Racial Integration	-2.732	1.469	-2.768
Foreclosure	-.213	.382	-.211
Moratorium	.921	.380	.905
Diffusion	-.683	.500	-.649
Achievment	-.618	.379	-.631
Int X Foreclosure	.338	.737	.343
Int X Moratorium	-1.833	1.050	-1.858
Int X Diffusion	1.466	1.392	1.483
Int X Achievement	2.880	1.385	2.920

Note. $R^2=.063$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2=.001$ for Step 2, $\Delta R^2=.083$ for Step 3; $\Delta R^2=.165$ for Step 4. * $p<.01$. ** $p<.002$.

explanation of the variance observed in Integration status, $F(7,52)=1.278$, $p=.279$, $\Delta R^2=.083$, $p=.299$. The final addition of interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages did not produce a significant model or contribute significantly to the overall predictive model for Integration status, $F(11,48)=1.974$, $p=.053$, $\Delta R^2=.165$, $p=.033$, $\Sigma R^2=.311$.

Study 2

In order to determine the existence of relationships between demographic (age and gender), racial integration history, ego-identity status, and interaction (integration and ego-identity) variables and the dependent variables (WRIAS: Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy) for White students, Pearson Product Correlations were calculated and are presented in Table 6 along with descriptive statistics. Specific correlation coefficients and hierarchical regression results will be presented by dependent variable.

Contact

Contact scores for White students were not found to be correlated with any of the specified predictors in the model. Essentially, students functioning in the Contact status of White Racial Identity Attitudes were not

Table 6

Intercorrelations Between Predictors of White Racial Identity Attitudes (WRIAS) and Subscales of the WRIAS (n=70)

Predictor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Mean	21.75	1.77	21.94	35.21	49.69	42.63	62.14	465.4
SD	4.9	.41	5.57	11.05	9.01	8.50	8.02	287.3
Range	18-57	1-2	11-39	17-67	31-74	22-60	42-89	136-1794
1. Age	-	-.245*	-.178	-.202	-.262*	-.234*	.300*	-.230*
2. Gender		-	-.113	-.084	.095	-.186	-.034	-.116
3. Integration History			-	.100	.036	.161	-.120	.807**
4. EIS Foreclosure				-	.304**	.274*	-.062	.617**
5. EIS Moratorium					-	.410**	-.280**	.142
6. EIS Diffusion						-	-.410**	.244
7. EIS Achievement							-	-.145
8. Int X Foreclosure								-
9. Int X Moratorium								
10. Int X Diffusion								
11. Int X Achievement								
12. WRIAS Contact								
13. WRIAS Disintegration								
14. WRIAS Reintegration								
15. WRIAS Pseudo-Independence								
16. WRIAS Autonomy								

Note. EIS = Ego Identity Scale; WRIAS = White Racial Identity Attitude Scale; *p<.05; **p<.01; Table 6 continued on following page.

Table 6 (continued)

Intercorrelations Between Predictors of White Racial Identity Attitudes (WRIAS) and Subscales of the WRIAS (n=70)

Predictor	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Mean	643.5	560.4	799.1	32.83	23.36	21.94	34.86	38.63
SD	324.8	314.4	384.4	3.68	5.73	5.57	5.63	4.15
Range	248-1880	220-1880	360-2379	20-40	12-41	11-39	18-48	27.48
1. Age	-.254*	-.215	-.113	-.007	-.199	-.171	.187	.207
2. Gender	-.038	-.127	-.139	.032	.141	.068	-.240*	-.110
3. Integration History	.910**	.923**	.967**	.044	-.069	-.038	.195	.138
4. EIS Foreclosure	.178	.170	.075	-.020	.286**	.359**	-.104	-.197
5. EIS Moratorium	.398**	.175	-.032	.014	.212	.100	-.045	-.015
6. EIS Diffusion	.302**	.491**	.072	-.036	.202	.169	-.015	-.046
7. EIS Achievement	-.208	-.225*	.121	.143	-.320**	-.234*	.338**	.301**
8. Int X Foreclosure	.752**	.775**	.761**	.000	.151	.202	.031	-.043
9. Int X Moratorium	-	.912**	.855**	.029	-.019	-.011	.188	.121
10. Int X Diffusion	-	-	.863**	.007	.004	.018	.185	.127
11. Int X Achievement	-	-	-	.076	-.164	-.108	.292**	.232**
12. WRIAS Contact	-	-	-	-	-.180	-.214	.151	.359**
13. WRIAS Disintegration	-	-	-	-	-	.704**	-.740**	-.530**
14. WRIAS Reintegration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. WRIAS Pseudo-Independence	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.520**	-.470**
16. WRIAS Autonomy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.670**

Note. EIS = Ego Identity Scale; WRIAS = White Racial Identity Attitude Scale; *p<.05; **p<.01

significantly differentiated from their peers on demographics (age and gender), racial integration history, ego-identity stages, or the interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages.

Table 7 presents the results of hierarchical regression analysis with Contact status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration history, ego-identity, and interactions among racial integration history and ego-identity stages as independent variables. According to hierarchical analysis, each of the variable sets were added to the overall model in four successive steps beginning with demographics (age and gender) in step 1. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Contact status, $F(2,68)=.032$, $p=.969$, $\Delta R^2=.001$, $p=.969$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,67)=.184$, $p=.907$, $\Delta R^2=.007$, $p=.487$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 did not produce significant explanation of the variance observed in Contact status, $F(7,63)=.498$, $p=.832$, $\Delta R^2=.044$, $p=.571$. The final addition of interactions between integration history and ego-identity

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Contact Status on the White Racial Identity
Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	-.006	.027	-.030
Gender	.008	.322	.003
Step 2			
Age	-.002	.027	-.012
Gender	.046	.328	.018
Racial Integration	.085	.123	.088
Step 3			
Age	-.016	.030	-.077
Gender	.017	.338	.007
Racial Integration	.096	.125	.098
Foreclosure	-.078	.134	-.077
Moratorium	-.046	.157	-.042
Diffusion	.063	.152	.061
Achievement	.231	.148	.211
Step 4			
Age	-.008	.031	-.041
Gender	.140	.361	.054
Racial Integration	3.640	2.040	3.711
Foreclosure	.095	.336	.094
Moratorium	-.137	.361	-.125
Diffusion	.712	.408	.691
Achievement	.772	.426	.704
Int X Foreclosure	-.383	.545	-.338
Int X Moratorium	.182	.818	.184
Int X Diffusion	-1.653	.990	-1.667
Int X Achievement	-2.009	1.520	-2.036

Note. R^2 =.001 for Step 1; ΔR^2 =.007 for Step 2, ΔR^2 =.044 for Step 3; ΔR^2 =.060 for Step 4. * p <.01. ** p <.002.

stages did not produce a significant model or contribute significantly to the overall predictive model for Contact status, $F(11,59)=.678$, $p=.753$, $\Delta R^2=.060$, $p=.418$, $\sum R^2=.112$.

Disintegration

Disintegration scores for White students were found to be correlated with Foreclosure ($r=.286$, $p=.009$) and Achievement ($r=-.327$, $p=.003$) stages of ego-identity development. Students functioning in a state of Foreclosure also tend to endorse Disintegration status racial attitudes: Students who develop racial identities characteristic of racial disorientation and anxiety provoked by racial moral dilemmas (Disintegration) also tend to make individual identity commitments based on little or no exploration of possible alternatives (Foreclosure). Likewise, students functioning in a state of ego-identity antithetical to Achievement also tend to endorse Disintegration status racial attitudes: Students who develop racial identities characteristic of racial disorientation and anxiety provoked by racial moral dilemmas (Disintegration) also tend not to make commitments to identity choices based on exploration of possible alternatives (Achievement).

Table 8 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with Disintegration status as the

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Disintegration Status on the White Racial
Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	-.042	.025	-.202
Gender	.256	.307	.100
Step 2			
Age	-.045	.026	-.218
Gender	.224	.313	.088
Racial Integration	-.071	.117	-.075
Step 3			
Age	-.018	.026	-.090
Gender	.385	.294	.151
Racial Integration	-.110	.108	-.114
Foreclosure	.307	.117	.308*
Moratorium	-.096	.136	-.090
Diffusion	.036	.132	.036
Achievement	-.384	.128	-.355*
Step 4			
Age	-.021	.207	-.101
Gender	.343	.313	.135
Racial Integration	1.383	1.772	1.433
Foreclosure	-.027	.292	-.028
Moratorium	.185	.314	.172
Diffusion	-.028	.354	.028
Achievement	.031	.370	.029
Int X Foreclosure	.507	.473	.520
Int X Moratorium	-.566	.711	-.582
Int X Diffusion	.119	.860	.122
Int X Achievement	-1.497	1.320	-1.542

Note. R^2 =.060 for Step 1; ΔR^2 =.005 for Step 2, ΔR^2 =.196 for Step 3; ΔR^2 =.047 for Step 4. * p <.01. ** p <.002.

dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration, ego-identity, and interactions among racial integration and ego-identity stages as independent variables. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Disintegration status, $F(2,68)=2.173$, $p=.122$, $\Delta R^2=.060$, $p=.122$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,67)=1.561$, $p=.207$, $\Delta R^2=.005$, $p=.542$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 produced significant explanation of the variance observed in Disintegration status, $F(7,63)=3.191$, $p=.006$, $\Delta R^2=.196$, $p=.005$. Of the ego-identity stages, Foreclosure ($t=2.637$, $p=.01$) and Achievement ($t=-2.990$, $p=.004$) were significant. The final additions of interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages did not produce a significant model or contribute significantly to the overall predictive model for Disintegration status, $F(11,59)=2.391$, $p=.016$, $\Delta R^2=.047$, $p=.419$, $\sum R^2=.308$.

Overall, model 3 (including steps 1-3) was the only model to produce significant explanation of the variation observed in Disintegration status. Of all the variables

entered into the model, Foreclosure and Achievement stages of ego-identity were the only variables to significantly account for variation observed.

