

**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

**A MULTIDIMENSIONAL MEASURE OF AFRICAN AMERICAN  
ACCULTURATION**

**By**

**Aisha Denise Smith**

**A THESIS**

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

**MASTERS OF ARTS**

**Department of Psychology**

**2003**

## ABSTRACT

### A MULTIDIMENSIONAL MEASURE OF AFRICAN AMERICAN ACCULTURATION

By

Aisha Denise Smith

Guided by the Acculturation theory, the proposed thesis sought to create a multidimensional measure of acculturation to be used within the African American community. The proposed measurement design comprised behavioral, affective, and cognitive processes into one measure with the hope of gaining a clearer picture of this phenomenon within this cultural group. Two hundred sixty six African Americans (n=266) from churches, as well as university settings, were given a self-report survey to investigate culture within the African American community. Understanding acculturation within this culture group is pertinent in the development of future culturally competent programming and interventions where diverse cultural groups are present. Confirmatory factor analysis as well as several tests of validity was utilized to analyze the results and establish the psychometric properties of the measure. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis yielded in the production of five statistically reliable components of African American acculturation. The components of this scale are African American behavior component, White American behavior component, White American interracial/intra-racial attitude component, White American preference component, and African American preference component.

**Copyright by  
Aisha Denise Smith  
2003**

**For Cynthia Ann Dorsey Smith (My Mommy)**

**Because of “You” I am “Me”**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I write my acknowledgements, tears flow from my eyes because I am elated to have this blessed opportunity. First, thank you Jesus! Without my faith in my savior this endeavor would have been impossible. If I had a million tongues, I would not be able to express how deeply my faith has been strengthened because of this experience. Next, I would like to extend sincere thanks to my family. To my mommy, Cynthia Ann Dorsey Smith, I say thank you over and over again. Without your love, support, guidance, faith, and strength I would not be the person that I am today. Thank you for being you, and allowing me to grow into the woman that you knew that I could be. I would also like to thank my father, Pastor Archie R. Smith. Thank you for remembering the vision even when I was ready to let it go. Your constant bible quotes and stories of faith helped me stay strong at times when I would have otherwise stumbled. To my Twin, Ahmad, thank you for the laughter when I wanted to cry. To my granny, Dr. L.C. Dorsey, thank you for being the example that paved the road and showed me that dreams do come true. To my aunts (Adriane, Anita, and Norma) thank you for being strong, beautiful African American queens.

Thank you to my committee, Drs. William Davidson II, John Sweitzer, and Isis Settles. Without your support and expertise this endeavor would be an under developed thought in the mind of a confused 1<sup>st</sup> year student. Thank you especially to Dr. Davidson, your countless hours of assistance helped pull me out of the darkness of woods into the light.

I must also say thank you to my best friends (Christopher, Danielle, Lois, Lori, and Rayna) and my good friend (David). All of you provided love and support when I needed it most. Thank you for loving and supporting me with no boundaries. Finally, I give homage to my ancestors; the faceless, countless individuals who worked and deferred their dreams so little Black girls from the south could achieve greatness. On your shoulders I stand. Thank you!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	1
The Study of Acculturation .....	4
The Importance of Acculturation .....	9
Acculturation Measures .....	11
African Americans and Acculturation .....	15
African American Historical Origins .....	16
Current African American Acculturation Measures .....	20
Measurement Design .....	23
Measurement Development .....	23
Traditional Behaviors and Practices .....	24
Interracial/Intra-racial Attitudes .....	26
Preferences for Things African American .....	27
Measurement Terminology .....	28
Summary .....	29
II. METHOD .....	31
Participants .....	31
Procedures .....	32
Recruiting African Americans from Black Churches .....	32
Recruiting African American Students from Michigan State .....	33
Study Measures .....	34
Demographic Sheet .....	34
The Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation .....	34
The Multidimensional Measure of Religious Involvement .....	34
III. RESULTS .....	35
What is the Dimensionality of African American Acculturation .....	35
Behavioral Component .....	37
Cognitive Component .....	39
Affective Component .....	42
The Need for Multidirectional Acculturation Measures .....	44
The Need for Multidimensional Acculturation Measures .....	47

IV. DISCUSSION.....	52
Major Findings.....	53
Dimensionality of the MM3A.....	53
Incorporating Multidirectional Measures into Acculturation Scales .....	58
Using Multidimensionality to Measure Acculturation .....	60
Limitations and Implications for Future Research.....	64
Conclusions.....	66
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	69
APPENDICES	
A. Consent Form.....	79
B. Demographic Sheet .....	80
C. Multidimensional Measure of Religious Involvement.....	82
D. Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation .....	83
E. White American Behavior Scale .....	87
F. African American Behavior Scale .....	88
G. White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude Scale .....	89
H. African American Preference Scale.....	90
I. White American Preference Scale.....	91

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.....	92
Table 2.....	93
Table 3.....	96
Table 4.....	97
Table 5.....	98
Table 6.....	99
Table 7.....	100
Table 8.....	101
Table 9.....	103
Table 10.....	104
Table 11.....	105
Table 12.....	106
Table 13.....	107
Table 14.....	108

## INTRODUCTION

### Statement of the Problem

Acculturation is the changes that occur as a result of continuous first-hand contact between individuals of differing cultural origins. Theorists have considered acculturation important, arguing, "Differences in the level of acculturation play a crucial role in many areas of psychological functioning, including cognition, personality, and the expression of psychopathology" (Burnam et al., 1987, p. 106).

Within the literature, it is indicated that the process of acculturation has been applied to African Americans only rarely, and few suitable scales have been developed. Several factors account for this neglect. Landrine and Klonoff (1994) observed that African Americans traditionally have been considered as a racial, rather than an ethnic group and therefore have been treated as lacking a non-American national identity and culture of origin. Using this perspective, African Americans are viewed solely as Americans, and intragroup differences between individuals of the same cultural group, are accounted for primarily by using regional and socioeconomic influences (Snowden & Hines, 1999).

Both methodological and conceptual difficulties must be overcome in attempting to apply the concept of acculturation to African Americans. Scales devised for use in non-African American cultural groups typically are created from several domains of interest. Most often these scales ask about length of residence in the United States, generation status (Buriel, 1975; Knight & Kagan, 1977; Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980; Griffith, 1983) and English-language use and proficiency (Olmedo & Padilla, 1978; Padilla, 1980; Taylor, Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980; Griffith, 1983; Neff, Hoppe, &

Perea, 1987; Hurley, & Riley, 1986). Length of residence and primary language preference are difficult to assess for an ethnic group whose migration took place more than 400 years ago.

For these reasons, only two attempts have been cited in the literature to measure African American acculturation. The first measure was developed by Landrine and Klonoff (1994). The instrument constructed by Landrine and Klonoff assesses eight aspects of African American traditional cultural behavioral practices. Even though, Landrine and Klonoff consider their scale to be multidimensional, based on the definition of dimensionality within the acculturation literature their scale will be defined as unidimensional/unidirectional. The second acculturation instrument was developed by Snowden and Hines (1999). Their scale is also a unidimensional/unidirectional scale, which emphasizes media preferences and social interaction patterns more than culturally defined beliefs and practices.

Despite the difficulty in applying this process to African Americans, many advantages can be gained by considering African American acculturation and creating measures to assess the process. Acculturation scales are essential to a precursory understanding of cultural diversity in human behavior. A measure of acculturation for usage within the African American community allows for assessing the complexities of acculturation within their community, such as the relation African American acculturation has with other applicable constructs such as behavioral, psychiatric, and health processes.

Acculturation scales for African Americans are needed because, many Anglo-American researchers have assumed that within-group differences among racially

identified persons are negligible or may be equated with social class differences in the mainstream society (Dana, 1993). However there has been consistent confusion with regard to the criteria for social stratification. Social classes among African Americans are different in income, occupation, and educational representation from the class structure of the mainstream society (Bass, 1982; Stricker, 1980). Moreover, the percentages of persons in each social class are dissimilar, and neighborhood of residence fails to indicate social class homogeneity of residents, as there is a mixture of lower and middle-class persons in segregated urban neighborhoods (Myers, 1982). For these reasons it is important that a culture specific moderator variable (such as acculturation) should be applied whenever cultural differences exist between two groups. Thus, many ethnic differences can be understood as a manifestation of degree of acculturation without recourse to deficit model explanations. The concept of acculturation thereby has the potential to decrease racist beliefs about ethnic differences and facilitate an understanding of all people as cultural products.

To address the gap in the literature regarding acculturation measures for African Americans, the current research endeavor sought to create a multidimensional instrument of acculturation for usage within the African American community. The measure emerged cultural practices and traditions, along with media preferences, primary group relationships, and personal comfort with one's racial group and interracial attitudes. The reason behind this developmental stance was that immersion in African American oriented social settings, cultural and behavioral practices, and socialization is thought to transmit African American culture and that interracial experiences and attitudes are

responsible for aiding in the cultural context and development of African American culture.

## THE STUDY OF ACCULTURATION

Contact between cultures is a centuries old phenomenon, as is the observation of change in the behavior of members of one cultural group toward the practices and behaviors of the other cultural group. Social scientists have labeled this phenomena as “acculturation.” Use of the concept of acculturation appears as early as 1880 (Berry, 1976). There are however, four classic formulations of this concept: Redfield, Linton, Herskovits (1936), Herskovits (1938), Linton (1940), and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Summer Seminar (1954). Redfield et al. (1936) define acculturation with the following definition:

Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups. Under this definition acculturation is to be distinguished from assimilation, which is at times a phase of acculturation. It is also to be differentiated from diffusion, which while occurring in all instances of acculturation, is not only a phenomena which frequently takes place without the occurrence of the types of contact between peoples specified in the definition above, but also constitutes only one aspect of the process of acculturation.

Early research on acculturation addressed the impact of modernization on indigenous peoples and traditional societies (Olmedo, 1979). More recently the field has sought to focus on the experience of immigrants and ethnic minority groups (Rogler, Cortes, & Malgady, 1991). Thus in recent years the field has broadened its application to a wider range of situations involving cultural contact. Moreover, the concept has been embraced by those studying the adjustment of non-ethnic minority groups to mainstream society. For example, the process of how lesbians and gay men adapt to the mainstream

culture has begun to be studied (Brown, 1989). Originally, of primary interest to anthropologists and sociologists, the term was first used in reference to group-level phenomena. More recently however, psychologists have become interested in the process of acculturation and these phenomena are now also studied at the individual level (Berry, 1997; Graves, 1967). The initial definition of acculturation proposed by Redfield, et al. (1936), made no explicit assumptions about the direction of cultural change. However, since the concept has been operationalized in research, the term has come to denote integration of an acculturating group into the mainstream culture (Berry, Trimble, & Olmedo, 1986), “whereby immigrants change their behavior and attitudes toward those of the host society” (Rogler, Cortes, & Malgady, 1991, p. 585).

As the research on acculturation has expanded, three broad theoretical approaches have emerged as guiding forces in the field of psychology. The first is associated with social identification theories and is concerned with the way people perceive and think about themselves and others, including how they process information about their own group (in-group) and other groups (out-group) (Ward, 1996). The second reflects a cultural learning approach, which highlights the social psychology of the intercultural encounter and the process involved in learning the culture-specific skills required to thrive and survive in a new milieu (Ward, 1996). The third approach is linked to psychological models of coping and is applied to the study of cross cultural transition and adaptation.

The social identity approach has been influenced by contemporary theory and research in the field of social cognition. This model offers two differing perspectives on intercultural change and culture. The first perspective functions at the individual level of

analysis, viewing acculturation solely as an individual process. This highlights selected aspects of ethnic or cultural identity and is concerned primarily with the definition and measurement of acculturation (e.g. Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980; Hocooy, 1996). The second line of inquiry is more suitable for group analysis. This method highlights the importance of intergroup perceptions and relations. This line of research places primary interest on social interactions between members of the host community and various sojourner or immigrant groups and most frequently interprets inter-group relations within the context of Tajfel's (1978, 1981) social identity theory (e.g., Kosmitzki, 1996; Moghaddam, Taylor, & Lalonde, 1987; Ostrowska & Bochenska, 1996).

The cultural learning approach has been strongly influenced by Argyle's (1969) work on social skills and interpersonal behaviors. This approach is based on the belief that cross-cultural problems arise because immigrants or minorities have difficulties managing everyday social encounters. Adaptation therefore, comes in the form of learning the culture-specific skills that are required to negotiate the new cultural milieu (Bochner, 1972, 1986). Researchers who have adopted a cultural learning approach to intercultural contact and change have emphasized the significance of culture-specific variables in the adaptation process. Attention is paid to differences in intercultural communication styles, including its verbal and nonverbal components, as well as rules, conventions, and norms and their influences on intercultural effectiveness (Ward, 1996). Recently, researchers have broadened this line of inquiry in attempts to build predictive models of sociocultural adaptation with emphasis on such factors as culture-specific knowledge, intercultural training, and contact with host nationals, and cultural identity (Ward, 1996).

The third major approach to understanding acculturation focuses on stress and coping. From this perspective, cross-cultural transition is viewed as a series of stress provoking life changes that draw on adjustive resources and require coping responses. This approach has been strongly influenced by Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) work on stress, appraisal, and coping, as well as earlier theory and research on life events (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). The analytical framework is broad and incorporates both characteristics of the individual and characteristics of the situation that may facilitate or impede adjustment to the new cultural environment (Ward, 1996). Researchers seeking to identify the factors that affect cross-cultural adjustment, particularly psychological well-being and satisfaction, have examined many of the same variables as those who investigate stress and coping in other domains. These factors include life changes, cognitive appraisal of change, coping strategies, personality, and social support. With respect to more culture-specific variables, cultural identity and acculturation status have been considered in sojourner, immigrants, and refugee populations (Ward, 1996).

Together, these three approaches (affective, behavioral, and cognitive) constitute acculturation. Affective components of acculturation are highlighted in the stress-and-coping approach; behavioral elements are featured in the culture learning approach; and cognitive variables are emphasized in the social identity approach.

Behavioral changes associated with the acculturation process have been well documented over the past 15 years (Rogler, Cortes, & Malgady, 1991; Cuellar et al., 1995). Psychological processes (i.e. affective and cognitive processes) have been generally left undefined. In the literature, cognitive changes refer to the attitudes of the individual undergoing the acculturation process regarding their in-group, as well as their

out-group (Berry, 1980). It is important to document the cognitive changes that occur during the acculturating process, because research has demonstrated that cognitive and behavioral changes are interrelated (Der-Karabetian, 1980; Ullah, 1987). Although the two concepts are interrelated, the two concepts exhibit different patterns of change over time (Cuellar, Arnold, & Gonzalez, 1995; Szapocznik et al., 1978). Acculturating individuals are usually willing to learn new behaviors and skills, but their attitudes and values are generally more resistant to change (Triandis, Kashima, Shimada, & Villareal, 1986; Wong-Rieger & Quintana, 1987). One example of this is demonstrated in a study conducted by Rosenthal et al., (1989). In this study the researchers compared Greek Australians to Anglo-Australians and to Greeks. Although Greek Australians were more similar to Anglo-Australians in terms of behaviors, they more closely resembled native Greeks in terms of values. Despite pragmatic behavioral responses, their core values remained largely unchanged. This suggests that neither simply changing behaviors or the acquiring of new cultural skills are necessarily indications of cultural identification (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993).

These attitude-behavior discrepancies deserve further attention, particularly in light of findings that show members of the majority culture are largely supportive of members not belonging to their cultural group retaining the cultural traditions relating to food, music or dress associated with their culture, but have stronger reservations about the maintenance of traditional, potentially conflicting values (Lambert, Moghaddam, Sorin, & Sorin, 1990). By failing to assess these changes that occur, understanding the specifics of culture and its influences are limited. Thus, emphasizing the importance of having multidimensional measures that adequately assesses several underlying principles

associated with the acculturation process results in a clearer picture of the phenomenon of acculturation.

### The Importance of Acculturation

Since the conception of the phenomenon of acculturation, many studies have been conducted to aid in understanding the relationship between acculturation and a variety of other variables. Studies have found relationships between acculturation levels and several behavioral, psychiatric, and health processes including, cigarette smoking (Sabogal, Otero-Sabogal, Perez-Stable, Marin & Marin, 1989; Landrine, Richardson, Klonoff, & Flay, 1994), drug and alcohol usage (Caetano, 1987; Landrine, Klonoff, & Richardson, 1993; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980); (Burnam, Hough, Karno, Escobar, & Telles, 1987; Montgomery & Orozco, 1985; Montgomery & Orozco 1985; Negy & Woods, 1993); and hypertension (Dressler, 1982; Dressler, Mata, Chavez, & Viteri, 1987). So many varying studies of acculturation have been utilized because the construct of acculturation can be measured in a variety of ways. The concept of acculturation is so valued in the field of cross cultural research and psychology because the construct can take on a variety of measurable concepts.

Acculturation can be used as a moderator variable in assessment to correct for cultural differences (one that is applied informally as part of an interview or more formally in a questionnaire) (Dana, 1993). The purpose of such a moderator variable is to obtain a reliable estimate of the potential contribution of cultural variance. Moderators are often helpful and may be necessary, because almost all assessment of culturally different persons in the country proceeds from an imposed ethnic status. In essence,

moderator variables prevent genuine differences from being ignored, disregarded, or minimized.

