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Several researchers suggest that racial identity is important to African American youth’s mental health and overall psychosocial adjustment (Jones, Cross, Defour, 2007; Mandara, Gaylord-Harden, Richards, & Ragsdale, 2009). The primary reason seems to be related to the fact that it helps youth cope with the stresses of discrimination (Caldwell, Zimmerman, Bernat, Sellers, & Notaro, 2002; Rowely, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1998; Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006). For instance, Spencer (1995) argued that normative development for African American youth is inextricably linked with exposure to environments which often devalue their racial group. For these youth, such environments can lead to debilitating perceptions of oneself as a person of African descent, and lower self-esteem and general mental health. She further argued that a positive view of one’s racial group buffers African American youth from the negative psychosocial consequences of such environments (Spencer, Dupree, & Hartmann, 1997).

A related notion is that a positive racial identity may offset the societal stigma of being African American, preventing youth from internalizing negative stereotypes of African Americans, as those with positive views of their “Africanness” are less concerned about the perceptions of others (McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi & Wilson, 2000).

These assertions suggest that high levels of racial identity are associated with more positive psychosocial outcomes in African American youth. Indeed, over the past few decades, a great deal of empirical research has focused on examining associations
between racial identity and psychosocial outcomes in African American youth. However, the increase in research also brings an increase in mixed findings, leaving the actual relationship between racial identity and African American youth psychosocial adjustment unclear. For example, some research has shown that high levels of racial identity among African American adolescents and young adults is associated with positive outcomes such as academic attainment, fewer risky behaviors, less aggression, active coping, and mental health (McMahon & Watts, 2002; Yasui, Dorham & Dishion, 2004; Rowley et al., 1998; Townsend & Belgrave, 2000; Wong, Eccles, Sameroff, 2003). Counter to these findings, several studies have found no relationship between racial identity and psychosocial adjustment (Awad, 2007; Caldwell et al., 2002; Carter, DeSole, Sicalides, Glass, & Tyler, 1997), while others found that some aspects of racial identity are related to poorer mental health and academic adjustment (Anglin & Wade, 2007; Munford, 1994; Pierre & Mahalik, 2005).

There are several reasons for these discrepancies. First, given that there are over fifteen racial identity theories, there may be differences in the theoretical conceptualizations of racial identity (e.g., stage models versus multidimensional conceptualizations). Second, there are several racial identity sub-factors (e.g., public regard, racial pride), which may be differentially related to various psychosocial adjustment outcomes. This problem is further compounded when studies use a composite measure of several different racial identity factors. Another problem may be that most studies fail to assess the effects of potentially important moderators, such as gender. These and other limitations make it difficult to compare studies and interpret the overall
findings. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is twofold. The first is to organize the disparate racial identity theories, models and sub-factors into a coherent conceptual framework. The second purpose is to conduct a meta-analytic review of the effects of racial identity on African American youth psychosocial adjustment using the derived conceptual framework, as well as examine potential moderators of this relationship. The growing interest in racial identity makes it an area in need of a systematic review that provides an overall estimate of effects. The ultimate goal is develop an understanding of the overall effect of racial identity on African American youth’s psychosocial adjustment.

The next sections of the current proposal will review the literature on the following topics: (1) identity development in youth, (2) commonly used racial identity measures, (3) the effects of racial identity on African American youth psychosocial adjustment, and (4) influences on this relationship. Lastly, problems with the current racial identity literature will be discussed and a conceptual framework to minimize these problems will be introduced.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Identity Development and Youth

The development of identity is crucial for youth development (Erikson, 1968). The most widely discussed identity development theory comes from Erikson’s (1968) stages of psychosocial development. The foundations or building block of identity (e.g., confidence, awareness of self, autonomy, etc) begin as early as infancy according to these stages. However, as indicated by Erickson’s theory, identity becomes most salient during adolescence when individuals must face the formidable tasks of resolving conflicts and integrating identity elements of previous developmental stages and exploring new roles. The importance of identity, according to Erikson, is that it helps youth develop future goals based on their understanding of who they are in the world. If this identity stage of development is interrupted, an identity crisis will occur and youth will have difficulty choosing roles and may be in a state of confusion which may be associated with a failure to commit to social and later occupational goals. Adaptive identity formation marks the end of youth and adolescence and the transition to adulthood (Erikson, 1968).

Most work on identity has focused on individual identity; however group identity is also important for youth (Newman & Newman, 1975, 2001). Group identity may be especially important for African American youth because of their communalistic or collectivist culture (Jetten, Postmes, & McCauliffe, 2002). Collectivism is an important dimension of an African-centered world view based on the old African proverb “I am
because we are and because we are therefore I am” (Boykin, Jagers, Ellison, & Albury, 1997). These ideals are in direct contrast with Euro-centric ideals of individualism which stress uniqueness and status gained through independence and self-reliance (Constantine, Gainor, Ahluwalia, & Berkel, 2003). This highlights the need to explore group identities in this demographic.

Racial identity is one such group identity. Racial identity refers to the “significance and meaning that African Americans place on race in defining themselves” (Sellers et al., 1998, p. 19). Another definition of racial identity describes the feelings of closeness and similarity to others in their racial group (Broman, Neighbors, & Jackson, 1988). In other words, racial identity represents the salience of race to an individual in his/her overall identity. This salience may vary in its valence (positive or negative) for an individual. Racial identity models encompass a range of ideas about race and its salience may change situationally or at different developmental time points (Cook, 1994; Cross, 1971; 1991; Phinney, 1992; Sellers et al., 1998). They also describe how these beliefs about race have come to develop (Yip, Seaton, Sellers, 2006). Research on African Americans often includes racial identity as it has been linked with overall psychosocial adjustment (Azibo, 1983; Baldwin, 1984; Cross, Parham, & Helms, 1998; Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006). Because of the stigma of being Black in American society, racial identity may be more important in predicting psychosocial outcomes in African Americans than other youth (Smith & Silva, 2011). In addition, racial identity is especially important to adolescents because of the marked identity
development at that time. The next section will discuss the various racial identity models that have been discussed in relation to African American youth.

**Primary Racial Identity Theories and Measures**

The following section will discuss the most influential and prominent racial identity theories since the beginning of its conceptualization. First, stage models which include some of the earliest racial identity theories will be introduced. Second, the newer concept of multidimensional models of racial identity will be highlighted. Included in this discussion will be descriptions of the instruments that have been developed to measure racial identity according to these models.

**Stage Models**

The earliest formal theories of racial identity were stage models similar to Erikson’s (1968) stages of identity development (e.g., Cross, 1991; Helms, 2007, Phinney, 1989). Perhaps the most famous of the various racial identity theories is Cross’ Nigrescence stage model of racial identity (Cross, 1971; 1991). This theory conceptualizes racial identity as stages that African American matriculate through based on life events. Cross’ model originally included five major stages: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, internalization, and internalization-commitment (Cross, 1971). The revised model combines the internalization and internalization-commitment stages into one internalization stage (Cross, 1991). The pre-encounter stage occurs before a person experiencing an incident of racial discrimination. There are three pre-encounter subtypes. The pre-encounter assimilation subtype describes a person whose racial identity is based on their idea of being an individual and being American, rather
than on being African American. The pre-encounter miseducation type describes a person who does not believe in strength or power in the Black community and does not involve themselves in African American related issues and problems. This person may separate themselves from the “average black person” and claim that he/she is “different.”

The last type of the pre-encounter type is racial self-hatred. Because of positive involvement in Black problems and culture, whether by choice or circumstance, this person has severely negative feelings towards African Americans despite being a person of African descent. The type may be associated with self-loathing and guilt (Marks, Settles, Cooke, Morgan, & Sellers, 2004).

The encounter stage occurs when a person experiences a significant discrimination event. This event must be outside the person’s normative experience enough to shock them and propel him/her to move to the next racial identity stage. It must challenge the person’s already established notions about race. The encounter stage consists of two phases. The first phase occurs when the person realizes that what he/she has previously believed about his/her race is incorrect which propels the person to explore a different racial identity. The second phase is when the person decides to then develop a new racial identity or move into the next racial identity stage (Parham, 1989).