Reintegration

Reintegration scores for White students were found to be correlated with Foreclosure ($r=.359$, $p=.001$) and Achievement ($r=-.234$, $p=.033$) stages of ego-identity development. Students functioning in a state of Foreclosure also tend to endorse Reintegration status racial attitudes: Students who develop racial identities characteristic of racial intolerance and denigration of other groups while idealizing one's own group (Reintegration) also tend to make individual identity commitments based on little or no exploration of possible alternatives (Foreclosure). Likewise, students functioning in a state of ego-identity antithetical to Achievement also tend to endorse Disintegration status racial attitudes: Students who develop racial identities characteristic of racial intolerance and denigration of other groups while idealizing one's own group (Reintegration) also are not likely to make commitments to identity choices based on exploration of possible alternatives (Achievement).

Table 9 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with Reintegration status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration history, ego-identity, and interactions among racial integration and ego-identity stages as independent variables. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Reintegration status, $F(2,68)=.697$, $p=.502$, $\Delta R^2=.020$, $p=.502$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,67)=.555$, $p=.646$, $\Delta R^2=.004$, $p=.594$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 did not produce significant explanation of the variance observed in Reintegration status, $F(7,63)=2.259$, $p=.041$, $\Delta R^2=.176$, $p=.013$. The final addition of interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages did not produce a significant model or contribute significantly to the overall predictive model for Reintegration status, $F(11,59)=1.597$, $p=.123$, $\Delta R^2=.029$, $p=.552$, $\sum R^2=.229$.

Pseudo-independence

Pseudo-independence scores for White students were found to be correlated with Gender ($r=-.240$, $p<.028$)

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Reintegration Status on the White Racial
Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	-.029	.027	-.138
Gender	.039	.324	.015
Step 2			
Age	-.032	.028	-.151
Gender	.001	.330	.004
Racial Integration	-.066	.124	-.067
Step 3			
Age	-.010	.028	-.047
Gender	.195	.316	.074
Racial Integration	-.105	.116	-.105
Foreclosure	.396	.125	.383
Moratorium	-.119	.146	-.108
Diffusion	.054	.142	.052
Achievement	-.245	.138	-.219
Step 4			
Age	-.014	.029	-.068
Gender	.126	.342	.048
Racial Integration	1.605	1.932	1.609
Foreclosure	.175	.319	.169
Moratorium	-.088	.342	-.080
Diffusion	.184	.386	.175
Achievement	.235	.404	.211
Int X Foreclosure	.332	.516	.331
Int X Moratorium	-.020	.775	.020
Int X Diffusion	-.272	.938	-.270
Int X Achievement	-1.771	1.440	-1.765

Note. $R^2=.020$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2=.004$ for Step 2, $\Delta R^2=.176$ for Step 3; $\Delta R^2=.029$ for Step 4. * $p<.01$. ** $p<.002$.

implying that males are more likely to espouse intellectualized commitment to the White racial group while practicing a deceptive tolerance for other groups (Pseudo-independence). Achievement stage of ego-identity development ($r=.338$, $p=.002$) was significantly correlated with Pseudo-independence suggesting that individuals endorsing commitment to identity choices based on exploration of available alternatives (Achievement) also tend to function from a racial attitude position of deceptive tolerance for other groups (Pseudo-independence) (Helms, 1995). The interaction between integration history and Achievement stage of ego-identity development was also significantly correlated with Pseudo-independence ($r=.292$, $p=.008$). This correlation suggests that individuals reporting higher levels of racial integration histories in combination with Achieved ego-identities also endorse racial attitudes which are deceptively intolerant.

Table 10 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with Pseudo-independence status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration, ego-identity, and interactions among racial integration and ego-identity stages as

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Pseudo-Independence Status on the White Racial
Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.044	.025	.205
Gender	-.572	.306	-.219
Step 2			
Age	.053	.025	.248
Gender	-.483	.306	-.185
Racial Integration	.200	.115	.203
Step 3			
Age	.036	.024	.169
Gender	-.550	.278	-.211
Racial Integration	.226	.102	.229
Foreclosure	-.223	.110	-.218
Moratorium	.193	.129	.175
Diffusion	.109	.125	.105
Achievement	.526	.121	.476**
Step 4			
Age	.035	.026	.166
Gender	-.572	.298	-.219
Racial Integration	-.910	1.687	-.921
Foreclosure	.131	.278	.128
Moratorium	.127	.299	.115
Diffusion	-.164	.337	-.158
Achievement	.224	.352	.202
Int X Foreclosure	-.569	.451	-.571
Int X Moratorium	.018	.677	.019
Int X Diffusion	.660	.819	.661
Int X Achievement	.990	1.257	.996

Note. $R^2=.111$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2=.039$ for Step 2, $\Delta R^2=.220$ for Step 3; $\Delta R^2=.032$ for Step 4. * $p<.01$. ** $p<.002$.

independent variables. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Pseudo-independence status, $F(2,68)=4.229$, $p=.019$, $\Delta R^2=.111$, $p=.019$. Likewise, controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,67)=3.926$, $p=.012$, $\Delta R^2=.039$, $p=.085$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 produced significant explanation of the variance observed in Pseudo-independence status, $F(7,63)=5.280$, $p=.000$, $\Delta R^2=.220$, $p=.001$). Of the ego-identity stages, Achievement stage was the only one observed at a significant level ($t=4.329$, $p=.000$). The final addition of interaction between racial integration history and ego identity stages produced a significant model; however, none of the predictors stood out as significant contributors to an increased description of the variance observed, $F(11,59)=3.600$, $p=.001$, $\Delta R^2=.032$, $p=.539$), $\sum R^2=.402$.

Overall, model three (including steps 1-3) was the only model to produce significant explanation of the variation observed in Pseudo-independence status. Of all of the variables entered into the model, Achievement (ego-identity)

was the only variable to significantly account for variation observed.

Autonomy

Autonomy scores for White students were found to be correlated with Achievement stage of ego-identity ($r=.301$, $p=.006$). Students functioning from an Achieved ego-identity state also tended to endorse Autonomous racial identity attitudes: Students who are committed to identity choices based on exploration of alternative choices (Achievement) also tend to have informed socio-racial-group commitment and use internal standards for self definition (Autonomy). Although integration history was not significantly correlated with Autonomy, the interaction between Achievement and racial integration history was significantly related ($r=.232$, $p=.037$).

Table 11 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with Autonomy status as the dependent variable and demographic variables (age and gender), racial integration history, ego-identity stages, and interactions among racial integration and ego-identity stages as independent variables. Age and gender in step 1 did not account for significant variation observed in Autonomy status, $F(2,68)=.973$, $p=.383$, $\Delta R^2=.028$, $p=.383$. Likewise,

Table 11

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Autonomy Status on the White Racial
Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (N=70)

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Age	.034	.027	.161
Gender	-.052	.322	-.020
Step 2			
Age	.042	.027	.197
Gender	.024	.324	.009
Racial Integration	.174	.121	.175
Step 3			
Age	.023	.027	.106
Gender	-.074	.302	-.028
Racial Integration	.204	.111	.205
Foreclosure	-.292	.120	-.284*
Moratorium	.165	.140	.149
Diffusion	.089	.136	.086
Achievement	.526	.121	.429**
Step 4			
Age	.027	.027	.125
Gender	-.033	.321	-.013
Racial Integration	-2.005	1.818	-2.016
Foreclosure	-.133	.300	-.129
Moratorium	.509	.322	.460
Diffusion	-.449	.363	-.430
Achievement	-.092	.380	-.084
Int X Foreclosure	-.252	.486	-.252
Int X Moratorium	-.940	.729	-.937
Int X Diffusion	1.392	.882	1.384
Int X Achievement	2.063	.355	2.062

Note. $R^2=.028$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2=.029$ for Step 2, $\Delta R^2=.207$ for Step 3; $\Delta R^2=.050$ for Step 4. * $p<.01$. ** $p<.002$.

controlling for age and gender, the addition of racial integration history into the model, at step 2, did not significantly contribute to variance observed, $F(3,67)=1.343$, $p=.268$, $\Delta R^2=.029$, $p=.157$. The addition of ego-identity stages in step 3 produced significant explanation of the variance observed in Autonomy status, $F(7,63)=3.227$, $p=.005$, $\Delta R^2=.207$, $p=.003$. Of the ego-identity stages, Achievement was the only one observed at a significant level ($t=3.612$, $p=.001$). The final addition of interactions between racial integration history and ego-identity stages did not produce a significant model or contribute significantly to the overall predictive model for Autonomy, $F(11,59)=2.453$, $p=.013$, $\Delta R^2=.050$, $p=.378$, $\sum R^2=.314$.

Overall, model 3 (including steps 1-3) was the only model to produce significant explanation of the variation observed in Autonomy status. Of all the variables entered into the model, Achieved ego-identity was the only variable to significantly account for the variation observed.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The previous chapter outlined specific statistical relationships between dependent variables (racial identity statuses) and independent variables (age and gender, racial integration history, ego-identity stages, and the interaction effect between integration history and ego-identity stages). I would like to use the remainder of this chapter to discuss the empirical outcomes of the study in relation to the hypotheses developed for each question. In discussing the study outcomes in relation to the specific hypotheses, I will state my conclusions in accordance with the principles of inferential statistics, in relation to each of the research questions asked for Black students (Study 1) and White students (Study 2).

Study 1

Several noteworthy findings emerged from the data analyses presented in the previous chapter. Of the four predictor variables, Integration History, and Ego-identity development appeared to have the most influence on describing racial attitudes of Black undergraduate students. Initially, the results appeared to suggest that much of racial attitude development was based on personal development on several fronts (i.e., experience that comes

from social interactions, psychological and emotional maturity, and an independent belief system).