Acculturation is a potentially important moderator because researchers in various disciplines (anthropology, biology, genetics) have expressed the desire to discontinue the usage of race as a moderator variable. The desire for this is because it is not possible to measure race biologically and also because the construct does not allow for the understanding and processing of within group differences (Snowden & Hines, 1999). In the literature it has been argued that the use of race confounds individual, biological, and cultural aspects of behavior (Wyatt, 1991). Another problem with race as a construct is an implied homogeneity among racially defined groupings and a lack of basis for assessing intra-racial diversity. A study conducted by Zuckerman (1990) illustrated the necessity to view within group processes. In Zuckerman's analysis of psychological studies he found more within group differences than between group differences.

Using the concept of acculturation in place of race can be seen in a study conducted by Dana (1993). Dana found that highly traditional ethnic minorities differ significantly from Whites on a variety of scales and behavioral practices; however, highly acculturated minorities scores typically are similar to those received by members of the White culture. The results of this study were a significant step for the study of acculturation, because the study illustrated that highly acculturated minorities tend to score similar to Whites on tests, and, in many instances behave in the same manner as Whites. Thus indicating the differences in behavioral practices in this study were accounted for by culture instead of race. The similar scoring by highly acculturated minorities and Whites is because by definition, the beliefs, values and cognitive styles

that characterize highly acculturated minorities are largely a result of the dominant society's culture. Thus ethnic differences can be understood as a manifestation of an individual's level of acculturation: as a simple reflection of the extent to which ethnic minority people participate (or not) in the beliefs, values, and cognitive styles of the dominant culture. Also, the concept of acculturation provides a theoretical framework for predicting the nature and the direction of ethnic group differences (Landrine and Klonoff, 1994). A specific example of using acculturation as a predictor variable is a study conducted by Wells et al., (1989). In this study, using a sample of 1,055 Mexican Americans, the researchers were looking to see how level of acculturation affects the probability that Mexican Americans use general health, mental health, and human social services. The study results indicated that less acculturated Mexican Americans had significantly lower probabilities of an outpatient medical visit for physical health problems and of a visit to a mental health specialist or human service provider for emotional problems. The concept of acculturation thereby has the potential to decrease racist ethnocentric beliefs about ethnic differences (Landrine & Klonoff, 1994).

#### Acculturation Measures

Recognizing the importance of understanding cultural differences, acculturation scales have been developed for a variety of ethnic groups, including: Chinese Americans (Yao, 1979), Japanese Americans (Masuda, Matsumoto, & Meredith, 1970), Asian Americans (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987), Mexican Americans (Burnam, Hough, Karno, Escobar, & Telles, 1987; Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980; Deyo, Diehl, Hazuda, & Stren, 1985; Olmedo, Martinez, & Martinez, 1978; Padilla, 1980), Native Americans (Hoffman, Dana, & Bolton, 1985), Cuban Americans (Szapocznik &

Kurtines, 1980), and only recently African Americans (Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. 1994; Snowden, L., & Hines, A., 1999).

As suggested by the variety of acculturation scales existing for usage among various ethnic groups researchers recognize the importance of acculturation. Even though researchers recognize the importance of this variable, they have yet to reach a consensus on how to adequately measure this phenomenon. Due to the lack of agreement surrounding the measurement of the acculturation process several measurements have been designed from a variety of perspectives. Based on these varying perspectives acculturation scales vary in two important ways:

**a) unidimensional and unidirectional**

**versus**

**b) multidimensional and multidirectional**

The unidirectional/unidimensional models are developed around the idea that the acculturating individual relinquishes identification with their culture of origin and progresses toward identification with the culture of primary contact by adopting the cultural traits, values, attitudes, and behaviors of the majority culture (Olmeda, 1979). This perspective was first detailed by Gordon (1964), he developed an assimilation model in which penetration into the mainstream culture is necessarily accompanied by “the disappearance of the ethnic group as a separate entity and the evaporation of its distinctive values” (Gordon, 1964, p.81). The unidimensional/unidirectional models are based on the implicit assumption that change in cultural identity takes place along a single continuum over the course of time. More specifically, the unidimensional/unidirectional models are models of acculturation generally measuring

cultural behavioral practices such as language preference, traditional practices (i.e. religion and values), etc.(Gordon, 1964). The unidimensional and unidirectional model is embodied in a range of self-report measurements designed for the assessment of acculturation. Such models include the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-I (ARSMA) (Cuellar et al., 1980); the Greek Immigrant Acculturation Scale (Madianos, 1980, cited in Mavreas, Bebbington, & Der, 1989); and the acculturation scale devised by Ghuman (1994) for Asian adolescents in Canada and the United Kingdom.

The multidimensional/multidirectional model offers a bicultural perspective by which identifications with home and host cultures are seen as counterbalancing, rather than opposing, forces in shaping the social identification of members (Ward, 2001). Theorists who adopt a multidimensional perspective argue that acculturation can be more completely understood when heritage and mainstream cultural identities are seen as being relatively independent of one another (e.g., Berry, 1997; Ramirez, 1984; Zak, 1973). Thus, individuals in the multidirectional/multidimensional model may adopt many of the values and behaviors of the mainstream culture without giving up facets of self-identity developed in their culture of origin. Such models are based on two core assumptions. First, these models presuppose that individuals differ in the extent to which self-identity includes culturally-based values, attitudes, and behaviors. Culture may play a large role in the identities of some individuals, whereas others may base their identity more on factors such as occupation or religion. Second, individuals are capable of having multiple cultural identities, each of which may independently vary in strength. Measurements that rely on this approach are: the Multicultural Acculturation Scale

(Wong-Rieger & Quintana, 1987); the ARMSA-II (Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995); the adult and youth versions of the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (Barona & Miller, 1994; Marin, Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, & Perez-Stable, 1987); the Behavioral Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978); the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987); the Acculturation Scale for Southeast Asians (Anderson et al., 1993); the Acculturation Scale for Asian Americans (Lai & Linden, 1993); and the International Relations Scale for International Students (Sodowsky, Lai, & Plake, 1991)

By continuing to use the unidirectional/unidimensional approach, an incomplete and misleading picture of acculturation is being painted. For example, unidimensional/unidirectional instruments are unable to distinguish a bicultural individual who strongly identifies with both reference groups from one who does not strongly identify with either group (Mavreas, Bebbington, Der, & 1989; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980). Both of these individuals would end up at the midpoint of a unidimensional/unidirectional scale. For example, high biculturals possessing high characteristics in both extremes (African American and American culture) cannot be differentiated from biculturals having low characteristics in both extremes (African American and American culture). However, it seems likely that people who have a well developed bicultural identity would differ in important ways from those for whom cultural identity is not a particularly salient aspect of their self-schemas. Similarly, if a dependent variable were to be strongly related with both cultural identities, the two effects would probably cancel each other out and remain invisible to unidimensional/unidirectional instruments (Ryder, Alden, & Paulus, 1999). In theoretical

terms, this instrumentation fails to consider alternatives to acculturation, such as the emergence of integrated or bicultural individual identities (Dion & Dion, 1996). In essence, while the unidimensional/unidirectional model provides an overly simplified approach to acculturation, the multidimensional/multidirectional approach is a broader, more inclusive and richer framework.

### AFRICAN AMERICANS AND ACCULTURATION

Despite the abundance of acculturation literature about other ethnic groups, a thorough literature review of this construct indicated that acculturation in the African American community has been empirically understudied (Snowden & Hines, 1999). Many researchers have failed to use cultural phenomena (i.e. acculturation) to explain differences within the African American population. There are three main reasons attributed to the understudy of culture within the African American community. First, many scholars adhere to the belief that no cultural differences for African Americans survived slavery (Jones, 1991). Second, it is difficult to address African American acculturation, because the culture of African Americans is largely intertwined into the mainstream culture, therefore at times, it is difficult to differentiate between the two (Jones, 1991). Third, for years the field of psychology has conceptualized African Americans as a race, not as an ethnic or cultural group like other minorities (Jones, 1991; Yee et.al., 1993). Because of the conceptualization of African Americans as a race, it is difficult to erase these notions proposed by the field and apply cultural components to the ethnic group.

Although it is difficult to assess acculturation within the African American population, it is still a relevant construct that needs to be understood within this ethnic

population. But before this construct can be fully understood within the African American population, first the history of this population needs to be explained. An understanding of the history of African Americans is important because their history in the United States is responsible for shaping their current culture (Dana, 1993).

### African American Historical Origins

African Americans have a turbulent and poignant history in this country, which has been accompanied by racism in the form of terrorism, lynchings, and property destruction (Dana, 1993). The following overview of African American history does not provide a myriad of detail about many of the historic events and the people who are important in African American, but the following does provide a snapshot of historical trends and events that have shaped the lives and the culture of African Americans.

#### *The 17<sup>th</sup> Century*

The history of African Americans began with many of their ancestors and their forcible removal from Africa, and chattel slavery in the United States. The majority of African Americans derive from ancestors who came to America as slaves against their will. The transporting of slaves across the Atlantic Ocean from the West Coast of Africa is described as the “greatest migration in recorded history” (Bennett, 1966, p.30). Of the millions of Africans forcibly removed from their homeland between the 15<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, it is estimated that about 4 million came to North America (Curtain, 1969). The million who came to North America are the genesis of today’s African American culture. By the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, 50,000-100,000 Africans each year were being moved across the Atlantic to Europe and the Americas. African labor is credited with keeping the rum, sugar, and molasses trade going; Africans also supported the

industries that developed around tobacco, hemp, fishing, railroading, and distilling (Genovese, 1974).

### *The 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries*

Slaves were an integral part of the building of pre-and post Revolutionary America. These individuals fought side by side with whites in the American Revolution and the Civil War-with optimism that changes that took place would afford them the status of being “created equal” with “certain inalienable rights” (Willis, 1999). African American soldiers from all of the original 13 states fought bravely in most of the major battles of the Revolutionary War, and, as a result of their fighting, approximately 100,000 slaves did receive their freedom (Bennett, 1966).

Neither the dreams inspired by the American Revolution, nor the hopes built on the Emancipation Proclamation, and the uniting of the states were to be easily realized by African Americans. African Americans were tolerable as slaves, but as free individuals they became a threat to White America and the system in which they thrived. Because of this, years of discrimination and racism ensued, which led to the advent of contradictory social forces: the Reconstruction Era, the Freedmen’s Bureau, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Black Codes. The Reconstruction Era was from 1867-1877. During this time, the South Carolina House of Representatives had an African American majority. The Freedmen’s Bureau lasted 5 years (1865-1870) the Bureau was dedicated to providing assistance to freedmen and whites in the areas of medical care and education (Willis, 1999). The Ku Klux Klan, was organized in 1866 as a white supremacy group dedicated to committing atrocities against African Americans. The institutionalization of the practice of lynching can be accredited to this group. The Black Codes (1865-1866) were harbingers of many

years or systematic disenfranchisement of African Americans. In 1896, the U.S. Supreme Court wrote the doctrine of racial separation and classification into law. This law (*Plessy vs. Ferguson*, 1896) gave states the sanction and the power to establish “separate but equal” accommodations and institutions for the races (Willis, 1999).

Beginning in the 1890's to 1970, there was a migration away from the South to the North and West with a gradual shift from rural residence in the South to predominantly urban residence in search of greater opportunities (Dana, 1993). The beginning voluntary migration of African Americans coincided with considerable crowding in northern and eastern cities occasioned by the influx of European immigrants (Leigh & Green, 1982). Educational, housing, and employment services were offered to the newly arrived European immigrants, but African Americans were viewed as “a group apart—a caste—physically present in American society but culturally distinctive because of appearance, origins, and the experience with slavery” (Leigh & Green, 1982, p.95). As a result of the prejudice encountered in the North, urban ghettos with slum conditions grew and became the homes for many African Americans (Willis, 1999). The upward mobility of African Americans continues to be restricted by poverty and discrimination in a society they did not choose, but of which they now consider themselves an integral part (Willis, 1999).

### *The 20<sup>th</sup> Century*

By 1901, laws dealing with Jim Crow became the blueprint of how the races would interrelate with one another. The culmination of Jim Crow was emphasized in the systematic and extreme measures taken by states to deprive African Americans of the right to vote. “Grandfather” clauses, literacy tests, white primaries, and poll taxes were

the most commonly used methods of disqualifying African American voters. Two major events are credited with being the catalysts for change: desegregation of the army and the Brown vs. Board of Education decision. The Brown vs. Board of Education decision concluded that “separate but equal” had no place in the American system of education and stated that separate educational facilities were inherently unequal (Bremner, 1974). Even though the passing of Brown vs. Board of Education was a giant leap towards equality, the legacy of Jim Crow was not to be removed by a decree of the Supreme Court. Negative attitudes, instilled by years of institutionalized racism, fear, and contempt are still evident (Willis, 1999). In the 1990’s many African Americans still have lifestyles that are significantly affected by racism (Jones, 1991). The most blatant indicators of the cumulative results of discrimination and racism are found in health, income, education, and occupation statistics that all show significant and increasing discrepancies between African Americans and Anglo-Americans (Dana, 1988).

All of these factors have contributed to a unique ethnicity or group identity, that may be described in terms of a common historical style, shared behaviors, values and perceptions, as well as distinctive patterns of cultural communication (Kochman, 1987). This group identity of African Americans is complex, as a result of large within-group differences and a mixture of cultural orientations. The ability to recognize cultural identity options and orientations for African Americans provides an explicit recognition of their heterogeneity, and therefore necessitates the need for measures that recognize such differences. Now that the history of African Americans has illustrated the differing cultural elements of this ethnic group, the need for a measure of African American acculturation can now be explained in full detail.

## Current African American Acculturation Measures

To date, only two instruments exist to measure acculturation within the African American community (Hines & Snowden, 1999; Landrine & Klonoff, 1994). The steps that the researchers made towards understanding the process of acculturation are a valued contribution to the field. The contributions made by these researchers can be built upon in order to create other measures of acculturation for use with this population. While these measures represent an important step in measuring acculturation they both have important limitations.

First with regards to measurement directionality and dimensionality, the operational definition used for the design of these measures does not retain the original definition of the construct of acculturation. Each measurement is designed to measure acculturation linearly (unidirectional). Acculturation is measured using American culture at one extreme and African American culture at the other. Acculturation, linearly defined, is represented as a function of movement in one direction along the continuum with corresponding reduction along the other direction of the continuum (Cuellar et al., 1995). The problem with this method is that the two poles are not independently measured; as one consequence, it does not yield measurement scores for those biculturals who score high or low in both directions (Cuellar et al., 1995).

The scale developed by Landrine and Klonoff (1994) is a unidirectional/unidimensional model, which assesses many aspects of traditional African American behaviors. The scale is a multidimensional scale in that eight factors of African American traditional behaviors are measured by the scale. However, it is not multidimensional with respect to having two distinct separate components of

acculturation being measured. Various components of the acculturation process are not addressed within the developmental design of their measure (i.e. cognitive component or affective component). Therefore, with regards to how the term multidimensionality is used within the acculturation literature, their scale fails to meet these criteria. Each aspect on the scale assesses a different practice of African American traditional behavior (i.e. traditional African American religious family structure and practices (family), preference for things African American (preference), preparation and consumption of traditional foods (foods), interracial attitudes/cultural mistrust (attitudes), traditional African American health beliefs and practices (health), traditional African American religious beliefs and practices (religion), traditional African American childhood socialization (child-hood), and superstitions). All of these aspects are measuring different contents of the same concept (African American traditional behaviors).

Along with directionality and dimensionality Landrine and Klonoff have scale limitations with the overall development of their measure. Acculturation is defined as those cultural changes that occur when two cultures come into continuous contact (Berry, 1980). Their scale assessing African American acculturation views acculturation only as a dynamic of within group processes without assessing how the mainstream culture has been instrumental in shaping the culture of the group being measured. By defining the process with primary focus on bearers of African American culture, without regards to the mainstream culture, acculturation is no longer the phenomena being measured. Rather, within group dynamics becomes the focus, and this can be defined by using ethnic or cultural identity measures. Also, by not comparing within group processes to

those processes of the out-group, within group homogeneity is assumed, which does not recognize the cultural differences that exist within ethnic groups.

The scale developed by Snowden and Hines (1999) is a unidimensional and unidirectional model looking only at behavioral preferences exhibited by African Americans (e.g. television and music preferences). This measure emphasizes media preferences and social interaction patterns, rather than culturally-defined beliefs and practices. By only focusing on preferences rather than culturally-defined beliefs their scale is limited in scope and the insight into the phenomenon of acculturation for African Americans is therefore limited because the scale does not address specific cultural practices.

With each scale, a unidimensional/unidirectional approach was utilized in the conceptual development, which used only behaviors or behavioral preferences exhibited by African Americans. Also, the unidirectional method used for both scales assumes within group homogeneity of African Americans, thus not accounting for those individuals who may be bicultural. In order to fully measure biculturals with characteristics relative to distinct cultures, a multidimensional framework applying two independently derived sub-scales are required.