The next stage in Cross’ model is the immersion-emersion stage and usually begins following a discrimination experience. There are two subtypes in this stage. The anti-White type has abhorrence toward White people, White society, or anything “not Black.” This person evades supposed symbols of White culture. This Anti-White type is associated with anger towards White individuals (Geismar & Nicoleau, 1993). In the
Black involvement type, the person becomes solely focused on African American culture. In this type, the person may often use visible symbols to display his/her affiliation with the African American racial group. He/she may also make extended efforts to explore their cultural traditions, history, and customs and seek relations with other Black peers (Cross, 1971; 1978; 1991). Also in this type, negative feelings and rage towards Whites may begin to lessen as the person becomes more focused on Blacks. Theoretically, the Immersion/Emersion stage produces a clearer understanding of one’s self identity (Geismar & Nicoleau, 1993).

The last identity stage, according to Cross’ original model, is the internalization stage. The three subtypes in this stage are the internalization nationalist, the internalization bi-culturalist, and the internalization multi-culturalist. An internalization nationalist attempts to emphasize his/her Afro-centricity by involving themselves in all aspects of the Black community and the Black community only. In contrast, an internalization bi-culturalist, focuses on being both African and American. This person is able to celebrate being part of two cultures and immerses him/herself in concerns of both cultures without necessarily having any identity conflict. Lastly, an internalization multi-culturalist derives their identity not just from the African and American cultures, but also from the cultures of various social, economic and spiritual groups. Overall, the internalization stage represents a person’s efforts to build significant relationships with people from both the majority and other oppressed groups. Finally, the Internalization-Commitment stage from the original model is where individuals have internalized their Blackness and are committed to addressing concerns that relate to the Black racial group
(Cross, 1991). The Cross Racial Identity Scale (Cross & Vandiver, 2001; Vandiver et al., 2000) is a 40-item scale based on the revised concepts of this theory.

When Cross’ Nigrescence model was developed many of his studies had been conducted with college student participants. Parham (1989) expanded Cross’ Nigrescence theory by examining how these racial identity stages may differ across the developmental life span. Parham proposed that racial identity begins in adolescence and continues across the life span. He opposed the Nigrescence model’s emphasis on racial identity as a reaction to discrimination and instead proposed that racial identity is a distinct developmental process outside of discrimination, although it may be influenced by discrimination. Thirdly, Parham also describes three pathways related to the manner in which one matriculates through these racial identity stages. The first pathway is called stagnation. This refers to when a person maintains one racial identity stage in their life. Linear progression occurs when a person progresses through the different stages over time. Finally, recycling occurs when an individual progresses through the racial identity stages but experiences a situation which causes them to return to a stage of racial identity that they have already experienced (Marks, Settles, Cook, Morgan, Sellers, 2004; Parham, 1989). Helms and Parham (1996) created the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS) based on the original Nigrescence model and its four stages. Examples of subscales and items in this measure can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Racial Identity Subscales and Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Encounter</td>
<td>I believe that large numbers of Blacks are untrustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>I am determined to find my Black identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
<td>White people can’t be trusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>I feel good about being Black but I don’t limit myself to Black activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>I am not so much a member of a racial group as I am an American.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miseducation</td>
<td>Blacks place more emphasis on having a good time than on hard work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Hatred</td>
<td>I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-White</td>
<td>I have a strong feeling of hatred and disdain for all White people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Nationalist</td>
<td>As Black Nationalists, we must work on empowering ourselves and not on hating others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalist Inclusive</td>
<td>As a multiculturalist, I am connected to many groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmation &amp; Belonging</th>
<th>I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Achieve.</td>
<td>I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Behaviors</td>
<td>I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Group Orientation</td>
<td>I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centrality</th>
<th>In general, being Black is an important part of my self-image.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Regard</td>
<td>I am proud to be Black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Regard</td>
<td>Overall, Blacks are considered good by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>Black people must organize themselves into a separate Black political force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Blacks should view themselves as being Americans first and foremost humans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppressed Minority</td>
<td>Black people should treat other oppressed people as allies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>Blacks should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>I have attended events that have helped me learn more about my ethnicity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td>I wish I were of a different ethnicity (reverse coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>I have a clear sense of what my ethnicity means to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Developmental Inventory of Black Consciousness (DIB-C) is another model based on Cross’ Nigrescence theory (Marks et al., 2004). The stages in this model are similar to the Nigrescence theory, but have different terms and slightly different meaning. The first stage, the preconscious stage, occurs before one has begun a transition towards “Black Consciousness. Following this stage is the confrontation stage, similar to Cross’ internalization nationalist stage, where a person possesses strong Black ideals and negative feelings towards White culture. Next is the internalization stage where the strong Black ideals remain but the anti-White sentiments have decreased. Finally, the integration stage occurs when Blacks seek to take action to end oppression and have tolerance and acceptance of other races. The DIB-C measure reflects these ideas and has 160 items encompassing each of the four stages of Black Consciousness (Milliones, 1976).

A final stage theory is the African Self-Consciousness theory (Baldwin & Bell, 1985). The model describes African Self Conscious as a core structure that all African people have which relates to how people of African descent view the world. Baldwin (1985) states that this Conscious is biologically-derived from melanin in Black’s skin and supported by affirming African environments (e.g., home, school, faith-based organizations). According to this theory, healthy African Self-Consciousness involves a strong sense of African identity and cultural heritage, belief that African survival a top priority, respect for all things “African” and a manner of being towards anything “African.” The African Self-Conscious Scale is a 42-item measure which assesses these four attributes as well as seven expressive dimensions including: education, family,
Another important stage model in assessing African American youth racial identity is Phinney’s (1992) model of ethnic identity development. Ethnic identity is distinguished from racial identity in that it is more often used to compare identities across groups and can be used across ethnicities. This theory conceptualizes ethnic identity as “an enduring, basic aspect of the self that includes a sense of membership in an ethnic group and the attitudes and feelings related to that membership” (Phinney, 1989, p. 37). Phinney’s theory states that ethnic minority individuals have to explore their identities more often because society has showcased their identities less than it has showcased the racial majority. When an ethnic minority child, such as an African American child, begins to explore their identity and comes to terms with the fact that he/she has a distinctly different identity and culture than the majority, the child will resolve issues that come with this exploration. With resolution of identity issues, Phinney’s studies have shown that children have higher self-esteem (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997, p. 28).

According to this model, the components of ethnic identity are self-identification and ethnicity, ethnic behaviors and practices, affirmation and belonging, ethnic identity achievement, and attitudes toward other groups. From this model of ethnic identity the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) was developed. The MEIM has four subscales based on the previously mentioned components of ethnic identity. See Table 1 for the subscales and sample items.

The self-identification and ethnicity subscale assesses what “ethnic label” one
uses for themselves. According to Phinney (1989), the concept of ethnic label differs from ethnicity in that it is not necessarily the group membership an individual has based on their parents’ heritage. Instead, this ethnic label refers to how one identifies himself or herself ethnically. The MEIM assesses this by using an open-ended question so that participants may have various responses (Phinney, 1992). Ethnic behaviors and practices subscale refers to when a person engages in behaviors that are associated with his or her ethnic label. Ethnic practices are most often one engaging social events with other ethnic group members or participating in cultural traditions. The affirmation and belonging subscale refers to feeling of pride that one experiences from being a member of an ethnic group. It includes how happy one feels with their ethnic group, how attached they feel with group, and general positive feelings towards their ethnic group. Ethnicity identity achievement is the stage where people have explored their ethnic groups’ customs, have a positive sense of group membership and have now achieved a secure sense of their racial identity (Phinney, 1992).

**Multidimensional Models**

Another set of theories on racial identity lie in multidimensional theories. In contrast to unidimensional measures which generate a total score of racial identity, multidimensional measures assert that there are various dimensions which comprise racial identity each are present at the same time. Therefore, various dimensions are assessed separately. For example, it may include both the meaning of one’s race to them as well as how they believed others regard their race. In each of these dimensions, there are types which may fluctuate based on situations. Also, distinct from stage theories is
that multidimensional theories also are not based on developmental stages, and thus, they are not exhibited uniformly in a sequence. Rather than being concerned with development, these theories are concerned with the current status of one’s racial identity (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, Chavous, 1998). One of the earliest conceptualizations of a multidimensional model of racial identity was developed by Demo and Hughes (1990). The model includes the following three components: closeness, Black separatism and Black group evaluation as three of the factors. Closeness refers to how much Black individuals believe their ideas are similar to other Blacks’ ideas. Black separatism refers to how much people limit their relationship to being with other Blacks. Black group evaluation refers to ideas that Blacks only have positive attributes rather than any negative ones. Again, these are not stages which do not allow for overlap like in Cross’ theory, so that each component is present at the same time, possibly at varying degrees, and is separately assessed (Marks et al., 2004).