The first research question asked about the effects of age and gender on the attainment of positive racial attitudes. In response to that question, I hypothesized that gender would not have a significant impact on racial identity development; however, I did predict that the age of Black students would positively impact the development of higher levels of racial identity attitude development (e.g., Integration). The results of Study 1 were partially consistent with this hypothesis: Gender was not a significant contributing factor to the development of any racial identity attitude status. The finding that age was also not a significant predictor of any racial identity attitude status, however, was not predicted. This may have been in part due to sample characteristics. Overall, the sample of Black students was positively skewed leaving the analysis of variance to be conducted on a group of predominantly younger students. A sample representing more variation in age may have produced significant results. Although Helms (1990, 1995) does not claim that the BRIAS is an instrument based on a linear developmental model, because it measures racial identity attitudes, the variable of age may account for level of experience and other forms of maturity in negotiating racism. At this juncture, all that

can be said for certain is that age did not predict higher forms of racial identity attitudes.

Because it was believed that age would be positively correlated with higher racial identity attitude formation, it also seemed reasonable to predict that other life experiences would also predict the formation of racial identity attitudes. This, in fact, was the premise for the idea of including racial integration history as a predictor variable for racial identity attitude formation. The notion that previous interracial experiences would improve the probability that Black students would develop positive racial identity attitudes was also supported by previous research (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1976; Steward, Jackson, and Jackson, 1990). These ideas led to the formation of the second research question: Is the level of integrated racial experience predictive of student racial identity attitudes?

The results of this study did not directly support the hypothesis that racial integration history would account for a significant portion of the variance observed among Black students' positive racial identity attitudes (e.g., Integration). Instead, the results highlighted a negative relationship between students endorsing Encounter status attitudes (ambivalence and confusion toward one's own socio-racial group along with ambivalent socio-racial self-definition) and racial integration history. The

interpretation of this finding suggested that as students reported increasing levels of racial integration, their tendencies to endorse ambivalence and confused socio-racial self-definitions decreased. Although this finding did not specifically address the impact of racial integration history on higher levels of racial identity attitudes (e.g., Integration), it did speak to the impact of racial integration history on lower levels of racial identity attitudes (e.g., Encounter).

If these findings were taken at face value, then the first explanation to emerge would be that Encounter status racial identity attitudes derive from the opposite of racial integration history. In this case, the opposite manifestation would be a history of racial segregation. This finding would be consistent with the overall outcome that Black students in this study reported relatively low levels of racial integration history. If this were true, then this would suggest that Black students on predominantly White campuses originating from racially segregated (predominantly Black) neighborhoods and schools are more likely to espouse confused and socio-racially ambivalent self-identities (Encounter status) in predominantly White university environments. This is not to say that these same students would endorse similar attitudes in their communities of origin. Rather, Black students may develop

racial attitudes specific to the environment in which they currently function given the degree to which their home community was racially integrated.

Another explanation for this finding and the absence of significant findings for the remaining statuses (Pre-encounter, Immersion, and Integration) emerges after consideration of the social requirements imposed on individuals in racially integrated environments. It may be that students with histories of integrated racial experiences also have learned to deal with issues of race and racism in ways very different from their counterparts who report non-integrated histories. In cases of racial integration history, it may be that students are encouraged or required to develop racial identity attitude statuses that are not "confused or ambivalent socio-racial identities" in order to survive racially integrated experiences.

Finally, the absence of significant relationships between racial integration history and the remaining racial identity statuses (Pre-encounter, Immersion, and integration) may mean that these racial identity attitudes occur independently of racial integration history. Racial integration history may be a critical factor only in circumstances in which there is a shift in setting leading to exposure (Encounter) to the 'other.' If this is found to

be the case, in future research, these findings may indicate points of intervention for the retention of Black students on predominantly White campuses.

Research question three introduced the construct of ego-identity development into the model in the following fashion: Is ego-identity status predictive of racial identity attitudes? This question resulted in the following hypothesis: Higher attainment of ego-identity (achievement) is predicted to be positively related to higher attainment of racial identity attitudes (e.g., Integration) and to account for a significant amount of the variance observed in racial identity attitudes. The inclusion of Ego-identity constructs, in this model, seems to have explained most of the variation observed among Black undergraduate students' racial identity attitudes. Of the Ego-identity stages (Foreclosure, Moratorium, Diffusion, and Achievement), Foreclosure (identity commitments based on little or no exploration of possible alternatives) was the only stage to significantly predict racial identity attitudes. Foreclosure was a significant predictor of Pre-encounter racial attitudes (tendency to devalue own group by defaulting to White standards of merit) and Encounter racial attitudes (ambivalence and confusion toward one's own socio-racial group; ambivalent socio-racial self-definition).

Instead of a relationship between higher racial identity attitude status (Integration) and higher ego-identity development (Achievement), the model predicted relationships between lower levels of racial identity attitude statuses (Foreclosure and Encounter) and unachieved ego-identity development (Foreclosure). The finding that Foreclosed ego-identity was related to Pre-encounter racial identity status was not inconsistent with the direction of predicted relationships between ego-identity development and racial identity attitude statuses. Rather, this finding would support the suggestion that individuals of minority status, in a predominantly White university environment, may unquestioningly endorse White standards of merit in order to maximize success in a potentially conflict prone experience. This may indeed represent a coping mechanism that Black students utilize in order to survive traditional, White academia.

The additional finding that Foreclosure ego-identity stage of development is also predictive of Encounter racial identity attitudes may provide additional explanation of a possible coping mechanism utilized by Black students. For example, Black students may enter the predominantly White learning environment with expectations that they will be required to comply with White standards of merit (Pre-encounter). After entering the environment of White

academia, students undoubtedly experience various covert, overt, and institutional forms of racism. Because students may believe that their success depends on an unquestioning approach to the academic environment (Foreclosure), they may cope with acts of racism by internalizing racist messages that potentially could result in racial identity attitude confusion (Encounter). Initially, this coping mechanism may assist students in maintaining external homeostasis with the environment; however, the continued practice of internalizing racist messages would seem to inevitably undermine one's internal homeostasis. Ultimately, the effects of cognitive dissonance (characteristic of Encounter Status) may lead to increased anxiety, depression, and subsequent attrition from White institutions of higher learning.

A continuation of this rationale would provide further possible explanations for the absence of the remaining racial identity attitude statuses among the significant findings. According to Helms (1990), the natural result of internalized socio-racial identity confusion is eventually a reversal of group identification in the transition to Black socio-racial group idealization (Immersion). A dilemma may emerge for students experiencing increased confusion and feelings of anger toward the White academic system: On one hand, the student desires academic success, and on the other

hand, the student recognizes incongruence in the previously held White socio-racial identity and new Black socio-racial identity configuration. Until additional data emerges to suggest otherwise, I will suggest that Black students facing this dilemma will generally choose to maintain either a Pre-encounter racial identity status or an Encounter racial identity status, for the purpose coping with racism in predominantly White educational environments.

A second explanation of the prominence of Foreclosure ego-identity status may be the manifestation of the individual's collective identity spoken of by Turner (1987). Instead of conceptualizing Foreclosed ego-identity as lacking ego-independence, it may in fact represent the individual's dependence on the collective community or group for negotiating issues of racism and race. This interpretation would explain the effect of both idealizing the White group (Pre-encounter) and denigration of the White group and idealization of own group (Immersion). In both cases, the foreclosed attitudes would be dependent upon the group of reference and the attitudes emanating from that group.

The fourth research question was stated as follows: Is there an interaction between students' ego-identity status and history of racial integration that mediates the relationship between the independent variables and racial

attitude? The hypothesis associated with this question stated: The interaction between ego-identity stage and racial integration history will mediate the relationship between the independent variables and racial identity attitudes. It was believed that higher levels of ego-identity (e.g., Achievement) and integration history would predict higher levels of racial identity attitudes (e.g., Integration). The interactions between ego-identity stages and racial integration history did not significantly predict any of the Racial Identity Attitude statuses. Although the interactions were predicted to be significant contributors to the overall model, much of the prediction was based on the belief that racial integration history would be an important factor in the formation of positive racial attitudes of Black students. Instead, the aforementioned results of racial integration history suggested that actual experiences in integrated environments bears little to no influence on Black students' racial attitudes.

Short of asking students their perceptions about the effect of integrated communities and schools, the findings were unclear. Students reported a range of integration experiences from which there was no significant differentiation noted in racial attitude formation. This finding seems to confirm the earlier speculation that the act of integrating neighborhoods and schools is not enough

to impact the overall development of individuals in a pluralistic society.

The solution is not a simple one. Social scientists have spent careers investigating prejudice and attempting to implement social change on issues such as racial integration. In a review of the lifetime work of social scientist Kenneth B. Clark, Keppel (2002) highlighted Clark's ideas on the topic of prejudice and racial integration in American society. In summary, Clark believed that prejudice and discrimination had negative effects on the development of personality. As he worked to counter the effects of prejudice on children in schools during the civil rights era, he concluded that there was a distinct difference between political rhetoric against segregation and the reality of continuing prejudice in segregated schools among self-proclaimed White liberals. After working to reverse the effects of prejudice and segregation, in time, he concluded that societies that structure themselves to treat minorities with contempt suffer from social pathology in an institutionalized, chronic, and self-perpetuating way.

Implications for Future Research

The implications of this "social pathology", highlighted by Keppel (2002), are widespread. A suggestion

that the solution to this problem rests merely in racially integrating people would be ludicrous given the history of American prejudice and racial integration attempts in the twentieth century. However, to suggest that nothing be done, defaulting to a system of unchecked prejudice and segregation, would also ignore negative social consequences observed in American history. Given this highlighted dilemma, it would seem appropriate to continue on a path of understanding the social implications of the status quo and alternative approaches for promoting responsible social change.

To this end, it would seem important to continue the investigation of factors that impact the development of Black racial identity attitudes. The impact of broad social influences, outlined above, are important; however, strict adherence to research focused on social change may eclipse opportunities to identify significant contributors to racial identity attitude development at the individual level. The findings of this study suggested that Black students may adapt to predominantly White settings by not questioning the merits of the White dominated system. In some cases, students may take this adaptation one step further by internalizing negative messages about themselves in order to maintain environmental stability or homeostasis. It would seem important to continue a line of research investigating

the coping styles of Black students in integrated environments.

