

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

A GLANCE WITHIN THE COLOR LINES OF THE 21ST CENTURY:
EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN ETHNIC AND RACIAL SELF-CONCEPTS WITHIN THE
BLACK RACE

WILLIAM OKRAFO-SMART
SPRING 2019

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Psychology and Global & International Studies
with honors in Psychology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Pamela M. Cole
Liberal Arts Professor of Psychology and
Human Development and Family Studies
Thesis Supervisor

Richard A. Carlson
Associate Head and Professor of Psychology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

The dominant discourse of race relations often views Black people as a monolithic group. This view veils varied experiences and perceptions that may exist among ethnic sub-groups within the Black Race. This thesis sought to challenge this view by exploring potential differences in self-concept between Black American Non-Immigrants and Black Immigrants/Descendants. To investigate this possibility, a survey of college students and college graduates who identified as Black was conducted in which participants were queried about their ethnic identification and racial identification concurrently. Findings indicated that there are differences in the extent to which Black American Non-Immigrants and Black Immigrants/Descendants endorse agreement with certain aspects of ethnic identity, but do not differ on other aspects of ethnic identity and do not differ on aspects of racial identity development. The participants appeared to have strong racial identities, based on Cross' model of internalized racial identity, but Black American Non-Immigrants appeared to have a somewhat lower sense of an achieved ethnic identity relative to Black Immigrants/Descendants. The thesis findings are discussed in terms of the need for more nuanced analyses of variations among Black individuals, limitations of the study, and future directions for the study of intra-racial group ethnic identity.

Key Words: Race, Ethnicity, Black, Identity, Immigrant, African, Caribbean, Black American

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Race and Ethnicity: Defining Within-Race	4
Within-Race Scholarship	8
Black Immigration Scholarship	10
Black American Self-Concept Scholarship	11
Ethnic and Racial Identity Models	13
The Present Study	17
Chapter 2 Methods	19
Participants	19
Procedure	20
Demographics Section	21
Ethnic Identity Section	21
Racial Identity Section	22
Chapter 3 Results	23
Ethnic Identity	23
Racial Identity	25
Chapter 4 Discussion	31
Overview of Within Race Differences	31
Ethnic Identity Findings	33
Racial Identity Findings	35
Study Limitations and Future Directions	37
Chapter 5 Conclusion	40
Appendix A Demographics Questionnaire	43
Appendix B Ethnic Identity Items	46
Appendix C Racial Identity Items	47
References	49

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Ethnic Identity Items</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Pre-Encounter Stage of Racial Identity Items</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Immersion-Emersion Stage of Racial Identity Items</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Internalization Stage of Racial Identity Items</i>	<i>30</i>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There was a point where the completion of this thesis only seemed like a dream. Now that it is complete, I must acknowledge that I could not have done it alone. There were many people who all helped make this dream a reality, all of whom deserve thanks.

I would like to begin by thanking Dr. Pamela Cole, my advisor, mentor, and professor over the past year and a half. Had it not been for her guidance I would not have completed this project. She truly pushed me, hard, to develop invaluable research virtues and to discover my inner scientist. More importantly, throughout this process she has provided invaluable support in forms of dedication, patience, wisdom, affirmations, and friendship. I am forever thankful she agreed to work with me. Secondly, I would like to thank Dr. Richard Carlson, for taking the time to read and review this thesis for approval. And of course, I would also like to thank those who volunteered for this study, your participation was essential to findings contained in this thesis.

In regards to my loved ones, family and friends, I decided to forgo naming names because I would not be able to honor everyone who has had a meaningful impact on my life. With that said, I would like to thank my mother, brother, girlfriend, close friends, mentors and teachers, and co-workers and friends from my organizations and internship experiences for their unyielding support and dedication to my success. These individuals inspired me, taught me much about life, the pursuit of truth, and pushed me to actualize the potential that lived within. When the darkness of doubt consumed me, they believed that I would make it to the light, even when I could not see this for myself. This thesis, perhaps the completion of my undergraduate career, would not have been possible had it not been for their contributions of time, affection, patience, and love to my life. So, from the bottom of my heart, I thank you all.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Eibach and Keegan (2006) hail W.E.B. Dubois' prediction—that the problem of the color line would be *the* problem of the 20th century—as one of the most prophetic statements ever made by a social scientist. The color line referred to the hierarchical division of individuals into distinct racial categories with differential levels of entitlement and treatment in accordance with the system of racism (Banton, 2012; Du Bois, 1900; Nelson, 2009). In the U.S, Whites were on the top, as the beneficiaries, and Blacks were on the bottom, as those oppressed by the system of racism which included the legalization of racial segregation as represented by Jim Crow laws. Du Bois (1900) foresaw racism dominating the U.S socio-political atmosphere contending it would no longer be tolerated as Blacks continued to fight to ensure their human rights and demand racial justice. His prediction was confirmed by public protests against racial injustice (e.g., the March on Washington in 1963), landmark racial legislation (e.g., Brown v. Board of Education in 1954 and the Civil Rights Acts of 1964), and escalated racial tensions (e.g., riots in the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles in 1965) from that era which are remembered for defining a large part of 20th century U.S history.

As the United States of America entered the 21st century, the color line remained a salient social divide as the issue of U.S racism remained unresolved. In 2019, racial injustice persisted on a broad scale in the form of racialized prejudice, police brutality, and institutionalized oppression (Brunson, 2007; Hicken, Kravitz-Wirtz, Durkee, & Jackson, 2018; Kochhar & Fry, 2014; Kuebler, 2013; Pearson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2009; Pettit & Gutierrez, 2018). Du Bois'

(1900) prophecy from over 100 years earlier still rang true as most Americans acknowledged the color line as a major issue plaguing society in the 21st century (Arenge, Perry, & Clark, 2018; Pew Research Center, 2017).

The persistence of racism and discrimination has prompted many scientific investigations on racism, inter-racial group differences, and on the causes and effects of these phenomena. However, research on racial differences has historically focused on the White-Black color line in an attempt to unpack the system of racism and capture its effects on members of the White and Black races (Bonilla-Silva, 2004; Feagin, 2000). As the composition of the U.S became increasingly multiracial and multiethnic, research broadened beyond White-Black differences and began to cast light on historically overlooked racial/ethnic groups such as Latinx and Asians (Lee & Bean, 2007; Marrow, 2009; Perez & Hirschman, 2009). New models of the color line, such as Black/Non-Black and the Tripartite models, developed to more adequately conceptualize the U.S. racial hierarchy and its differential impacts on the lived experiences of increasing populations of Latinx and Asians immigrants and their descendants (Banton, 2012; Bonilla-Silva, 2004; Lee & Bean, 2007; Marrow, 2009; Tatum, 2003).

What remains invisible, however, is that race scholarship often veils the nuanced lived experiences existing *within* racial groups. That is, race scholarship maintains a focus on differences between racial/ethnic groups. This inter-group focus obscures and minimizes differences that exist within racial groups. The result of overlooking within-group differences is that racial/ethnic groups are viewed as homogenous. Consequently, little is known about how the U.S racial hierarchy may differentially influence individuals within the same racial group, disallowing ways in which those individuals may differ in their lived experience and how they may conceptualize their racial identities differently from being understood.

In this thesis, the focus is on one group for whom within-racial group differences are largely invisible, namely people who identify as Black. In much of society, as well as in the culture of science, the Black race is viewed in a monolithic manner. Put differently, it is commonplace for people who identify as Black to be thought of as a singular demographic presumed to share the same lived experiences and attitudes regarding race. In reality, the Black race consists of multiple sub-groups with distinct ethnicities who may be impacted by racism differently despite their shared race. In psychological science, there is ample empirical evidence documenting differences between White and Black persons, and these likely do provide information about actual similarities among sub-groups of Black people. However, to better understand similarities and differences among these sub-groups, and for psychological science to move forward, the Black Monolith must be addressed; its maintenance masks how members of these different sub-groups, who identify as Black, may experience and think about their race, ethnicity, and racism differently.

This thesis addressed differences between two Black sub-groups: first- and second-generation immigrants—those who migrated to the U.S from another country and their children who were born in the U.S, respectively—(referred to as Immigrants/Descendants), and Americans whose heritage was not voluntary immigration, but who are descendants of U.S chattel slavery (referred to as American Non-Immigrants). Specifically, this thesis examined the question of whether Black immigrants and their descendants have different ethnic and racial self-concepts from Black American Non-Immigrants. They may regard themselves differently in these aspects of their identity based on the argument that these two sub-groups likely experienced the U.S racial hierarchy differently.

The first section of this thesis offers a conceptualization of “within-race” ethnic identity that guided the research. Then, the literature on ethnic and racial identity is examined, revealing gaps in the study of intra-group variation among Black individuals. Next, two ethnic and racial identity models are described; these models guided the creation of items utilized in this study to begin to determine whether Black Immigrants/Descendants and Black American Non-Immigrants differ in ethnic and racial identity. Lastly, the results of a survey study of these two groups are presented and discussed.

Race and Ethnicity: Defining Within-Race

In this thesis, the conceptual understanding of separate groups within one race requires an explicit distinction between race and ethnicity. Race is often thought of as relatively distinct homogeneous category in which individuals are identified based on certain physical characteristics such as skin color and hair texture (Conley & Cheng, 2003; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). This commonplace and fairly crude conceptualization is an example of how race continues to be understood, mistakenly, as a biological construct whereby physical characteristics indicate significant innate differences thought to explain social inequalities (Richeson & Sommers, 2016; Smedley & Smedley, 2005). However, race has been largely discredited as a biological construct and is understood as a social construction. In this perspective, racial inequalities and differences are explained by the differential impacts of racism on individuals based on the social interpretation of their physical appearance (i.e., race), rather than assuming innate inferiority of Blacks and other Non-Whites (Jones, 2002; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). Race categories, defined by physical features, are rooted in historical contexts in which social norms and laws justified racial exploitation, which in turn influenced racial self-identification. Minoritized racial groups were typically victims of institutional oppression,

stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination all of which have been shown to influence their racial identity (Brown & Jones, 2015; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). Racial self-identification, then, can be understood as a product of racialization, whereby institutional processes impose racial categories on individuals and these imposed racial categories result in differential treatment and access of resources.