A second multidimensional model of racial identity comes from Allen and colleagues (1989) and includes the following five components: closeness to elite Blacks (more wealthy, elite groups), closeness to mass groups (less SES, oppressed in age and religion), positive stereotypes (embracing only positive beliefs about Blacks), negative stereotypes (embracing only negative beliefs about Blacks), and Black autonomy (building up the Black community through political and social institutions and Black cultural values). Sanders-Thompson’s (1991) created the Multidimensional Racial Identification Scale (MRIS) which is a 31-item measure that was influenced by the components of Allen and Demo & Hughes’ models. The dimensions included in this
measure relate to discrimination, involvement in the Black community, and how one has
been socialized to race in each of the dimensions including physical (how comfortable
one feels with their physical characteristics), cultural (knowledge of cultural traditions
and practices), socio-political (how much awareness and dedication to the social and
political causes that are relative to African Americans), and psychological (sense of
closeness, pride, and commitment to their racial group) (Marks et al., 2004).

More recently, Sellers and colleagues (1998) created the Multidimensional Model
of Racial Identity (MMRI) which combines ideas of the meaning African Americans
attribute to their race, as well as how this meaning may change situationally. This model
argues that racial identity should be understood in the context of other important
identities, such as gender and occupation (Sellers et al., 1998). The MMRI discusses four
race dimensions: salience, centrality, ideology, and regard. Salience refers to how
significant one’s race is to their own self-concept at a specific moment in time or event.
Salience is flexible and dynamic and changes over time. Centrality refers to how
important one’s race is to their self-concept in general. The ideology dimension pertains
to how one believes people of one’s race should behave in society. The final dimension is
regard which is what one believes about their own race. This dimension is divided into
how one believes society feels about his/her race (public regard) and the way that
individual feels about his/her own group (private regard). From the MMRI model both
the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) and a teen version (MIBI-T)
were created to assess these dimensions in African American participants (Scottham,
lists sample items from the MIBI (Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997).

In sum, racial identity is a widely-studied topic in African American literature and numerous models of racial identity have been created to illustrate this crucial aspect of the African American psyche. Two basic types of models have emerged from racial identity research: stage and multidimensional models. Within these models there are differences in how the various components and processes that are involved in racial identity are conceptualized. The existence of different types of models coupled with the various conceptualizations derived from each of those models makes it difficult to manage this information and adds to confusion in the racial identity literature. Again, one of the purposes of this study is to synthesize this literature into a more manageable model to better develop an overall understanding in the literature of the various components of racial identity and how they work. In the next section, the effects of racial identity on psychological and academic variables will be discussed. Also, the way in which these various parts of racial identity may manifest differently on outcomes is highlighted.

**Effects of Racial Identity on African American Youth Psychosocial Adjustment**

The idea of racial identity assumes that African American children exist in a context of racism, discrimination and oppression (McCreary, Slavin, & Berry, 1996; Stevenson & Arrington, 2009). Many studies have found that racism can be acutely distressful to one’s physical and emotional psychosocial adjustment (Carter, 2007; Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Harrell, Hall, & Taliaferro, 2003; Nyborg & Curry, 2003; Plummer & Slane, 1996). Racial discrimination also contributes negatively to African American adolescents' mental health (Broman, 1997; Gaylord-Harden &
Research on racial identity posits that racial identity buffers against the negative effects of racial discrimination (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk-Cone, Zimmerman, 2003; Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006). The research on discrimination highlights the indirect effects of racial identity on outcomes; however racial identity also has direct effects on outcomes in African American youth. The following section will review research on both the direct and indirect associations between racial identity and developmental outcomes by focusing on those that are most commonly studied as outcomes of racial identity in African American youth: academic adjustment, self-esteem, externalizing behaviors, internalizing behaviors, and overall psychosocial adjustment.

**Academic**

One of the most important outcomes for youth is in their academic adjustment. Research studies often discuss the failure of African American youth to achieve academically as the result of a system of oppression which has denied educational opportunities to African Americans, and therefore slowed their academic growth (Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000; Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006; Neblett, Phillip, Cogburn, Sellers, 2006). There are several concepts associated with academic adjustment, such as one’s ideas about their ability to achieve academically (academic efficacy), one’s grade point average, or a combination of these and other variables into an overarching academic adjustment term. Racial identity seems to be directly associated with academic adjustment in that it provides youth with the confidence to achieve academically and enhances their self concept (Smith, Walker, Fields, Brookins, & Seay, 1999). Indirectly, a
positive bond with one’s racial group may buffer against the negative effects of discrimination on these academic outcomes (Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003).

Some studies have found no or minimal relations between racial identity and academic outcomes (Awad, 2007; Lockett & Harrell, 2003). Other studies have found mostly indirect relationships between racial identity and academic outcomes in that racial identity reduces the effect of some other variables (e.g., school attachment, school relevance, motivation, academic self-concept) which then predicts more desired academic outcomes (Awad, 2007; Chavous et al., 2003; 2008). Again, there are various racial identity components, and each one may be associated with different academic outcomes. For example, racial centrality, private regard, and public regard have been shown to be related to more positive beliefs about academia (Chavous et al., 2003). Further, youth with high public regard have greater school attachment which may enhance their motivation to perform well in school (Chavous et al., 2003). However, only private regard and centrality was found in relation to later academic outcomes such as high school completion and college attendance. This finding shows that the components of racial identity may be more important to particular academic outcomes at specific times.

In contrast, other research has examined possible negative effects of strong racial identity on academic outcomes. For example, Arroyo and Zigler (1995) explored how African American youth racially “deidentify” so as to please their teachers and to not fall victim to the negative perception of their racial group. Although historically there has been a resistance to youth adopting these attitudes and there has been an idea that strong racial identity is more adaptive academically, this research found that students who
adopted more “raceless” values and behaviors were high achieving. Overall, there is evidence that racial identity is associated with academic outcomes, but the exact nature of this relationship remains unclear.

**Self-esteem**

Self-esteem is one of the most widely studied outcomes in relation to racial identity for both youth and adults. In a review of racial identity and health outcomes in both youth and adults, self-esteem had effects sizes twice the size of other outcome correlations with racial identity (Smith & Silva, 2011). Several racial identity theories have proposed the idea that strong or well-developed racial identity enhances one’s self-esteem in the context of racial oppression while less developed racial identity or “self-hate” is associated with lower self-esteem. However, empirical studies on this topic have mixed results. Many studies have found significant associations between strong racial identity and self-esteem (McMahon & Watts, 2002; Parham & Helms, 1985; Speight, Vera, & Derrickson, 1996). On the other hand, some studies have only yielded moderate findings with this relationship (Phinney, Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997; Roberts et al., 1999). Other studies have found the association between racial identity and self-esteem to be stronger in African Americans over other ethnic groups (Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997; Martinez & Dukes, 1997), as well as stronger for boys than girls (Mandara et al., 2009).

The literature has examined which components of racial identity are related to self-esteem and under what conditions. The self-hate racial identity hailing from Cross’s stage model of racial identity has a negative association with self-esteem (Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, Fhagen-Smith, 2002). However,
some researchers state that this may be due to having issues with their overall personal identity rather than their racial identity specifically (Vandiver, 2001). On the other hand, a mature racial identity or Internalization is positively associated with self-esteem (Mumford, 1994; Pierre & Mahalik, 2005; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Speight, Vera, Derrickson, 1996). Also immersion in one’s culture has been related to higher self-esteem (Speight et al., 1996). Centrality and public regard have been found not to be related specifically to self-esteem, while private regard was positively associated (Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1998). In sum, the literature on racial identity and its relation to self-esteem shows that various racial identity components have different relations to self-esteem outcomes.

**Externalizing and Other Problem Behaviors**

Externalizing behaviors refer to a group of behaviors that are exhibited outwardly. The most common expressions of externalizing symptoms are aggression, delinquency, and hyperactivity (Liu, 2004). Some studies state that more achieved racial identity is protective against externalizing behaviors, while the exploration phase is more associated with negative behaviors such as aggression and attitudes about fighting (Greig, 2003). This finding holds true across ethnic minority groups. In a study of Korean youth, those with greater attachment to their ethnic group exhibited fewer problems behaviors than those with less attachment to their ethnic group (Shrake & Rhee, 2004). Similarly in a study of Hispanic youth, ethnic identity predicted less behavioral problems (Greig, 2003). Analogous findings have been demonstrated with African American youth (Thomas, Townsend, Belgrave, 2003). Specifically, racial identity has shown positive relations to
non-fighting attitudes and fewer beliefs supporting aggression (Arbona, Jackson, McCoy, & Blakely, 1999; McMahon & Watts, 2002). Also, fewer problems behaviors both in school and at home have been found in the presence of strong racial identity (Greig, 2003; Holmes & Lochman, 2009; Thomas, Townsend & Belgrave, 2003). There are also indirect effects of racial identity on externalizing behaviors. Racial centrality has been shown to moderate the association between racial discrimination and violent behaviors for both boys and girls (Caldwell, Kohn-Wood, Schmeelk-Cone, Chavous, & Zimmerman, 2004). Overall, while there are few studies which measure the relationship between racial identity and externalizing behaviors in the same way, there seems to be an important adaptive relationship which exists among these variables.