In addition to better understanding the possible coping mechanisms used among Black undergraduate students in predominantly White universities, further investigation of the differences in ego-identity development and racial identity attitude formation among Black students at predominantly White universities versus Black students at Historically Black Colleges seems in order. For example, Miville, et al. (2000) noted that Black students, at a Historically Black College, were found to endorse racial identity attitudes that were significantly related to lower forms of ego-identity development (Foreclosure, Moratorium, and Diffusion) as well as higher forms of ego-identity development (Achievement). The discrepancy in these findings compared to the current study may indicate that integration on university campuses impacts one or both of these variables. Further study of this effect will improve educators' understanding of the dynamic processes of ego-identity and racial identity attitudes on predominantly White university campuses. Ultimately, it would seem most useful to delineate the variables that contribute to the acquisition of integration attitudes of Black racial identity attitude status. The future study of individual values (e.g, religious commitment/practice and

spirituality), in addition to personality structure, may contribute to further understanding of racial identity attitude development.

In addition to better understanding undergraduate populations with respect to ego-identity development, racial integration history, and racial identity attitudes, further research on the impact of these variables on graduate students seeking degrees in the helping professions (e.g., counseling) is also warranted. If Black graduate students follow the pattern of acquiescence to White standards of merit, as highlighted by the undergraduate sample in this study, in order to succeed in graduate training programs, then it seems that the positive impact of multicultural training would be severely compromised. For example, if Black graduate students were accustomed to looking toward White faculty and peers for 'correct' answers, then potential opportunities to explore the personal impact of topics covered in diversity training (e.g., racism) would be missed or minimized. Ultimately, missed opportunities such as this would impact the service population that the counselor trainees wish to serve. Both the evidence and following speculation suggest that additional research on the effects of ego-identity development on racial identity attitudes among Black graduate students and professionals is warranted.

Study 2

Similar to Study 1, several noteworthy findings emerged from the data analyses presented in the previous chapter. Of the four predictor variables, Ego-identity development, appeared to have the most influence on describing racial identity attitudes among White students. Initial review of the results suggested that much of racial attitude development among White undergraduate students is based on personal development (i.e., psychological and emotional maturity, and an independent belief system).

The first research question asked about the effect of age and gender on the attainment of positive racial identity attitudes (e.g., Autonomy). Gender and age were initially hypothesized to account for a significant portion of the variance observed among White undergraduate students. This hypothesis was based on previous research (Neil and Steward, 1999) in which White women were found to espouse attitudes consistent with anti-racist activism as the variable of age increased. Contrary to what was hypothesized, this study produced results suggesting that neither age nor gender significantly accounted for variation observed among racial attitudes.

In explaining the discrepancy in findings, a review of both studies, the Neil and Steward study (1999) and the

current study, revealed differences in the ways racial identity attitudes were conceptualized, measured and constructed. The current study assessed subjects' racial attitudes toward the Black racial group through the use of Helms (1990) WRIAS. The WRIAS asks White subjects to endorse, to varying degrees, statements about Whites in relation to Blacks. For example, Helms, (1990) included the following item in the WRIAS: "I get angry when I think about how Whites have been treated by Blacks." The degree to which subjects endorsed the statements was then attributed to the various statuses of White racial identity attitude development. The Neil and Steward (1999) study assessed White students' beliefs about their own racial identity, or 'Whiteness' through the use of the ORAS-P, based on the Oklahoma Racial Consciousness Model (Rowe, et al., 1994). The ORAS-P assessed racial attitude through a series of questions that ask about the White subject's beliefs about minorities in general (e.g., "Minorities are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights"). Subjects were not asked to endorse or disagree with statements about Whites in relation to Blacks.

In the study conducted by Neil and Steward (1999), the authors concluded that the relationship established between age, gender, and racial consciousness was the result of womens' experience in America as under-represented

minorities. Specifically, the authors speculated that older women endorsed racial consciousness attitudes consistent with racial activism because they understood the consequences and impact of being discriminated against in American society. The critical point highlighted in this speculation was womens' ability to vicariously empathize with the circumstances of ethnic minorities and discrimination.

Very different from the ORAS-P, the WRIAS highlighted the dynamic history of Black and White race relations by asking subjects about specific experiences and feelings related to inter-racial interactions. In this instance (WRIAS), women were not given the option of identifying with any minority group, but were specifically required to assess their racial attitudes in reference to Blacks. As a result of this difference, it is believed, the data suggested that neither age nor gender were significant contributors to the predictive model of White racial identity because White women were not able to identify with 'Blacks' in the same way that they were able to identify with 'minorities.'

With a better understanding of the possible non-implications of age and gender on White racial attitudes, a turn toward the effects of Integration history on White racial attitudes seems in order. The second research question stated: Is the level of integrated racial

experience predictive of student racial identity attitudes? The related hypothesis stated that racial integration history was predicted to account for a significant portion of the variance observed among White students' racial identity attitudes and that this relationship between variables would be positive (i.e., Identity Achievement would be related to higher levels of racial integration). Contrary to what was predicted, racial integration history did not bear any significant impact on White students' racial attitudes, positive or negative. This finding of no relationship was unexpected given that in a previous study (Neil & Steward, 1999), integration history was found to provide significant explanation of White students' racial consciousness and associated attitudes. Given the disparity in study outcomes, the probable explanation rests again with differences between the racial attitude and racial consciousness constructs and measurement in each study.

As noted earlier, the ORAS-P and WRIAS assess racial attitudes in discretely different ways: The ORAS-P asks subjects to endorse attitudes about minorities, in varying degrees; whereas, the WRIAS asks White subjects to endorse racial attitudes in reference to Blacks. What seems apparent is the degree of separation that occurs for Whites in the process of taking the ORAS-P. Rather than being faced with specific details of people (e.g., racial

identification), or groups of people, on which to base endorsements of racial attitudes, subjects are asked to report attitudes based on generalities (e.g., designation 'minority'). In this case, the impact of racial integration history may have been different if the WRIAS used the term 'minority' instead of 'Black(s).' Regardless of the reasons that might explain the absence of a relationship between these variables, at the very least, the results indicate that the construct in racial integration history was not a significant predictor of racial attitudes as measured by the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (Helms, 1990).

Although age, gender and racial integration history were predicted to significantly contribute to the understanding of racial attitude formation and development, their actual impact was minimal. Instead, results from this study indicated that most of the variation observed was accounted for by differences in ego-identity development among White students.

Returning to the third research question: Is ego-identity status predictive of racial attitude(s)? In this regard, the initial hypothesis stated that higher levels of ego-identity development (e.g. Achievement) would be significantly related to higher levels of racial attitude (e.g., Autonomy). As the results from the analysis emerged, the hypothesis statement was found to be true. Foreclosure

stage of ego-identity development (identity commitments based on little or no exploration of possible alternatives) was found to be predictive of Disintegration racial identity attitude status (disorientation and anxiety provoked by unresolvable racial moral dilemmas). Achieved stage of ego-identity development (identity commitments based on exploration of possible alternatives) was found to be predictive of Autonomy racial identity attitude status (informed positive socio-racial-group commitment; use of internal standards for self-definition; capacity to relinquish the privileges of racism) and Pseudo-independence status (intellectualized commitment to one's own socio-racial group and deceptive tolerance of other groups).

Although foreclosed ego-identity stage is a significant predictor of Disintegration status and contraindicated for Autonomy status, it seems peculiar that a significant relationship does not exist with Contact status, which by definition (satisfaction with the status quo; obliviousness to racism) seems more consistent with the features of Foreclosed ego-identity (commitment based on little or no exploration of alternatives). The latter finding may represent the possibility that White students are maintaining higher levels of racial consciousness in educational settings (due to diversity awareness campaigns) that may result in the 'obliviousness' feature of Contact

status being less viable in distinguishing between lower levels of racial attitudes. Although these campaigns may in fact heighten racial awareness among White students, external forces for increased awareness may do little to promote positive internal shifts in racial attitudes. Instead, this may be the beginning point for discrepancies between what students say or report in public displays of tolerance in classrooms and how they behave (externalized representation of racial attitudes) when not under the scrutiny of social mediators in classroom environments. For example, White students are taught by teachers and school administrators from early ages that overt forms of racism are not acceptable (e.g., telling of racial jokes, use of demeaning labels, etc.). Society, in general, makes attempts to educate students in politically correct language and public behavior.

After everything that society does to clear overt prejudice and discrimination, students still learn and practice racism. Instead of overt displays of hostility and violence, racism continues to maintain acceptance in covert forms (e.g., exclusion). The explanation for this occurrence may be as simple as the basic human desire to be accepted and part of 'the group.' In relation to the finding of Steward et al. (1998) discussed earlier, the counselor trainees who continued to rate peers as

'culturally sensitive' after displays of covert racism may have done so to avoid social isolation from peers who were part of the 'in group'. In other words, it is likely difficult to convince an individual to speak against a group of individuals participating in overt or covert racist acts. This may be an example of what Keppel (2002) was referring to when he relayed the message that societies that treat minorities with contempt suffer from social pathology, a pathology that is chronic and self-perpetuating.

The final and fourth research question stated: Is there an interaction between trainees' ego-identity status and history of racial integration? The associated hypothesis suggested that an interaction between ego-identity status and racial integration history would mediate the relationship between the independent variables and racial identity status. Similar to the findings of Study 1, the interactions between ego-identity stages and racial integration history) did not significantly predict any of the Racial identity attitude statuses. Although the interactions were predicted to be significant contributors to the overall model, much of the prediction was based on the belief that integration history would be an important factor in the formation of positive racial attitudes of White students. Instead, the results suggested that actual experiences in integrated environments bears little to no

influence on White students' racial attitudes. With no significant integration effect, the interaction between integration history and ego-identity stage was inconsequential.