A multidimensional model will also allow us a clearer understanding of African American culture, thus providing another method for researchers to understand cultural differences. The problem with using this method of development is that this prospective gives a narrow insight into the phenomenon of African American acculturation, thus limiting the conclusions that can be made. A multidimensional/multidirectional instrument within this cultural group can aid in the understanding of cultural processes

that occur for this ethnic group. The culture of African Americans has been affected by mainstream society on a variety of levels, to just view the culture of this community with regards to traditional behaviors', we are missing a plethora of information that could allow us a deeper understanding of this cultural group. The historical events that have shaped the lives of the African American community, have not just affected the traditions that this community adheres to, but it has impacted the way in which this community socializes White America (mainstream society), and also the racial attitudes that they hold towards White America. Without adding these two components into an acculturation framework, we will continue to have only a myopic view of these individuals whose uniqueness and resiliency could be extremely beneficial to the social science research of this phenomenon.

## MEASUREMENT DESIGN

### Measurement Development

Generally, acculturation has been understood to reflect "social distance from the dominant society along the dimensions of culture-language, religion, values; primary group interaction-work, social clubs, family, and friends (Gordon, 1964). Individuals and groups become more acculturated, according to this formulation, as they adopt cultural beliefs and practices of mainstream society. This underlying approach recognizes social interactions more than culturally-defined beliefs and practices. Beliefs and practices characteristic of African Americans do exist, but appear to vary considerably according to age, education, gender, and region of current residence (Heurtin-Roberts, Snowden & Miller, 1997; Snowden, Libby, & Thomas, 1997). Recognizing the difficulty of using only behavioral practices as a measure of acculturation, this measure of acculturation

integrated psychological (i.e. cognitive and affective) changes into the overall measurement design. The proposed model for acculturation will comprised two essential elements: behavioral (cultural awareness) and psychological changes (affective and cognitive).

The set of African American acculturation questions developed represent the aforementioned dimensions of existing acculturation measures. Traditional behaviors and practices, preferences for things African American and interracial attitudes will be brought together under one construct to assess a multidimensional measure of African American acculturation.

*Traditional Behaviors and Practices Component*

This dimension assessed involvement in fundamental behaviors, practices, holidays and traditions displayed within the African American culture, as well as those displayed by the mainstream culture. Items for this dimension were developed from the existing contrasting beliefs, values, and practices paradigms proposed by Willis, (1999). This model lists the specific beliefs, values and practices of the African American tradition, as well as the White American tradition:

**African American**

Collective Orientation  
Kinship and extended family bonds  
Religious, spiritual orientation  
More authoritarian child-rearing practices  
  
Greater respect for elderly and their role in the family  
  
More oriented to situation than time

**White American**

Individual Orientation  
Nuclear family bonds  
More secular orient  
More permissive child rearing practices  
Less respect for the role of elderly in the family  
More oriented to time than situation

*Spirituality & Religious Orientation.* A strong sense of spirituality persisted among the slaves and remains a major aspect of African American community, culture and personality development (McAdoo, 1981; Pipes, 1981). The organized church in African American life was established after the Revolutionary War in 1787 (Willis, 1999). Religion has traditionally been the source of spiritual subsistence in the African American family, regardless of whether the family regularly attends formal church services (Randall-David, 1989). Inference to the role of the church in the African American community Chambers wrote,

Since its inception, the black church has been more than a place to worship. It is where the community has gathered to lobby for freedom and equal rights, where African-Americans have joined together to celebrate their victories and mourn their losses ...it is a symbol of hundreds of years of hopes and dreams. A living testament to the indomitable spirit of its people, the black church is not only a part of African-American history, it is a part of our collective American history. (1997, p. 42).

Although organized churches are not as influential as they were in the past, the spiritual resources of the community have had a direct impact on the lives of most African American people (Billingsley, 1974). At a young age children within the African American community are taught that they must “believe in something” (have faith) in order to have a good (meaningful) life (Willis, 1999).

*Familism & Collectivism.* Items pertaining to familism (the conviction that family takes precedent over personal needs) and collectivism are significant within the African American tradition, because the family is often deemed as a source of strength, resilience, and survival (Willis, 1999). The family also provides socialization, guidance, and inspiration (Billingsley, 1974). The value of group efforts is taught as a more enduring

strategy for the survival of the African American community, as opposed to individual effort for private gain (Billingsley, 1974).

*Elderly Respect.* Deep respect for elderly individuals is another important component of the African American tradition. (Boyd-Franklin, 1989; Carter & Helms, 1987). Elderly individuals are seen as having insight or wisdom; because of this they should be respected and obeyed (Randall-David, 1989).

*Child Rearing.* African Americans are strongly dedicated to the social development of children within their cultural group. Setting limits, or disciplining children, is part of the socialization process needed for the child to learn to be sensitive and as a way for the child to follow family rules outside the home (Willis, 1999).

*Holidays.* Significant cultural events and holidays that have emerged within the African American tradition are the celebration of Kwanzaa and Juneteenth. The purpose of the celebration of Kwanzaa, is to reinforce African American identity (i.e. the bonds between African Americans and their family and friends. Kwanzaa specifically focus on the traditional African values of family, community responsibility, commerce and self-improvement. Juneteenth is the oldest known celebration of the ending of slavery. The observance of June 19<sup>th</sup> as the African American Emancipation Day, emphasizes education and achievement (Willis, 1999). The purpose of the celebration marks a time for assessment, self-planning, and preparations for the future. (Appendix E)

#### *Intra-racial & Interracial Attitudes Component*

The affective component of acculturation was measured under the heading of intra-racial/interracial attitudes. The rationale for this is because affective components of acculturation are highlighted in the stress-and-coping approach. Thus, indicating how

each individual feels about their culture, as well as the mainstream culture, can ultimately affect their level of acculturation. This dimension assessed an individual's values, attitudes, and beliefs about African Americans, as well as mainstream society. This dimension assessed attitudes about African Americans and their institutions, as well as Anglo-Americans and institutions commonly associated with their cultural group. The logic for this dimension is set in the foundation that in the United States, culture does not exist independently of race and racism. A result of these two constructs, individuals may struggle with acculturation. Culture is often linked with race and ethnicity. Interracial attitudes (linked to racism and discrimination) are an important aspect of how a minority group member sees his or her own culture. Understanding attitudes towards the in-group, as well as the out group, is important because feelings towards one's own cultural group as well as the mainstream culture, are important in shaping the behaviors and traditions individuals participate in actively. This belief is emphasized in a study conducted by (Davis et.al., 2000). In their study of 194 college students, they found that those individuals whom exhibited higher scores on the Racial Identity index also proved to be more traditional when given the African American Acculturation index. This finding indicates that greater acceptance of self and ethnic group can be related to how individuals view their culture as well as other cultural groups. (Appendix G).

### *Preferences Component*

The measure of the cognitive component of acculturation was defined under the label of preferences for things African American or White American. The rationale for this labeling is because cognitive variables are emphasized in what an individual socially identifies with. Beliefs and practices characteristic of African Americans do exist, but

appear to vary considerably according to age, education, gender, and region of current residence (Heurtin-Roberts, Snowden, & Miller, 1997; Snowden, Libby, & Thomas, 1997). To help alleviate limitations in research literature that solely views traditional behavioral practices, this dimension will also assess the individual's preference for practices and behaviors of their cultural group as well as those displayed by the out-group. This dimension will primarily assess cultural loyalty (i.e. the individual's preference of one cultural orientation over the other). Preferences are behavioral indices of cultural awareness and convey information about the extent of an individual's acculturation (Padilla, 1980). The logic is that the lesser acculturated individual will prefer activities associated with their cultural group of origin. Thus, it is the belief that ongoing interactions with African Americans are thought to transmit African American culture. (Appendix F)

#### Measurement Terminology

For each item on the measure relating to the minority culture, it was decided that the term African American was used within the various dimensions on the instrument. The people referred to as African Americans originate from the continent of Africa. These individuals come from several racial stocks and many Central and West African tribes, including Ashantis, Bantu, Efiks, Hausas, Ibos, Krus, Mandingo, Sengalese, and Yorubas (Bennett, 1966; Holloway & Vass, 1993). The term is potentially less stigmatizing than other terms such as "Black" or "Negro", which have been associated historically with negative racial attitudes and represent changes from one European language to another (Fairchild, 1985). Fairchild (1985) suggests that the term African American is preferable to the terms "Black" or "Negro" because it formalizes the African

connection, avoids ambiguity inherent in the capitalization/non-capitalization issue, and adds a consciousness-raising dimension of self-respect and dignity.

## SUMMARY

As stated earlier in this document, among other cultural groups there are a variety of existing acculturation measures. These measures vary in terms of whether they view acculturation as a unidimensional or multidimensional phenomenon, and as a unidirectional or multidirectional phenomenon. Documented in the literature, only two scales for African American acculturation currently exist and both of these scales only assess acculturation as a unidimensional and unidirectional process. This indicates a gap in the African American acculturation literature and suggests that acculturation for this community is studied from an ethnic identity perspective, which has led to a limited conceptualization of African American acculturation. In order to address the present gap in the existing scales of African American acculturation, a multidimensional/multidirectional measure of African American Acculturation (MM3A) was developed. The developed measure views acculturation with African American's from a within group/out-group process, therefore not assuming within group homogeneity. This multidimensional/multidirectional measure of African American acculturation allows researchers to more accurately examine different dimensions of African American acculturation. It also allows for the study of the complexities of acculturation, such as the relation African American acculturation has with other applicable constructs such as behavioral, psychiatric, and health processes. This conceptual step could not be made without a measure that assesses the multiple dimensions of acculturation within the African American community. Hence, the

rationale for the development of a multidimensional measure of African American acculturation.

## METHOD

### Participants

Two hundred sixty-six persons participated in the completion of the MM3A. Individuals from the community were recruited via churches and Michigan State University. The churches where data collection were conducted were; St. Stephens located in Lansing, MI (n = 40). The day the announcement regarding the study was made to the congregation 64 members were in attendance. Thus indicating that 63% of the church population present that day participated in the research study. Also, Trinity AME located in Lansing, MI (n = 13). The day the study appeared in the Sunday bulletin, 130 members were in attendance indicating that 10% of the church population present that day participated in the study. Another church involved in the study, Union Missionary Church located in Lansing, MI (n = 34). The day the study appeared in the Sunday bulletin, 300 members were in attendance. Thus indicating that 11% of the church population participated in the study. Finally, New Beginnings Cathedral located in Detroit, MI (n = 27). The day the study appeared in the Sunday bulletin, 400 members were in attendance. Thus indicating that 6% of the church population participated in the study.

Individuals from Michigan State University were recruited through the Black Graduate Student Association (n = 44), the Black Caucus (n = 17), the Black Poets Society (n = 16), McNair/SROP (n = 21), the Black Student Association (n = 31), Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity Inc. (n = 7) and Case Hall Black Caucus (n = 17). All student organizations that participated in the study had a 100% participation rate except for the Case Hall Black Caucus, this organizations participation rate was 57%.

All locations were contacted by the researcher and permission to use their facility as a participation recruitment site or to attend a meeting to recruit participants was granted. All participant recruitment sites were selected using the criteria of whether or not they serviced a large population of African Americans. This sample was recruited for convenience. Amongst the 266 participants all identified as being African American, 100% (n = 266). Seventy-three percent (n = 193) were female and twenty-seven were male (n = 73). The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 63 with the mean age being 25. See Table 1 for complete demographic information. No study participants were compensated for their involvement.

#### Procedure

The researcher recruited participants in the current study from two locations: (1) African Americans from predominately Black churches (2) students from various organizations on Michigan State's campus. Below is a discussion on the procedures taken to recruit participants from various locations.

*Recruiting African Americans from Black churches.* In order to recruit African Americans from various churches within the area, the researcher first contacted the assistant pastor of various churches within the community. After speaking with a church representative over the telephone the researcher would then schedule a meeting to speak with the representative in person to provide further detail about the nature of the study. At the meeting the researcher described in more detail the purpose of the study and went through a copy of the survey with the representative. At the meeting if the church were interested in being a part of the study the researcher would ask for a description of her study along with the date, time and location of scheduled data collection to posted in the

Sunday bulletin or if she could make an announcement directly to the congregation during Sunday morning church announcements. All churches contacted agreed to participant. After posting the abstract in the Sunday bulletins all interested participants would show up at the designated time and location as indicated in the church bulletin. The surveys were group administered. Before each survey administration the researcher explained elements of anonymity, confidentiality, acculturation, and voluntary participation to the participants. Once they understood the purposes and procedures of the study, the researcher asked participants to read and sign the consent form.

*Recruiting African American students at Michigan State University.* In order to recruit African Americans from various organizations on campus the researcher first contacted the president of various organizations on campus. After speaking with the president over the telephone the researcher would then schedule a meeting to speak with the president in person to provide further detail about the nature of the study. At the meeting the researcher described in more detail the purpose of the study and went through a copy of the survey with the president. After speaking with the president if the president were interested in allowing their organization to be a part of the study the researcher scheduled a time to attend a general assembly meeting. At the assembly meeting of the organization the researcher verbally explained the purpose and goals of the study. The researcher would then sit through the entirety of the general meeting in order to sign up interested individuals. Individuals interested in study participation would schedule a time to attend the next group administration of the survey. Before each survey administration the researcher explained elements of anonymity, confidentiality, acculturation, and voluntary participation to the participants. Once they understood the

purposes and procedures of the study, the researcher asked participants to read and sign the consent form.

### Study Measures

*Demographic Sheet.* Seven items assessed participants' ethnicity, gender, age, education level, marital status, region of the country raised in, and socioeconomic status. Participants selected from a list of several responses. (Appendix B). Respondents were included in the sample based on the self-identification of self and their family of origin. Respondents identifying as Black, not of Hispanic origin were designated as African American.

*The Multidimensional Measure of Religious Involvement for African Americans.* Eleven items assessed religiosity among African Americans living within the US. Lewin, Taylor and Chatters (1995) scale was utilized in this study. The measure included items on spirituality as well as religiosity to ensure that both aspects of religiosity and spirituality are being assessed. The response items are on a 5-point Likert scale such that, 1= "not at all" to 5= "always". A sample item on the scale will read, "How often do you attend religious services?" (Appendix C)

*Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation.* Initially ninety-eight items were used to assess acculturation within the African American community. The measure consists of three dimensions: traditional behavioral practices, preference for things African American, and interracial attitudes. Response items are on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. (Appendix D)

## RESULTS

The results are presented according to the research question and method through which these questions were answered. Thereby, there will first be a discussion of the results yielding the dimensions of the Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation (MM3A). Following, there will be a discussion of the results indicating the necessity to include multidirectional methods (i.e. separate scale for African American and White American) when measuring African American acculturation. Last there will be a discussion of the results indicating the relationship between the dimensions of the behavioral, cognitive and affective components of the MM3A.

### What is the Dimensionality of African American Acculturation?

Four steps were taken to construct the dimensionality of the MM3A. The first step involved examining the item distribution. With regards to item distribution, the problem of missing data was resolved by imputing the item means. The second step involved exploring the component structure of the items within the MM3A by performing an exploratory factor analysis. The third step involved performing a confirmatory factor analysis to confirm the items fit for each proposed item in the scale. The final step involved calculating the reliability of the final scales.

In terms of an exploratory analysis, a principal component analysis with orthogonal varimax rotations was performed. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized in performing the principal analysis. This analysis was used to assess the loading of each item on a component and to assess if any conceptually meaningful components emerged. For each scale (behavior, cognitive, and affective) two components were extracted. These components were extracted based on the discretion

of the researcher because of the inclusion of African American items and White American items on each scale.

In determining which items were a part of the factor structure, items with component loadings of .30 or above were deemed as belonging to that particular factor component. This cutoff score was derived from Thomas and Thompson (1994). These researchers suggested that researchers consider items with component loading coefficients of at least .30 in absolute value as “loading on the respective factor” and should be considered in the interpretation of the meaning of that particular component.

After the scales’ structure was determined using the principal component analysis, confirmatory analysis was conducted to illustrate how well each item fit its’ perspective scale placement. Since the research regarding African American acculturation is in the infancy stage exploratory factor analysis was used first to help generate the theory proposed by the researcher.

The statistical package AMOS was used to graph the model that would be used to test the theory of the three components (six scales) as they relate to African American acculturation. The fit statistics were then analyzed to test how well the competing models fit the data. The fit statistics that were used in data analysis are as follows. First, the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), is “a measure of the relative amount of variances and covariances jointly accounted for by the model” (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1986, p. 41). The GFI fit statistic was used rather than the chi square statistic, because the GFI is less sensitive to sample size. A goodness-of-fit score can range from 0.0 to 1.0, but the closer this score is to zero the better is the fit of the model of the data (Thomas & Thompson, 1994). Next, the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) is a measure of

discrepancy per degree of freedom. It is suggested by Bentler (1990) that a RMSEA of .05 or less represents a close fit to the data; .05-.10 a moderate fit to the data; and above .10 is a bad fit. Finally, the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) this fit statistic compares the fitted model to the null model. A cutoff of .95 is recommended by Gillapsy (1996). Below will be a discussion on the results that surfaced from the exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis and reliabilities on each component of the MM3A, as well as the scales of each of these components of the MM3A.

### *Behavioral Component*

#### *Step 1: Examining Item Distribution*

In order to examine item distribution a frequency distribution was conducted with all items in each subscale. This was the first step taken towards understanding how well each subscale performed. No items within the subscale were dropped.