**Internalizing Symptoms**

The literature on racial identity and internalizing behaviors has focused primarily on depressive symptoms. Studies examining the direct link between racial identity and internalizing behaviors have found that some components of racial identity are more related to these symptoms than others. As with many of the other outcomes variables, better outcomes for internalizing symptoms seem to be related with higher levels of racial identity or “achieved” racial identity. For example, the internalization stage from Nigrescence theory and having strong racial pride are negatively associated to depression (Munford, 1994; Simons et al., 2002). Having positive regard towards African Americans and being an African American is directly associated with less depressive and anxiety symptoms (Smith-Bynum, Best, Barnes, & Burton, 2008). Another study stated that low private regard was associated directly with fewer anxiety symptoms (Sellers
Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006). Research describes how those who have identities where race is not salient (pre-encounter), as well those who have strong feelings of hate towards whites (Anti-White) may have more feelings of inferiority or anxiety related to these ideas (Helms, 1985).

However, in contrast to findings demonstrating an inverse association between racial identity and internalizing symptoms, other studies have not demonstrated this effect. For example, one study examining centrality and private regard found no correlation between these constructs and depression or anxiety in African American youth (Caldwell et al., 2002). Another study also found that the public regard was not significantly related to internalizing symptoms (Sellers et al., 2006). In general, higher racial identity may be associated with fewer internalizing symptoms, but there are a few studies that run counter to this effect.

There is also literature on the indirect effects of racial identity on internalizing symptoms in the context of racial discrimination. The PVEST model states that having positive ideals about one’s racial group helps to buffer against the negative psychological effects of discrimination (Spencer, Dupree, & Hartmann, 1997). Racial identity may protect against these negative effects by helping youth not internalize negative views of African Americans. A study examining clusters based on racial identity, discrimination, and mental health, found that racial identity moderated the positive relationship between discrimination and depressive symptoms (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007). Having positive regard towards African Americans and being an African American has been shown to indirectly buffer against the negative effects of racial discrimination on depressive
symptoms (Smith-Bynum, Best, Barnes, & Burton, 2008). Also, those who had a more multicultural racial identity tended to appraise discrimination as less stressful, which in turn, leads to fewer depressive symptoms (Jones, Cross & Defour, 2007). Overall, while the research on the direct effects of racial identity on internalizing symptoms is somewhat equivocal, the research examining indirect effects suggests that racial identity tends to buffer against the negative effects of racial discrimination on internalizing behaviors.

**Overall Psychosocial Adjustment**

Finally, there are several other adaptive psychological outcomes important to African American youth development that have been discussed in the literature but have not been studied to the extent of the aforementioned variables. Sellers and colleagues (2006) conceptualized adaptive psychological functioning as a series of behaviors including self-acceptance, adaptive relationships, autonomy, mastering one’s environment, personal growth, and having a sense of purpose in one’s life. Using those psychosocial adjustment variables, it was found that more favorable views towards African American were associated with more favorable psychological outcomes in a sample of 314 African American adolescents (Sellers et al., 2006). In addition, a mature or achieved racial identity was positively associated with overall psychological psychosocial adjustment at two time periods (Seaton, Scottham, & Sellers, 2006). In a meta-analysis of ethnic identity and psychosocial adjustment, strong ethnic identity in people of color was related to more positive psychosocial adjustment (Smith & Silva, 2011). Another study found differences in psychological psychosocial adjustment outcomes based on the specific racial identity of a person (Whitaker & Neville, 2010).
For example, a Multiculturalist identity, in which one’s identity relates to both being an African American as well as having an appreciation of diversity was related to greater psychological psychosocial adjustment (Whitaker & Neville, 2010). The authors hypothesize this to be due to less internal conflict which results in more life satisfaction and psychosocial adjustment. However the Immersion group, where one immerses themselves in Black culture, was related to greater psychological distress due to being anti-White in a society where many of the people with whom they will have to interact may be of the majority culture.

Other variables that racial identity is positively associated with are more active coping and hope (Jackson & Neville, 1998; McMahon & Watts, 2002). The relation between self-esteem and racial identity may lend itself to more effective coping strategies which enhance psychological psychosocial adjustment (McMahon, 2002). In a sample of 122 African American college students, positive racial identity increased hope that one can achieve future life goals (Jackson & Neville, 1998). Again, it should be noted that self-esteem may confound with these results.

Overall, the results of racial identity and its specific components on various psychosocial variables are unclear; however it appears that some components are related to more positive outcomes than others. Having positive feelings towards African American and being an African American has most consistently in the literature been related to positive outcomes such as self-esteem, academic achievement and overall psychosocial adjustment and negatively related to less favorable outcomes outcomes (i.e., Chavous et al., 2003; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Vandiver, Cross, Worrell,
However, the stages in which one is having negative feelings towards their own race, exploring their race, and have feeling mistrust towards Whites seem to be related to more deleterious outcomes (i.e., Greig, 2003; Helms, 1985).

**Influences on Racial Identity**

There are several variables that may influence the impact of racial identity on the aforementioned outcomes in African American youth. However, the ways in which they influence these outcomes may differ depending on the variable. The following section will describe the moderators that have been discussed in the literature and discuss their impact as intervening variables.

**Gender**

Gender is one variable which may influence the relationship between various racial identity components and outcomes. Girls and boys are socialized to race in different ways by their parents, thus the way in which they perceive race related experiences may differ (Berry & McClain, 2009; Stevenson, 2003; Way & Chu, 2004, & Hughes et al., 2009). Boys tend to experience more frequent and more overt discrimination experiences than girls, which may make boys more “attuned” to racial discrimination experiences (Honora, 2002; Swanson et al., 2003). Girls, however, receive more messages about racial pride from their parents and therefore tend to have a more “racial-pride oriented” racial identity than did their male counterparts (Hughes et al., 2009). Another idea related to differences in how boys and girls are racially socialized is that boys may be less socialized in terms of relating to others and more towards independence and achievement. Therefore, achievement or exploration
components of racial identity may be more salient to girls since they tend not to be socialized in this manner (Oyserman, Harrison, & Bybee, 2001).

Gender differences may be especially apparent when gender is examined as a moderator of the association of racial identity to mental health and psychosocial adjustment for youth. Hughes and colleagues (2009) examined relationships between racial identity, racial socialization, gender and self-esteem in adolescents. They found that girls received more messages about racial pride and that these feelings were more strongly associated with self esteem in girls than in the boys. In African American college women, it was found that the more women endorsed anti-Black racial identity attitudes, the lower their self esteem and the higher their depression (Pyant & Yanico, 1991). They also reported that these relationships may be lower in males, although they did not have a male sample to empirically examine these associations. A study with adolescents found that racial identity and self-esteem has a larger correlation for boys than it does girls (Mandara, Gaylord-Harden, Richards, & Ragsdale, 2009). Again, race may be more salient for boys than girls in terms of discrimination, while girls may be more attuned to pride messages given their frequent levels of exposure to them. Thus, racial identity may be more important to male self-esteem because they do not receive messages of pride in other areas of their life.

In addition to psychological symptoms, gender has been shown to moderate the association between racial identity and academic outcomes. The results of one study demonstrated that the achievement or exploration component of racial identity was related to positive academic efficacy for girls, while there were not important differences
in outcomes for boys (Oyserman, Harrison, & Bybee, 2001). Again, they stated that this may be because boys already have more of an academic adjustment focused racial identity so it is less important for their outcomes to have this component. Another study on academic outcomes, racial identity, and gender and found that racial centrality was more important to academic outcomes and attitudes toward school for boys, again highlighting that since they receive fewer messages related to this area that they may require more of these messages (Chavous et al., 2003). These results do not hold true in all instances as there are other studies which have found no significance between gender and outcomes (Gaines et al., 1997; Munford, 1994; Phinney & Alipuria, 1990; Phinney, Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997; Smith & Silva, 2011).