With these overall findings, with respect to the predictor racial integration history, similar to Study 1, conclusions should follow in similar form. The reason that racial integration history does not produce the desired effect may originate from the same pathology noted earlier (prejudice and discrimination); however, the outcomes of this pathology impact Whites and Blacks very differently.

For example, Whites are often unaware that they should have a reason to question racist ideologies. Without a reason to change, or an understanding of the overall social benefits that pervasive eradication of racism would create, Whites have little reason to change. Likewise, Blacks also learn to accept the status quo. For example, Blacks sometimes learn to accept the status quo and unquestioningly collude with the system in order to obtain the benefits of compliance. If this is true, then one social solution in the form of racially integrating schools, is not likely to meet the needs of both groups. This assumption seems to have been confirmed by this study. Instead, it would seem more efficient, and productive, to assume that Whites and Blacks are in need of proactive measures addressing each

groups' role in the cycle of oppression. It seems unlikely that simply integrating the races will result in changes beyond what is already socially apparent.

Implications for Future Research

Most noteworthy, in response to the findings from Study 2, is the need to continue the investigation of predictors of White racial identity attitudes. Although the ego-identity statuses contributed to the understanding of racial identity attitude development, to some degree, there is still a great deal to be explained. For example, it would be helpful to clarify the reason behind the absence of relationship between Contact status of racial identity attitude status and the ego-identity statuses. Is this simply a case of students achieving heightened awareness of racial issues, or is there some other effect at work? One consideration may be the impact of cognitive development on the acquisition of racial identity attitudes. In a study conducted by Steward, Boatwright, Sauer, Baden, and Jackson (1998), it was found that counselors utilizing a dualistic cognitive pattern were also more likely to deny the impact of race and maintain their feelings of racial superiority (contact and reintegration statuses of White racial identity attitudes). Furthermore, men were more likely to adopt this cognitive style. Incorporation of constructs such as

cognitive development into future predictive models may prove informative.

Likewise, given that racial identity attitudes are presumed to result from inter-racial interactions, the variable of racial integration history would seem to be a predictor of racial identity attitudes. Given the current findings, however, this may or may not be the case. Further investigation of the possible forms, with associated features, of racial integration would be helpful in understanding the characteristics of racial interactions that contribute to Autonomous racial identity attitude formation. Future research delineating the variables that contribute to Autonomous racial identity attitudes is also needed. Ultimately, it would seem most useful to delineate the variables that contribute to the acquisition of Integration attitudes of White racial identity attitude status. The future study of individual values (e.g., religious commitment/practice and spirituality), in addition to personality structure, may contribute to further understanding of racial identity attitude development.

The implications of these findings are also important in considering future research of ego-identity formation and racial identity attitudes among graduate students (e.g., counselors). The willingness of counselor trainees to be open to new alternatives and opposing worldviews seems

critical in counseling work. Although ego-identity Achievement is a critical component of personality development, its combination with Autonomous racial identity attitudes seems crucial. Although the findings of this study revealed this match does occur in the development of undergraduate students, it seems imperative to determine the possible combinations between Achieved ego-identity development and the other racial identity attitude statuses of graduate students. Likewise, a better understanding of ego-identity formation and racial identity attitude status combinations of graduate trainees in counseling would better facilitate the planning of multicultural courses and practical experiences.

Summary and Comparison of Study Findings

A review of the similarities and differences between the studies revealed that neither Black racial identity attitudes nor White racial identity attitudes were predicted by age or gender. Similarly, with the exception of Black racial identity Encounter status, racial integration history was not a significant variable in predicting racial identity attitudes. With these variables not contributing significantly to the models explaining Black or White racial identity development, ego-identity development was left to explain most of the variance observed for both models.

The ego-identity stages of Foreclosure and Achievement were the only stages to predict racial identity attitude development in both Study 1 and Study 2. Among Black students, Foreclosure predicted earlier stages of Black racial identity development (e.g., Pre-encounter and Encounter). Likewise, among White students Foreclosure ego-identity stage predicted earlier stages of White racial identity development (e.g., Disintegration). For White students, Achievement stage of ego-identity development was also predictive of higher statuses of racial identity attitude development. In this case, Achievement was predictive of both Pseudo-independence and Autonomy statuses. Of all possible outcomes, this seems to be the most promising. Given the natural course of racial identity attitude development, this finding seems to suggest that some White students have attained a sufficient level of ego-identity complexity to enable them to question previously held racist beliefs and respond in non-racist ways. This author would suggest that this response pattern represents a higher order set of functional knowledge, awareness, and behaviors.

Limitations

As is the case with most studies in the social science professions, questions of internal validity arise when random sampling is not used. In this study, it is

acknowledged that the sample was not random, but a sample of convenience. The Black student sample was heavily represented by students in the natural sciences, although some represented more diverse majors. Furthermore, the Black sample was positively skewed in terms of age. Although the sample was collected from university courses that traditionally enroll students of all undergraduate rankings, older students were either not in attendance or not enrolling at the same rate as younger students. This finding may also have been related to higher levels of attrition among Black students, discussed earlier, on predominantly White university campuses.

In addition, because of the timing of data collection, the White sample was not asked about chosen major; therefore, the ability to generalize information to the overall White student population is questionable, although it is believed that the sample represented a diverse range of academic majors.

In addition to the non-random nature of the sample, I acknowledge that the validity of all self-report instruments may be in question. This possibility is acknowledged given the specific chance that some students may have consciously or unconsciously given negatively skewed ratings of themselves when asked about issues of race and racist attitudes.

Furthermore, there may be some concern with measurement and internal consistency of the racial identity attitudes instruments. Specifically, some in the profession consider the use of the WRIAS questionable based on item analysis results and the underlying assumption that the measure actually assesses the developmental nature of racial identity for White people (Behrens, 1997; Behrens & Rowe, 1997; Knox, 1996). As with all current measures of racial identity attitudes, the WRIAS has some questionable reliability indices (e.g., alpha .55 on the Contact scale). Similar concerns persist with the BRIAS. The author acknowledges that although reliability of the instruments has always been questionable, part of the discrepancy may be due, in part, to socio-historical changes that have occurred since the development of both instruments.

Although concerns such as these limit one's ability to confidently make inferences to the general undergraduate population, the decision to use the scales was based on rigor; the WRIAS and BRIAS are considered the most rigorous of all available racial attitude assessment scales for White and Black Students.

Appendix A

Pilot Study

In order to test the assumption that racial integration history and ego-identity status account for a significant portion of the variance observed among White undergraduate and graduate student racial identity development, Neil and Steward (1999) conducted the following pilot study.

Participants

Eighty-six White undergraduate and graduate students were recruited from undergraduate level psychology courses and graduate counselor training programs at two large mid-western state universities (sample size of 74 based on Cohen's 1992 estimate for medium effect size, $\alpha = .05$, 3 variable regression model). Given the nature of the undergraduate courses, even distributions of Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors, Seniors and graduate students were obtained. Noting the large nature of the state universities, the student participants represented a variety of socio-economic statuses. The universities regularly serve students from urban, rural, and suburban areas.

Measures

Racial attitudes were operationalized through use of the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Preliminary Form (ORAS-P). The instrument consists of 50 self-report items developed to assess five racial attitude levels proposed by

Rowe, Behrens, and Leach (1993). Ten items assess the unachieved statuses of White racial consciousness: avoidant, dependent, and dissonant. Thirty-one items make up the four scales measuring the achieved White racial consciousness statuses: conflictive, dominative, integrative, and reactive. One item is not scored. To describe White Americans' racial attitudes toward African Americans, each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

The following are examples of items used on the ORAS-P: (avoidant) "Racial issues may be important, but I don't want to think about them"; (dependent) "Other people's opinions have largely determined how I feel about minorities"; (dissonant) "Because I'm really not sure about how I feel, I'm looking for answers to questions I have about minority issues"; (conflictive) "Over the past few years the government has paid more attention to minority concerns than they deserve"; (dominative) "Minorities don't try as hard as they ought to"; (integrative) "I feel quite comfortable around minority people"; and (reactive) "Most minorities who are in prisons could be considered political prisoners".

Coefficient alpha reliabilities along with test-retest and factor analysis data are reported to be adequate suggesting that the instrument appears to be measuring the attitudes associated with White Racial Consciousness theory.

The theorists note that it would be impossible to develop an instrument that measures racism as a multidimensional construct, yet they suggest that of all available instruments, the ORAS-P most accurately measures the attitudes associated with racism.

Social integration status was measured through a researcher developed instrument that assessed the racial composition of participants' neighborhood and school settings (assessed independently): Ages 1-5 (pre-school), 6-10 (elementary school), 11-14 (middle school), and 15-19 (high school). There are a total of five neighborhood scales and five school scales for a total of ten scales. Participants reported social integration history using a 5 point Likert scale, high scale representing predominantly non-White and low scale representing predominantly White. Each of the scales were associated with a statement similar to the following: "Your neighborhood/community during your pre-school years was: (predominantly non-White/White). The five points on the Likert Scale were assigned recommended values (i.e., #1 had the value 100% (approximately) White; #2 had the value 75% White; #3 had the value of 50% White; #4 had the value of 25% White; and #5 had the value of 0% (approximately) White. Full scale scores ranged from 5 (low integration) to 50 (high integration).

Social status was assessed through a self-report demographics form. Subjects reported levels of perceived social class, actual social class (determined by parents' combined household income), education level of father, and education level of mother on five-point Likert scales. The scales were blocked together for analysis in the regression.

Ego-identity status was measured by the Ego Identity Scale (EIS) (Bennion & Adams, 1986). The EIS was developed to measure ego identity status in ideological domains (occupation, politics, religion, and philosophical lifestyle) and in interpersonal domains (friendship, dating, sex roles, and recreation). Subjects self-reported on a six point Likert scale. Each of the eight domains was measured by eight items, including two items for each identity status originally developed by Marcia (1966), (achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion). There are 64 total items on this scale.