Race is different than ethnicity. A generally accepted definition of ethnicity is a group of people defined by shared common symbols and/or traits that distinguish them from other people and groups (Glazer, Greeley, Patterson, & Moynihan, 1974; Smedley & Smedley, 2005). A person's identification with an ethnic group is often rooted in symbols and traits of shared values, beliefs, language, culture, ancestry, and/or history of a defined ethnic group (Brown & Jones, 2015; Glazer et al., 1974; Smedley & Smedley, 2005). Although ethnic group identity has been argued to have a component of choice in some instances, the available choices can largely be limited by external factors including racialization because ethnicity is largely determined by social costs (Brown & Jones, 2015; Waters, 1990). The social cost of being non-white, which is strongly influenced by racialization, affects an individual's choice of where to live, occupation, community affiliation, and general life experience all of which strongly influence of the choice to identify with an ethnic group (Waters, 1990).

Race and ethnicity are often thought of interchangeably. As a result, there is a conflation of two distinct aspects of identity, furthering the misguided perception that racial groups are pan-ethnic in nature. Simply put, various individuals with distinct ethnicities are grouped under one broad and encompassing racial label and seen as sharing one ethnicity (Brown & Jones, 2015; Okamoto, 2003). In addition, race and ethnicity are often treated as separate and distinct phenomena, and not as multiple aspects of the individual. Multiple scholars lamented the fact

that race and ethnicity are used interchangeably or yet studied in isolation of each other (Brown & Jones, 2015; Brubaker, 2009; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). To remedy this, Richeson and Sommers (2016) proposed conceptualizing ethnic categories as subordinate to racial categories. Put differently, under the socio-political groupings of race, defined by physical characteristics, there are multiple ethnic groups, each defined by shared cultures and/or national origins (Richeson & Sommers, 2016). For example, the racial label American Indian includes individuals from diverse, distinct tribes (i.e., which can be conceptualized as ethnic groups), such as Cherokee, Inuit, and Navaho. The racial label Asian-American includes ethnic groups of East Asian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean), Southeast Asian (e.g. Vietnamese, Cambodian), and South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani), groups that regard themselves as distinct and have their own histories of discrimination and political tension. Understanding ethnic groups as subordinate to racial groups, more adequately informs personal social identification and lived experiences (Flores & Huo, 2012; Jones-Correa & Leal, 1996; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). In the context of this research, the concept of "within-race" will refer to ethnic sub-groups (immigrants and non-immigrants) under a single racial category (Black).

The Black race, often denoted by physical features of dark skin, curly hair, and dark eyes is composed of various ethnic sub-groups in the United States. These sub-ethnic group include individuals who are descendants of and have direct ties to U.S chattel slavery (i.e., Black Americans Non-Immigrant), and recent immigrants and their descendants (i.e., Black Immigrants/Descendants) from various African (e.g., Sierra Leone, Senegal), South American (e.g., Guyana, Brazil), and Caribbean (e.g. Jamaica, Dominican Republic) nations (Richeson & Sommers, 2016; Waters, Bean, & Rose, 1999). To honor the histories of the immigrant ethnic sub-groups, it is worth noting that these groups also have histories with slavery and/or colonial

oppression by European powers. Moreover, to honor the complexity of the Black race and African Diaspora, it is also worth acknowledging that these ethnic sub-groups can be defined by even smaller community units. However, this thesis focused on aggregated sub-groups of immigrants and non-immigrants in search of preliminary findings.

The increase in the number of Black Immigrants in the U.S in the 21st century provided a means of investigating the nuances that are hidden by a monolithic conception of the Black race. There are essays and films that illustrate these nuances by highlighting often overlooked dynamics of conflicts and differences in lived experiences among Black sub-ethnic groups (Attiah & Madowo, 2018; Coogler, 2018; Owino, 2014; Reddick, 1998). For instance, Marvel's film *Black Panther (2018)* portrayed ethno-political conflict between Black Americans and Africans as well as portraying identity struggles Black Americans may have experienced due to being disconnected from their African roots (Coogler, 2018). Similarly, the documentary *Bound (2014)* explored conflict and tension existing between Black immigrants and Black Americans and suggested that it may originate from misunderstanding the other's lived experiences in the U.S racial hierarchy (Owino, 2014).

Media portrayals such as these illustrate the presence of these issues in the minds of contemporary U.S. individuals and the value in exploring how Black ethnic sub-groups wrestle with their identities in various ways. These issues and their relative absence as a subject of study in the psychological literature motivated this thesis. Next, the literature on within-race ethnic differences, Black immigration, and Black (non-immigrant) self-concept are discussed as they reveal gaps in the scientific literature and justify the survey conducted as part of this thesis.

Within-Race Scholarship

In psychological science there is ample race research, focused on topics such as racism and power, inter-groups attitudes and behavior, impact of diversity, and ethnic and racial identity development among racial groups (e.g. Cikara & Van Bavel, 2014; Craig, Rucker, & Richeson, 2017; Eibach & Keegan, 2006; Pearson et al., 2009; Phelan & Rudman, 2010; Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006; Saperstein, Penner, & Light, 2013). However, as aforementioned, race research in psychology is reflective of the dominant paradigm of race which homogenizes racial groups by maintaining a focus on a physical conception of race and underestimating the significance of within racial group differences. The homogenous conceptualization of race contributes to problems such as the perpetuation of inaccurate and harmful stereotypes (e.g., Asian “model” minority) and a failure to acknowledge diverse experiences of immigrant populations who may differ from other members of their racial groups (Chun, 1980; Flores & Huo, 2012; Jones-Correa & Leal, 1996; Suzuki, 1977, 2002).

The available social science research on within-race differences, as conceptualized in this thesis, illustrated the importance of sub-ethnic identities. Flores and Huo (2012) highlighted the tension that exists between national origin identity of Asian and Latinx immigrants and pan-ethnic categories—categories that encompass multiple sub-ethnic groups. Their research acknowledged the effects of neglect or mis-categorization—i.e, treating ethnic sub-groups as one ethnicity or as interchangeable—of national origin identities. They found that identity neglect or miscategorization yielded adverse effects on those individuals who identify with a distinct nationality because a meaningful aspect of their identity is undervalued (Flores & Huo, 2012). Similarly, Trujillo, Garcia, and Shelton (2015) reported that miscategorization of ethnic sub-groups in Asian-Americans constituted microaggressions and elicited negative reactions among

those who were miscategorized. Other research by Huo and colleagues, while not directly studying intra-racial differences, emphasized the need to recognize both sub-group identities and common (shared) identities (Huo, Molina, Sawahata, & Deang, 2005). Jones-Correa and Leal (1996) found that identification with pan-ethnic/racial labels were endorsed at different levels among Latinx subethnic groups. Alvarez (2002) called attention to the need to avoid treating racial and ethnic identity constructs as interchangeable in order to better document how Asian-Americans internalize and cope with racism.

Research on within-race differences demonstrated the importance of the recognition of ethnic sub-group identities. These studies revealed that members of ethnic sub-groups may be impacted adversely when their ethnic identity is neglected and/or miscategorized. Moreover, studies showed that self-identification with racial/pan-ethnic categories differ across ethnic groups within a single race. This line of research also suggests there is value in exploring ethnic identities within racial groups. However, most of the available research did not evaluate ethnic and racial identities concurrently. Furthermore, when studies investigated subgroups, the work primarily focused on Latinx and Asian population to the relative exclusion of Black populations.

The social science literature examining differences among Black ethnics has tended to examine political differences rather than directly evaluating differences in how those Blacks identify. Although not directly investigating identity, the research posited that observed difference in political attitudes may be explained by differences in racial and ethnic identity constructions of Black immigrants. However, these studies did not assess racial and ethnic identity constructions among Black ethnics groups (see Butcher, 1994; Gooding, 2019; Greer, 2013; Imoagene, 2018; Waters, Kasinitz, & Asad, 2014). There is a dearth of empirical studies on within-race identity differences among Black sub-groups; however, the scholarly literature

that addressed how members of each of these groups construe themselves can offer useful insights and inform investigation of within-race differences in Black identity. The next sections review scholarly conceptualizations of Black immigration and of Black American (non-immigrant) self-concept.

Black Immigration Scholarship

Conceptualizations of Black immigration typically focused on the interaction of racial and ethnic identities of Black immigrants and their children as they assimilated into the U.S. racial hierarchy (Greer, 2013; Kretsedemas, 2008; Rong & Brown, 2002; Sall, 2019; Waters, 1994; Waters et al., 1999). Rong and Brown (2002) and others emphasized the dual identity struggle of Black immigrants in the racial hierarchy (Greer, 2013; Kretsedemas, 2008; Sall, 2019). These authors noted that as immigrants assimilate into U.S. society they must negotiate maintaining their unique ethnic identities while wrestling with mass media portraying a largely negative image of Blacks (Greer, 2013; Kretsedemas, 2008; Rong & Brown, 2002; Sall, 2019).

Racial identification is a symbol of socio-political status and Black immigrants are likely to initially resist identifying with the Black racial label because of the negativity and lower social status associated with it, but the longer an immigrant family stays in the U.S the more likely they are to endorse the Black racial label (Rong & Brown, 2002). This finding can be further supported by segmented assimilation theory which asserts that immigrants, rather than assimilate to a mainstream ideal, assimilate to specific segments of society based on how they are viewed and treated in society (Portes, Fernández-Kelly, & Haller, 2005). Black immigrants are viewed as Black and thus face the accompanying racial discrimination of the Black racial label similar to their Black American Non-Immigrant counterparts (Greer, 2013). However, Black immigrants may have different interpretations of racism due to having experienced different racial

hierarchies in their homelands. These various facts then are presumed to influence how they identify.

Waters (1994, 1999) provided germinal work on first- and second-generation Black immigrants. This work found that subjective understandings of ethnicity—American (in the general sense), Black-American, and native ethnic group—shaped how first- and second-generation Black immigrants chose to identify themselves which influenced their perception of racial discrimination and how likely they were to distance themselves from their Black American Non-Immigrant counterparts (Waters, 1994; Waters et al., 1999). Additionally, she found that Black Caribbean immigrants used their ethnic identity to defend themselves against stigmatization while, at the same time, acknowledging their membership in the Black race (Kretsedemas, 2008; Waters, 1999). These findings illustrated the complex interaction of race and ethnicity in Black immigrants as they maintain their ethnic identity alongside their racial identity (Greer, 2013).