**Socioeconomic Status**

Another important moderator of racial identity and psychosocial adjustment may be the socioeconomic status (SES) of the individual. African American youth disproportionately live in poverty compared to other racial/ethnic groups, which in turn may be associated with a greater exposure to poverty-related stressors (Myers, 2009). A recent review found no significant differences across socioeconomic status groups when examining racial identity and psychosocial adjustment (Smith & Silva, 2011). However, this review included studies on people of all ages and multiple ethnic groups, and the results may differ depending on the age or ethnicity of participants. To make matters more complicated, SES is confounded with other moderators such as education level, type of discrimination, etc. Myers (2009) discussed how ethnicity and SES can severely affect health outcomes and put people at risk for a host of disorders. In their model,
psychological problems are largely a result of an interaction between race and SES. Also important is that socioeconomic status has been found to be a significant moderator of ethnic identity and psychosocial adjustment relationship in other ethnicities besides African Americans. In a study of Irish adolescents, those who were of middle-class backgrounds were less likely to have strong ethnic identity than those who were from lower SES backgrounds (Phinney, 1990). SES has been associated differentially with closeness to African Americans and racial group evaluation such that African Americans with lower SES and education reported greater feelings of closeness to African Americans (Broman, Neighbors, & Jackson, 1988). There is, however, some literature that asserts socioeconomic status is not as important in these relationships as are racial socialization experiences (Boykin & Forrest, 1985; Cross, 1978). Indeed, some studies have found no relationship between racial identity and socioeconomic status (Carter & Helms, 1988, Smith & Silva 2011), suggesting that the effects of socioeconomic status remain unclear.

Age

Another demographic variable which may influence the effects of racial identity is the age of the child. As mentioned, racial socialization is a predictor of racial identity (Hughes et al., 2006). Adolescents are more likely than younger children to receive racial socialization messages from their parents due to their developmental competency. Parents may believe that older children can understand issues associated with discrimination better than younger children and may be better able to cope with these issues (Hughes et al., 2006). Younger children tend to receive messages which stress
equality of racial groups and the importance of individual accomplishment, whereas older children receive the racial socialization messages associated with coping with discrimination (Hughes et al., 2006). Given the different types of racial socialization messages received and the developmental maturity of children at various ages, racial identity may be differ as a function of child age. Several studies have purported to examine racial identity across the lifespan, however none of these studies have included youth under the age of 13 (e.g., Plummer, 1996; Yip, Seaton, & Sellers, 2006). Many of the studies begin their evaluation at 13 years of age because adolescence is the time when youth tend to explore identity in general and is achieved in adulthood (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 2002). However, African American youth are reared in a context where race is so apparent that their racial identity may be well established already by adolescence (Yip, Seaton, Sellers, 2006). Nevertheless, there is research which highlights a significant association between age and racial identity attitudes. Most studies state that adults are more like to have a stable sense of racial identity than youth (e.g., Yip, Seaton, & Sellers, 2006). However, encounters with race may challenge one’s current racial identity so that certain developmental periods may be associated with specific racial identities (Yip, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2008). For example, entering a new school or starting a new job may restart the racial identity process or challenge one’s already established racial identity. Also, because discrimination experiences tend to decrease with age, racial identity may also fluctuate as own becomes older (Adams & Dressler, 1988; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999).
Additionally, the protective nature of racial identity may depend on age based on how stable one’s ethnic identity is at that time (Yip et al., 2008). Another study examining racial identity in African Americans across the lifespan found that youth possessed internalization attitudes similar to adults and as youth got older they were less likely to have immersion attitudes which are more associated with a less stable racial identity (Plummer, 1996). A study examining racial identity at different developmental periods found that while adolescence has been associated with less achieved racial identity factors (e.g., Assimilation, Miseducation, and Self-Hatred) than in adulthood, there were few differences between more developed racial identities (e.g., Immersion-Emersion and Internalization) between adolescents and adults (Worrell, 2008). Overall, the literature highlights differences in racial identity between adults and youth, while there is little information about differences in childhood and adolescence. Therefore, the nature of the relationship between racial identity and age should be examined further in younger participants.

Although several researchers have theorized about the benefits racial identity, its effects on youth psychosocial adjustment remain mixed. Some studies have found that racial identity was negatively related to psychosocial adjustment while others found positive relationships. Another set of studies have not found such strong effects of racial identity on African American youth mental health and achievement. Other studies found null effects of racial identity on African American youth mental health (Caldwell et al., 2002; Sellers et al., 2006). Not only is the relationship between racial identity and outcomes unclear, it is uncertain which variables moderate these relationships. These
rather stark inconsistencies prevent researchers from making more definitive statements about the effects of racial identity.

**Possible Reasons for the Inconsistencies in Findings**

There are several possible reasons for the inconsistencies in the effects of racial identity on psychosocial functioning. First, although demographic factors, such as age and gender, may influence the association between racial identity and outcomes, few studies accounted for these differences. For example, a few studies have demonstrated that racial identity is correlated with outcomes more strongly for boys than for girls (Mandara, Gaylord-Harden, Richards, & Ragsdale, 2009; Chavous, Rivas-Drake, Smalls, Griffin, Cogburn, 2008). Second, some research uses a global measure of racial identity that combines several dimensions (McMahon & Watts, 2002; Swenson & Prelow, 2005). Modern research cautions research against using a single composite score over separate scales because it decreases the reliability of the measure especially when assessing multidimensional processes. (Cokely, 2007; Helms, Henze, Sass, & Mifsund, 2006; Netemeyer, Bearden, & Sharma, 2003). As described previously, there are several dimensions or stages which encompass racial identity, ranging from racial pride to racial self-hate, and the different dimensions may produce distinctive outcomes. For example the pre-encounter stage, (i.e., the stage that occurs before one has had a significant race encounter) has been found to be related to lowered self-esteem and overall psychological health (Pillay, 2005; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). Conversely, having a strong internal representation of one’s race has been associated with greater self-esteem and greater college adjustment (Anglin & Wade, 2007; Munford, 1994). Meanwhile,
immersing oneself in African American culture has been related to higher rates of
depression (Munford, 1994). Because of these differences it may be inaccurate to
describe racial identity in terms of total benefits and instead discuss each sub-factor
separately.

Further, there may be differences in what constitutes psychosocial adjustment in
youth as opposed to how psychosocial adjustment manifests in adults. In adults, racial
identity has been measured in relation to mood problems, vocational ability, and self-
estime (McCowan & Alston, 1998; Phinney, 1991; Thomas & Speight, 1999). In youth,
however, other outcomes may be more salient to development, such as psychosocial,
academic, and cognitive development (Awad, 2007; Munford, 1994; Pope, 2000). Also,
the way in which these outcomes are manifested in youth versus adults may differ. For
example, depression may appear as sadness in adults, but as anger in youth. These
differences should be noted and accounted for in the literature.

An additional reason for these inconsistencies is that studies utilize a variety of
different instruments which may have the same name for different constructs. For
example, the Pre-encounter Assimilation scale of the CRIS refers to one’s sense of
identity related to being American rather than African American while the Assimilation
scale of the MIBI has more to do with denying one’s Blackness in order to blend in with
White society (Scottam, Sellers, Nguyen, 2008; Cross & Vandiver, 2001). Another
inconsistency is in the different theoretical underpinnings associated with the measures
(e.g., ethnic identity vs. racial identity). Additionally, differences in methodology in these
studies also affect the standardization. Studies may be generalized as positively affecting
mental health, despite differences in significance requirements, effects sizes, and analyses used (Cokely, 2007). Also important is the way in which racial identity is conceptualized. As mentioned previously, some studies utilize a stage model while others use more of multidimensional conceptualization. It may be difficult to compare studies from these two paradigms.

**Comprehensive Conceptual Framework**

To help bring a sense of coherence to the field and further our understanding of the overall effect of racial identity on African American youth’s psychosocial adjustment, the prevailing models and measures of racial identity were organized into a comprehensive conceptual framework. The current study sought to reduce the overlap in the literature by combining similar constructs across measures. Inconsistencies in the literature (e.g., stage vs. multidimensional models, different names for the same constructs, etc.) make it difficult to compare studies which have used different measures.