#### *Step 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis*

Next, an exploratory factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed on the behavioral items. The exploratory factor analysis had a forced component solution of two components extracted (refer to Table 2). This forced extraction was conducted because of the researchers initial scale construction of purposefully placing White American items and African American items into the scale.

*White American Behavior.* For the two-component solution component one consisted of twenty-seven items. Of the twenty-seven items initially included in the White American behavioral scale only eighteen items were retained within the subscale. The retained items encompass various components of White American behavior as defined by the researcher. The various component structure is as follows: item 23, refers

to the permissive child rearing, items 27, 43, 61, and 84 refer to a secular orientation, items 28 and 32 refer to celebrations of the mainstream culture, items 37, 41, 44, 46, 56, 89, 96, and 98 refer to a preference for individualism, item 40 indicates less respect for the elderly, and item 58 refers to the nuclear family. The loadings for these items ranged from .307 to .672 (see Table 2). A unity weighted scale for White American behavior was created based on the items with loadings of .30 or higher. Some of the items included in this dimension were: “My successes are attributed mainly to my own ability.”; “There is no one force in control of the things going on in the world.”; “I believe that I am the only person who can solve my problems.” These items are a part of the White American Behavioral Scale. These items accounted for 12.01% of the explained variance.

*African American Behavior.* For the two-component solution component two consisted of twenty-seven items. Of the twenty-seven items initially included in the component structure only twenty-two items were retained. The retained items encompass various components of African American Behavior as defined by the researcher. The various component structure is as follows: items 1, 2, 29, 62, 67, 68, and 75 refer to kinship/extended family bonds, items 8 and 17 refer to 38, 45, 55, and 64 refer to spiritual/religious orientation, items 24, 36, 48, and 90 refer to a collective orientation and items 31 and 63 refer to authoritarian child rearing practices. The loadings for these items ranged from .303 to .625 (see Table 2). A unity-weighted scale for African American behavior was created based on the items with loadings of .30 or higher. These items were included in scale construction and all other items were dropped. Examples of the retained items are: “ I take pride in the accomplishments of other African Americans.”; “I believe that if I have a problem it can be solved through prayer”; “I

believe that if I work hard I can improve my family's status in life". These items are a part of the African American Behavioral Scale. These items accounted for 8.89% of the explained variance.

### *Step 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

A confirmatory factor analysis on the final two scales was performed. The goodness of fit (GFI) for the first component, White American Behavior, was .81. The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) was .79. The Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was .06. For the second component, African American Behavior, the GFI was .78. The TLI for this scale was .60. The final fit statistic for this scale, the RMSEA, was .08. Based on the item fit statistics analyzed for these two subscales, it is concluded that the items within the two subscales are a moderate fit to the overall scale models.

### *Step 4: Reliability Analysis*

A reliability analysis on the final two scales was performed. The alpha coefficient for the first component, the White American Behavior Scale, was .80. The corrected item-total correlations for this scale ranged from .16 to .53 (See Table 3). The alpha coefficient for the second component, the African American Behavior Scale, was .81. The corrected item-total correlations for this scale ranged from .24 to .54 (See Table 4). The correlation between two scales was significant but small ( $r = -.134, p < .05$ ).

## *Cognitive Component*

### *Step 1: Examining Item Distribution*

In order to examine item distribution a frequency distribution was conducted with all items in each subscale. This was the first step taken towards understanding how well each subscale performed

## *Step 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis*

Next, an exploratory factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed next on the preference for things African American items. The exploratory factor analysis had a forced component solution of two components extracted (refer to Table 5). This forced extraction was conducted because of the researchers initial scale construction of purposefully placing White American items and African American items into the scale.

*White American Preference.* For the two-component solution component two consisted of nine items. Of the nine items initially included in the component structure all nine items had a factor loading of .30 or higher. The loadings for these items ranged from .471 to .618 (see Table 5). A unity-weighted scale for White American Preference was created based on the items with loadings of .30 or higher. Examples of retained items are: “I like reading books that are written by White Americans.”; “I like to work with White Americans.”; “I am married to/would marry a White American.” All of these items are a part of the White American Preference Scale. These items accounted for 16% of the explained variance

*African American Preference.* For the two-component solution component consisted of nine items. Of the nine items initially included in the component structure all items had a factor loading of .30 or higher. The loadings for these items ranged from .501 to .723 (see Table 5). A unity-weighted scale for African American Preference was created based on the items with loadings of .30 or higher. Examples of retained items are: “I like listening to music that is created by African American artists.”; “I am married to/would marry another African American.”; “I like going to movies or seeing plays that

have an African American cast.” All of these items are a part of the African American Preference Scale. These items accounted for 22% of the explained variance.

*Step 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

A confirmatory factor analysis on the final two scales was performed. The goodness of fit (GFI) for the second component, White American Preference, was .97. The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) was .93. The Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was .09. For the first component, African American Preference, the GFI was .92. The TLI for this scale was .80. The final fit statistic for this scale, the RMSEA, was .09. Based on the item fit statistics for the two subscales it is concluded that the items represented in the White American Preference subscale are a good fit to the overall model design, whereas the items represented in the African American Preference subscale are a moderate fit to the overall model design.

*Step 4: Reliability Analysis*

A reliability analysis on the final two scales was performed. The alpha coefficient for White American Preference scale was .68. The corrected item-total correlations for this scale ranged from .32 to .46 (See Table 6). The alpha coefficient for, the African American Preference Scale, was .77. The corrected item-total correlations for this scale ranged from .41 to .59 (See Table 7). The correlation between two scales was not significant ( $r=-.06$ ).

## *Affective Component*

### *Step 1: Examining Item Distribution*

In order to examine item distribution a frequency distribution was conducted with all items in each subscale. This was the first step taken towards understanding how well each subscale performed. No items within the subscale were dropped.

### *Step 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis*

An exploratory factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed next on the interracial/intra-racial attitude items. The exploratory factor analysis had a forced component solution of two components extracted (refer to Table 8). This forced extraction was conducted because of the researchers initial scale construction of purposefully placing White American items and African American items into the scale.

*White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude.* For the two-component solution component one consisted of thirteen items. Of the thirteen items initially included in the component structure only eight items were retained. The loadings for these items ranged from .310 to .717 (see Table 8). A unity-weighted scale for White American interracial/intra-racial attitude was created based on the items with loadings of .30 or higher. Examples of retained items are: “I believe that White people are intellectually superior to African Americans.”; “The person I respect the most is a White American.”; “I believe in the values of White Americans.” These items are a part of the White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude scale. These items accounted for 15.05% of the explained variance.

*African American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude.* For the two-component solution component two consisted of 13 items. Of the thirteen items initially included in

the component structure only nine were retained within the subscale. All dropped items had a factor loading less than .30. Examples of dropped items are: “I feel uncomfortable around White Americans.”; “I identify with the African American culture.” The loadings for these items ranged from .310 to .554 (see table 8). A unity-weighted scale for African American interracial/intra-racial attitude was created based on the items with loadings of .30 or higher. Examples of retained items are: “ I find it hard to trust most White Americans.”; I feel that African Americans are not capable of being racist.”; “I believe that African American parents should surround their children with Black art, music, and literature. All of these items were initially a part of the African American Interracial Attitude Scale. These items accounted for 9.20% of the explained variance.

*Step 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis.*

A confirmatory factor analysis on the final two scales was performed. The goodness of fit (GFI) for the first component, White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude, was .94. The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) was .76. The Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was .1. For the second component, African American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude, the GFI was .91. The TLI for this scale was .60. The final fit statistic for this scale, the RMSEA, was .1. Based on the item fit statistics analyzed for these two subscales, it is concluded that the items within the two subscales are a moderate fit to the overall scale models.

*Step 4: Reliability Analysis*

A reliability analysis on the final two scales was performed. The alpha coefficient for the first component, the White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude Scale, was .71. The corrected item-total correlations for this scale ranged from .31 to .49

(See Table 10). The alpha coefficient for the second component, the African American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude Scale, was .53. The corrected item-total correlations for this scale ranged from .20 to .32 (See Table 9). The correlation between two scales indicated no relationship ( $r = -.06$ ). Since the reliability for the African American interracial/intra-racial attitude scale was below .65, this scale was dropped from further analyses.

In summary, the results indicated that the Multidimensional Measure of African American acculturation has five reliable and statistically fit scales which assess African American acculturation: (1) African American Behavior (2) White American Behavior (3) African American Preference (4) White American Preference and (5) White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitudes. After the dimensionality of the test was confirmed, next test were conducted to determine if the construct should be viewed a multidirectional and multidimensional construct.

#### Are Multidirectional Components When Measuring African American Acculturation Needed?

After determining what dimensions comprise the MM3A, next correlations were conducted. The correlations were conducted to understand if separate scales for separate racial groups are needed or if a single scale is acceptable. In order to answer this question several statistical steps were conducted. First, correlations were conducted between the various dimensions of the MM3A. In order to correlate the various dimensions z transformations were performed. Next, the observed correlations were corrected for reliability. Last, the patterns of correlations between the various scales were examined to determine if these were evidence of the differential validity of the five scales. Determining if the two dimensions behaved differently was done by using two

criteria. First it was determined if the subscales were related to external variables in statistically different ways. In other words, did the two subscales have statistically significant different correlations with the external variables. Next, it was determined if the subscales led to different conclusions. Meaning would different conclusions occur by using separate subscales or are the same conclusions obtained regardless of the subscale being utilized (Refer to Table 13).

### *Behavioral Component*

#### *Step 1: Inter-correlations between the Behavioral Component*

First, the directionality of the behavior component was determined: African American Behavior and White American Behavior. A z transformation was performed centering the two scales thus making the two separate scales comparable. After the z transformation was performed, the correlation between the two scales was examined after correction for reliability. The observed correlation of  $-.14$  was significant and when corrected was  $-.22$ .

Even though a significant relationship between the two dimensions emerged, the size of the correlation was moderate and insufficient to justify combining into a single dimension. Therefore, the next step involved relating these two subscales to several external variables.

#### *Step 2: Correlation with External Variables*

Both subscales had statistically different patterns of relationships with the income variable and the spirituality variable (Refer to table 12). The income finding was significant because individuals who displayed a White American behavioral orientation had a statistically significant lower income ( $r = -.23, p < .01$ ). There was no relationship

between an African American behavioral orientation and income ( $r = .11$ ). The spirituality finding was significant because individuals who displayed an African American behavioral orientation had a statistically significant higher level of spirituality ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ). There was a significant relationship in the opposite direction between White American behavior and spirituality ( $r = -.14, p < .05$ ). Neither dimension had a relationship with the friendship variable. These results indicate that there is a significant difference between African American behavior and White American dimension behavior, thus concluding that the two should be viewed separately when attempting to understand the behavioral component of acculturation within the African American community.

### *Cognitive Component*

#### *Step 1: Inter-correlations between the Cognitive Component*

Next, the directionality of the cognitive component was analyzed: African American Preference and White American Preference. A z transformation was performed centering the two scales thus making the two separate scales comparable. After the z transformation was performed, the correlation between the two scales was examined after correction for reliability. The observed correlation of  $-.06$  was not significant and when corrected was  $.11$ . The next step involved relating these two subscales to several external variables to determine if they behaved differently.

#### *Step 2: Correlation with External Variables*

Of the four external variables included there were no conceptually different conclusions (Refer to table 12). The statistical differences of the cognitive component behaved as expected with regards to the friendship variable. Both dimensions had statistically significant opposite patterns of correlations. White American preference had

a significant positive correlation with White American friends ( $r = .32$ ) and a significant negative correlation with African American friends ( $r = -.22$ ). African American preference had a significant positive correlation with African American friends ( $r = .27$ ) and a significant negative correlation with White American friends ( $r = -.19$ ). These correlation relationships were expected. It is expected that individuals whom display an African American preference orientation would have friends who were mostly African Americans. The opposite is also true of individuals who display a White American preference orientation. It is expected that these individuals would have friends who are mostly White American. In essence, even though statistical differences emerged as a result of the correlations, no different conclusions were made based upon the pattern of correlations. Neither dimension had a relationship with the income variable or the spirituality variable. Based on these results it is concluded that these two scales could be combined into a single scale when assessing the cognitive component of African American acculturation.

#### Do We Need Multidimensional Scales When Measuring African American Acculturation?

After determining the directionality of the MM3A, next the multidimensionality of the scale was determined. This step involved determining if multiple components (i.e. behavioral, cognitive, affective) were necessary in understanding African American acculturation. To determine the multidimensionality, the various subscales of the MM3A were grouped based on whether or not the subscale assessed elements of African American or White American (i.e. African American preference vs. African American behavior). First, correlations were conducted between the various dimensions of the

MM3A. In order to correlate the various dimensions z transformations were performed. Next, the observed correlations were corrected for reliability. Third, the patterns of correlations between the various scales were examined to determine if these was evidence of the differential validity of the five scales. Determining if the two dimensions behaved differently was done by using two criteria. First it was determined if the subscales were related to external variables in statistically different ways. In other words, did the two subscales have statistically significant different correlations with the external variables. Next, it was determined if the subscales led to different conclusions. Meaning would different conclusions occur by using separate subscales or are the same conclusions obtained regardless of the subscale being utilized (Refer to Table 14).

### *African American Behavior vs. African American Preference*

#### *Step 1: Correction for Reliability*

First the need for two separate dimensions for African American behavior and African American preference was analyzed. A z transformation was performed centering the two scales thus making them comparable. After the z transformation was performed, the correlation between the two scales was examined after correction for reliability. The observed correlation of .51 was significant and when corrected was .82. A significant relationship between the two dimensions emerged providing evidence for combining the two scales. The next step involved relating these two subscales to several external variables.

#### *Step 2: External Variables*

Both subscales had statistically different patterns of relationship and conceptually different conclusions with the spirituality variable (Refer to table 12).

Individuals with an African American behavioral orientation had a statistically significant relationship with spirituality ( $r = .46$ ;  $p < .01$ ). There was no relationship between African American preference and spirituality ( $r = .03$ ). Both subscales also had statistically different patterns of relationship and conceptually different conclusions with the friendship variable. Individuals with an African American preference orientation had a statistically significant relationship with the Black friendship variable ( $r = .27$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and the White friendship variable ( $r = -.19$ ;  $p < .01$ ). There was no relationship between African American behavior and the Black friendship variable ( $r = .11$ ) or the White friendship variable ( $r = -.06$ ). These results indicate that there is a significant difference between the African American behavior subscale and the African American preference subscale, thus concluding that the two should be viewed separately.

#### *White American Behavior vs. White American Preference*

##### *Step 1: Correction for Reliability*

Next, the need for a separate White American behavior and White American preference component was analyzed. A z transformation was performed centering the two scales thus making them comparable. After the z transformation was performed, the correlation between the two scales was examined after correction for reliability. The observed correlation of .25 was significant and when corrected was .45. A significant relationship between the two dimensions emerged providing evidence for combining the two scales. However, the size of the correlation was moderate and insufficient to justify combining into a single scale. Therefore, steps were taken to determine if the two subscales behaved differently.

##### *Step 2: External Variables*

Of the four external variables included there were statistically different patterns of relationships and conceptually different conclusions with all variables (Refer to table 12). Individuals with a White American behavioral orientation had a statistically significant relationship with spirituality ( $r = -.14$ ;  $p < .05$ ). There was no relationship between White American preference and spirituality ( $r = .08$ ). In addition to this relationship, individuals with a White American behavior orientation had a statistically significant relationship with income ( $r = -.23$ ;  $p < .05$ ). There was no relationship between White American preference and income. Individuals with a White American preference orientation had a significant relationship with the friendship variable: Black friends ( $r = -.22$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and White friends ( $r = .32$ ;  $p < .05$ ). There was no relationship between White American behavior and the friendship variable: Black friends ( $r = .03$ ) and White friends ( $r = .11$ ). These results indicate that there is a significant difference between these two subscales, thus concluding that the two should be viewed separately when attempting to understand the White American behavioral and White American preference component of African American acculturation.

*White American Behavior vs. White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude*

*Step 1: Correction for Reliability*

Next the need for two separate dimensions for White American behavior and White American interracial/intra-racial attitude was analyzed. A z transformation was performed centering the scales thus making them comparable. After the z transformation was performed, the correlation between the two scales was examined after correction for reliability. The observed correlation of .53 was significant and when corrected was .93. A strong significant relationship between the two dimensions emerged providing

evidence for combining the two scales. Even though the correlation between the subscales was significantly large, steps were taken to determine if the two subscales behaved differently.

*Step 2: External Validity*

Of the external variables included there were statistically different patterns of relationships and conceptually different conclusions with the spirituality variable and the income variable (Refer to table 12). Individuals with a White American behavioral orientation had a statistically significant relationship with spirituality ( $r = -.14$ ;  $p < .05$ ). There was no relationship between White American interracial/intra-racial attitude and spirituality ( $r = .03$ ). Individuals with a White American behavioral orientation had a statistically significant relationship with income ( $r = -.23$ ;  $p < .05$ ). There was no relationship between White American interracial/intra-racial attitude and income ( $r = .02$ ). These results indicate that there is a significant difference between these two subscales, thus concluding that the two should be viewed separately when attempting to understand the White American behavioral and White American interracial/intra-racial component of African American acculturation.