Thus, it is necessary to understand the intersection of both race and ethnic identity in capturing the lived experience of Black immigrants and their descendants in the U.S. racial hierarchy. However, the importance of the race and ethnicity interaction has not been applied to Black Americans. Literature on Black American self-concept has largely focused on the importance of studying racial identity in Black Americans, without differentiating among different types of individuals who are classified or who are identified as Black Americans.

Black American Self-Concept Scholarship

Early research on self-concept as it pertained to Blacks in the U.S. focused on racial awareness and the development of a general Black personality (Gordon, 1977). Much of the findings on the Black self-concept between the years of 1939 and 1970 were thought to support

the Lewinian Hypothesis that posited a positive correlation between Black identity and self-esteem. Correspondingly, Blacks who did not endorse a strong racial identity were thought to be victims of self-hatred and/or psychopathology (Cross, 1971, 1978). However, some reviewers of Black self-concept research refuted the Lewinian Hypothesis and proposed a two-factor theory of Black identity in which self-esteem and group identity are separate (Cross, 1991; Gordon, 1977). In this theory, self-concept consists of two parts: personal identity (PI)—consisting of the building blocks of personality such as self-esteem and competence—and reference group orientation (RGO)—consisting of identification to social groups identities and worldviews. Thus, it suggests a person's endorsement of racial/ethnic identity only reflects worldviews and social attitudes rather than self-esteem (Cross, 1991; Gordon, 1977). However, other scholars maintain that attitudes toward ethnic and racial identity are central to the psychological functioning of those who live in societies in which their racial/ethnic category is poorly represented, discriminated against, or threatened (Phinney, 1990; Weinreich, 1983).

In evaluating racial/ethnic identity, 21st century scholarship treats race and ethnicity as interchangeable constructs for Black Americans (Byrd, 2011; see for a recent review). Although race and ethnicity may be closely related for Black Americans in the U.S., they are not the same. The two-factor theory of Black identity recognizes multiple reference points in Black Americans' reference group orientation. Therefore, Black Americans could be understood as identifying outside of their ascribed racial status and could self-identify with other and multiple social identities (Cross, 1991; Gordon, 1977). These other social identities may include ethnicities outside of Black American culture. Black American Non-Immigrants may, in fact, manage their racial and ethnic identity differently, similar in how Black immigrants demonstrate this, yet this is not analyzed in Black identity literature. Hence, this thesis proposes a simultaneous

assessment of ethnic and racial identity to evaluate differences in ethnic and racial self-concepts between Black Immigrants/Descendants and Black American Non-Immigrants. Accordingly, this thesis will review the ethnic and racial identity models which guided this study.

Ethnic and Racial Identity Models

Byrd (2011)—referring to the work of Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, and Chavous (1998)—offered a broad definition of racial and ethnic identity as the significance and meaning of race and ethnicity in an individual's life. This broad definition which implicitly conflates the two terms is often used in scientific literature. However, Alvarez (2002)—drawing on the works of Helms and Cook (1999)—parsed out the ways to think about race and ethnic identity as distinct constructs. Racial identity can be thought to reflect intrapsychic and interpersonal reactions to racism and identification with a larger socio-political pan-ethnic category, while ethnic identity is associated with the beliefs, values, and tradition of distinct ethnic groups of national origin or shared ancestry (Alvarez, 2002; Helms & Cook, 1999).

Self-identification with race and ethnicity is complex in that is multi-layered and can change over time and context (Phinney, 1989; Weinreich, 1988). Kinket and Verkuyten (1997) offered a multi-level framework in which lower levels of self-identification involve cognitive recognition of belonging to an ascribed social category (i.e., ethnic self-definition) and higher levels involve incorporation of a social category into one's self-concept (i.e., self-evaluation and introjection). Their research recognized that persons can understand themselves as members of social categories, but this does not necessarily imply that they will also identify with the social category in question (Kinket & Verkuyten, 1997). Additionally, social identities are not stagnant entities, rather they are constructed and formed through developmental processes that take place over time with explorations and decisions of commitment (Phinney, 1990). To incorporate this

multilevel conceptualization, this thesis relied primarily on Phinney's developmental model of ethnic identity and Cross' Nigrescence Model of Black identity. The description of each is presented below.

Phinney (1989) derived a stage model of ethnic identity designed to be applied to adolescents from diverse ethnic backgrounds. Her model applied prior work by Marcia (1980), who described a process beginning with ego identity formation to ethnic identity formation. Phinney found the interaction of an individual's level of exploration and level of commitment yielded four status of ethnic identity as follows:

“1. **Diffuse**: Little or no exploration of one's ethnicity and no clear understanding of the issues.

2. **Foreclosed**: Little or no exploration of ethnicity, but apparent clarity about one's own ethnicity. Feelings about one's ethnicity may be either positive or negative, depending on one's socialization experiences.

3. **Moratorium**: Evidence of exploration, accompanied by some confusion about the meaning of one's own ethnicity.

4. **Achieved**: Evidence of exploration, accompanied by a clear, secure understanding and acceptance of one's own ethnicity.”

(Phinney, 1989, p. 5)

Using these four forms of status, Phinney proposed a three-stage progression. In designing the ethnic identity model, the research assistants Phinney's lab were not able to code reliable distinctions between the two lowest stages so they were combined into a single category. The first stage is defined by no exploration regardless of ethnic identity commitment (diffusion/foreclosure). The second stage is defined by exploration without commitment

(moratorium). The third stage is defined by commitment following exploration (achieved). Phinney provided empirical support for these stages of ethnic identity development among minority populations. After findings empirical evidence to support the three-stage model, Phinney (1989) concluded that members of an ethnic minority group face a need to wrestle with what their ethnic group membership means for them in a majority white society.

The Cross (1971, 1978) Nigrescence Model challenged the binary understanding of Black identity as either one which is conscious or one which is not conscious of racial injustice. He contended that Black identity is neither stagnant nor innate in Black individuals. Rather it is nuanced, complex, and formed through different stages in a developmental process. The Cross model proposed that Black people undergo five stages in developing their racial identity. The stages include how they must wrestle with what it means to be a member of the Black race and how salient Blackness should be reflected in their identity. The five stages are summarized below:

1. **Pre-Encounter stage** signifies low racial salience. Individuals may recognize that they are members of the Black race, but they do not believe race plays an important role in their everyday life. Individuals in this stage may be naïve to the role of race in their lives, have anti-Black attitudes, be unaware of other cultural perspectives, or prefer White culture. This stable identity stage is shaped by early development and socialization by family, school, and community.
2. **Encounter stage** consists of a profound experience or collection of experiences, either positive or negative, directly related to race that challenges and encourages a re-examination of the world view from the pre-encounter stage.

3. **Immersion-Emersion** is the stage in which individuals become extremely pro-Black and/or anti-white. That is, in this stage individuals undergo passionate immersion into "Blackness." They begin to consume Black literature, media, art, and educate themselves about Black history and the political issues facing Black people as a means of trying to understand Blackness. They deify Black people and Black culture while denigrating White people and White culture. Passion, euphoria, and rage are common in this stage as individuals are deeply inspired by their race and angered by injustices against their race. However, their Black identity is thought to be superficial in the sense that symbols of Blackness are highly-romanticized and the complexity of Blackness has not yet been truly wrestled with. As a result, there is often insecurity associated with this stage of Black identity and individuals may appear to be trying to prove their Blackness ("Blacker than thou syndrome").
4. **Internalization** is the stage in which individuals feel secure and satisfied with their Black identity. In this stage, individuals shift away from seeking external validation of their Blackness ("Am I Black enough?") to confidence in defining their own personal standards of Blackness. They shift away from defensiveness and simplistic views of Blackness and conceptualize Blackness more openly, sophisticatedly, and critically. Their Black racial salience remains high but they demonstrate a decline in anti-white attitudes and may endorse a more multicultural understanding of others. Moreover, rage towards White people shifts to a controlled anger towards systems of oppression. Having resolved dissonance and achieved inner peace with their Black identity some Blacks may fail to sustain long-term involvement in Black affairs, however.

5. **Internalization-Commitment** in this stage individuals seek ways to be committed to Black political advancement in the long-term.

(Cross, 1971, pp. 15-24; 1991, pp. 189-223).

In the original Cross model, Black individuals were thought to be in one of these five different stages at any given moment in their lives and progress through them once. However, revisions of the Nigrescence Model recognized that individuals may recycle through the stages as they redefine Blackness at different moments in their life (Parham, 1989). It must be noted that going through the stages does not imply a singular Black identity. The Nigrescence Model asserted that some Black individuals may up becoming Black Nationalists or some may become be multiculturalists in the later stages of their racial identity development, for example.

The Present Study

To summarize, this thesis sought to explore within-race differences in the ethnic and racial self-concept between Black American Non-Immigrants and Black Immigrants/Descendants in order to nuance homogenous conceptions of the Black race. The small corpus of empirical evidence on within-race differences and the broader scholarly literature on Black immigration illustrate the importance of studying both race and ethnicity. However, the dual importance of race and ethnicity in self-concept has been recognized in groups other than in Black Americans. Furthermore, the constructs of race and ethnicity have not been studied as elements of the whole identity in studies of within-race differences among sub-ethnic groups.

Thus, the thesis aimed to address this gap in knowledge by simultaneously studying ethnic identity alongside racial identity between Black Immigrants/Descendants and Black American Non-Immigrants. This thesis investigated based on these differences based on two questions:

1. Do Black Americans and Black Immigrants/Descendants differ in their level of ethnic identity?
2. Do Black Immigrant/Descendants differ in the level of identification with the Black racial identity?