One aim of the current study was to advance the literature by proposing a framework which will make it easier to compare studies across different measures and models. To develop this framework, we reviewed the seminal articles on racial identity theory and the sub-factors and items of the most prominent racial identity measures. Several commonalities were found across the different measures. As shown in Table 2, we were then able to classify most of the sub-factors from the different racial identity measures into eight conceptual categories based on the similarities and differences of the items themselves. The eight racial identity conceptual categories or dimensions are as follows: (1) racial pride, (2) racial exploration, (3) cultural mistrust, (4) race salience, (5) public
regard, (6) humanistic/multiculturalist identity (7) achievement, and (8) assimilation.

Each dimension is discussed in more detail below.

Table 2. Individual Study Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors (Year)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Average Age (age range) / Gender (% female)</th>
<th>Racial Identity Measure</th>
<th>Racial Identity Dimension</th>
<th>Mental Health Variable (Measure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburn-Nardo, Monteith, Arthur, &amp; Bain (2007)</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>N/R *(71.5%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Sa, PuR,</td>
<td>Internalizing (BDI),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psych. Well-Being (SLS &amp; HS),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem (RSES),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic (GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awad, (2007)</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>19.3(N/R*)</td>
<td>CRIS</td>
<td>As, Rp, Cm, Hu</td>
<td>Self-Esteem (RSES),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depression (RADS-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem (RSES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell (2007)</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>16.1(54.1%)</td>
<td>REIS</td>
<td>Rp, Cm</td>
<td>Internalizing (CES-D),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Externalizing (PRBV),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem (PHC-SCS),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internalizing (BSI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracey, Bámaca, &amp; Umana-Taylor, (2004)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>15.6(50%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (2002)</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>12.0(51%)</td>
<td>ASBL</td>
<td>Rp, Cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley &amp; Carter, (2005)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16.0(100%)</td>
<td>RIAS</td>
<td>Rp, Ex, Cm, Sa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd &amp; Chavous (2007)</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>12.27(44%)</td>
<td>RCM</td>
<td>Rp, Sa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell, Zimmerman, Bernat, Sellers, &amp; Notaro, (2002)</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>17.48(53%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, Sa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers-Young (1997)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>17.60(64.4%)</td>
<td>RIAS</td>
<td>Rp, Ex, Cm</td>
<td>Psych. Well-Being (CPIWS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors (Year)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Average Age (age range) / Gender (% female)</td>
<td>Racial Identity Measure</td>
<td>Racial Identity Dimension</td>
<td>Mental Health Variable (Measure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavous, Bernat, Schmeelk-Cone, Caldwell, Kohn-Wood, &amp; Zimmerman, (2003)</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>17.51(52.6 %)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, PuR, Sa</td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (GPA) Self-Esteem (SEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavous, Rivas-Drake, Smalls, Griffen, &amp; Cogburn (2008)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>16.50(100 %)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (GPA, Importance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels (2004)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17.63(63%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Ex, Rp, Ach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis (2000)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.17(100 %)</td>
<td>RIAS</td>
<td>Rp, Ex, Cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner-Kitt (2005)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14.0(70%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Hu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaylord-Harden, Ragsdale, Mandara, Richards, &amp; Petersen, (2007)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>12.55(63%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper (2003)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>14.80 (52.9%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, Sa, PuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors (Year)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Average Age (age range) / Gender (% female)</td>
<td>Racial Identity Measure</td>
<td>Racial Identity Dimension</td>
<td>Mental Health Variable (Measure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper (2003)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>17.63(56.6%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, Sa, PuR</td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harps (2005)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>15.73(58.3%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, Sa, PuR</td>
<td>Internalizing (CES-D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving &amp; Hudley (2003)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>N/R*(0%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp, Cm</td>
<td>Internalizing (MAACL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo (1999)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14.5(56%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp, Ach, Hu, Ex</td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones (2003)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>11.93(100%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Internalizing (MAACL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyersman, Bybee, &amp; Terry (2003)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13.50(51.5%)</td>
<td>REIS</td>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney, Cantu, &amp; Kurtz, (1997)</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>16.10(49.6%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp</td>
<td>Self-Esteem (RSES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton (2009)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>16.0(53%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, PuR, Sa</td>
<td>Internalizing (CES-D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton, Scottham, &amp; Sellers, (2006)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>15.0(60%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Ex, Ach</td>
<td>Self-Esteem (RSES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, &amp; Lewis, (2006)</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>13.8(61%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, PuR</td>
<td>Internalizing (CES-D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psych. Well-Being (PWBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors (Year)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Average Age (age range) / Gender (% female)</td>
<td>Racial Identity Measure</td>
<td>Racial Identity Dimension</td>
<td>Mental Health Variable (Measure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smalls, White, Chavous, &amp; Sellers (2007)</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>13.5 (56.2%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>As, Hu, Sa, Rp, Cm</td>
<td>Being (PWBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (SAE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Externalizing (NSBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem (USRS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speight, Vera, &amp; Derrickson, (1996)</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>19.00(65.3%)</td>
<td>RIAS</td>
<td>Rp, Ex, Cm</td>
<td>Internalizing (CES-D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swenson &amp; Prelow, (2005)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>16.37(59.4%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp, Ex, Ach</td>
<td>Self-Esteem (RSES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem (RSES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internalizing (CDI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem (HSGS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Esteem (POI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Adjus. (GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internalizing (CDI-IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Externalizing (CBCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umana-Taylor &amp; Shin, (2007)</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>19.73(69.3%)</td>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Ex, Ach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston (1998)</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>16.5(52%)</td>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Rp, Sa, PuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witherspoon, Speight, &amp; Thomas (1997)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.4(65%)</td>
<td>RIAS</td>
<td>Rp, Ex, Cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasui, Dorham, &amp; Dishion, (2004)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.3(58%)</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>Rp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial Pride

The most common racial identity dimension measured by the prominent instruments is related to a sense of racial pride or esteem. The pride dimension refers to one’s positive feelings about their African and African American heritage, culture and phenotypic features (Mandara et al., 2009). Fundamentally, it is an affective dimension that is concerned with one’s feelings about their Blackness and refers to developing positive feelings related to one’s racial group (Mandara et al., 2009). These ideas may develop through the messages parents provide their children around race, from experiences where one feels connected to their culture, or through education around various aspects of one’s culture. Examples of racial pride behaviors include engaging in
cultural practices related to one’s race, holding one’s race in high regard, telling others about one’s race, and being knowledgeable about the accomplishments one’s race has made (Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Johnson, Stevenson, & Spicer, 2006). Studies have consistently highlighted the fact that racial pride is an important aspect of racial identity and is associated with a variety of positive outcomes (Mandara et al., 2009, Phinney, 1992, Rowley et al., 1998).

The measurements tools in these studies reflect these ideas as well. The internalization ideas in the RIAS-B (Parham & Helms, 1996), private regard in the MIBI (Sellers et al., 1997), affirmation and belonging subscales from the MEIM (Phinney, 1992) and Ethnic Group Esteem scale reflect this concept. Overall, many studies describe the concept that ideas about race must be shared, then internalized, which then leads to feelings of satisfaction, pride, or regard for one’s race. For example, the internalization stage from Cross’ model, describes how one incorporates one’s sense of Blackness with balancing their other identities (e.g., gender, religion, etc.) (Vandiver et al, 2002). For this aspect of racial pride, the person embraces traditional cultural values and customs. Another aspect of racial pride involves regard one has for their race, as reflected in Seller’s (1998) concept of the multidimensional aspects of racial identity and private regard. With private regard, youth hold their race in high regard, or have pride in their race. Examples of questions in this measure are “I feel good about Black people,” “I am happy that I am Black,” “I am proud to be Black.” The final component of racial pride can be seen in MEIM and in the Ethnic Identity Scale (Phinney, 1992; Umâna-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004). This concept highlights belonging to one’s race.
and the process of affirming one’s pride in the culture. It highlights the communalism aspect of black identity and taking pride in experiencing this identity with others.