*White American Preference vs. White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude*

*Step 1: Correction for Reliability*

Next, determining the need for two separate dimensions for White American behavior and White American interracial/intra-racial attitude was analyzed. First, a z transformation was performed centering the two scales thus making them comparable. After the z transformation was performed, the correlation between the two scales was examined after correction for reliability. The observed correlation of .39 was significant

and when corrected was .78. A strong significant relationship between the two dimensions emerged providing evidence for combining the two scales. Even though the strong correlation would justify combining into a single scale, further steps were taken to determine if the two subscales behaved differently.

### *Step 2: External Variables*

Of the external variables included there were statistically different patterns of relationships and conceptually different conclusions with the friendship variable (Refer to table 12). White American preference had a significant correlation with White American friends ( $r = .32$ ) and a significant correlation in the opposite direction with African American friends ( $r = -.22$ ). There was no relationship between White American interracial/intra-racial attitude and the friendship variable: Black friends ( $r = -.04$ ) and White friends ( $r = .07$ ). There were no relationships between either dimension and the income variable or the spirituality variable. These results indicate that there is a significant difference between these two subscales, thus concluding that the two should be viewed separately when attempting to understand the White American preference and White American interracial/intra-racial component of African American acculturation.

## DISCUSSION

The current research study sought to develop a multidimensional measure of African American acculturation. Currently, there are only two scales measuring African American acculturation. Landrine & Klonoff (1994) and Snowden & Hines (1999) are the only scholars who have developed a scale to measure acculturation within the contexts of African Americans. Neither of these scales measured acculturation with reference to the cognitive or affective functions that can contribute to the understanding

of the phenomenon of acculturation for this cultural group. Hence, the role of the present study was to develop reliable scales assessing the behavioral as well as the cognitive and affective components of acculturation. The results of the study do provide evidence that multidimensional/multidirectional scales can provide richer information when being used within the African American community. The following sections will highlight the major findings found in the present study. Next, there will be a discussion on the limitations and implications for future research.

### Major Findings

#### *The Dimensionality of the Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation Behavioral Component*

Regarding the behavioral component of the African American acculturation measure, the results of the exploratory factor analysis with a two components varimax rotated solution yielded two components that measured African American behavior and White American behavior. Moreover, the intercorrelation between the two scales further supports the result that the African American behavioral subscale and the White American behavioral subscale appear to be two separate constructs. By examining the intercorrelation of the two constructs, the results indicated that they were not highly correlated with one another and that they had different patterns of correlation with other variables or other scales in the study. Therefore, the scales may be considered orthogonal. The African American behavioral and the White American behavioral scales were also reliable sub-scales of the African American acculturation measure. However, there were items dropped respectively from each scale to retain this reliability.

Items 10, 19, 39, 42, and 49 were deleted from the White American behavioral scale because their component loadings were less than .30. In addition, the corrected item-total correlation also indicated that these five items correlated least with the other items that appeared to be a measure of White American behavior. Furthermore, after examining conceptual meaning of the dropped items, the researcher determined that the items were not conceptually clear. The items were written poorly, which could have been confusing to some participants.

For example, item 19 stated “I only consider my parents and siblings as a part of my immediate family”. Edwards (1957) indicated that when writing survey items avoid using the words such as “only”, “always”, and “never” because often times such words introduce ambiguity. The statement of item 19 stated “I ‘only’ consider my parents and siblings as a part of my immediate family.” This statement does not take into account offspring and siblings. Thus the word ‘only’ in the statement of 19 might have been ambiguous, which might explain why this item did not load highly on the component that appeared to be a measure of White American behavior. In addition, some of the items in this scale were double loaded or too complicated in the manner in which they were written. For example, item 39 stated “I would rather place an aging family member in a nursing home, rather than keeping them in my home.” This item is very wordy and thus fails to capture the cultural practice that the researcher was initially attempting to achieve.

For the African American behavioral scale items 15, 35, 51, 79, and 97 were dropped. Items were dropped from this subscale for two reasons, either they had a factor loading less than .30 or the items loaded higher with the White American behavior subscale. Only one item within this subscale loaded higher with the White American

behavior subscale: “I believe that if a child is not whipped/spanked while misbehaving, they will only continue to misbehave.” This item had a loading of .13 with the African American behavior subscale and a factor loading of .32 with the White American behavior subscale. Because subscales were initially constructed based on traditional and cultural beliefs for each cultural group represented it was not contextually logically to remove this item and the item was therefore dropped. The other four dropped items had a factor loading that ranged from .02 to .14. After examining the dropped items within this scale the researcher recognized that there were wording issues with several of these items. For example, item 51 states “I believe in the existence of a Supreme Force.” By using the word “Supreme Force” this question could have been confusing or vague to participants.

The confirmatory factor analysis adds further support for the two scale models. When conducting the confirmatory factor analysis, the items within the two subscales had a moderate fit to the overall scale models. A moderate fit to the data was a necessity in justifying retaining the two dimensions (Thompson & Thompson, 1994). A poor fit would have resulted in dropping scale items to increase the over all model fit. The dropping of scale items could have decreased the overall reliability of the scale. Altogether, the results indicate that both the African American behavior and White American behavior scales appear to be orthogonal and that they are reliable measures of the behavioral component of African American acculturation. These findings are consistent with theory and previous research on acculturation, which implies that the behavioral component is a measurable construct in the acculturation process (Berry, 1976; Cuellar et. al., 1993).

### *Cognitive Component*

The cognitive component of the African American acculturation measure also yielded two scales of African American preference and White American preference. An exploratory factor analysis, rotating a two-component solution, yielded two components that appeared to be a measure of African American preference and White American preference, respectively. The intercorrelation also indicated that these two scales were separate constructs in that they did not correlate with one another. Furthermore, as with the African American behavior and White American behavior scales, African American preference and White American preference did not have the same patterns of correlation with other external variables. Thus indicating, that the two scales appear to be separate constructs. The African American preference and the White American preference scales were also reliable sub-scales of the African American acculturation measure. Each scale retained all initial items.

The confirmatory factor analysis added further support for the two-scale model. When conducting the confirmatory factor analysis, the two subscales had a good fit to the overall scale models. The items of these two-scale models represented better fits than the other scales within the MM3A. A good fit to the data was a necessity in justifying retaining the two dimensions. Altogether, the results indicate that the African American preference and White American preference scales are measures of the cognitive component of African American acculturation. This upholds the literature that indicates that assessing the cognitive component independently of the behavioral component is important when measuring the construct of acculturation (Berry, 1976; Cuellar et. al., 1993).

### *Affective Component*

Finally, with regards to the affective component of the African American acculturation measure, the results of the exploratory factor analysis with a two components varimax rotated solution yielded two components. These two components were a measure of African American interracial/intra-racial attitude and White American interracial/intra-racial attitude. Even though two components emerged from the factor analysis, the African American subscale was subsequently dropped. This subscale was dropped because the scale retained a low alpha of .53. In order to be retained as a scale an alpha of .65 or higher is needed (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995). However, the White American interracial/intra-racial scale was also a reliable sub-scale of the African American acculturation measure. To retain reliability for the White American interracial/intra-racial attitude scale several items were dropped.

All dropped items had a factor loading of less than .30. In all there were five items dropped from this scale (item 5, item 6, item 12, item 13, item 33). Upon reviewing the dropped items it appeared that several items lacked conceptual clarity. For example, item 12 states "I have changed my lifestyle to fit my beliefs about White American." This statement could have been interpreted in several ways interpretation simply depended on the participant.

The confirmatory factor analysis added further support for the one-scale model. When conducting the confirmatory factor analysis, the White American interracial/intra-racial subscale had a moderate fit to the overall scale models. A moderate fit to the data was a necessity in justifying retaining the final scale. Altogether, the results indicate that

the White American interracial/intra-racial scale is a measure of the affective component of African American acculturation.

The results indicated that five statistically reliable dimensions emerged as suppose to six as initially assumed. The results are in accordance with the literature which views acculturation as a multiple construct phenomenon (Berry, 1997; Ward, 2001).

*Incorporating multidirectional measures into acculturation scales with African Americans*

With regards to measuring acculturation as a multidirectional construct (i.e. a scale for African Americans and a scale for White Americans), only one of the subscales provided evidence regarding the necessity to intertwine separate racial subscales rather than just recoded items within the dimension.

*African American Behavior and White American Behavior*

The behavioral component had statistically and conceptually significant relationships with several external variables. The difference in significant relationships adds to our knowledge about how to view individuals who fall within either dimension. For example, there was a significant relationship between White American behavior and income ( $r = -.23$ ), whereas there was no correlation between African American behavior and income ( $r = .11$ ). This finding contradicts other findings within the literature regarding acculturation and income, in other studies individuals with a White American orientation have a higher income than their counterparts (Landrine & Klonoff, 1994; Snowden & Hines, 1997). There was also a significant relationship between the spirituality variable. African American behavior correlated positively and significantly with spirituality, whereas White American behavior correlated negatively and

significantly with spirituality. This indicates that the more one upholds an African American behavioral orientation the more important spirituality is in their life. This finding is consistent with theory and previous research on African American acculturation (Landrine & Klonoff, 1994). These findings are significant because, if we used one scale we would make an incorrect assumption by assuming that each group had the same pattern of correlation. Therefore, this provides evidence that a richer framework of understanding is gained when two separate dimensions of behavior are included.

#### *African American Preference and White American Preference*

Based on the non-significant intercorrelation between White American preference and African American preference, it appeared that these two dimensions would provide separate information. But upon further examination, no conceptual differences emerged between external variables. Only statistical differences emerged with the Black friend and White friend variables. African American preference was positively and significantly correlated with Black friends, and was negatively and significantly correlated with White friends. The same pattern of correlation emerged for the White American preference scale. White American preference was positively significantly correlated with White friends, and was negatively and significantly correlated with Black friends. These statistical differences do not justify keeping the scales separate. It is expected that individuals who preferred African American activities would also prefer to be friends with other African Americans', therefore even though there was a statistical relationship the relationship does not provide a strong argument for separating the two dimensions. This finding adds support for the argument of having multidimensional scales, but it does not support the need for multidirectional scales when assessing the

cognitive component. Therefore, it is concluded that creating one scale for the cognitive component and simply using recoded items to assess the mainstream group would obtain the same information.

*African American Inter-racial/intra-racial Attitude and White American Inter-racial/intra-racial Attitude*

This component was not analyzed for directionality because the African American dimension was dropped due to low scale reliability.

Based on these results, at this point it only seems necessary to view the behavior component of African American acculturation with regards to separate racial scales. The cognitive subscale can simply use recoded items in order to achieve the same information. Conclusions regarding the directionality of the affective component cannot be reached due to reliability concerns with the African American component of the affective dimension. Even though this is not the conclusion that the researcher hoped to obtain, this conclusion makes logistical sense. The behavior component for each subscale (White American and African American) was formed using various cultural and traditional specific items in order to ensure that the subscales were culture specific. Due to the specificity of items it would prove to be difficult to intertwine these two separate scales into one overall scale. In contrast, the construction of the cognitive component contained virtually identical questions, except White American was substituted for African American in order to obtain the questions for the African American scale.

*Using Multidimensionality to Measure Acculturation for African Americans*

With regards to multidimensionality, the literature regarding multidimensionality argues that multidimensional measures provide a richer and clearer framework for

understanding individual differences regarding an array of dimensions (Berry, 1997). The literature states that the acculturation process can be observed in a number of different domains, including attitudes, values, behaviors and a sense of cultural identity (Ryder, et. al., 2000). Therefore, the current study sought to provide such a measure for usage within the African American community. The current study argued that this measurement design would provide a clearer understanding into the many complexities of African American acculturation. In order to support this argument the various dimensions encompassed in the measurement design were correlated with one another based on racial specificity (i.e. African American behavior was correlated with African American preference).

#### *African American Behavior vs. African American Preference*

Without statistical analysis, one could assume that the cognitive and behavioral components are measuring the same construct. There are inconsistent findings in the literature regarding the behavioral and cognitive component of acculturation. Some research has demonstrated that the two are interrelated (Der-Karabetian, 1980; Ullah, 1987). However, other literature indicates they exhibit different patterns of change over time (Cuellar, et. al., 1995). The research findings of the current study are in accordance with the second viewpoint, which argues that they are separate constructs. The African American behavior and African American preference components have different patterns of correlations with the various external factors, thus illustrating that they are separate constructs. For example, the external variable of spirituality had a significant correlation with African American Behavior ( $r = .46$ ), but there was no correlation with African American preference ( $r = .03$ ). Thus this indicates that just because an individual has a

strong preference for African American settings does not mean that they will have the same religious orientations as their counterparts who have a strong African American behavioral orientation. Furthermore, African American preference correlated positively and significantly with the Black friend variable. This same variable correlated negatively and significantly with the White friend variable. African American behavior did not display a statistically significant relationship with either variable. This means that individuals with an African American behavior orientation and those with an African American preference orientation view friendships and spirituality differently. If these two dimensions were measuring the same construct, the correlation relationships would have been the same. This illustrates the need for including both dimensions when assessing African American acculturation, because if we had used only one dimension we would have missed pivotal information regarding African American acculturation.

#### *White American Behavior vs. White American Preference*

Both subscales behaved differently with regards to the Black friend variable, the White friend variable, the income variable and the spirituality variable included. For example, those individuals who displayed a White American behavior orientation displayed a statistically significant relationship with the income variable, whereas those individuals displaying a White American preference orientation displayed no relationship with the income variable. This indicates that individuals displaying a White American behavior orientation have a lower household income. Also the White American behavior scale correlated negatively and significantly with the spirituality variable. There was no relationship between White American preference and spirituality. This conclusion indicates that individuals, who display a White American behavior orientation will be

less likely to view spirituality as important in their life. No assumptions can be made about spirituality and White American preference. These findings are important, because if both scales are not included incorrect assumptions can be made. Also if these two dimensions, were measuring the same construct, they would have displayed the same pattern of correlation across variables.

*White American Behavior vs. White American Interracial/intra-racial Attitude*

Individuals who display a White American behavior orientation correlated negatively and significantly with the spirituality variable and the income variable. The White American interracial/intra-racial attitude scale did not correlate with either scale. This indicates that individuals with a White American behavioral orientation would have a lower income and they would also view spirituality as less important. The differences in these correlation patterns between the two scales are important, because without them incorrect assumptions can be made. It can be assumed that since each scale is assessing a White American orientation that they are one and the same; based on the patterns of correlations, this would be an incorrect assumption. These results indicate that it is necessary to view White American behavior and White American interracial/intra-racial attitude as two separate scales when measuring African American acculturation.

*White American Preference vs. White American Interracial/intra-racial Attitude*

White American preference had a significant positive correlation with White American friends and a significant negative correlation with African American friends. This pattern of correlation is expected. It is expected that individuals who have a White American preference orientation would have friends who were mostly White. However, there was no relationship between White American interracial/intra-racial attitude and the

friendship variable: Black friends and White friends. If these scales were measuring the same construct it is expected that White American interracial/intra-racial attitude would have the same pattern of correlations. These results indicate that there is a significant difference between these two subscales, thus concluding that the two should be viewed separately when attempting to understand the White American preference and the White American interracial/intra-racial component of African American acculturation.

In essence, a richer understanding of the phenomenon was achieved by using the behavioral, affective, and cognitive components. According to this study, all components are needed to achieve a clear understanding of African American acculturation. By eliminating various components critical information is not obtained and incorrect assumptions can be made. These results are in accordance with other multidimensional models, which have been used within the Hispanic community (Berry, 1997; Ward, 2001)

#### Limitations and Implications for Future Research

Although there were several significant findings regarding the scales of the MM3A, no study is without limitations. The first study limitation is in regards to measuring the MM3A. The scales of the MM3A represent items thought to represent the mainstream culture as well as the African American culture. With the present study no individuals representing the mainstream culture were surveyed. Because of this, there is no sure way of knowing if the items chosen to represent White American culture are truly representative of that culture or if they are just the manifestation of one culture's biases towards another culture. A future study should give the sample to individuals

representing the mainstream culture, since this cultural group is largely represented throughout the various components MM3A.

A second limitation is that the measure was tested specifically on African Americans living in the Detroit, Lansing and East Lansing communities. Even though it is hoped that participants in this study encompass a large geographical background due to the inclusion of college and graduate students into the sample, one should be cautious when generalizing the findings found in this study to the general African American population. A future study should take into account the various geographical origins of individuals participating in the study to see if any acculturation differences emerge as a result of where the individual has spent the majority of their adult life.

A third limitation to the study design has problems with validity. Validation for the affective component did not emerge. Validation for this component did not emerge because of reliability issues with both dimensions of this component: African American interracial/intra-racial attitude and White American interracial/intra-racial attitude. With regards to the White American dimension, the correlations between the affective and cognitive dimension relating to White Americans are extremely large (i.e.  $r = .93$ ;  $r = .78$ ). Also, none of the external scales used correlated with this subscale. This indicates that these dimensions may be dependent upon one another. Although, this scales reliability indicates that the items are measuring a particular construct consistently. Without further validation, there is no absolute certainty what construct this scale is measuring. Therefore further validation is needed for this scale to ensure that the concept is measuring what it purports to measure.