This thesis did not put forth any formal predictions on the direction of potential differences between these two groups because there was a lack of empirical data to guide such a prediction. In terms of ethnic identity, Black Immigrants/Descendants may demonstrate higher levels of ethnic identity achievement due to having a clearer sense of distinct ancestry and national origin that may be lost to Black American Non-Immigrants who may feel disconnected from their historical nationalities and ancestral ties. Another possibility is that Black immigrants and descendants may demonstrate a less achieved ethnic identity as they struggle to maintain their distinct ethnicity as they negotiate both Black American and their native cultures. In regards to racial identity, it is possible that Black immigrants and descendants may demonstrate a less internalized racial identity because they may perceive racialized incidents differently from their Black American Non-Immigrant counterparts. Despite these possibilities, the paucity of research on this subject limited the ability to pose formal hypotheses.

These initial inquiries into potential differences were assessed with the use of an online survey. The items in the survey were generated following the concepts of ethnic identity and racial identity in the literature, particularly the Phinney (1989) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Model and the Cross (1971, 1991) Nigrescence Model. After presenting the research method and results, the findings are discussed in relation to these models and future research directions are suggested.

Chapter 2

Methods

Participants

Recruitment for study participation occurred during the 2018 Fall semester. Information about the study was distributed in three ways. First, information of the survey was distributed in group chats of Black student organizations and in on-campus group chats that were primarily composed of students of color (the author was a member). Secondly, the author sent SMS text messages to friends and peers he knew identified as Black. Lastly, the author approached peers and classmates in person to inform them of the survey and inquired about their interest in participation. It is worth noting that the author is a descendant of West-African Immigrants.

Information about the online survey study and its purpose and voluntary nature was provided as part of these contacts. Specifically, participants were told that this was a study trying to explore intra-racial differences among Black populations. All participants were unpaid volunteers. The method of recruitment was not designed to identify a random sample of individuals identifying as Black. The only inclusionary criterion for this study was that individuals self-identified as Black in any capacity on a categorical choice question regarding race and ethnicity in the demographics section of the survey.

The resulting sample of individuals identifying as Black (N=58) consisted of 19 Black Americans Non-Immigrants (32.8% of participants) and 39 Black Immigrants/Descendants (67.2%). Fourteen participants identified with more than one ethnic category. Participants who

reported having at least one parent who was a first-generation immigrant were classified in the Immigrant/Descendant group.

Among the Black Immigrant/Descendants, eight (20.5%) were first-generation immigrants and the majority (n=31; 79.5%) were second-generation immigrants. Among first-generation immigrants, the length of time living in the U.S. varied. Half of the first-generation immigrants reported having spent more than 15 years in the U.S (n=4; 50%); the remainder reported spending 11 to 15 years (n=2; 25%), 6 to 10 years (n=1; 12.5%), and less than 5 years (n=1; 12.5%) in the U.S. The Black-identifying immigrants were also asked to report their own and/or their parents nation of origin. Black Immigrants/Descendants from African nations comprised of 25.8% of the sample and Black Immigrants/Descendants from Caribbean nations comprised 37.9% of the sample; 3.5% of Black immigrants reported both African and Caribbean background.

In addition to reporting how they identified in terms of race and ethnicity, all Black-identifying individuals were asked to report their age, college classification, and gender. Age was recorded as a categorical variable and the majority were between the ages of 18 to 25 years (n=54; 93.1%) with the minority between the ages of 26 to 35 years (n=4; 6.9%). All classes were represented in this study: 4 first-year students, 3 sophomores, 7 juniors, 17 seniors, 10 fifth-year seniors, and 17 college graduates. In terms of gender, 53.4% of participants identified as a Woman and 46.6% as a Man.

Procedure

The first page of the survey provided a statement of the study's purpose and an informed passive consent statement. Specifically, consent was assumed if the participant continued to the next pages to complete the survey. The survey did not ask for any personally identifiable

information. However, participants had the option to provide contact information at the end of the survey if they were interested in any follow-up research on this topic. If a participant provided personally identifiable information in an open-ended section of the survey, that information was deleted after the conclusion of the study.

After deciding to continue with the study past the first page—hence providing passive consent—participants were presented with the survey questions. There were 37 items: 12 demographic items, 7 strength of ethnic self-identification, and 15 development of racial identity items. A final set of 3 optional open-ended responses invited participants to offer their general thoughts on the subject of within race differences among Black ethnic groups.

Demographics Section

Twelve items addressed demographic characteristics of the participant. Specifically, participants were asked about to report their age, gender, racial identity, ethnic identity, college classification, university they are attending or graduated from, college major, and cumulative GPA. For participants who identified as Black Immigrants/Descendants, additional questions asked them to report their country of origin for themselves and/or their parents, whether they were born in the U.S, time in U.S (if not born in U.S), and whether their parents were born in the U.S (if born in the U.S).

Ethnic Identity Section

Seven items addressed ethnic identity. These items were either taken directly or derived from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Phinney, 1992). These items were intended to assess the progression of ethnic identity of participants. Specifically, six items assessed: involvement and exploration of ethnic identity (2 items) and confidence and commitment in ethnic identity (4 items). These items were rated on a 6-point Likert scale: (1)

Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Weakly disagree (4) Weakly agree, (5) Agree, and (6) Strongly agree. One of the items asked if participants felt more connected to another culture rather than their own. As a result, there was one additional open-ended item which asked participants to indicate culture in question. At the beginning of this section, the participants were instructed to think about their specific ethnicity and not general Black or diasporic culture.

Racial Identity Section

The racial identity items were largely derived from the Cross (1979, 1991) Racial Identity Scale. The items had to be adjusted to contain contemporary language. These items assessed both participants' stage of racial identity development. There were 15 items which assessed Cross' three dominant stages of racial identity: the pre-encounter stage (4 items), the immersion-emersion stage (6 items), and the internalization stage (5 items). Participants rated these items on the 6-point Likert scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (6) Strongly agree.

Chapter 3

Results

The purpose of this thesis was to determine whether Non-Immigrant Black Americans and Black Immigrants/Descendants differed in two aspects of self-identity: ethnic identity and racial identity. Because there is a dearth of theory and empirical evidence on intra-racial group differences, no hypotheses were generated. Rather the aim was to take the first step into a scientific investigation by describing how these two groups of individuals rated items assessing ethnic and racial identity. The data analytic plan then was to conduct an item-by-item independent sample *t*-tests to determine which items differentiated the groups. The statistics were conducted using the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 25.

The first objective was to explore if Black American Non-Immigrant and Black Immigrants/Descendants differed in terms of the strength of their ethnic identity. The second objective sought to explore differences in racial identity development.

Ethnic Identity

Six independent sample *t*-tests were conducted using a confidence interval of 95% to determine significant differences. A significant difference emerged for three of the six ethnic identity items. Specifically, there was a significant difference in participants' ratings of the extent to which they agreed that they participate in cultural practices of their own ethnic group. Black

American Non-Immigrants agreed with this item ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.60$) less than Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 5.18$, $SD = 1.12$) groups, $t(56) = -2.39$, $p = .021$

Next, there was a significant difference in participants' ratings of the extent to which they agreed that they have a clear sense of their ethnic background. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 1.83$) agreed with this statement less than Black Immigrants/Descendants did ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.14$), $t(56) = -2.69$, $p = .009$.

Finally, there was a significant difference in the extent to which participants agreed with the statement that they felt more connected to another culture than the culture of the ethnic group they identified with. Black American Non-Immigrants agreed less with feeling more connected to another culture other than their own ($M = 1.63$, $SD = 0.90$) compared to Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 2.38$, $SD = 1.52$), $t(54) = -2.37$, $p = .021$. The degrees of freedom in this last result was corrected for not assuming equal variances.

In contrast, there were no significant differences on the other three ethnic identity items. That is, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants agreed with the statement that they felt lost in their ethnic identity. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 1.49$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.63$) both reported low levels of agreement with feeling lost, $t(56) = .101$, $p = .920$. Next, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants agreed that they spent time trying to learn more about their ethnic background. Both Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 1.59$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 1.36$) indicated agreeing modestly with efforts to learn more about their own ethnic group, $t(56) = -1.25$, $p = .215$. Third and finally, there was no significant difference between the groups for the level of positive regard for their own ethnic group; Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 5.42$, $SD = 1.17$) and Black

Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 5.64$, $SD = .74$) groups both reported, on average, a high level of positive regard for their own ethnic group, $t(56) = -.87$, $p = .387$.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Ethnic Identity Items

Items	Group				95% CI for Mean Difference		t	df
	Black American Non-Immigrant (n=19)		Black Immigrants/Descendants (n=39)					
	M	SD	M	SD	Lower	Upper		
Participation in cultural practices	4.32	1.600	5.18	1.121	-1.589	-.138	-2.385*	56
Clear sense of ethnic background	3.84	1.834	4.90	1.142	-1.841	-.269	-2.690*	56
Feeling more connected to another culture	1.63	.895	2.38	1.515	-1.390	-.116	-2.369*	54**
Feeling lost in ethnicity or in-between cultures	2.74	1.485	2.69	1.625	-.842	.931	.101	56
Spent time trying to learn more about ethnic group	4.26	1.593	4.77	1.366	-1.315	.303	-1.254	56
Happy to be a part of my ethnic group	5.64	.743	5.64	.743	-.726	.286	-.871	56

* $p < .05$.

**degrees of freedom adjusted to not assume equal variance

Racial Identity

Fifteen independent sample t -tests were conducted using a confidence interval of 95% to determine significant differences. There were no significant differences found on any of the items for any of the stages.

Pre-Encounter Stage. There were no significant differences in any of the items aimed at capturing the pre-encounter stage of racial identity development. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 1.84$, $SD = 1.34$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 1.51$)

both reported high levels of disagreement with the statement that race was not a big part of their life, $t(56) = -1.08$, $p = .284$. There was no significant difference in the extent to which participants reported having negative feelings being a member of their racial group. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.78$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 1.24$) both disagreed with this item, indicating low levels of negative feelings of being Black, $t(56) = .987$, $p = .328$. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants reported feeling pressured to make Blackness a larger part of their identity than they desire. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.65$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 1.57$) both reported disagreement with the statement that they felt pressure to make Blackness a larger part of their identity than they desire, $t(56) = -.837$, $p = .406$.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Pre-Encounter Stage of Racial Identity Items

Items	Group				95% CI for Mean Difference		t	df
	Black American Non-Immigrant (n=19)		Black Immigrants/Descendants (n=39)		Lower	Upper		
	M	SD	M	SD				
Race is not a big part of my life	1.84	1.344	2.36	1.513	-1.336	.302	-1.265	56
The way Blacks behave will never result in acceptance	3.42	1.835	2.95	1.413	-.403	1.347	1.081	56
Privately have negative feelings about my racial group	2.47	1.775	2.08	1.244	.987	-.408	1.202	56
Social pressure to make Blackness a larger part of my identity when it doesn't need to be	2.47	1.645	2.85	1.565	-.837	-1.264	.519	56

* $p < .05$.