Another component commonly assessed in racial identity instruments refers to the opposite of racial pride. This construct is termed racial self-hate. The self-hate dimension refers to negative feelings about being African American. Subscales from the measures based on Cross’ Nigrescence model, including the RIAS-B (Parham & Helms, 1996) and the CRIS (Cross & Vandiver, 2001) capture this idea. Specifically, the pre-encounter subscale of the RIAS-B refers to individuals for whom race is not as salient to their identity as much as other aspects are; they may even have negative views of African Americans despite being African American themselves (Parham & Helms, 1996). The CRIS also refers to both of these components in its miseducation and self-hate subscales in items such as “I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black” and “Blacks place more emphasis on having a good time than on hard work” (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). The miseducation subscale refers to the idea of having stereotyped views of African Americans usually from societal representation in entities like the media. Instead of creating a separate conceptual category, we considered racial self-hate as the reverse of racial pride (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). Examples of more items in these scales can be found in Table 1. Just as racial pride is associated with a variety of positive outcomes, self-hate is often thought to be associated with negative outcomes (Mtose & Bayaga, 2011). This may be because people experiencing this type of racial identity are internalizing negative ideas about such a huge part of their overall identity.
Racial Exploration

Another commonly assessed racial identity dimension refers to one seeking a deeper understanding of their heritage and racial group, termed exploration. This concept often manifests itself in the enactment of culturally-based behaviors, such as with members of one’s racial group, and reading about one’s history and culture. In this stage, the young person aims to learn positive information about their history and culture and begins to challenge stereotypes and messages that he/she may have received from others before they began this process. The Encounter subscale from the RIAS-B describes how one has an encounter which causes them to reevaluate how they feel about their race (Parham & Helms, 1996). This may be an experience in which he/she is discriminated against or an experience where one witnesses a positive aspect of African Americans that challenges what they already believed about the Black race. Questions in this subscale include items such as “I am determined to find my Black identity.” The MEIM (Phinney, 1992) also references this stage in its ethnic behaviors subscale in which adolescents began to search for meaning regarding their racial group through engaging in more cultural practices (e.g., “I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music or customs;” Phinney, 1992). Finally, items from the exploration subscale of the ethnic identity scale were included in our conceptualization of this area of racial identity (Umâna-Taylor et al., 2004). This subscale includes items such as “I have attended events that have helped me learn more about my ethnicity.” During this stage people are in a state of transition where they are finding out new information about their identities, because of this period of instability, they may have more negative outcomes as discussed
previously.

**Cultural Mistrust**

The cultural mistrust dimension of racial identity is also referenced in several measures. Mistrust refers to having wary or negative feelings of other races, especially towards Whites and tends to be related to more negative outcomes, especially academic outcomes (Irving & Hudley, 2005). When one experiences mistrust, they caution themselves against other races for fear of possible discrimination (Sellers et al., 1997). In Cross’ model this stage (Immersion-Emersion) also may include an abhorrence of anything that is “not Black” (Cross, 1971). Items from the RIAS include “White people can’t be trusted” (Parham & Helms, 1996). This idea is also in the Anti-White subscale of the CRIS where African Americans abhor anything “White” due to their mistrust of the majority culture (Cross & Vandiver, 2001).

**Race Salience**

Another component in the literature that is referred to in many of the racial identity measures is salience. In the MIBI, (Sellers et al., 1997) this construct is measured by the centrality subscale with questions such as “Being Black is an important reflection of who I am,” and “Overall, being Black has very little to do with how I feel about myself.” As mentioned above, the multidimensional model of racial identity (MMRI) assumes that racial identity is stable, but it is influenced situationally. The centrality of one’s race, according to this theory, varies across individuals. The MEIM measure also captures this construct with items such as “I have a clear sense of what my ethnic background and what it means for me.” (Phinney, 1992). Also included in our
conceptualization was the EIS resolution subscale with items such as “I have a clear sense of what my ethnicity means to me” (Umâna-Taylor et al., 2004).

The salience of one’s race seems to affect how racial identity will be related to other outcomes (Phinney, 1991). For example, if an individual’s race is not salient to him or her, then changes in their identity may not have a significant effect on their self-esteem. The component of salience is especially important to consider when evaluating the complex influence of racial identity across individuals and may determine how the interplay of environment and individual attributes predict outcomes. While the CRIS does not have a specific salience subscale, the salience of race is implied in the revised Cross model (Cross & Vandiver, 2001; Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002). This model describes the concept of Reference Group Orientation which refers to salience of one’s social group membership (e.g., racial group) to them and then also the valence or direction in which that salience is shown (Vandiver et al., 2002). For example, a person may have high racial salience, which means that being a member of a racial group is of high importance to them, but may have a negative valence meaning that the views they have about their racial group are negative.

**Public Regard**

The public regard dimension of racial identity is only discussed in Sellers and colleagues’ (1997) Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity and their measure based on this model, the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (Sellers et al., 1997). However, the public regard dimension is important because it discusses how a person believes that others who are not members of their racial group feel about their race. The
way someone develops these ideas may be based on several factors, including the
tolerance/acceptance of their race in their current environment, media images, and their
own private regard of their race (Mandara et al., 2009). If someone has high public
regard, they believe that the society at large holds their race in high regard. Examples of
public regard questions in the MIBI (Sellers et al., 1997), can be seen in Table 1.

**Humanistic/Multiculturalist**

The humanistic/multiculturalist dimension of racial identity has to do with a
mature form of racial identity where the person is able to embrace his/her Blackness as
part of his/her identity as well as embrace other social identities. In this dimension,
individuals are also able to accept members of other groups while simultaneously
embracing their own. Many of the current racial identity measures include this concept.
The MIBI (Sellers et al., 1997), as these components in its Humanistic subscale, with
items such as, “Blacks should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the
White race”, or “Black values should not be inconsistent with human values.” The
humanistic/multiculturalist dimension does not separate Blacks from other races but
rather highlights the commonalties across races. People with this type of racial identity
may stress values that are important to all people such as hard work, determination,
achievement, and virtue. Similar to the MIBI (Sellers et al., 1997). Cross’ model of
racial identity describes Multiculturalism as how some Blacks chooses to embrace ideals
related to being Black as well as other social identity values (Vandiver et al., 2002). The
CRIS includes items such as “I believe it is important to have both a Black identity and a
multicultural perspective, which is inclusive of everyone,” and “Celebrate Black identity
and a multicultural view.” (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). In fact, research has shown a positive correlation between the Humanist subscale from the MIBI and the Multiculturalist subscale from the CRIS (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, Fhagen-Smith, 2002).

The implications of literature on humanist/multiculturalist racial identity are that this component of racial identity is associated with adaptive outcomes such as hardiness, well-being, and general mental health (Cross et al., 1998; Neville & Lilly, 2000). However, there are other research that implicates maladaptive outcomes such as lower levels of curiosity and persistence associated with humanist/multiculturalist identity (Smalls, White, Chavous, & Sellers, 2007). Overall, findings are mixed in relation to this construct.

**Achievement**

Phinney’s (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure and Umâna-Taylor and colleagues’ (2004) Ethnic Identity Scale discuss the component of ethnic identity achievement or resolution. This concept refers to when individuals have a clear sense of and commitment to what their ethnicity means to them (Yip, 2006). This usually occurs after matriculating through other phases such as in exploring one’s culture and identity. Many theories posit that individuals in with achieved racial identities have the greatest levels of psychological wellness and security and achievement is considered a mature dimension of racial identity (Oyersman, Harrison, & Bybee, 2001; Phinney, 1992; Seaton, 2006). An example of items used to assess this component are “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me” (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) and “I know what my ethnicity means to me” (EIS; Umâna-Taylor et al., 2004).
Assimilation

The assimilation dimension refers to when African Americans give emphasis to their similarities to Americans in general rather than in being distinctly African American. This component differs from the humanism/multiculturalism components because it does emphasize the similarities across various identities and cultural groups as much as the person attempts to stress the similarities between African Americans and European Americans and also tries to blend in to this culture. According to Sellers and colleagues (1998) who have the assimilation subscale in their MIBI measure, describe how a person who has an assimilationist ideology tries to integrate themselves into mainstream society. This does not necessarily mean that the person de-emphasizes the importance of being an African American. The MIBI includes such items as “Blacks should view themselves as being American first and foremost” and “A sign of progress is that Blacks are in the mainstream of America more than ever before” (Sellers et al., 1998). The CRIS, however, include assimilation as an early stage where Blacks have “pro-American” ideals and race is not salient to them (Vandiver et al., 2002). CRIS items from Cross’ model include “I think of myself primarily as an American and seldom as a member of a racial group” and “I am an American, not a racial person.”

In sum, a review of the most commonly utilized racial identity models and measures showed interesting commonalities across constructs. While there are some differences between measures, we identified eight themes that were consistent across many of the measures. Having a conceptual framework which organizes concepts across models will assist greatly in elucidating the relationships between racial identity and
outcomes in a more comprehensive manner.