After further tests of validation are conducted for the various scale dimensions, steps can be taken to integrate all dimensions into one scale of acculturation for usage within the African American community. Creating one scale of acculturation can be done because each component of the scale contains two separate subscales: an African American Orientation Subscale (AAOS) and a White American Orientation Subscale (WOS). The sum of the AAOS scale can be divided by the total number of items in that subscale to obtain a mean score for that subscale (the same can be done for the WOS scale). The WOS mean is subtracted from the AAOS mean to obtain a linear acculturation score that represents an individual's score along a continuum from African American-oriented to White-oriented. The acculturation score can be used to obtain an acculturation level for the subject by employing the suggested cutting scores. The cutting scores will be selected based on standard deviation units from the mean of the combined sample of the individuals selected for this study.

The integration of the dimensions into one scale will create a multidimensional/multidirectional measure of acculturation for African Americans'. As indicated earlier, this scale will assess various components of the acculturation process as well as allowing for the inclusion of individuals who fall within the bicultural category.

The final limitation regarding this study is that all findings are exploratory. The steps taken within this research design represent groundbreaking research within the area of acculturation for the African American population, therefore none of the findings are absolute, and thus should not be treated as such. Replication studies need to be conducted in order to ensure the validity and reliability of all indicated results.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the current study sought to construct a multidimensional /multidirectional measure of African American acculturation (MM3A). This is the first step towards understanding acculturation as a multidimensional/multidirectional measure within the African American community. Theorists who adopt a multidimensional perspective argue that acculturation can be more completely understood when heritage and mainstream cultural identities are seen as being relatively independent of one another (e.g., Berry, 1997; Ramirez, 1984; Zak, 1973). Thus, individuals in the multidirectional/multidimensional model may adopt many of the values and behaviors of the mainstream culture without giving up facets of self-identity developed in their culture of origin.

Based on the findings of this study it is indicated that the multidimensional/multidirectional model proposed within the Hispanic literature could also be employed within the African American community. By employing multiple dimensions a clearer understanding of a confusing topic is achieved. In the literature it is argued that it is difficult to assess African American acculturation due to several reasons: lack of a distinct culture, or African American's are simply a race not a culture. By taking a myopic approach to understanding the acculturation process of African Americans, researchers are only adding to the confusion. Therefore, this study sought to add multidimensional and multidirectional models into the research design in an attempt to get a clearer understanding of the acculturation process.

Regarding multidimensionality, reliable sub-scales emerged that assessed the behavioral, affective and cognitive processes that are affected during the acculturation

process. This was a first attempt to merge all these processes when attempting to measure the phenomenon of acculturation within the African American population. This study has helped address a gap within the literature regarding African American acculturation by illustrating that in order to address acculturation within this cultural group it is necessary to assess more than the behavioral component; one should also assess the cognitive and affective component of individuals. This study also argued that multidirectional measures need to be utilized when measuring acculturation; according to the findings of this study, this factor is true only with the behavioral component. When using the cognitive component, recoded items assessing elements of both culture groups can be utilized. In essence, based on the findings of this study, it is indicated that a clearer understanding of the acculturation process for African American's is achieved when using a multidimensional/multidirectional model.

## References

- Anderson, J., Moeschberger, M., Chen, M. S., Kunn, P., Wewers, M. E., & Guthrie, R. (1993). An acculturation scale for Southeast Asians. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 28, 134-141.
- Argyle, M. (1969). *Social interaction*. London: Methuen.
- Barona, A., & Miller, J.A. (1994). Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanic Youth (SASH-Y): A preliminary report. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 16, 155-162.
- Baker, F.M. (1987). The Afro-American life cycle: Success, failure, and mental health. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 79(6), 625-633.
- Bass, B.A. (1982). The validity of socioeconomic factors in the assessment and treatment of Afro-Americans. In B. A. Bass, G. E. Wyatt, & G. J. Powell (Eds.), *The Afro-American family: Assessment, treatment, and research issues* (pp. 69-83). New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Bennet, L. (1996). *Before the Mayflower*. Baltimore : Penguin Books.
- Bentler, P.M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural modeling. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Berry, J. W. (1976). *Human ecology and cognitive style: Comparative studies in cultural and psychological adaptation*. London: Sage.
- Berry, J.W. (1980). Social and cultural change. In H.C. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Berry, J. W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact*. New York: Academic Press.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde T., Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review*, 21, 491-511.
- Berry, J.W., Kim, U. (1988). Acculturation and mental health. In P. Dasen, J.W. Berry, & N. Sartorius (Eds.), *Health and cross-cultural psychology* (pp.207-236). London: Sage.
- Billingsley, A. (1974). *Black families in white America* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bochner, S. (1972). Problems in culture learning. In S. Bochner & P. Wicks (Eds.), *Overseas students in Australia* (pp. 65-81). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

- Bochner, S. (1986). Coping with unfamiliar cultures: Adjustment or culture learning? *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 347-358.
- Boyd-Franklin, N. (1989). *Black families in therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Bremner, R.H. (1974). *Children and youth in America: A documentary history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, L.S. (1989). New voices, new visions: Toward a lesbian/gay paradigm for psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13(4), 445-458.
- Buriel, R. (1975). Cognitive styles among three generations of Mexican American children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 6, 417-429.
- Burnam, M.A., Hough, R.L., Karno, M., Escobar, J.L., & Telles, C.A. (1987). Acculturation and lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders among Mexican Americans in Los Angeles. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 28, 89-102.
- Caetano, R. (1987). Acculturation and drinking patterns among U.S. Hispanics. *British Journal of Addictions*, 82, 789-799.
- Caetano, R. (1987). Alcohol use and depression among U.S. Hispanics. *British Journal of Addiction*, 82, 1245-1251.
- Carter, R. T. & Helms J.E. (1987). The relationship of Black value-orientations to racial identity attitudes. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 185-195.
- Chambers, V. (1997). Say amen, indeed. *American Way*, 30(4), 38-43, 102-105.
- Comrey, A (1973). *A first course in factor analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- Comrey, A (1988). Factor analytic methods of scale development in personality and clinical psychology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56, 754-761.
- Cronbach, L., J., & Meehl, P.E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281-302.
- Cuellar, I., Harris, I. C., Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, 2, 89-102.
- Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II: A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 17(3), 275-304.

- Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., Gonzalez, G. (1995). Cognitive referents of acculturation assessment of cultural constructs in Mexican Americans. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 339-356.
- Curtain, P.D. (1969). *Atlantic slave trade: A census*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dana, R.H. (1988). Culturally diverse groups and MMPI interpretation. *Professional minorities: Research and Practice*, 19, 490-495.
- Dana, R.H., & Whatley, P.R. (1988). When does a difference make a difference? MMPI scores and African Americans. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 417-440.
- Dana, R.H., & Whatley, P.R. (1991). When does a difference make a difference? MMPI scores and African-Americans. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 417-440.
- Dana, R. H. (1993). *Multicultural Assessment Perspectives for Professional Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Der-Karabetian, A. (1980). Relation of two cultural identities of Armenian-Americans. *Psychological Reports*, 47, 123-128.
- DeVellis, R (1991). Scale Development; Theory, and Applications. *Applied Social Research Method*, 26, 12-113.
- Dion, K. L. & Dion, K. K. (1996). Chinese adaptation to foreign cultures. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 457-478). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Domino, G., & Acosta, A. (1987). The relation of acculturation and values in Mexican Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 131-150.
- Dressler, W.W. (1982). *Hypertension and culture change: Acculturation and disease in the West Indies*. New York: Redgrave.
- Dressler, W.W., Mata, A., Chavez, A., & Viteri, F.E. (1987). Arterial blood pressure and modernization in a Mexican community. *Social Science and Medicine*, 24, 679-687.
- Fairchild, H.H. (1985). Black, Negro, or Afro-American? The differences are crucial! *Journal of Black Studies*, 16(1), 47-55.
- Gamble, V. N. (1997). Under the shadow of Tuskegee: African Americans and health care. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87(11), 1773-1778).

- Genovese, E.D. (1974). *Roll, Jordan, roll: The world slaves made*. New York. Pantheon Books.
- Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P., & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Ghuman, P., (1994). Canadian or Indo-Canadian: A study of South Asian adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 4, 229-243.
- Goldberg, D. (1987). Raking the field of the discourse of racism. *Journal of Black Studies*, 18(1), 58-71.
- Gonzalez, R., & Cuellar, I., (1983). The readmission and prognosis of Mexican American psychiatric inpatients. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 17, 81-94.
- Gordon, M.M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gould, S.J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: Norton.
- Graves, T. (1967). Acculturation, access and alcohol in a tri-ethnic community. *American Anthropologist*, 69, 306-321.
- Griffith, J. (1983). Relationship between acculturation and psychological impairment in adult Mexican-Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 431-459.
- Greene, R.L. (1987). Ethnicity and MMPI performance: A review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 497-512.
- Hines, A. M., & Caetano, R. (in press). Alcohol and AIDS-related sexual behavior among Hispanics: Acculturation and gender differences. *Journal of AIDS Education and Prevention*.
- Heurtin-Roberts, S., Snowden, L., R., & Miller, L. (1997). Expressions of anxiety in African Americans: Ethnography and the epidemiological catchment area studies. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 21, 337-363.
- Hocoy, D. (1996). Empirical distinctiveness between cognitive and affective elements of Ethnic identity and scales for their measurement. In H. Grad, A. Blanco, & J. Georgas (Eds.), *Key issues in cross cultural psychology* (pp. 128-137). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Hoffman, T., Dana, R.H., & Bolton, B. (1985). Measured acculturation and MMP-II68 performance of Native American adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16, 243-256.

- Holloway, J., & Vass, W.K. (1993). *The African heritage of American English*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Holmes, T. H. & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The Social Readjustment Rating Scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 11, 213-218.
- Jones, J. M. (1991). Psychological models of race: What have they been and what should they be ? In J. D. Goodchilds (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on human diversity in American* (pp. 7-46). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Joreskog, K.G., & Sorbom, D. (1986). *LISREL VI: Analysis of linear structural relationships by maximum likelihood, instrumental variables, and least squares methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Uppsula, Sweden: University of Uppsula Department of Statistics.
- Kim, J., & Mueller, C.W. (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, Series No. 07-013. Beverly Holls, CA: Sage.
- Knight, G. P., & Kagan, S. (1977). Acculturation of pro-social and competitive behaviors among second- and third-generation Mexican-American children. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 8, 273-284.
- Kochman, T. (1987). The ethnic component of Black language and culture. In J.S.
- Kosmitzki, C. (1996). The reaffirmation of cultural identity in cross-cultural encounters. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 238-248.
- Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp.219-238). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pope-Davis, D., Liu, W., Ledesma-Jones, S., Nevitt, J. (2000). African American Acculturation and Black Racial Identity : A Preliminary Investigation. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 120-134.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(3), 395-412.
- Lai, J., & Linden, W. (1993). The smile of Asia: Acculturation effects on symptom reporting. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 25, 303-313.
- Lambert, W. E., Moghaddam, F. M., Sorin, J., & Sorin, S. (1990). Assimilation versus multiculturalism: Views from a community in France. *Sociological Forum*, 5, 387-411.

- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E.A. (1992). Culture and health-related schema: Review and proposal for interdisciplinary integration. *Health Psychology*, 11, 267-276.
- Landrine, H., Klonoff, E.A., & Richardson, J.L. (1993). *Cultural diversity in the predictors of adolescent substance use*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Atlanta, GA.
- Landrine H., Richardson, J.L., Klonoff, E.A., & Flay, B. (1994). Cultural diversity in the predictors of adolescent cigarette smoking. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 17(3), 331-346.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1994). The African American Acculturation Scale: Development, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 20, 104-127.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). The Schedule of Racist Events: A measure of racial discrimination and a study of its negative physical and mental consequences. *Journal of Black psychology*, in press.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, coping and appraisal*. New York: Springer.
- Leigh, J.W., & Green, J. W. (1982). The structure of the black community: The knowledge base for social services. In J.W. Green (Ed.), *Cultural awareness in human services* (pp.94-121). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Manly, J. J., Miller, S. W., Robert, K. R., Byrd D., Reilly, J., Velasquez, R.J., & Accuzzo, D.P, (1998). The effect of African-American acculturation on neuropsychological test performance in normal and HIV-positive individuals. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 4, 291-302.
- Marin, G., Sabogal, F., Marin, B., Otero-Sabogal, R., & Perez-Stable, E.J. (1987). Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, 2, 21-34.
- Mavreas, V., Bebbington, P., & Der, G. (1989). The structure and validity of acculturation: Analysis of an acculturation scale. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 24, 233-240.
- McAdoo, H.P. (1981). *Black families*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mendoza, R. H., & Martinez, J.L. (1981). The measurement of acculturation. In A. Baron (Ed.), *Explorations in Chicano psychology* (pp.71-82). New York: Praeger.

- Moghaddam, F.M., Taylor, D.M., & Lalonde, R. N. (1987). Individualistic and collective integration strategies among Iranins in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, 22, 301-313.
- Montgomery, G.T., & Orozco, S. (1985). Mexican Americans' performance on the MMPI as a function of level of acculturation. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 41, 203-212.
- Myers, H. F. (1982). Research on the Afro-American family: A critical review. In B. A. Bass, G. E. Wyatt, & G.J. Powell (Eds.), *The Afro-American family: Assessment, treatment, and research issues* (pp.35-68). New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Neff, J. A., Hoppe, S. K., Perea, P. (1987). Acculturation and alcohol use : drinking patterns and problems among Anglo- and Mexican-American male drinkers. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 151-181.
- Negy, C., & Woods, D. J. (1992). The importance of acculturation in understanding research with Hispanic Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 224-247.
- Nobles, W. (1980). African philosophy; Foundations for Black psychology. In R. Jones (Ed.), *Black Psychology* (pp.23-36). New York: Harper & Row.
- Olmedo, E. L., & Padilla, A.M. (1978). Empirical and construct validation of a measure of acculturation for Mexican-Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 105, 179-187.
- Olmedo, E.L. (1979). Acculturation: A psychometric perspective. *American Psychologist*, 34, 1061-1070.
- Ostrowska, A., & Bochenska, D. (1996). Ethnic stereotypes among Polish and German Silesians. In H. Grad, A. Blanco, & J. Georgas (Eds.), *Key issues in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 102-113). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Seitlinger.
- Padilla, A. (1980). *Acculturation*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Pipes, W.H. (1981). Old-time religion. In H. McAdoo (Ed.), *Black families* (pp. 54-76). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ramirez, M.I. (1984). Assessing and understanding biculturalism-multiculturalism in Mexican-American adults. In J. L. Martinez (Ed.), *Chicano psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 77-94). New York: Academic Press.
- Randell-David, E. (1989). *Strategies for working with culturally diverse communities and clients*. Washington, DC: Association for the Care of Children's Health.

- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M.H. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American anthropologist*, 38, 149-152.
- Rogler, L.H., Cortes, D.E., & Malgady, R.G. (1991). Acculturation and mental health status among Hispanics: Convergence and new directions for research. *American Psychologist*, 46(6), 585-597.
- Rosenthal, D., Bell, R., Demetriou, A., & Efklides, A. (1989). From collectivism to individualism? The acculturation of Greek immigrants in Australia. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24, 57-71.
- Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (1999). *Cultural identities in transition: A comparison of two acculturation models*. Poster presented at the 107<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.
- Sabogal, F., Otero-Sabogal R., Marin, B., & Marin G. (1989). Perceived self-efficacy to avoid cigarette smoking and addiction: Differences between Hispanics and Non-Hispanics Whites. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 11, 136-147.
- Sheder, R., & LeVine, R. A. (1984). *Culture theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shore, B. (1991). Twice born, once conceived: Meaning construction and cultural cognition. *American Anthropologist*, 93, 9-27.
- Social Science Research Council Summer Seminar (1954). Acculturation: An exploratory explanation. *American Anthropologist*, 56, 973-1002.
- Sodowsky, G.R., Lai, J., & Plake, B.S. (1991). Psychometric properties of the American International Relations Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 201-215.
- Snowden, L., R., Libby, A., & Thomas, K. (1997). Health-care related attitudes and utilization among African American women. *Women's Health: Research on Gender, Behavior and Policy*, 3, 301-314.
- Snowden, L. R., & Hines, A. M.(1999). A scale to assess African American Acculturation. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 25(1), 36-47.
- Sowell, T. (1994). *Race and culture: A worldview*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stonequist, E. V. (1935). The problem of the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology*, 41, 1-12.
- Stricker, L. J., (1980). "SES" indexes: What do they measure? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 1, 91-101.