Immersion-Emersion Stage. Similarly, there were no significant differences on any of the items aimed at assessing the immersion-emersion stage of racial identity development. That is, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants reported agreement with the importance of symbols of Black pride to them. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.95$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.49$) both reported modest levels of agreement with importance of symbols of Blackness in their life, $t(56) = .231$, $p = .818$. Secondly, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants reported disagreement with feelings of hatred or disdain for the majority culture and/or people. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.64$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.42$) both reported low-level disagreement with the statement of feeling disdain toward the majority culture and/or people, $t(56) = 1.55$, $p = .126$. In addition, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants agreed with feeling that racial liberation could not occur unless they were guided by principles and values of their racial heritage. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 1.82$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.63$) both reported low level of agreement with this item, $t(56) = .482$, $p = .632$.

Moreover, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants endorsed a complete separation of the races as a solution to the race problem. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 1.84$, $SD = 1.12$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 1.49$, $SD = .854$) both reported high-levels of disagreement with this item, $t(56) = 1.34$, $p = .186$. Similarly, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants disagreed with the statement that it is more important to be connected to their own race more than other races and ethnic groups. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.58$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.55$) both reported disagreement with feeling pressure to make Blackness a larger

part of their identity than they desire, $t(56) = .730$, $p = .468$. Finally, for the Immersion-Emersion stage, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants expressed agreement with being critical and impatient with most White people as well as Black people who are not aware of injustice. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.47$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.51$) both reported low levels of agreement with this item, $t(56) = -1.83$, $p = .076$.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Immersion-Emersion Stage of Racial Identity Items

Items	Group				95% CI for Mean Difference		t	df
	Black American Non-Immigrant (n=19)		Black Immigrants/Descendants (n=39)					
	M	SD	M	SD	Lower	Upper		
Symbols of Black Pride are extremely important to me	4.16	1.951	4.05	1.486	-.818	1.031	.231	56
Feelings of animosity toward majority culture and/or people	3.32	1.635	2.67	1.420	-.187	1.486	1.554	56
Racial liberation can only occur if guided by principles grounded in our racial heritage	3.67	1.628	3.67	1.628	-.721	1.177	.482	56
Solution to race problem is the complete separation of the races	1.84	1.119	1.49	.854	-.176	.886	1.339	56
More important to be connected to my own race rather than other backgrounds	3.42	1.575	3.10	1.553	.436	-.556	.730	56
Critical/impatient w/ Whites and Blacks unaware of injustice	3.47	1.467	4.23	1.512	-1.597	.082	-1.806	56

* $p < .05$.

Internalization stage. As with the other stages, there were no significant differences on any items aimed at measuring the internalization stage of racial identity development. That is, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants reported agreement with the importance of maintaining both solid racial identity as well as a multicultural perspective. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 5.42, SD = .769$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 5.44, SD = .821$) both reported high levels of agreement with importance of a racial identity and a multicultural perspective, $t(56) = -.066, p = .948$. In addition, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants reported with feeling comfortable with their level of Blackness and Black Awareness. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.17$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.04$) both indicated agreeing modestly with comfort with their level of Blackness and Black awareness, $t(56) = .053, p = .958$.

Furthermore, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants agreed that it is easy to think about criticism about socio-political Black ideas and movements without feeling like a traitor. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 4.53, SD = 1.31$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.41$) both reported moderate levels of agreement with this item, $t(56) = -.231, p = .818$. There was no significant difference in the extent to which participants agreed that it is easy for them to openly criticize socio-political Black ideas and movements without feeling like a traitor. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M = 3.53, SD = 1.64$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 4.10, SD = 1.47$) both reported a low level of agreement with this item, $t(56) = -1.35, p = .182$. Moreover, there was no significant difference in the extent to which participants expressed agreement in being patient and understanding to people who do not have their level of racial awareness. Black American Non-Immigrants ($M =$

4.42, $SD = 1.17$) and Black Immigrants/Descendants ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 1.21$) both reported moderate agreement with this item, $t(56) = .109$, $p = .914$.

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Group's Level of Agreement on Internalization Stage of Racial Identity Items

Items	Group				95% CI for Mean Difference		t	df
	Black American Non-Immigrant (n=19)		Black Immigrants/Descendants (n=39)		Lower	Upper		
	M	SD	M	SD				
Importance of solid racial identity and multicultural perspective	5.42	.769	5.44	.821	.225	-.466	-.066	56
Comfortable with level of Blackness	4.63	1.165	4.62	1.042	-.591	.623	.053	56
Easy to THINK of criticism of Blackness w/o feeling like "traitor"	3.53	1.645	4.10	1.465	-.860	.682	-.231	56
Easy to OPENLY criticize Blackness w/o feeling like a "traitor"	4.53	1.307	4.62	1.407	-1.431	.279	-1.350	56
Patient with those who do not have my level of racial awareness	4.42	1.170	4.38	1.206	-.633	.706	.109	56

* $p < .05$.

Chapter 4

Discussion

This purpose of this study was to investigate possible differences in the ethnic and racial self-concepts of Black American Non-Immigrants and Black Immigrants/Descendants. Historically, studies of race and ethnicity compared racial groups in a homogeneous manner, overlooking the ethnic variations among individuals who identify as being members of the same race. Although there has been increasing appreciation of the importance of conceptualizing and studying variations in the experience and perceptions within groups (Alvarez, 2002; Chun, 1980; Flores & Huo, 2012; Huo et al., 2005; Jones-Correa & Leal, 1996; Suzuki, 2002), much of this work focused on individuals who identify as Latinx or Asian and not on individuals who identify as Black. Two separate literatures—one focused on Black immigrant groups and another on Black racial identity—provided guidance on ways to begin to explore whether Black American Non-Immigrants and Black Immigrant/Descendants differ in their ethnic and racial identity. In general, the findings, based on this convenience sample, suggested some interesting group differences in ethnic identity but not for racial identity. The implication for these general findings will be discussed first. Then the implication of the findings for ethnic identity followed by the implications of the racial identity findings will be discussed.

Overview of Within Race Differences

The most significant finding of this study was that the groups differed on aspects of ethnic identity, but not in their racial identity. This result suggested that Black American Non-Immigrant and Black Immigrant/Descendants manage their racial identity similarly while still maintaining a distinct process of managing their ethnic identity at the same time. Put differently,

members of these groups identify with the larger socio-political Black racial category and manage intrapsychic and interpersonal reactions to racism in a similar fashion, but at the same time, manage affiliation to their defined ethnic community differently—in accordance with definitions of Alvarez (2002) derived from Helms and Cook (1999). Although this finding is preliminary, it is supported by the two-factor theory of Black identity in which Black individuals are recognized as having multiple social identities that can have different strengths of identification with each identity (Cross, 1991). This challenged the monolith conception of the Black race in suggesting that Blacks do not have a homogenous shared ethnicity—which is implied by the Black Monolith. Furthermore, this preliminary finding—which suggested different processes of constructing ethnic identity and racial identity—lent support to the existing within race scholarship which acknowledged the importance of studying both ethnic sub-group identity and shared pan-ethnic/racial identities (Flores & Huo, 2012; Huo et al., 2005; Jones-Correa & Leal, 1996).

It is interesting to note, however, that this preliminary finding is somewhat inconsistent with an empirical finding of contained in a within-race group study. Jones-Correa and Leal (1996) found different levels of identification with pan-ethnic/racial labels among Latinx sub-groups. While they did not evaluate pan-ethnic/racial identity using a developmental model, the strength of identification with a pan-ethnic/racial identity is a common factor between their study and this present study. In contrast, the Blacks in this preliminary study demonstrate a similar level of racial identity between ethnic sub-groups. Perhaps, this conflict in findings can be explained by the high-representation of first-generation immigrants in their sample. When Jones-Correa and Leal (1996) stratified participants responses by generation, they found that pan-ethnicity was more likely to be endorsed similarly among second-generation Latinx sub-groups.

Second-generation immigrants are likely to assimilate to the marginalized identities that they racial groups as (Portes et al., 2005).

Ethnic Identity Findings

The results suggested that Black American Non-Immigrant respondents and Black Immigrant/Descendant respondents differed in some but not all aspects of their ethnic self-concept in terms of how it was assessed that were queried in the online survey. While the results were a little ambiguous, they suggested that Black American Non-Immigrants had a somewhat less achieved ethnic identity than their Black Immigrant/Descendant counterparts. Recall that an achieved ethnic identity consists of exploration accompanied by an acceptance and clear and secure understanding of one's ethnic group (Phinney, 1989).

Black American Non-Immigrants endorsed a lower level of participation in their own cultural group's practices—such as ethnic foods, music, and customs— and less of a clear understanding of their ethnic background. However, Black American Non-Immigrants reported a lower level of feeling more connected to another culture other than the one of their ethnic group compared to their immigrant counterparts. This finding conflicted with the first two findings and suggests that Black American Non-Immigrant have more commitment to their ethnic identity in some aspect. Nonetheless, the feeling of being more connected to another culture more than the one of their ethnic group was moderately disagreed with in Black Immigrants/Descendants which means a generally moderate level of commitment on this item. Overall, these three findings then suggest that Black American Non-Immigrants may have a less achieved ethnic identity due to having a lesser degree of ethnic group exploration and clarity than Black immigrants/ descendants, despite a conflicting finding.