The following statements are used on the Ego-Identity Scale (Bennion & Adams, 1986) to assess level of ego identity achievement: "My ideas about men's and women's roles are identical to my parents'. What has worked for them will obviously work for me." (Identity Foreclosure); "There are a lot of different kinds of people. I'm still exploring the many possibilities to find the right kind of friends for me". (Moratorium); "There's no single "life

style" which appeals to me more than another." (Identity Diffusion); and "Based on past experiences, I've chosen the type of dating relationship I want now." (Identity Achievement).

Bennion and Adams (1986) report Cronbach Alpha coefficients for identity statuses within the Ideology and Interpersonal domains. Ideology domain: .62 (Achievement), .75 (Moratorium), .75 (Foreclosure); and .62 (Diffusion). Interpersonal domain: .60 (Achievement), .58 (Moratorium), .80 (Foreclosure), and .64 (Diffusion).

Procedure

White students who were recruited from the psychology and counseling courses met with a research assistant who explained the procedures of the study. After completing an informed consent form, the students completed a demographics form, the EIS and the ORAS-P. After completion of the measures, participants were debriefed and received experimental credit.

Analysis

Analysis of the data employed hierarchical regression with social status, ego identity status, and social integration status as predictor variables. The first two variables (social status and ego-identity status) were entered as blocked groups of data. The variables were

entered into the regression model as follows: social status (gender, age, participant SES ranking of self, participant SES ranking of family of origin, participant education level, education level of father, education level of mother, and family income at time of high school graduation), ego-identity status (foreclosure, moratorium, diffusion, and achievement), and social integration history. Standardized racial attitude identity scores (conflictive, dominative, integrative, reactive, avoidant, dependent, and dissonant) served as the dependent variables for the seven regressions. In order to protect against the possibility of Type II error, a Bonferonni adjustment was made to accommodate the seven independent tests. Significant p equals .007.

Results

Conflictive Status

There was a significant negative relationship between Conflictive status on the ORAS-P and the student's age $r = -.36$, $p = .01$). In the regression analysis, age ($t = -2.93$, $p = .005$) was a significant predictor of conflictive racial consciousness; again the relationship was negative suggesting that students become less conflicted in racial attitude as time passes. Additional findings suggest a negative relationship between the Moratorium Ego Identity and Conflictive attitudes ($t = -3.16$, $p = .002$). Finally, The

analysis indicated a positive relationship between social integration history and the dependent variable ($t=3.18$, $p=.002$). The overall model was a significant predictor of Conflictive Racial Attitude development ($R^2=.47$, $F(13,60)=4.09$, $p=.00$).

Dominative Status

A significant positive relationship emerged between Foreclosure Ego Identity status and Dominative racial attitudes $r=.42$, $p=.01$; $t=4.37$, $p=.00$). Overall, the model was a significant predictor of Dominative attitudes ($R^2=.38$; $F(13,61)=2.89$, $p=.003$).

Integrative Status

Foreclosure was the only predictor variable to demonstrate a significant relationship with Integrative attitudes, however, the relationship was negative $r=-.23$, $p=.01$). Although there was a significant correlation with Foreclosure, the overall model did not adequately describe Integrative attitudes ($R^2=.26$; $F(13,61)=1.71$, $p=.08$).

Reactive Status

Age ($t=3.16$, $p=.002$) and Gender ($t=2.91$, $p=.005$) were both significant predictors of Reactive Attitude status. This suggests that females and older students in general are more likely to ascribe to this attitude pattern. Conversely, a negative predictive relationship emerged

between social integration status and Reactive Attitudes ($t=-.29$, $p=.005$). The negative relationship implies that students from less integrated backgrounds are more likely to exhibit Reactive attitudes. Overall, the regression model significantly predicted Reactive attitudes ($R^2=.40$, $F(13,59)=3.12$, $p=.001$).

Unachieved Attitude Statuses

None of the predictors from the model significantly contributed to the prediction of the Avoidant, Dependent, or Dissonant Attitude statuses. As well, the overall models did not significantly describe the development of Avoidant Attitudes ($R^2=.32$, $F(13,61)=2.22$, $p=.01$); Dependent Attitudes ($R^2=.31$, $F(13,61)=2.14$, $p=.02$); or Dissonant Attitudes ($R^2=.27$; $F(13,60)=1.71$, $p=.08$).

Appendix B

Social Attitude Scale-II

BRIAS

This questionnaire is designated to measure people's social and political attitudes. There are no right or wrong answers. Use the scale below to respond to each statement. On your answer sheet beside each item number, write the number that best describes how you feel.

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

1. I believe that being Black is a positive experience.
2. I know through experience what being Black in America means.
3. I feel unable to involve myself in White experiences and am increasing my involvement in Black experiences.
4. I believe that large numbers of Blacks are untrustworthy.
5. I feel an overwhelming attachment to Black people.
6. I involve myself in causes that will help all oppressed people.
7. I feel comfortable wherever I am.
8. I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks.
9. I feel very uncomfortable around Black people.
10. I feel good about being Black, but do not limit myself to Black activities.
11. I often find myself referring to White people as honkies, devils, pigs, etc.
12. I believe that to be Black is not necessarily good.
13. I believe that certain aspects of the Black experience apply to me, and others do not.
14. I frequently confront the system and the man.
15. I constantly involve myself in Black political and social activities (art shows, political meetings, Black theater, etc.)
16. I involve myself in social action and political groups even if there are no other Blacks involved.
17. I believe that Black people should learn to think and experience life in ways which are similar to White people.
18. I believe that the world should be interpreted from a Black perspective.

19. I have changed my style of life to fit my beliefs about Black people.
20. I feel excitement and joy in Black surroundings.
21. I believe that Black people came from a strange, dark, and uncivilized continent.
22. People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.
23. I find myself reading a lot of Black literature and thinking about being Black.
24. I feel guilty and/or anxious about some of the things I believe about Black people.
25. I believe that a Black person's most effective weapon for solving problems is to become part of the White person's world.
26. I speak my mind regardless of the consequences (e.g., being kicked out of school, being imprisoned, being exposed to danger).
27. I believe that everything Black is good, and consequently, I limit myself to Black activities.
28. I am determined to find my Black identity.
29. I believe that White people are intellectually superior to Blacks.
30. I believe that because I am Black, I have many strengths.
31. I feel that Black people do not have as much to be proud of as White people do.
32. Most Blacks I know are failures.
33. I believe that White people should feel guilty about the way they have treated Blacks in the past.
34. White people can't be trusted.
35. In today's society if Black people don't achieve, they have only themselves to blame.
36. The most important thing about me is that I am Black.
37. Being Black just feels natural to me.
38. Other Black people have trouble accepting me because my life experiences have been so different from their experiences.
39. Black people who have any White people's blood should feel ashamed of it.
40. Sometimes, I wish I belonged to the White race.
41. The people I respect most are White.
42. A person's race usually is not important to me.
43. I feel anxious when White people compare me to other members of my race.
44. I can't feel comfortable with either Black people or White people.
45. A person's race has little to do with whether or not he/she is a good person.

46. When I am with Black people, I pretend to enjoy the things they enjoy.
47. When a stranger who is Black does something embarrassing in public, I get embarrassed.
48. I believe that a Black person can be close friends with a White person.
49. I am satisfied with myself.
50. I have a positive attitude about myself because I am Black.

Appendix C

EIS Scale

Instructions: Please read each item and indicate to what extent it reflects your own thoughts and feelings. If a statement has more than one part, indicate your reaction to the statement as a whole. Using the scale below, place the appropriate number next to the item in the space provided.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly		Disagree		Agree	Strongly
Disagree					Agree

- ___ 1. I haven't chosen the occupation I really want to get into, and I'm just working at whatever is available until something better comes along.
- ___ 2. When it comes to religion, I just haven't found anything that appeals and I don't really feel the need to look.
- ___ 3. My ideas about men's and women's roles are identical to my parents'. What has worked for them will obviously work for me.
- ___ 4. There's no single "life style" which appeals to me more than another.
- ___ 5. There are a lot of different kinds of people. I'm still exploring the many possibilities to find the right kind of friends for me.
- ___ 6. I sometimes join in recreational activities when asked, but I rarely try anything on my own.
- ___ 7. I haven't really thought about a "dating style." I'm not too concerned with whether I date or not.
- ___ 8. Politics is something that I can never be too sure about because things change so fast. But I do think it's important to know what I can politically stand for and believe in.
- ___ 9. I'm still trying to decide how capable I am as a person and what jobs will be right for me.
- ___ 10. I don't give religion much thought and it doesn't bother me one way or another.
- ___ 11. There's so many ways to divide responsibilities in marriage, I'm trying to decide what will work for me.

- _____ 12. I'm looking for an acceptable perspective for my own "life style" view, but I haven't really found it yet.
- _____ 13. There are many reasons for friendship, but I choose my close friends on the basis of certain values and similarities that I've personally decided on.
- _____ 14. While I don't have one recreational activity I'm really committed to, I'm experiencing numerous leisure outlets to identify one I can really get involved in.
- _____ 15. Based on past experiences, I've chosen the type of dating relationship I want now.
- _____ 16. I haven't really considered politics. It just doesn't excite me much.
- _____ 17. I might have thought about a lot of different jobs, but there's never really any question since my parents said what they wanted.
- _____ 18. A person's faith is unique to each individual. I've considered and reconsidered it myself and know what I can believe.
- _____ 19. I've never really seriously considered men's and women's roles in marriage. It just doesn't seem to concern me.
- _____ 20. After considerable thought I've developed my own individual viewpoint of what is for me an ideal "lifestyle" and don't believe anyone will be likely to change my perspective.
- _____ 21. My parents know what's best for me in terms of how to choose my friends.
- _____ 22. I've chosen one or more recreational activities to engage in regularly from lots of things and I'm satisfied with those choices.
- _____ 23. I don't think about dating much. I just kind of take it as it comes.
- _____ 24. I guess I'm pretty much like my folks when it comes to politics. I follow what they do in terms of voting and such.
- _____ 25. I'm really not interested in finding the right job, any job will do. I just seem to flow with what is available.
- _____ 26. I'm not sure what religion means to me. I'd like to make up my mind but I'm not done looking yet.