- Suinn, R.M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. *Education and Psychological Measurement*, 47, 401-402.
- Stonequist, E.V. (1937). *The marginal man: A study in personality and culture conflict*.
- Szapocznik, J., & Kurtines, W. (1980). Acculturation, biculturalism, and adjustment among Cuban Americans. In A.M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 139-159). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M.A., Kurtines, W.M., & Aranalde, M.A. (1978). Theory and measurement of acculturation. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 12, 113-130.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the psychology of inter-group relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, V. L., Hurley, E. C., & Riley, M. T. (1986). The influence of acculturation upon the adjustment of preschool Mexican-American children of single-parent families. *Family Therapy*, 13, 249-256.
- Thomas, L., & Thompson, B. (1994, November). *Perceptions of control over health: A confirmatory LISREL construct validity study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 329).
- Tinsley, H.E.A., & Tinsley, D.J. (1987). Uses of factor analysis in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34, 414-424.
- Triandis, H.C., Kashima, Y., Shimada, E., & Villareal, M. (1986). Acculturation indices as a means of confirming cultural differences. *International Journal of Psychology*, 21, 43-70.
- Ullah, P. (1987). Self-definition and psychological group formation in an ethnic minority. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 19-23.
- Van den Berghe, P.K. (1978). *Race and racism: A comparative approach*. New York: John Wiley.
- Ward, C. (1996). Before and after cross-cultural transition: A study of New Zealand volunteers on field assignments. In H. Grad, A. Blanco, & J. Georgas (Eds.), *Key issues in cross-cultural psychology* (pp.138-154). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

- Ward, C. (2001). The A, B, Cs, of Acculturation. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The Handbook of Culture & Psychology* (pp. 411-445). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wells, K. B., Golding, J.M., Hough, R.L. Burnam, M.A. & Karno, M. (1989). Acculturation and the probability of use of health services by Mexican Americans. *Health Services Research*, 24(2), 237-257.
- Wong-Reiger, D., Quintana, D. (1987). Comparative acculturation of Southeast Asian and Hispanic immigrants and sojourners. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18, 345-362.
- Wyatt, G. E. (1991). Examining ethnicity versus race in AIDS related sex research. *Social Science Medicine*, 33(1), 37-45.
- Yao, E.L. (1979). The assimilation of contemporary Chinese immigrants. *Journal of Psychology*, 101, 107-113.
- Yee, A. H., Fairchild, H.H., Weizman, F., & Wyatt, G.E. (1993). Addressing psychology's problems with race. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1132-1140.
- Zak, I. (1973). Dimensions of Jewish-American identity. *Psychological Reports*, 33, 891-900.
- Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences. *American Psychologist*, 45, 1297-1303.

**Appendix A**  
**Consent Form**  
***A Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation***

You have been asked to participate in a study pertaining to African American culture within the United States. Your participation in this study will add to the knowledge of group differences, as they exist within the African American culture. The following questions assess your feelings about your culture as well as that of the mainstream culture. No one theme is emphasized in this study, rather we are attempting to use a combination of themes to gain an understanding of African American culture as it relates to life in the United States.

Your participation in this study is strictly confidential. You will be identified by an identification number rather than your name, student identification number, or social security number.

If at any time you feel uncomfortable with the content of this study please be aware that you can discontinue at any time.

No compensation will be given for your participation in this study.

It is estimated that the time required to complete the study is estimated to be from 30-45 minutes.

If you have any questions regarding this study please feel free to contact the investigator, Aisha Smith by phone: (517)-353-9925, email: [smithaisha@hotmail.com](mailto:smithaisha@hotmail.com), or regular mail: 135 Snyder Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824. If you have questions or concerns regarding your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact-anonymously, if you wish-Ashir Kumar, M.D., Chair of the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) by phone: (517)355-2180, fax: (517) 432-4503, email: [ucrihs@msu.edu](mailto:ucrihs@msu.edu), or regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

If you are comfortable with your participation in the study please sign at the bottom of this page, if not please turn the unsigned consent form in to the researcher.

Thank you for your participation!

*Your signature below indicates your voluntary agreement to participate in this study.*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix B**  
**Demographic Sheet**

**Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation**

For these questions please fill in or circle the appropriate information.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ What is your present age?
2. What is your gender ?
  1. Male
  2. Female
3. \_\_\_\_\_ What state have you lived the majority of your adult life in?
4. What is your marital status?
  1. Never married
  2. Married
  3. Divorced
  4. Widowed
  5. Cohabiting
  6. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Indicate the highest level of education you received:
  1. 8<sup>th</sup> grade or Less
  2. Some High School
  3. High School Graduate
  4. Some College/Vocational Training
  5. College Graduate
  6. Graduate School
6. Which of the following best describes your current annual (yearly) income?
  1. Less than \$14,000
  2. \$14,000 - \$24,999
  3. \$25,000 - \$34,999
  4. \$35,000 - \$44,999
  5. \$45,000 - \$54,999
  6. \$55,000 – and Higher
7. What do you consider your racial or ethnic background to be?
  1. African American
  2. White American
  3. Hispanic American

- 4. Native American
- 5. Other \_\_\_\_\_

***(If you identify with any racial background other than African American please inform the researcher at this time).***

- 8. What is the ethnicity (race) of your neighbors on your left hand side?
  - 1. African American
  - 2. White American
  - 3. Hispanic American
  - 4. Asian American
  - 5. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  - 6. You are not sure of your neighbor's race.
  
- 9. What is the ethnicity (race) of your neighbors on your right hand side?
  - 1. African American
  - 2. White American
  - 3. Hispanic American
  - 4. Asian American
  - 5. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  - 6. You are not sure of your neighbor's race.
  
- 10. What is the majority racial group represented by the individuals living on your street?
  - 1. Mostly African American Street
  - 2. Mostly White American Street
  - 3. Ethnically Mixed Street (street representing a variety of racial groups)

***For the following questions please use the given choices. Circle the answer that is most appropriate.***

None 1	Less Than Half 2	About Half 3	More Than Half 4	All 5
-----------	---------------------	-----------------	---------------------	----------

11. How many of your friends are African American?	1	2	3	4	5
12. How many of your friends are White American?	1	2	3	4	5
13. How many of your best-friends are African American?	1	2	3	4	5
14. How many of your best-friends are White American?	1	2	3	4	5

## Appendix C

The following section asks questions pertaining to your participation in religious or spiritual activity.

For each one please tell me whether you do the following: never, rarely, usually, often or always.

Never 1	Rarely 2	Usually 3	Often 4	Always 5
------------	-------------	--------------	------------	-------------

a. How often do you usually attend religious services?	1	2	3	4	5
b. Do you belong to or participate in church clubs or organizations?	1	2	3	4	5
c. Besides regular service, how often do you take part in other activities at your place of worship?	1	2	3	4	5
d. How often do you read religious books or other religious materials?	1	2	3	4	5
e. How often do you watch or listen to religious programs on TV or radio?	1	2	3	4	5
f. How often do you pray?	1	2	3	4	5
g. How often do you ask someone to pray for you?	1	2	3	4	5
h. How religious would you say you are?	1	2	3	4	5
i. When you were growing up how often was religion talked about in your home?	1	2	3	4	5

**Appendix D**  
**Multidimensional Measure of African American Acculturation**

The following questions assess your feelings about your culture as well as that of other cultures. No one theme is emphasized in this study, rather we are attempting to use a combination of themes to gain an understanding of African American culture as it relates to life in the United States. In this section we are interested in your cultural beliefs.

Please choose the answer that best describes how often you do or feel each statement. Please try to answer all questions, but if any one question makes you uncomfortable please feel free to skip to the next item.

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

1. If I had a problem, I would discuss it with a family member or a close personal friend.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I consider my parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins all to be a part of my immediate family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I like reading books that are written by White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I am married to/would marry a White American.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I have difficulty identifying with the culture of African American people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I feel uncomfortable around African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I like listening to music that is created by White American artists.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I believe that older African Americans are wise.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I like to work with White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I believe that I should not be held responsible for the problems of my family members.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I like to date other African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I have changed my lifestyle to fit my beliefs about White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I believe that African Americans use racism as an excuse for their failures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I like/would like for my children to attend school with mostly White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I celebrate Kwanzaa.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. I believe prayer "changes things."	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I would rearrange my life to accommodate an aging family member.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I feel uncomfortable around White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6

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

19. I only consider my parents and siblings as a part of my immediate family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I feel annoyed when other people do better than me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. My successes can be attributed to the contributions of my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. I believe in miracles.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I believe that disciplining children, stifles their creative expression.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. I enjoy being part of a group.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I like going to movies or seeing plays that have an African American cast.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I find it hard to trust most White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I believe that God was created to help people not fear death.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I participate in July 4 <sup>th</sup> activities (marches, picnics, festivals, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I would sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I celebrate St. Patrick's Day.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I believe that it is disrespectful for a child to interrupt an adults' conversation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. I keep my personal life private from my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. I feel that some African Americans are just as racist as Whites.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. I like reading books that are written by African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. I believe that my happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. I take pride in the accomplishments of other African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. My successes are attributed mainly to my own abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. I believe that religion can help me solve my problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I would rather place an aging family member in a nursing home, rather than keeping them in my home.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. I believe that education, not age, is a measure of wisdom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. I am more concerned with my status in life (i.e. educational, financial, social) rather than the accomplishments of other African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. I believe that a child should be free to speak whenever they have something to add to the conversation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. There is no one force in control of the things going on in the world.	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. I would rather be on my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. I pray before I make a major life decision.						
46. I believe that I have my own, and it is up to others to get theirs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
47. I believe that "time out" is a sufficient method for disciplining a child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. I feel pride in the successes of other African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6

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

49. I identify with the African American culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. I believe that White people are intellectually superior to African Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6
51. I believe in the existence of a Supreme Force.	1	2	3	4	5	6
52. I believe that if I work hard I can improve my status in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
53. In this country, all African Americans regardless of income or education are affected by racism.	1	2	3	4	5	6
54. I believe that African American parents should surround their children with Black art, music, and literature.	1	2	3	4	5	6
55. I believe that religion provides personal closeness with God.	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. I believe that I am responsible for creating my own meaning and purpose in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. If a family member were in need, it would be up to them to deal with it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. I believe that because of racial differences, African Americans and White Americans cannot live in harmony.	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. The person I respect the most is an African American.	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. I believe that science can explain life's deepest mysteries.	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. If a family member were in need, I would help within my means.	1	2	3	4	5	6
63. I believe that if a child is misbehaving, there is nothing wrong with whipping/spanking them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
64. I believe that if I have a problem it can be solved through prayer.						
65. I am married to/would marry another African American.	1	2	3	4	5	6
66. I believe that African Americans are just as intellectually capable as White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
67. I believe that if I work hard I can improve my family's status in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
68. I share my personal life with my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
69. The African American culture is no different than any other culture within this country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
70. I believe that African Americans and White Americans are currently living harmoniously.	1	2	3	4	5	6
71. I have changed my lifestyle to fit my beliefs about Blacks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
72. I believe that African Americans continue to use past injustices as an excuse for their current failures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
73. The person I respect the most is an White American.	1	2	3	4	5	6
74. I enjoy social settings exclusive to mostly White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
75. I feel obligated to assist my family members.	1	2	3	4	5	6
76. I like to work with other African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
77. I like/would like for my children to attend school with mostly African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6

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

78. I feel that African Americans are not capable of being racist.	1	2	3	4	5	6
79. I participate in Juneteenth Day activities (i.e. marches, picnics, festivals etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6
80. I believe that the sharing of resources to others less fortunate is important.	1	2	3	4	5	6
81. I enjoy social settings exclusive to mostly African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
82. What I want is more important than the desires of anyone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6
83. I prefer to date White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
84. I believe that we are responsible for our own destiny.	1	2	3	4	5	6
85. I think that African American culture is comprised of certain elements that give individuals strength to withstand certain hardships.	1	2	3	4	5	6
86. I find it hard to trust most African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
87. I believe in the values of White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
88. I believe that African American parents should surround their children with White/traditional art, music, and literature.	1	2	3	4	5	6
89. I believe that I am the only person who can solve my problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
90. I believe that White Americans should feel guilty about the way their ancestors have treated African Americans in the past.	1	2	3	4	5	6
91. I like going to movies or seeing plays that have a White American cast.	1	2	3	4	5	6
92. Regardless of their interests, educational background and social achievements I like to be friends with other African Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
93. I like listening to music that is created by African American artists.	1	2	3	4	5	6
94. I believe in the values of African American culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6
95. Regardless of their interests, educational background and social achievements I like to be friends with White Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6
96. I believe that I should live my life independently of others	1	2	3	4	5	6
97. I believe that if a child is not whipped/spanked with misbehaving, they will only continue to misbehave.	1	2	3	4	5	6
98. I believe that if I have a problem the best resolution is to work it out myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6

## Appendix E

### White American Behavior Scale

23. I believe that disciplining children, stifles their creative expression.
27. I believe that God was created to help people not fear death.
28. I participate in July 4<sup>th</sup> activities (marches, picnics, festivals, etc.).
32. I believe that it is disrespectful for a child to interrupt an adults' conversation.
37. My successes are attributed mainly to my own abilities.
40. I believe that education, not age, is a measure of wisdom.
41. I am more concerned with my status in life (i.e. educational, financial, social) rather than the accomplishments of other African Americans.
43. There is no one force in control of the things going on in the world.
44. I would rather be on my own.
46. I believe that I have my own, and it is up to others to get theirs.
56. I believe that I am responsible for creating my own meaning and purpose in life.
58. If a family member were in need, it would be up to them to deal with it.
61. I believe that science can explain life's deepest mysteries.
82. What I want is more important than the desires of anyone else.
84. I believe that we are responsible for our own destiny.
89. I believe that I am the only person who can solve my problems.
96. I believe that I should live my life independently of others.
98. I believe that if I have a problem the best resolution is to work it out myself

## Appendix F

### African American Behavior

1. If I had a problem, I would discuss it with a family member or a close personal friend.
2. I consider my parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins all to be a part of my immediate family.
8. I believe that older African Americans are wise.
16. I believe prayer "changes things".
17. I would rearrange my life to accommodate an aging family member.
21. My successes can be attributed to the contributions of my family.
22. I believe in miracles.
24. I enjoy being part of a group.
29. I would sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my family.
31. I believe that it is disrespectful for a child to interrupt an adults' conversation.
36. I take pride in the accomplishments of other African Americans.
38. I believe that religion can help me solve my problems.
45. I pray before I make a major life decision.
48. I feel pride in the successes of other African Americans.
55. I believe that religion provides personal closeness with God.
62. If a family member were in need, I would help within my means.
63. I believe that if a child is misbehaving, there is nothing wrong with whipping/spanking them.
64. I believe that if a problem it can be solved through prayer.
67. I believe that I work hard I can improve my family's status in life.
68. I share my personal life with my family.
75. I feel obligated to assist my family.
80. I believe that the sharing of resources to others less fortunate is important.

## Appendix G

### White American Intra-racial/Interracial Attitudes

- 50. I believe that White people are intellectually superior to African Americans
- 69. The African American culture is no different than any other culture within this country.
- 70. I believe that African Americans and White Americans are currently living harmoniously.
- 72. I believe that African Americans continue to use past injustices as an excuse for their current failures.
- 73. The person I respect the most is a White American.
- 86. I find it hard to trust most African Americans.
- 87. I believe in the values of White Americans.
- 88. I believe that African American parents should surround their children with White/traditional art, music, and literature.

## Appendix H

### African American Preference Scale

11. I like to date other African Americans.
25. I like going to movies or seeing plays that have an African American cast.
34. I like reading books that are written by African Americans.
65. I am married to/would marry another African American.
76. I like to work with other African Americans.
77. I like/would like for my children to attend school with mostly African Americans.
81. I enjoy social settings exclusive to mostly African Americans.
92. Regardless of their interests, educational background and social achievements I like to be friends with other African Americans.

## Appendix I

### White American Preference Scale

3. I like reading books that are written by White Americans.
4. I am married to/ would marry a White American.
7. I like listening to music that is created by White American artists.
9. I like to work with White Americans.
14. I like/would like for my children to attend school with mostly White Americans.
74. I enjoy social settings exclusive to mostly White Americans.
83. I prefer to date White Americans.
91. I like going to movies or seeing plays that have a White American cast.
95. Regardless of their interests, educational background and social achievements I like to be friends with White Americans.