In a way, these findings suggested a Black American Non-Immigrants may be more likely to have a foreclosed ethnic identity; where they have accepted Black culture as their own, but yet they do not endorse a particularly strong sense of involvement and/or clarity of what their culture means for them. However, this view must be qualified by their responses to other aspects of ethnic identity that did not differentiate them from Black Immigrants/Descendants. Both groups reported high positive regard for their ethnic group and spending time exploring their own cultural group. Furthermore, both groups rejected the statement, albeit weakly, that they felt lost regarding in regard to their ethnic identity. Thus, taken together, the pattern of results for ethnic identity may indicate that both groups have an achieved ethnic identity. However, there are specific, perhaps nuanced ways that Black American Non-Immigrants feel less fully embedded in an ethnicity than do Black Immigrants/Descendants and vice versa. However, the nuanced feeling of not being fully embedded into an ethnicity was stronger for Black American non-immigrants in this study compared to their immigrant counterparts. Being an immigrant may highlight certain kinds of differences with members of one's own ethnicity in the new country and this may contribute to a somewhat stronger ethnic identity for Black Immigrants/Descendants relative to Black American Non-Immigrants.

Perhaps this pattern of results should not be surprising. Black Americans have been disconnected from their original African roots for over 400 years and may still struggle with what it means to be a distant African descendant in America (Owino, 2014; X & Haley, 1965). Alongside having developed their own culture within the U.S., socio-cultural movements—such as the Pan-African movement or more recently the natural hair movement—encourage many Black Americans Non-Immigrants to embrace their African ancestry. However, many Black Americans Non-Immigrants do not know their exact exactly where their African bloodline hails

from. Perhaps the difference in the strength of ethnic clarity may result from Black Americans Non-Immigrants feeling disconnected from their ancestral culture. In other words, they may understand that they have a different culture from those who inhabit their ancestral homelands and yet at the same time their culture (and sub-cultures) are neither positively regarded or authentically embraced in America. In regards, to the conflicting finding that suggests that Black Immigrants/Descendants may feel more connected to another culture other than the one of their own ethnic group, this may stem from living in-between cultures.

However, just as there should not be a focus on a Black Monolith that overestimates important psychological differences in experience and identity among Blacks, one should not treat all Black American Non-Immigrants as alike. Indeed, the complexity of these preliminary findings only underscores the need for a more nuanced understanding of individuals and their intersectionality of identities (Crenshaw, 1989; Strayhorn, 2013).

Racial Identity Findings

In contrast to the pattern of findings regarding ethnic identity, the two groups did not differ on any stage of racial identity development based on the Cross (1971) Nigrescence Model. The survey polled respondents on three of the five racial identity stages Cross proposed—pre-encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization. The results suggested a high degree of similarity between Black American Non-Immigrants and Black Immigrants/Descendants in terms of Black racial identity development. Specifically, the findings suggested that Black American Non-Immigrants and Black Immigrants/Descendants both had disagreed with being in pre-encounter and immersion-emersion stages marked by low-racial salience or extreme and superficial Black pride and anti-white attitudes. Rather, these findings suggested that members of

both groups were in the internalization stage which implies a salient Black identity and multicultural perspectives.

It was possible that Black American Non-Immigrants might have had higher scores than Black Immigrants/Descendants for both the immersion-emersion and internalization. Black Americans whose forbearers did not choose to immigrate to the United States were anticipated to have a higher score on those measures due to the assumption that they have a longer relationship with the U.S racial stratification system and thus should have a stronger embrace of a racial identity (Rong & Brown, 2002). Also based on the possibility that immigrants and their descendants may interpret the racial hierarchy and perceive racism differently (Waters, 1994). Additionally, intra-generational trauma from slavery and other histories of oppression affects reactions and the impacts of racism (DeGruy, 2005). Since these groups have had different histories of slavery and oppression, it is possible that their reactions to racism may be varied based on these facts.

However, the results from this preliminary finding did not evidence those possibilities. Rather these preliminary findings suggested having dark skin, regardless of ethnic origin, may make one's race salient to others and to self especially if non-Blacks do not differentiate among Black people and if the society generally treats Black individuals poorly (Greer, 2013; Rong & Brown, 2002). This finding is supported by segmented assimilation theory which asserts that immigrants will assimilate to specific segments of society based on how they are viewed and treated—i.e., racialized (Portes et al., 2005). This finding suggests Black Immigrants/Descendants are racialized in a similar manner as their non-immigrant counterparts.

It was notable, however, that the responses of the two groups appeared to place them in the internalization stage. Members of both groups agreed that racial identity and multicultural

perspectives are important, expressed a moderate sense of comfort with Blackness and Black awareness, endorsed feelings of patience and understanding and generally felt a sense of solidarity among Blacks. This finding may be explained by the composition of the study's sample—college-educated Blacks—who volunteered to participate in this study. College can be an environment that can trigger development in racial identities due to exposure of different peoples and cultures and to discrimination and racism (Alvarez, 2002; Nsangou & Dundes, 2018). This finding is also supported by the research of Cross (1979) which found the internalization stage to have the highest scores among Black college students. Additionally, the high number of second-generation immigrants may have played a role, as aforementioned, since they are likely to assimilate to marginalize identities (Portes et al., 2005).

Moreover, many of the participants, who were known to the author, tended to be involved in multicultural affairs on campus which can enhance the development of a racial identity. Professionals involved in multicultural affairs can support students' racial identity development by validating feelings of confusion and anxiety in the encounter stage and providing resources to express emotions of anger and passion in the immersion-emersion state. Additionally, these professionals can assist students in defining what their racial identity could mean for them and push students to have an intersectional awareness which will allow for a more internalized identity (Alvarez, 2002).

Study Limitations and Future Directions

As a first step in understanding intra-racial group identity differences among Blacks living in the United States, this study drew attention to a few possibly meaningful differences between Black ethnic groups. The findings underscored the need for and value in conceptually

driven, nuanced analysis of what these groups shared and how they differed. However, the limitations of this study must be acknowledged.

First, the sample was a convenience sample of volunteers whose identity with their race may have contributed to their willingness to volunteer. Furthermore, the study consisted of a well-educated sample which may also bear influences on the development of racial and ethnic identities. In addition, there was perhaps important variations in the characteristics of the Black Immigrant/Descendants group. For example, there may be important differences in their experiences, or the experiences of their forebearers, as a function of the nation from which they or their parents immigrated. Black individuals in the Caribbean nations may share with Black American Non-Immigrants a family history of being brought to the Americas as slaves. These group histories may be more shared than Black Africans who may have had forms of slavery and/or colonial oppression that was different. Of course, racism is worldwide, and the study did not investigate the specific background experiences of its participants, backgrounds that may bear on ethnic and racial identity. Future studies should carefully consider how best to differentiate among groups in order to study their experiences and perceptions. The present study provided preliminary evidence that such research efforts could be fruitful.

The items used in the survey were selected based on the judgment and interest of the author. There are many other questions that could have been posed. It was encouraging that three ethnic identity items did provide some evidence of differentiation among the two groups. The item selections were guided by conceptual models—Cross (1971) and Phinney (1989)—and a longer item battery (and larger sample size) would permit psychometric assessment of an ethnic and/or racial identity questionnaire's construct validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability. By virtue of its preliminary nature, the data analysis focused on item-by-item

comparisons, which could yield differences that were not actually true differences. Yet, these preliminary findings suggested that certain features of ethnic identity may be important in understanding these two groups of Black individuals and provided a basis for future item development. With longer batteries, it would be possible to test whether sets of items cluster on factors such as racial identity development, for instance.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The color line that DuBois (1900) prophesied remained salient in the 21st century as race relations were continually escalated by contemporary issues such as institutionalized racism, racialized police brutality, and other racial disparities. Many scientific investigations and conversations about race have been prompted in attempt to unpack the system of the U.S racial hierarchy and understand its effects on the lived experience of members of different racial groups. Although it is important to investigate and understand inequalities among racial groups, it is equally important that scientific endeavors not reduce race relations and the racial dialogue to pan-ethnic race monoliths. A focus primarily among racial groups masks potentially important nuances within racial groups and results in this monolithic conception, particularly for the Black race. As argued in the introduction, the dominant discourse of race relations results in Black people being viewed in a monolithic manner. The thesis attempted to dissect the Black Monolith by exploring possible identity differences between ethnicities within the Black race and made initial steps to differentiate between Black Americans and their counterparts who were first- or second-generation immigrants. The findings begin to erode the value of the Black Monolith by uncovering differences in ethnic identity that may capture differences in other aspects of the lived experience including the social cost of ethnic identities, experiences of racialization and intra-racial interactions.

In closing, I seek to let the curious reader know that the motivation for this research stemmed from the laboratory of my life. Being born in the United States and being a descendant

of Sierra Leonean immigrants, I struggled in negotiating both my ethnic and racial identity. This research sought to draw attention to the identity struggle I face which may be common in other second-generation immigrants as our identities become racialized and we live in-between cultures. I attempted to highlight new ways to think of racial identity and ethnic identity as distinct, but complementary constructs that can be shaped independently and simultaneously. In witnessing my own Nigrescence, I have come to better understand how my Black identity exists alongside my Sierra Leonean identity. It is my hope that the findings from this research may help make sense of internal conflicts that may be present in other Black sub-populations negotiating both their ethnicity and their race.

I believe the tensions that exists among Black ethnic groups is, in part, to an implicit belief in a Black Monolith. As Black people, we may oversimplify our own experiences in the spirit of racial solidarity. While this has good intentions, it can often lead to frustration when there is a lack of cooperation and resistance, especially among Black immigrants, to converge toward a singular Black identity which may implicitly overlook important cultural and historical differences inherent to these ethnic identities. This research hopes to inspire better solidarity among Black ethnic groups by helping us to see, understand, and honor the ethnic differences that exist among us. In having a better understanding of how Black ethnic groups can see and experience their Blackness differently, we can reduce miscommunication between us which results from neglecting these nuances in our identities and thus allow for better collaboration. It is my humble hope that this thesis could offer this more nuanced understanding which may have profound implications for racial solidarity.

As a young scholar, I am aware, however, that I had neither the tools nor the knowledge to fully uncover the potential ground-breaking implications for this topic. Nonetheless, let this

thesis demonstrate that I was willing to essay a shot in the dark in pursuit of new findings. This research attempted to pave a way into examining intra-racial differences by exploring the ethnic and racial complexities that exist within Black race as a microcosm. My humblest hope is that this thesis may add to the larger race scholarship and may instigate new conversations that will allow us to glance *within* the color lines of the 21st century.