- _____ 27. My ideas about men's and women's roles come right from my parents and family. I haven't seen any need to look further.
- _____ 28. My own views on a desirable life style were taught to me by my parents and I don't see any need to question what they taught me.
- _____ 29. I don't have any real close friends, and I don't think I'm looking for one right now.
- _____ 30. Sometimes I join in leisure activities, but I really don't see a need to look for a particular activity to do regularly.
- _____ 31. I'm trying out different types of dating relationships. I just haven't decided what is best for me.
- _____ 32. There are so many different political parties and ideals. I can't decide which to follow until I figure it all out.
- _____ 33. It took me a while to figure it out, but now I really know what I want for a career.
- _____ 34. Religion is confusing to me right now. I keep changing my views on what is right and wrong for me.
- _____ 35. I've spent some time thinking about men's and women's roles in marriage and I've decided what will work best for me.
- _____ 36. In finding an acceptable viewpoint to life itself, I find myself engaging in a lot of discussions with others and some self-exploration.
- _____ 37. I only pick friends my parents would approve of.
- _____ 38. I've always liked doing the same recreational activities my parents do and haven't ever seriously considered anything else.
- _____ 39. I only go out with the type of people my parents expect me to date.
- _____ 40. I've thought my political beliefs through and realize I can agree with some and not other aspects of what my parents believe.
- _____ 41. My parents decided a long time ago what I should go into for employment and I'm following through with their plans.

- _____ 42. I've gone through a period of serious questions about faith and can now say I understand what I believe in as an individual.
- _____ 43. I've been thinking about the roles that husbands and wives play a lot these days, and I'm trying to make a final decision.
- _____ 44. My parents' views on life are good enough for me; I don't need anything else.
- _____ 45. I've tried many different friendships and now I have a clear idea of what I look for in a friend.
- _____ 46. After trying a lot of different recreational activities I've found one or more I really enjoy doing by myself or with friends.
- _____ 47. My preferences about dating are still in the process of developing. I haven't fully decided yet.
- _____ 48. I'm not sure about my political beliefs, but I'm trying to figure out what I can truly believe in.
- _____ 49. It took me a long time to decide but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career.
- _____ 50. I attend the same church or synagogue my family always attended. I've never really questioned why.
- _____ 51. There are many ways that married couples can divide up family responsibilities. I've thought about lots of ways and now I know exactly how I want it to happen for me.
- _____ 52. I guess I just kind of enjoy life in general, and I don't see myself living by any particular viewpoint to life.
- _____ 53. I don't have any close friends. I just like to hang around with the crowd.
- _____ 54. I've been experiencing a variety of recreational activities in hopes of finding one or more I can enjoy for some time to come.
- _____ 55. I've dated different types of people and now know exactly what my own "unwritten rules" for dating are and who I will date.

- _____ 56. I really have never been involved in politics enough to have made a firm stand one way or the other.
- _____ 57. I just can't decide what to do for an occupation. There are so many possibilities.
- _____ 58. I've never really questioned my religion. If its right for my parents it must be right for me.
- _____ 59. Opinions on men's and women's roles seem so varied that I don't think much about it.
- _____ 60. After a lot of self-examination, I have established a vary definite view on what my own lifestyle will be.
- _____ 61. I really don't know what kind of friend is best for me. I'm trying to figure out exactly what friendship means to me.
- _____ 62. All of my recreational preferences I got from my parents and I haven't really tried anything else.
- _____ 63. I date only people my parents would approve of.
- _____ 64. My folks have always had their own political and moral beliefs about issues like abortion and mercy killing and I've always gone along accepting what they have.

Appendix D

History Questionnaire

Instructions: Please complete the following information to the best of your knowledge.

1. Sex: _____ 2. Age: _____ 3. Race/Ethnicity: _____

4. Level of Education: _____ 5. Major _____
 a. freshman
 b. sophomore
 c. junior
 d. senior

6. Which of the following categories best represents the group of people (including their value and belief systems) that your family of origin affiliates with? _____
 a. lower class
 b. lower-middle class
 c. middle class
 d. upper-middle class
 e. upper class

7. Which of the above categories (question 5) best represents the group of people (including their value and belief systems) that you affiliate with? _____

8. When you graduated from high school, what was your family's annual household income? _____
 a. less than \$10,000
 b. \$10,000 - \$40,000
 c. \$40,000 - \$70,000
 d. \$70,000 - \$100,000
 e. more than \$100,000

9. Highest education level of father _____ 10. Highest education level of mother _____
 a. high school
 b. trade school
 c. associates degree
 d. bachelors degree
 e. masters degree
 f. doctoral degree or equivalent
 a. high school
 b. trade school
 c. associates degree
 d. bachelors degree
 e. masters degree
 f. doctoral degree or equivalent

On a scale of 1-5 indicate (below left) the degree to which your community (or communities if you moved) was primarily non-white (1) or primarily white (5). A community that was integrated (racially balanced) would receive a score of (3):

Non-white	1	2	3	4	5	White
_____						_____
_____						_____
_____						_____
_____						_____
_____						_____
_____						_____
_____						_____
_____						_____
_____						_____

To the right of each question above, please indicate the racial composition of your neighborhood or school during the different stages of your life. Please indicate a percentage equivalent for the three primary racial groups.

Appendix E

Consent Form

Dear Participant:

Thank you for your interest in our research. The purpose of this study is to gain better understanding of students' social experiences before and during the course of university education. To accomplish this objective, we will ask you to complete three questionnaires. The first will ask you to identify basic demographic information (e.g., racial/ethnic group affiliation and social status). The second measure will ask you about beliefs and attitudes that contribute to your current lifestyle. Finally, the third questionnaire will attempt to identify beliefs and attitudes that you hold for people from different cultural and social groups. The resulting information will help us to better understand the personal experiences which contribute to the development of culturally sensitive students in counselor training programs. We estimate that the entire experience will take you 20-30 minutes.

You are participating in this activity as a volunteer. You may choose not to participate at all, or you may discontinue the activity at any time without penalty. Furthermore, all information that you provide will be treated with strict security and confidence. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. Information that you provide will remain anonymous in any report of research findings. Your name, or any identifying information, will not appear on any survey.

In return for your participation in this study, we are offering you the opportunity to enter your name in a drawing to receive a \$50.00 prize. If you would like to enter your name in the drawing, please complete the requested information form below. If you do not want to be considered for the drawing, please leave this part of the form blank. After data collection is completed, the investigators will randomly select a name and notify the winning participant. If you are participating in this study and wish to receive extra credit for a class, complete the section below for extra credit.

We do not anticipate that this activity will cause you difficulty or distress; however, if this occurs and you feel the need to discuss your reaction or concern related to this study, please contact Dr. Robbie J. Steward, Primary Investigator, at 432-1524. If you have questions about your rights as a human subject, please contact the IRB Chairperson: Dr. Kumar, 355-2180.

Sincerely,

Robbie J. Steward, Ph.D.

Douglas M. Neil, M. A.

Consent for Participation in the Steward/Neil Study

I have read the attached description of the proposed study to be conducted by Robbie J. Steward, Ph.D. By signing this form, I agree to voluntarily participate in this study.

Signature

Full Name (printed)

Date

☐ Please enter me in the \$50.00 Drawing: ☐ Please notify my instructor of extra credit completion:

Name: _____

Instructor

Name: _____

Course#: _____

Appendix F

SOCIAL ATTITUDE SCALE-III
WRIAS

This questionnaire is designated to measure people's social and political attitudes. There are no right or wrong answers. Use the scale below to respond to each statement. On your answer sheet beside each item number, write the number that best describes how you feel.

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

1. I hardly think about what race I am.
2. I do not understand what Blacks want from Whites.
3. I get angry when I think about how Whites have been treated by Blacks.
4. I feel as comfortable around Blacks as I do around Whites.
5. I involve myself in causes regardless of the race of the people involved in them.
6. I find myself watching Black people to see what they are like.
7. I feel depressed after I have been around Black people.
8. There is nothing that I want to learn from Blacks.
9. I seek out new experiences even if I know a large number of Blacks will be involved in them.
10. I enjoy watching the different ways that Blacks and Whites approach life.
11. I wish I had a Black friend.
12. I do not feel that I have the social skills to interact with Black people effectively.
13. A Black person who tries to get close to you is usually after something.
14. When a Black person holds an opinion with which I disagree, I am not afraid to express my viewpoint.
15. Sometimes jokes based on Black people's experiences are funny.
16. I think it is exciting to discover the little ways in which Black people and White people are different.
17. I used to believe in racial integration, but now I have my doubts.
18. I'd rather socialize with Whites only.
19. In many ways Blacks and Whites are similar, but they are also different in some important ways.
20. Blacks and Whites have much to learn from each other.
21. For most of my life, I did not think about racial issues.
22. I have come to believe that Black people and White people are very different.

23. White people have bent over backwards trying to make up for their ancestors' mistreatment of Blacks, now it is time to stop.
24. It is possible for Blacks and Whites to have meaningful social relationships with each other.
25. There are some valuable things that White people can learn from Blacks that they can't learn from other Whites.
26. I am curious to learn in what ways Black people and White people differ from each other.
27. I limit myself to White activities.
28. Society may have been unjust to Blacks, but it has also been unjust to Whites.
29. I am knowledgeable about which values Blacks and Whites share.
30. I am comfortable wherever I am.
31. In my family, we never talked about racial issues.
32. When I must interact with a Black person, I usually let him or her make the first move.
33. I feel hostile when I am around Blacks.
34. I think I understand Black people's values.
35. Blacks and Whites can have successful intimate relationships.
36. I was raised to believe that people are people regardless of their race.
37. Nowadays, I go out of my way to avoid associating with Blacks.
38. I believe that Blacks are inferior to Whites.
39. I believe I know a lot about Black people's customs.
40. There are some valuable things that White people can learn from Blacks that they can't learn from other Whites.
41. I think that it's okay for Black people and White people to date each other as long as they don't marry each other.
42. Sometimes I'm not sure what I think or feel about Black people.
43. When I am the only White in a group of Blacks, I feel anxious.
44. Blacks and Whites differ from each other in some ways, but neither race is superior.
45. I am not embarrassed to admit that I am White.
46. I think White people should become more involved in socializing with Blacks.
47. I don't understand why Black people blame all White people for their social misfortunes.
48. I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks.
49. I feel comfortable talking to Blacks.