**Table 1: Demographic Information of Participants**

---

	Number	Percentage
Mean Age	25	
Gender		
Male	73	27%
Female	193	73%
Race		
African American	266	100%
Level of Education		
8 <sup>th</sup> grade or less	1	.4%
Some High School	1	.8%
High School Graduate	56	21%
Some College/Vocational	133	50%
College Graduate	35	13%
Graduate School	40	16%
Income		
Less than \$14,000	154	58%
\$14,000 - \$24,999	42	16%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	29	11%
\$35,000 - \$44,999	16	6%
\$45,000 - \$54,999	8	3%
\$55,000 – and Higher	17	6%
Marital Status		
Never Married	211	79%
Married	35	13%
Divorced	11	4%
Widowed	3	1%
Cohabiting	6	2%

Table 2

*Behavioral Component: Varimax Rotated Component Matrix – 2 Components White American and African American*

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
White American Behavior	6.487	12.014	12.014
African American Behavior	4.799	8.888	20.901

  

Scale Items	White American Behavior	African American Behavior	h
N1. If I had a problem I would discuss it with a family member or a close personal friend.	-.00	<b>.36</b>	.13
N2. I consider my parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins all to be a part of my immediate family.	.00	<b>.30</b>	.10
N8. I believe that older African Americans are wise.	.00	<b>.34</b>	.12
N10. I believe that I should not be held responsible for the problems of my family.	.15	-.00	.02
N15. I celebrate Kwanzaa.	-.17	.11	.04
N16. I believe prayer “changes things”.	-.25	<b>.34</b>	.18
N17. I would rearrange my life to accommodate an aging family member.	-.22	<b>.39</b>	.20
N19. I only consider my parents and siblings as a part of my immediate family.	.13	-.00	.01
N20. I feel annoyed when other people do better than me.	.26	-.13	.08
N21. My successes can be attributed to the contributions of my family.	.00	<b>.31</b>	.10
N22. I believe in miracles.	-.27	<b>.43</b>	.26
N23. I believe that disciplining children, stifles their creative expression.	<b>.41</b>	-.00	.17
N24. I enjoy being part of a group.	.00	<b>.38</b>	.15
N27. I believe that God was created to help people not fear death.	<b>.33</b>	.23	.16
N28. I participate in July 4 <sup>th</sup> activities.	<b>.31</b>	.21	.14
N29. I would sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my family.	-.00	<b>.33</b>	.11
N30. I keep my personal life private from my family.	.20	-.11	.05
N31. I believe that it is disrespectful for a child to interrupt an adults’ conversation.	.11	<b>.38</b>	.16
N32. I celebrate St. Patrick’s Day.	<b>.36</b>	.00	.13
N35. I believe that my happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.	.27	.00	.07
N36. I take pride in the accomplishments of other African Americans.	-.00	<b>.63</b>	.40

N37.	My successes are attributed mainly to my own ability.	<b>.67</b>	.00	.45
N38.	I believe that religion can help me solve my problems.	-.14	<b>.54</b>	.31
N39.	I would rather place an aging family member in a nursing home, rather than keeping them in my home.	.23	-.22	.10
N40.	I believe education, not age, is a measure of wisdom.	<b>.45</b>	.00	.20
N41.	I am more concerned with my status in life rather than the accomplishments of other African Americans.	<b>.51</b>	-.00	.27
N42.	I believe that a child should be free to speak whenever they have something to add to the conversation.	.20	-.00	.04
N43.	There is no one force in control of the things going on in the world.	<b>.58</b>	-.18	.33
N44.	I would rather be on my own.	<b>.35</b>	-.00	.12
N45.	I pray before I make a major life decision.	-.16	<b>.61</b>	.40
N46.	I believe that I have my own, and it is up to others to get theirs.	<b>.58</b>	-.16	.36
N47.	I believe that time out is a sufficient method for disciplining a child.	.29	.15	.11
N48.	I feel pride in the successes of other African Americans.	-.00	<b>.59</b>	.35
N51.	I believe in the existence of a Supreme Force.	-.38	.14	.16
N52.	I believe that if I work hard I can improve my status in life.	.00	.54	.30
N55.	I believe that religion provides personal closeness with God.	.00	<b>.51</b>	.26
N56.	I believe that I am responsible for creating my own meaning purpose in life.	.62	.22	.43
N57.	I look at the pros and cons of a situation before making a major life decision.	.00	.51	.26
N58.	If a family member were in need, it would be up to them to deal with it.	<b>.40</b>	-.13	.17
N61.	I believe that science can explain life's deepest mysteries.	<b>.54</b>	-.11	.30
N62.	If a family member were in need, I would help within my means.	-.00	<b>.57</b>	.32
N63.	I believe that if a child is misbehaving, there is nothing wrong with spanking/whipping them.	.00	.41	.17
N64.	I believe that if I have a problem it can be solved through prayer.	-.27	<b>.63</b>	.47
N67.	I believe that if I work hard I can improve my family's status in life.	.00	<b>.58</b>	.33
N68.	I share my personal life with my family.	-.00	<b>.35</b>	.13
N75.	I feel obligated to assist my family members.	-.00	<b>.38</b>	.15
N79.	I participate in Juneteenth Day activities.	.00	.00	.01
N80.	I believe that the sharing of resources to others less fortunate is important.	-.24	<b>.40</b>	.22
N82.	What I want is more important than the desires of anyone else.	<b>.54</b>	-.15	.32
N84.	I believe that we are responsible for our own destiny.	<b>.54</b>	.19	.32
N89.	I believe that I am the only person who can solve my problems.	<b>.64</b>	-.11	.41

N96.	I believe that I should live my life independently of others.	<b>.49</b>	.00	.24
N97.	I believe that if a child is not whipped/spanked while misbehaving, they will only continue to misbehave.	<b>.32</b>	.13	.17
N98.	I believe that if I have a problem the best resolution is to work it out myself.	<b>.63</b>	-.00	.42

Component one = White American behavioral items  
Component two = African American behavioral items

Table 3

---

*Reliability Analysis of Behavioral Components*

---

White American Reliability Analysis

Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean If Item Deleted	Scale Variance If Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
MMAA23	61.00	162.13	.32	.17	.80
MMAA27	62.38	161.05	.27	.20	.80
MMAA28	63.04	165.63	.25	.20	.80
MMAA30	61.19	160.92	.33	.22	.80
MMAA32	62.13	168.97	.18	.13	.81
MMAA40	62.19	161.94	.36	.20	.79
MMAA41	62.34	161.74	.41	.28	.79
MMAA43	61.33	153.71	.49	.31	.79
MMAA44	62.00	164.27	.28	.17	.80
MMAA46	61.83	157.38	.48	.34	.79
MMAA56	63.16	155.79	.50	.37	.79
MMAA58	61.16	163.73	.31	.20	.80
MMAA61	61.42	159.43	.44	.23	.80
MMAA82	61.69	160.98	.43	.27	.79
MMAA84	62.91	158.93	.45	.37	.79
MMAA89	61.38	154.83	.53	.43	.78
MMAA96	62.18	159.43	.43	.24	.79
MMAA98	62.19	157.35	.52	.41	.79

Reliability Coefficients 18 items

Alpha = .80      Standardized item alpha = .81

Table 4

---

*Reliability Analysis of Behavioral Component*


---

African American Behavior component Reliability Analysis

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
MMAA1	104.61	124.96	.33	.28	.81
MMAA2	105.02	124.17	.24	.14	.81
MMAA8	104.98	125.26	.30	.18	.81
MMAA16	104.38	127.39	.30	.33	.81
MMAA17	105.01	124.99	.34	.21	.81
MMAA21	105.20	125.49	.28	.16	.81
MMAA22	104.57	124.03	.40	.29	.80
MMAA24	105.23	124.95	.30	.17	.81
MMAA29	105.32	124.14	.30	.21	.81
MMAA31	105.09	124.97	.28	.19	.81
MMAA36	104.59	123.38	.52	.49	.80
MMAA38	104.79	121.93	.44	.50	.80
MMAA45	104.90	119.13	.53	.51	.80
MMAA48	104.74	123.61	.46	.46	.80
MMAA55	104.61	123.30	.38	.41	.80
MMAA62	104.69	123.80	.48	.35	.80
MMAA63	104.76	126.12	.31	.24	.81
MMAA64	104.71	120.84	.54	.59	.81
MMAA67	104.91	122.32	.43	.35	.80
MMAA68	105.82	122.91	.31	.23	.81
MMAA75	105.53	123.41	.33	.23	.81
MMAA80	105.01	124.89	.33	.24	.81

Reliability Coefficients 22 items

Alpha = .81      Standardized item alpha = .82

Table 5

*Cognitive Component: Varimax Rotated Component Matrix – 2 Components White American Preference and African American Preference*

<b>Component</b>	<b>Eigenvalue</b>	<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
African American Preference	3.760	22.115	22.115
White American Preference	2.713	15.960	38.075

<b>Scale Items</b>		<b>African American Preference</b>	<b>White American Preference</b>	<b>h</b>
N3.	I like reading books that are written by White Americans.	<b>.45</b>	<b>.63</b>	<b>.59</b>
N4.	I am married to/would marry a White American.	<b>-.30</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.43</b>
N7.	I like listening to music that is created by White American artists.	<b>-.00</b>	<b>.51</b>	<b>.27</b>
N9.	I like to work with White Americans.	<b>.19</b>	<b>.60</b>	<b>.39</b>
N11.	I like to date African Americans.	<b>.57</b>	<b>-.00</b>	<b>.34</b>
N14.	I like/would like for my children to attend school with mostly White Americans.	<b>-.10</b>	<b>.48</b>	<b>.24</b>
N25.	I like going to movies or seeing plays that have an African American cast.	<b>.63</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.42</b>
N34.	I like reading books that are written by African Americans.	<b>.60</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.38</b>
N65.	I am married to/would marry another African American.	<b>.65</b>	<b>-.11</b>	<b>.43</b>
N74.	I enjoy social settings exclusive to mostly White Americans.	<b>-.26</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.43</b>
N76.	I like to work with other African Americans.	<b>.54</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.30</b>
N77.	I like/would like for my children to attend school with mostly African American children.	<b>.50</b>	<b>-.20</b>	<b>.29</b>
N81.	I enjoy social settings exclusive to mostly African Americans.	<b>.54</b>	<b>-.17</b>	<b>.32</b>
N83.	I prefer to date White Americans.	<b>-.43</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.41</b>
N91.	I like going to movies or seeing plays that have a White American cast.	<b>.18</b>	<b>.55</b>	<b>.34</b>
N92.	Regardless of their interests, educational background and social achievements I like to be friends with other African Americans.	<b>.55</b>	<b>.24</b>	<b>.37</b>
N93.	I like listening to music that is created by African American artists.	<b>.72</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>.53</b>
N95.	Regardless of their interests, educational background and social achievements I like to be friends with White Americans.	<b>.02</b>	<b>.60</b>	<b>.35</b>

Table 6

---

*Reliability analysis of Cognitive Component*

---

White American Preference Component Reliability Analysis

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
MMAA3	24.49	35.98	.44	.23	.69
MMAA4	25.94	28.37	.44	.28	.66
MMAA7	24.79	30.27	.35	.16	.68
MMAA9	24.50	30.94	.40	.27	.67
MMAA14	25.86	32.25	.31	.11	.67
MMAA74	26.18	29.91	.45	.30	.66
MMAA83	26.46	31.21	.34	.35	.68
MMAA91	24.61	31.01	.37	.24	.67
MMAA95	24.58	30.06	.39	.19	.67

Reliability Coefficients 9 items

Alpha = .70      Standardized item alpha = .73

Table 7

---

*Reliability analysis of Cognitive Component*

---

African American Preference Component Reliability Analysis

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
MMAA11	39.51	28.05	.43	.23	.75
MMAA25	39.59	28.95	.47	.27	.75
MMAA34	39.79	27.99	.44	.28	.75
MMAA65	39.54	28.10	.45	.32	.75
MMAA76	40.09	29.00	.42	.19	.75
MMAA77	40.79	27.61	.41	.28	.76
MMAA81	40.53	26.65	.44	.27	.75
MMAA92	40.30	27.35	.42	.26	.75
MMAA93	39.71	27.30	.59	.40	.73

Reliability Coefficients 9 items

Alpha = .77      Standardized item alpha = .78

Table 8

*Affective Component: Varimax Rotated Component Matrix – 2 Components White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude and African American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude*

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
White American Attitude	4.017	15.451	15.451
African American Attitude	2.391	9.196	24.647

Scale Items	White American Attitude	African American Attitude	h2
N5. I have difficulty identifying with the culture of African American people.	.21	-.00	.05
N6. I feel uncomfortable around African Americans.	.25	-.00	.06
N12. I have changed my lifestyle to fit my beliefs about White Americans.	.19	.00	.04
N13. I believe that African Americans use racism as an excuse for their failures.	.25	-.51	.32
N18. I feel uncomfortable around White Americans.	.24	.18	.01
N33. I feel that some African Americans are just as racist as Whites.	-.11	-.42	.19
N26. I find it hard to trust most White Americans.	-.11	<b>.50</b>	.26
N49. I identify with the African American culture.	-.48	.17	.26
N50. I believe that White people are intellectually superior to African Americans.	<b>.63</b>	.18	.44
N53. In this country, all African Americans regardless of income or education are affected by racism.	-.36	<b>.39</b>	.28
N54. I believe that African American parents should surround their children with Black art, music, and literature.	-.31	<b>.46</b>	.31
N59. I believe that because of racial differences, African Americans and White Americans can not live in harmony.	.31	<b>.45</b>	.30
N60. The person I respect the most is an African American.	-.42	.27	.26
N66. I believe that African Americans are just as intellectually capable as White Americans.	-.56	-.00	.34
N69. The African American culture is no different than any other culture within this country.	<b>.43</b>	-.00	.18
N70. I believe that African Americans and White Americans are currently living harmoniously.	<b>.50</b>	-.00	.25
N71. I have changed my lifestyle to fit my beliefs about African Americans.	.19	<b>.31</b>	.13
N72. I believe that African Americans continue to use past injustices as an excuse for their current failures.	<b>.31</b>	-.49	.33
N73. The person I respect the most is a White American.	<b>.72</b>	.00	.52

N78.	I feel that African Americans are not capable of being racist.	.35	<b>.56</b>	.43
N85.	I think that the African American culture is comprised of certain elements that give individuals strength to withstand certain hardships.	-.33	<b>.32</b>	.21
N86.	I find it hard to trust most African Americans.	<b>.43</b>	.00	.18
N87.	I believe in the values of White Americans.	<b>.53</b>	-.00	.29
N88.	I believe that African American parents should surround their children with White/traditional art, music and literature.	<b>.45</b>	-.00	.21
N90.	I believe that White Americans should feel guilty about the way their ancestors have treated African Americans in the past.	.00	<b>.46</b>	.22
N94.	I believe in the values of the African American culture.	-.41	<b>.31</b>	.26

Table 9

---

*Reliability analysis of Affective Component*

---

African American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude Component Reliability Analysis

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
MMAA26	31.04	26.59	.30	.14	.53
MMAA53	29.00	27.18	.34	.20	.52
MMAA54	29.55	26.40	.35	.26	.52
MMAA59	31.60	26.48	.25	.16	.55
MMAA71	31.29	28.81	.13	.03	.58
MMAA78	31.89	26.38	.20	.14	.56
MMAA85	29.29	28.02	.28	.26	.54
MMAA90	31.04	26.08	.29	.11	.53
MMAA94	28.99	29.03	.26	.25	.54

Reliability Coefficients 9 items

Alpha = .57      Standardized item alpha = .59

Table 10

*Reliability analysis of Affective Component*

---

White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude Component Reliability Analysis

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
MMAA50	19.09	31.56	.44	.23	.67
MMAA69	17.68	29.79	.34	.22	.69
MMAA70	18.02	30.45	.46	.30	.66
MMAA73	18.84	30.76	.49	.31	.66
MMAA86	17.97	33.04	.33	.16	.69
MMAA87	18.04	31.09	.45	.28	.67
MMAA88	17.98	31.15	.39	.23	.68
MMAA72	17.33	31.79	.31	.13	.70

Reliability Coefficients 8 items

Alpha = .71      Standardized item alpha = .72

Table 11

*Intercorrelations between all subscales*

	African American Behavior	White American Behavior	White American Interracial	African American Preference	White American Preference
African American Behavior	1	-.14*	-.18*	.51**	.10
Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.02	.00	.00	.11
N	266	266	266	266	266
White American Behavior	-.14*	1	.53**	-.04	.25**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.02	.	.	.55	.00
N	266	266	266	266	266
White American Interracial Attitude	-.18*	.53**	1	-.28**	.39**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.	.	.00	.00
N	266	266	266	266	266
African American Preference	.51**	-.04	-.28**	1	-.06
Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.55	.00	.	.33
N	266	266	266	266	266
White American Preference	.10	.25**	.39**	-.06	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.11	.00	.00	.33	.
N	266	266	266	266	266

**Table 12**

*Correlations between all scales and measures of validity*

	African American Behavior	White American Behavior	White American Interracial Attitude	African American Preference	White American Preference
<b>Black Friends</b>					
Correlation	.11	.03	-.04	.27**	-.22**
Sig.	.07	.61	.52	.00	.00
N	266	266	266	266	266
<b>White Friends</b>					
Correlation	-.06	.11	.07	-.19**	.32**
Sig.	.37	.86	.28	.00	.00
N	266	266	266	266	266
<b>Income</b>					
Correlation	.11	-.23**	.02	.02	-.09
Sig.	.09	.00	.77	.77	.17
N	266	266	266	266	266
<b>Spirituality</b>					
Correlation	.46**	-.14*	.03	.03	.08
Sig.	.00	.02	.62	.62	.20
N	266	266	266	266	266

**Table 13**

***Rational for Multidirectional Scales***

	African American Preference Vs. White American Preference	African American Behavior Vs. White American Behavior
African American Behavior	Statistically & Conceptually	
White American Behavior	Statistically & Conceptually	
White American Interracial/Intra-racial Attitude	Statistically & Conceptually	Statistically & Conceptually
African American Preference		Statistically & Conceptually
White American Preference		Statistically & Conceptually
Black Friends	Statistically Different Only	No differences
White Friends	Statistically Different Only	No differences
Income	No differences	Statistically & Conceptually
Spirit	No differences	Statistically & Conceptually

**Table 14**

***Rationale for Multidimensional Scales***

	African American Behavior Vs. African American Preference	White American Behavior Vs. White American Preference	White American Behavior Vs. White American Interracial/ Intra-racial Attitude	White American Preference Vs. White American Attitude
Black Friends	Statically & Conceptually	Statically & Conceptually		Statistically Different Only
White Friends	Statically & Conceptually	Statically & Conceptually		Statistically Different Only
Income	No differences	Statically & Conceptually	Statically & Conceptually	
Religion/ Spirit	Statically & Conceptually	Statically & Conceptually	Statically & Conceptually	

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02461 4517