Appendix A

Demographics Questionnaire

General Demographic Information

*Indicates Required Question

1. What is your age? (select one) *

- a) Under 18
- b) 18 to 25
- c) 26 to 34
- d) 35 to 50
- e) over 50

2. To which gender identity do you most identify with? (select one) *

- a) Man
- b) Woman
- c) Gender Variant/ Nonconforming
- d) Prefer not to specify
- e) Prefer to self-describe (please indicate in space below in "other")
- f) Other:_____

3. What racial/ethnic identity do you identify with? (check all that apply) *

Description: "Black American" your family history traces back to U.S Slavery. "Afro Caribbean" you are an immigrant from a Caribbean country and you are classified as Black in the U.S or you were born here, but your parents and/or grand parents have immigrated from any Caribbean Country. "African" you are an immigrant from any African country and you are classified as Black in the U.S or you were born here, but your parents and/or grand parents have immigrated from any African country.

- a) Black American/ African-American
- b) Black Caribbean/ Afro-Caribbean
- c) Black African
- d) Latinx / Hispanic
- e) Asian/Pacific Islander
- f) Middle Eastern
- g) Native American/
- h) American Indian
- i) White/ Caucasian
- j) I prefer to self-describe (please indicate below in "other"):

4. What is your classification in college? (select one) *
- a) Freshman/ First Year
 - b) Student
 - c) Sophomore
 - d) Junior
 - e) Senior
 - f) Fifth Year
 - g) Senior
 - h) Graduated
 - i) Did not attend
 - j) Other:
5. Are you currently enrolled or have you graduated from Penn State? (select one) *
- a) Yes
 - b) No
6. If no, please list institution that you are attending/graduated from: _____
7. What is/are or was/were your major(s)? *
(If not applicable, put N/A): _____
8. What range does/did your cumulative GPA fall into? (select one) *
- a) 4.00 to 3.80
 - b) 3.79 to 3.50
 - c) 3.49 to 3.00
 - d) 2.99to 2.50
 - e) 2.49 to 2.00
 - f) Below 2.00
 - g) Prefer not to answer
 - h) Nonapplicable

Caribbean/African Demographic Information

Description: If you indicated Black American and not Afro-Caribbean, African, or Latinx, skip this section and continue to the next one. If you indicated Afro Caribbean, African, or Latinx, please answer the following:

9. Which country or countries are you and/or your relatives from? _____
10. Were you born in the U.S? (select one)
- a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Other: _____

11. If you were not born in the U.S, how long have you lived in the U.S? (select one)
(If you were born in the U.S please skip this question)

- a) 0 to 5 years
- b) 6 to 10 years
- c) 11 to 15 years
- d) 15 years and over
- e) Other: _____

12. Were your parents born in the U.S? (select one)

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know
- d) Other: _____

Appendix B

Ethnic Identity Items

Description: These statements are geared towards understanding how much you identify with your specific ethnicity within the African Diaspora given your family background and history. These questions are NOT referring to engaging with a "General Black or Diaspora Culture". Please Indicate whether or not you: Strongly disagree (1), Disagree (2), Weakly disagree (3), Weakly agree (4), Agree (5), Strongly agree (6) to the following statement

*Indicates Required Question

13. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs. *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

14. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

15. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me. *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

16. I am happy to be a part of my ethnic group. *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

17. I feel like I'm either lost, in "limbo", or in-between cultures without a strong sense of a specific cultural pride. *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

18. I feel more connected to another culture than my own ethnic group. *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

19. If you agreed on any level to the above question please indicate the culture:_____

Appendix C

Racial Identity Items

Description: Please Indicate whether or not you: strongly disagree (1), Disagree (2), Weakly disagree (3), Weakly agree (4), Agree (5), Strongly agree (6) to the following statements:

*Indicates Required Question

20. I acknowledge race, but it is not a big part of my life.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

21. The way some of Black people are behaving we will never be accepted *
("Black People" refers to the Black race in general in this case)

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

22. Privately, I sometimes have negative feelings about being a member of my ethnic/racial group.*

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

23. I feel social pressure to make Blackness a much larger part of my identity when I don't feel like it has to be *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

24. The way I dress, my hair style, and other symbols of Black Pride are extremely important to me.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

25. I find myself feeling a hatred and disdain for the majority culture and/or people more times than not *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

26. We cannot truly be free as a people until our daily lives are guided by values and principles grounded in our ethnic/racial heritage *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

27. The solution to the race problem is a complete separation of the races *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

28. I believe it is important to have both an ethnic identity and a multicultural perspective, because this connects me to other groups (Blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, Whites, Jews, LGBTQ, American Indians, etc.) *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

29. I believe it is more important to be connected to with individuals of my own ethnic/racial group rather than all cultural backgrounds*

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

30. I tend to be rather critical and impatient with most White people as well as Black people who are not aware of injustice *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

31. I feel at ease and comfortable with my level of Blackness and Black Awareness *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

32. It is easy for me to OPENLY criticize issues, movements, dominant ideas of Blackness without feeling like a "traitor"*

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

33. It is easy for me to THINK of some criticisms of issues, movements, dominant ideas of Blackness without feeling like a "traitor" *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

34. I am patient and understanding toward people who do not have my level of awareness *

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

References

- Alvarez, A. N. (2002). Racial identity and Asian Americans: Support and challenges. *New directions for student services*, 97, 33-44. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alvin_Alvarez/publication/11839140_Racial_identity_and_reflected_appraisal_as_influences_on_Asian_Americans%27_racial_adjustment/links/0fcfd50b7bef537fe8000000/Racial-identity-and-reflected-appraisal-as-influences-on-Asian-Americans-racial-adjustment.pdf
- Arengue, A., Perry, S., & Clark, D. (2018). Poll: 64 percent of Americans say racism remains a major problem. *NBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/politics-news/poll-64-percent-americans-say-racism-remains-major-problem-n877536>
- Attiah, K., & Madowo, L. (2018). 'Black Panther': Why the relationship between Africans and Black Americans is so messed up. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/global-opinions/wp/2018/02/16/black-panther-why-the-relationship-between-africans-and-african-americans-is-so-messed-up/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.7ac13f1366c5
- Banton, M. (2012). The colour line and the colour scale in the twentieth century. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(7), 1109-1131. doi:10.1080/01419870.2011.605902
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(6), 931-950. doi:10.1080/0141987042000268530

- Brown, H., & Jones, J. A. (2015). Rethinking panethnicity and the race-immigration divide: An ethnoracialization model of group formation. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(1), 181-191. doi:10.1177/2332649214558304
- Brubaker, R. (2009). Ethnicity, race, and nationalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 21-42. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115916>
- Brunson, R. K. (2007). "Police don't like black people": African-American young men's accumulated police experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 6(1), 71-101. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2007.00423.x
- Butcher, K. F. (1994). Black immigrants in the United States - A comparison with native Blacks and other immigrants. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 47(2), 265-284. doi:10.2307/2524420
- Byrd, C. M. (2011). The measurement of racial/ethnic identity in children: A critical review. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 38(1), 3-31. doi:10.1177/0095798410397544
- Chun, K.-T. (1980). The myth of Asian American success and its educational ramifications. *IRCD Bulletin*, 15, n1-2. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED193411.pdf>
- Cikara, M., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2014). The neuroscience of intergroup relations: An integrative review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(3), 245-274. doi:10.1177/1745691614527464
- Conley, D., & Cheng, J. (2003). Race-the power of an illusion. Retrieved from https://www.pbs.org/race/000_General/000_00-Home.htm
- Coogler, R. (Director). (2018). *Black Panther* [Motion Picture]. Buena Vista Home Entertainment. United States: Marvel Studios

- Craig, M. A., Rucker, J. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). The pitfalls and promise of increasing racial diversity: Threat, contact, and race relations in the 21st century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 188-193. doi:10.1177/0963721417727860
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). *Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics*. Paper presented at the University of Chicago Legal Forum.
- Cross, W. E. (1971) *Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation*. *Black World*, 1971, 20 (9), 13-27
- Cross, W. E. (1978). The Thomas and Cross models of psychological nigrescence: A review. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 5(1), 13-31. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F009579847800500102>
- Cross, W. E. (1979). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: An empirical analysis. In A. W. Boykin, A. J. Franklin, & J. F. Yates (Eds.), *Research directions of black psychologists* (pp. 107-130): Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*: Temple University Press.
- DeGruy, J. L. (2005). *Post traumatic slave syndrome: America's legacy of enduring injury and healing*. Milwaukie, Oregon: Uptone Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1900). The present outlook for the dark races of mankind. In *The problem of the color line at the turn of the twentieth century (2014)*: Fordham University Press. Retrieved from https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/english/currentstudents/undergraduate/modules/fulllist/special/en304/syllabus2017-18/dubois_the_present_outlook.pdf

- Eibach, R., & Keegan, T. (2006). Free at last? Social dominance, loss aversion, and White and Black Americans' differing assessments of racial progress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(3).
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.453>
- Feagin, J. R. (2000). *Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations*: Routledge.
- Flores, N. M., & Huo, Y. J. (2012). “We” are not all alike: Consequences of neglecting national origin identities among Asians and Latinos. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4*(2), 143-150. doi:10.1177/1948550612449025
- Glazer, N., Greeley, A. M., Patterson, O., & Moynihan, D. P. (1974). What is ethnicity? *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 27*(8), 16-35. doi:10.2307/3822652
- Gooding, C. C. (2019). Race, ethnicity, and respectability: Examining Afro-Caribbean identity politics through the Obama presidency. *Politics, Groups, and Identities, 1*-18.
doi:10.1080/21565503.2019.1584754
- Gordon, V. V. (1977). *The self-concept of Black Americans*: University Press of America.
- Greer, C. M. (2013). *Black ethnics: Race, immigration, and the pursuit of the American dream*: Oxford University Press. USA.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hicken, M. T., Kravitz-Wirtz, N., Durkee, M., & Jackson, J. S. (2018). Racial inequalities in health: Framing future research. *Social Science & Medicine, 199*, 11-18.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.027>