50. I value the relationships that I have with my Black friends.

References

- Akbar, N. (1979). African roots of Black personality. In W. Smith, K. Burlew, M. Mosley, and W. Whiteney (Eds.), *Reflections on Black Psychology* (79-87). Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- Allen, W. R. (1985). Black student, White campus: Structural, interpersonal, and psychological correlations of success. *Journal of Negro Education*, 54, 134-147.
- American Psychological Association Education and Training Committee of Division 17. (1980). *Cross-cultural counseling competencies: A position paper*. Eighty-eighth Annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada.
- American Psychological Association. (1990). *Guidelines for psychological practice with ethnic and culturally diverse populations*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Banks, J. A. (1981). The stages of ethnicity: Implications for curriculum reform. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multi-ethnic education: Theory and practice* (pp. 129-139). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Behrens, J. T. (1997). Does the White racial identity attitude scale measure racial identity? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 44, 3-12.
- Behrens, J. T., & Rowe, W. (1997). Measuring White racial identity: A reply to Helms. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 44, 17-19.
- Bennion, L. D., & Adams, G. R. (1986). A revision of the Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status: An identity instrument for use with late adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 183-198.
- Blos, P. (1974). The genealogy of the ego ideal. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 29, 43-89.
- Brown, S. P., Parham, T. A., & Yonder, R. (1996). Influence of a cross-cultural training course on racial identity attitudes of White women and men: Preliminary perspectives. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 74, 510-516.

- Chong, D. (1994). Tolerance and social adjustment to new norms and practices. *Political Behavior*, 16(1), 21-53.
- Clark, K. B. (1992). Infecting our children with hostility. In G. W. Albee, et al. (Eds), *Improving children's lives: Global perspectives on prevention. Primary prevention of psychopathology*, Vol. 14. (330-333). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology, *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Claney, D., & Parker, W. M. (1989). Assessing white racial consciousness and perceived comfort with Black individuals: A preliminary study. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67, 449-451.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World*, 20(9), 13-27.
- D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. Special issue: Multiculturalism as a fourth force in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70(1), 143-150.
- Dizard, J. E. (1970). Black identity, social class, and Black power. *Journal of Social Issues*, 26(1), 195-207.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1982). *The life cycle completed: A review*. New York: Norton.
- Gay, G. (1974). Implications of selected models of ethnic identity development for educators. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 54(1), 43-52.
- Gibbs, J. T. (1974). Patterns of adaptation among Black students at a predominantly White university: Selected case studies. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 44(5), 728-740.

- Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A black and white model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12(3-4), 153-165.
- Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White racial identity inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and practice*. Needham Heights, MA, USA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Helms, J. E., & Parham, T. (1990). Black racial identity scale (Form RAIS-B). In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E., & Piper, R. E. (1994). Implications of racial identity theory for vocational psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 124-136.
- Ibrahim, F. A., & Arredondo, P. M. (1986). Ethical standards for cross-cultural counseling: Counselor preparation, practice, assessment, and research. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 64, 349-352.
- Jackson, B. (1975). Black identity development, In L. Golubschick and B. Persky (Eds.), *Urban social and educational issues* (pp. 158-164). Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hall.

- Katz, J. H. (1985). The socio-political nature of counseling. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 13(4), 615-624.
- Keppel, B., (2002). Kenneth B. Clark in the patterns of American culture. *American Psychologist*, 57(1), 29-37.
- Knox, P. L. (1996, August). *Racial identity: Refuting the developmental "Stage" structure*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- LaFromboise, T. D., Coleman, H. L., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and factor structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 22, 380-388.
- Lamb, D. H., Presser, N. R., Pfof, K. S., Baum, M. C., Jackson, V. R., & Jarvis, P. A. (1987). Confronting professional impairment during the internship: Identification, due process, and remediation. *Professional Psychology*, 18, 597-603.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 551-558.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Marcia, J. E., Waterman, A. S., Matteson, S. L., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1993). *Ego identity: A handbook for psycho-social research*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Matteson, D. R. (1975). *Adolescence today: Sex roles and the search for identity*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Milliones, J. (1980). Construction of a Black consciousness measure: Psychotherapeutic implications. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 17(2), 175-182.

- Minatoya, L. Y., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1981). Assessing attitudes of White university students toward Blacks in an a changing context. *Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance*, 12, 69-79.
- Mio, J. S. & Iwamasa, G. (1993). To do, or not to do: That is the question for White cross-cultural researchers. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 21(2), 197-212.
- Miville, M. L., Koonce, D., Darlington, P., & Whitlock, B. (2000). Exploring the relationships between racial/cultural identity and ego identity among African Americans and Mexican Americans. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 28(4), 208-224.
- Miville, M. L. & Helms, J. E. (1996). *Exploring relationships of cultural, gender, and ego identity among Latinos/as*. Poster presentation at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Neil, D. M., & Steward, R. J. (1999, August). *Social integration experience and ego-identity status: Predicting trainee racial attitude*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston.
- Neville, H. A., Heppner, M. J., Louie, C. E., Thompson, C. E., Brooks, L, & Baker, C. E. (1996). The impact of multicultural training on White racial identity attitude and therapy competencies. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 27, 83-89.
- Ottavi, T. M., Pope-Davis, D. B., & Dings, J. G. (1994). Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 149-154.
- Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985). Relation of racial identity attitudes to self-actualization and affective states of Black students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32(3), 431-440.

- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1976). Informal interaction with faculty and freshmen ratings of academic and non-academic experiences of college. *Journal of Educational Research*, 70, 35-41.
- Phinney, J. S., & Alipuria, L. L. (1990). Ethnic identity in college students from four ethnic groups. *Journal of Adolescence*, 13(2), 171-183.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (1998). Charting a course for research in multicultural counseling training. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26(1), 43-68.
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Casas, J. M. (1987). In search of multicultural competence within counselor education programs. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 430-434.
- Pope-Davis, D. & Dings, J. (1995). The assessment of multicultural counseling competencies. In J. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Robinson, S. E. (1988). Self-instruction versus traditional training for teaching basic counseling skills. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 28(2), 140-145.
- Rowe, W., Behrens, J. T., & Leach, M. M. (1995). Racial/ethnic identity and racial consciousness: Looking back and looking forward. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Rowe, W., Bennett, S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (1994). White racial identity models: A critique and alternative proposal. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 22, 129-146.
- Sabnani, H. B., Ponterotto, J. G., & Borodovsky, L. G. (1991). White racial identity development and cross-cultural counselor training: A stage model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 19, 76-102.
- Schlenker, B. R. (Ed.). (1985). *The self and social life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Sodowsky, G. R., & Taffe, R. C. (1991). Counselor trainees' analyses of multicultural counseling videotapes. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 19*, 115-129.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T. B., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of the multicultural counseling inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*(2), 137-148.
- Steward, R. J., Boatwright, K. J., Sauer, E., Baden, A., & Jackson, J. D. (1998). The relationships among counselor-trainees' gender, cognitive development, and White racial identity: Implications for counselor training. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26*(4), 254-272.
- Steward, R. J., Davidson, J. A., & Borgers, S. A. (1993). Racial majority vs. minority status: A study of interactional styles of successful White students on a predominantly White university campus. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*(4), 295-299.
- Steward, R. J., Gimenez, M. M., & Jackson, J. D. (1995). A study of personal preferences of successful university students as related to race/ethnicity, and sex: Implications and recommendations for training, practice, and future research. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(2), 123-131.
- Steward, R. J., Jackson, M. R., Jr., & Jackson, J. D. (1990). Alienation and interactional styles in a predominantly White Environment: A Study of successful Black students. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*, 509-515.
- Steward, R. J., Morales, P. C., Bartell, P. A., Miller, M., & Weeks, D. (1998). The multicultural responsive versus the multicultural reactive: A study of perceptions of counselor trainees. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26*(1), 13-27.

- Steward, R. J., Neil, D. M., Jo, H., Hill, M., & Baden, A. (1998, March). White counselor trainees: Is there multicultural counseling competence without formal training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Counseling Association, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- Steward, R. J., Neil, D. M., & Miller, M. A. (2000). Breaking down the walls of institutional racism in counseling psychology training programs in the 21st century. A symposium presentation at the 2000 Cross Cultural Roundtable Conference, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 477-486.
- Sue, D. W., Carter, R. T., Casas, J. M., Fouad, N. A., Ivey, A. E., Jensen, M., LaFromboise, T., Manese, J. E., Ponterotto, J. G., & Vasquez-Nutall, E. (1998). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Individual and organizational development*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Sue, D. W., & Zane, N. (1987). The role of culture and cultural techniques in psychotherapy: A critique and reformulation. *American Psychologist*, 42, 37-45.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Thomas, C. (1971). *Boys no more*. Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press.
- Toldson, I. & Pasteur, A. (1975). Developmental stages of Black self-discovery: Implications for using Black art forms in group interaction. *Journal of Negro Education*, 44, 130-138.

- Turner, J. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Vontress, C. E. (1970). Counseling Blacks. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 48, 713-719.
- Waterman, A. S. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 342-358.
- Zinn, H. (1980). *A history of the United States*. New York: Harper & Rowe.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02372 9969