- Huo, Y. J., Molina, L. E., Sawahata, R., & Deang, J. M. (2005). Leadership and the management of conflicts in diverse groups: Why acknowledging versus neglecting subgroup identity matters. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(2), 237-254. doi:10.1002/ejsp.243
- Imoagene, O. (2018). Gauging panethnicity: Affirmative action, African Americans, and children of Black immigrants. *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal, 1*-15. doi:10.1080/17528631.2018.1559790
- Jones, C. P. (2002). Confronting institutionalized racism. *Phylon (1960-), 7*-22. Retrieved from https://sph.umd.edu/sites/default/files/files/Jones-Confronting-Institutionalized-Racism_Phylon%202003.pdf
- Jones-Correa, M., & Leal, D. L. (1996). Becoming "Hispanic": Secondary panethnic identification among Latin American-origin populations in the united states. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18*(2), 214-254. doi:10.1177/07399863960182008
- Kinket, B., & Verkuyten, M. (1997). Levels of ethnic self-identification and social context. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*(4), 338-354. doi:10.2307/2787094
- Kochhar, R., & Fry, R. (2014). Wealth inequality has widened along racial, ethnic lines since end of great recession. *Pew Research Center, 12*, 1-15. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/12/12/racial-wealth-gaps-great-recession/>
- Kretsedemas, P. (2008). Redefining 'race' in North America. *Current Sociology, 56*(6), 826-844. doi:10.1177/0011392108095341
- Kuebler, M. (2013). Closing the wealth gap: A review of racial and ethnic inequalities in homeownership. *Sociology Compass, 7*(8), 670-685. doi:10.1111/soc4.12056
- Lee, J., & Bean, F. D. (2007). Reinventing the color line immigration and America's new racial/ethnic divide. *Social Forces, 86*(2), 561-586.

- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. *Handbook of adolescent psychology*, 9(11), 159-187. Retrieved from https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/36763424/identity.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1554668132&Signature=4gfDan5KBNXzwhCk2WZGFpnr0vo%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DIdentity_in_Adolescence.pdf
- Marrow, H. B. (2009). New immigrant destinations and the American colour line. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(6), 1037-1057. doi:10.1080/01419870902853224
- Nelson, C. (2009). *An interpretive history of African-American education 1700 to 1950*. The Ohio State University, Retrieved from <https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/u.osu.edu/dist/1/3078/files/2012/06/Charley-Nelson.pdf>
- Nsangou, A., & Dundes, L. (2018). Parsing the gulf between Africans and African Americans. *Social Sciences*, 7(2), 24. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7020024>
- Okamoto, D. G. (2003). Toward a theory of panethnicity: Explaining Asian American collective action. *American Sociological Review*, 68(6), 811-842. doi:10.2307/1519747
- Owino, P. (Writer). (2014). Bound: Africans versus African Americans [Documentary]. In Nyar Nam Productions, End Time Harvest Productions, & Triwar Pictures.
- Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological nigrescence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 17(2), 187-226. doi:10.1177/0011000089172001
- Pearson, A. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2009). The nature of contemporary prejudice: Insights from aversive racism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3(3), 314-338. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00183.x

- Perez, A. D., & Hirschman, C. (2009). The changing racial and ethnic composition of the us population: Emerging American identities. *Population and Development Review*, 35(1), 1-51. doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457.2009.00260.x
- Pettit, B., & Gutierrez, C. (2018). Mass incarceration and racial inequality. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 77(3-4), 1153-1182. doi:10.1111/ajes.12241
- Pew Research Center. (2017). *Views of racism as a major problem increase sharply, especially among Democrats*. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/08/29/views-of-racism-as-a-major-problem-increase-sharply-especially-among-democrats/>
- Phelan, J., & Rudman, L. (2010). Reactions to ethnic deviance: The role of backlash in racial stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 99, 265-281. doi:10.1037/a0018304
- Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9(1-2), 34-49. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0272431689091004>
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 499. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2270238>
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of adolescent research*, 7(2), 156-176. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F074355489272003>

- Portes, A., Fernández-Kelly, P., & Haller, W. (2005). Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(6), 1000-1040. doi:10.1080/01419870500224117
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17(1), 271-320. doi:10.1080/10463280601055772
- Reddick, T. (1998). African vs. African-American: A shared complexion does not guarantee racial solidarity. *Ghana Life*. Retrieved from <https://www.library.yale.edu/~fboateng/akata.htm>
- Richeson, J. A., & Sommers, S. R. (2016). Toward a social psychology of race and race relations for the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67(1), 439-463. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115115
- Rong, X. L., & Brown, F. (2002). Socialization, culture, and identities of Black immigrant children: What educators need to know and do. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(2), 247-273. doi:10.1177/0013124502342008
- Sall, D. (2019). Convergent identifications, divergent meanings: The racial and ethnic identities of second-generation west African youth. *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal*, 1-19. doi:10.1080/17528631.2018.1559785
- Saperstein, A., Penner, A. M., & Light, R. (2013). Racial formation in perspective: Connecting individuals, institutions, and power relations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 359-378.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American

- racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(1), 18-39.
doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0201_2
- Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist*, 60(1), 16. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15641918>
- Strayhorn, T. (Ed.). (2013). (Ed.). *Living at the intersections: Social identities and Black collegian*: Information Age Publishing. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=QIoDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR1&dq=black+college+men+intersectional+identities&ots=2PR3TjTNkS&sig=r93-UWfVLqO71zX8y0xiEA1_yWs#v=onepage&q=black%20college%20men%20intersectional%20identities&f=false
- Suzuki, B. H. (1977). Education and the socialization of Asian Americans: A revisionist analysis of the “model minority” thesis. *Amerasia Journal*, 4(2), 23-51. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ172849>
- Suzuki, B. H. (2002). Revisiting the model minority stereotype: Implications for student affairs practice and higher education. *New directions for student services*, 2002(97), 21-32. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ss.36>
- Tatum, B. (2003). Beyond black and white. In *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* (Revised Edition ed., pp. 107-130): Basic Books.
- Trujillo, M. D., Garcia, R. L., & Shelton, J. N. (2015). “I thought you were Japanese”: Ethnic miscategorization and identity assertion. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 21(4), 507.

doi: 10.1037/cdp0000016

Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America*: University of California Press.

Waters, M. C. (1994). Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation Black immigrants in New York City. *International Migration Review*, 28(4), 795-820. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2547158>

Waters, M. C. (1999). *Black identities*: Harvard University Press.

Waters, M. C., Bean, F., & Rose, S. B. (1999). West Indians and African Americans at work: Structural differences and cultural stereotypes. *Immigration and opportunity: Race, ethnicity and employment in the United States*.

Waters, M. C., Kasinitz, P., & Asad, A. L. (2014). Immigrants and African Americans. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40(1), 369-390. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145449

Weinreich, P. (1983). Emerging from threatened identities: Ethnicity and gender in redefinitions of ethnic identity. In *Threatened identities*, edited by G. Breakwell. London: John Wiley and Sons. 149-185.

Weinreich, P. (1988). The operationalization of ethnic identity. In J. Berry and R. Annis (Eds.), *Ethnic psychology: Research and practice with immigrants, refugees, native peoples, ethnic groups and sojourners*, 149-168.

X, M., & Haley, A. (1965). *The autobiography of Malcom X*. New York: Grove Press.

ACADEMIC VITA

William Okrafo-Smart

Email: willsmart121@gmail.com

EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University | Schreyer Honors College
College of Liberal Arts

University Park, PA
May 2019

Bachelor of Science in Psychology, Concentration: Neuroscience

Bachelor of Science in Global & International Studies, Concentration: Wealth & Inequality

Minors: Economics and Sociology

Honors & Awards: Student Marshall for Global and International Studies Department (2019)

Paterno Fellow, Dean's List Recipient, Bunton Waller and Lenfest Scholarship Recipient, Sharbaugh Trustee

Scholarship Recipient, MRC Academic Scholarship Award (2019), Black Man on the Rise (2017 & 2016)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

World in Conversation: A Center for Public Diplomacy

University Park, PA
May 2017-May 2019

Advanced Facilitation Coach

- Worked with and provided regular feedback for facilitators to navigate conversations in ways that constructively challenge perspectives and invite deeper understanding of society and inequity.
- Collaborated in weekly meetings with staff to deliberate on design and delivery of weekly workshops and class sessions for advanced facilitation team; Aid in development of training modules.
- Shared basic management responsibilities for student facilitation team including date entry and grades.

Dialogue Assistant—level 2 | Advanced Dialogue Facilitator

August 2015-May 2017

- Engaged in over 400 hours of training in conflict transformation, Socratic inquiry and small group management in order to understand and navigate complex dynamics of dialogues surrounding contentious social issues.
- Expanded the perspectives of participants in dialogue by facilitating radically open conversations the largest University based cross-cultural dialogue center in the United States.
- Work alongside students in a way that supports their own examination of the art of facilitation.

iKhaya Le Langa: Social Enterprise for Community Development

Cape Town, South Africa

Council on International Educational Exchange Intern

June 2018-August 2018

- Designed, implemented, and facilitated Youth Enterprise Program (YEP) which taught 10 local youth topics such as leadership, fundamentals of business, and marketing to support informal business in the community over a period of 5 weeks.
- Learned and familiarized and marketed a new crypto-token, UBU, and its uses in a socioeconomically disadvantaged community to encourage economic liquidity.
- Assisted in drafting proposal for Academic Partnership Center to increase Black Male representation among abroad interns utilizing groundwork and cases studies.

LEADERSHIP & INVOLVEMENT

BLUEprint: Peer Mentorship Program

University Park, PA

Family Leader | Peer Mentor

August 2015-May 2018

- Received leadership and mentorship training through an established peer-mentoring curriculum, which is internationally certified by the College Reading and Learning Association
- Serve as peer-mentor to a first-year student by offering academic, social and cultural support towards their acclimation to Penn State
- Participate in enrichment programs that promote the development of cultural awareness, professional and personal skills, in addition to engaging in various community service activities
- Nurture cohesive relationships of trust that help interactions between diverse people in small groups

For more information visit: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/william-okrafo-smart-7481a8129/>