**The Current Study**

Identity formation is a critical developmental task for youth (Erikson, 1968). Group identity may be especially important for African American youth because of their collectivist culture (Jetten, Postmes, & McCauliffe, 2002). Racial identity is one such group identity. Despite the plethora of studies conducted on racial identity, there is still little clarity in the field of its overall effects on psychosocial adjustment. In addition, many studies have focused on racial identity in adults, but have not evaluated how these associations manifest in youth. The studies that examine the effects of racial identity in African American youth have yielded mixed findings. These inconsistencies are likely due to inconsistencies in the literature regarding the measurement and conceptualization of racial identity. Without a comprehensive review of this literature and a framework to unify the various theories, it becomes difficult to understand the overall effects of racial identity on African American youth. Further, conflicting theories and measures make findings are unable to be translated across studies and generalized to the population. To help bring consistency to the field, the prevailing theories and measures were critically evaluated and organized into a comprehensive conceptual framework which included the eight most common dimensions of racial identity. Next, utilizing the new conceptual framework, a meta-analytic review of the available studies assessing the effects of racial identity on African American youths’ psychosocial adjustment was conducted. Based on a review of the literature, the hypotheses and research questions of the current study were as follows:
(1) Research Question 1: What the relationship between Racial Pride and psychosocial outcomes?
   - Hypothesis 1: There would be a significant positive relationship between Racial Pride and adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and a negative association between racial pride and maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) across studies.

(2) Research Question 2: What the relationship between Exploration and psychosocial outcomes?
   - Hypothesis 2: There would be a significant negative relationship between Exploration and adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and a positive association between exploration and maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) across studies.

(3) Research Question 3: What the relationship between Cultural Mistrust and psychosocial outcomes?
   - Hypothesis 3: There would be a significant negative relationship between Mistrust and adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and a positive association between mistrust maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) across studies.

(4) Research Question 4: What the relationship between Achievement and psychosocial outcomes?
• Hypothesis 4: There would be a significant positive relationship between Achievement and adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and a negative association between Achievement and maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) across studies.

(5) Research Question 5: What the relationship between Overall Racial Identity and psychosocial outcomes?

• Hypothesis 5: There would be a significant positive relationship between Overall Racial Identity and adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and a negative relationship with maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors).

(6) Research Question 6: What the relationship between Salience and psychosocial outcomes?

• There are no hypotheses for the relationships.

(7) Research Question 7: What the relationship between Public Regard and psychosocial outcomes?

• There are no hypotheses for the relationships.

(8) Research Questions 8: What the relationship between Humanism/Multiculturalism and psychosocial outcomes?

• There are no hypotheses for the relationships.

(9) Research Questions 9: What the relationship between Assimilation and psychosocial outcomes?
• There are no hypotheses for the relationships.

In addition, we examined the following variables as moderators of the effect of racial identity on well being: gender, age, and socioeconomic status. The following hypotheses and questions were addressed in the moderator analyses:

(1) Research Question A: Does the percentage of male and female participants moderate the association between studies of racial identity and psychosocial adjustment?

• Hypothesis A: It is hypothesized that the relationship between racial identity and psychosocial adjustment would covary more for males rather than females across studies.

(2) Research Question B: Does the average age of the participants moderate the association between studies of racial identity and psychosocial adjustment?

• Hypothesis B: It is hypothesized that the relationship between racial identity and psychosocial adjustment would vary more for older rather than younger participants across studies.

(3) Research Question C: Does the socioeconomic status of participants moderate the association between studies of racial identity and psychosocial adjustment?

• There are no hypotheses related to socioeconomic status.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Literature Review and Inclusion Criteria

To be included in the meta-analysis, the studies had to: (1) be written in English; (2) include a sample that is primarily college aged or younger since the study is focused on youth (3) include at least one of the eight dimensions of racial identity (e.g., public regard, racial pride, etc.) and at least one psychosocial adjustment measure (e.g., anxiety, depression, self-esteem, academic adjustment, overall psychosocial adjustment), (4) have been published since the 1990’s when many of the measures used in the conceptual framework were first developed; and (5) provide statistics that may be transformed into effect size estimates for the relationships between racial identity and psychosocial adjustment among African Americans. For the purposes of the current study, only studies that presented univariate results were included. When studies also involved European American participants, we analyzed only the disaggregated data for African American youth and young adults. If studies reported data on other variables, only data specific to racial identity and psychological psychosocial adjustment or academic adjustment were included. Studies that used college samples were only utilized if the mean age was below 20 since youth were operationalized as childhood to late adolescence.

Three strategies were used to identify suitable published studies. First, a search of abstracts from the following electronic databases was conducted: PsycInfo,
PsychARTICLES, Social Sciences Abstract, JSTOR, and ERIC. Unpublished studies were also included in a search of abstracts from electronic dissertation databases (e.g., Dissertation Abstracts, ERIC). In these searches, the phrases *racial identity* and *ethnic identity* were crossed with descriptors of variables of interest such as *African American, Black, youth, adolescent, young adult, mental health, academic, self-esteem, depression, externalizing behaviors*, and *anxiety*. These search terms were intended to be broad in order to capture studies that may not have defined themselves as racial and ethnic identity studies specifically, but are using the racial identity measures of interest. Second, the reference sections of identified studies were reviewed in order to locate additional articles that fit the inclusion criteria but were not initially found through the database searches. Last, members of professional organizations related to these topics (e.g., Society for Research on Child Development, Society for Research on Adolescence, Association of Black Psychologists, etc.) were contacted to ask about both published and unpublished studies of which they may have been aware.

**Publication Bias**

Publication bias is an important consideration during the literature search and analyses. The “file-drawer problem,” states that studies with small or non-significant effect sizes tended to remain unpublished (Rosenthal, 1991). To address this problem, we included unpublished works from fourteen dissertations. To avoid the overestimation of the random-effects estimate, we used the nonparametric trim and fill procedure (Duval & Tweedie, 2000) to assess the sensitivity of results to publication bias. The trim and fill procedure estimates the number of publications theoretically missing because of funnel
plot asymmetry, and then recalculates the random-effects mean and confidence interval to include the imputed missing studies (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012).

**Study Coding**

Eligible studies were coded by the study author and a trained undergraduate assistant. Each study was independently coded by this pair of coders, followed by comparison of coding and resolution of discrepancies via discussion and consensus among the coding pairs. The assistant coder was trained and supervised by the author who is a clinical psychology graduate student. The training process included having the undergraduate student review several articles on racial identity theory and involved another process of reviewing these materials with the author to ensure comprehension. The assistant was then given a list of codes and their descriptions according to the conceptual framework described previously (see Table 2). Next the assistant and author coded the various racial identity measures separately. Racial identity measures were coded according to the conceptual framework described previously (see Table 2). The interrater agreement of coding decisions across coding pairs was acceptably high (average Cohen’s kappa= .91) for categorical variables. The two raters agreed 96% of the time. The coders came to an agreement for all discrepancies prior to completion. Interrater agreement was high because (a) coders had worked together on projects previously and (b) the majority of information obtained from the studies was extracted verbatim from the documents, which reduced the likelihood of coding error. When a study did not contain certain information, it was excluded from the analysis of that particular variable but not from other analyses. When coding inconsistencies occurred
across the coder pair, the disparities were resolved through further examination of the study.

Along with information necessary for effect size computation, the following outcome categories, moderators, and study characteristics were coded. Outcomes for assessment measures used in effect size calculation were categorized into the following five areas: academic adjustment (e.g., grade point average, academic self-concept), internalizing behaviors (e.g., depressive symptoms, anxiety symptoms), externalizing and other problem behaviors (e.g., violent behavior, aggressive behaviors), self-esteem (e.g., self-regard, self-efficacy), and overall psychosocial adjustment (e.g., psychological resiliency, total mental health). Study characteristics were be categorized (e.g., author, sample utilized, year of publication). Moderator categories include age and gender of participants, and family income-level (e.g., low, middle, upper).

**Analysis**

Meta-analysis is a statistical technique that combines related research studies to estimate an overall effect of a specific predictor (Cooper, Hedges, & Valentine, 2009; Glass, 1976; Hedges & Olkin, 1985). The purpose of a meta-analysis, then, is to test the relationship between two variables through statistically summarizing effect sizes as well as to make predictions about moderating variables which may affect variability in this relationship (Cooper, Hedges, & Valentine, 2009). We conducted analyses using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2005) software.
**Effect Size Analysis**

Meta-analysis assumes independence of findings. Therefore we utilized a widely used procedure to ensure this independence. If studies had more than one representation of a racial identity category for the same outcome variable then we aggregated the effects across that same category (ie., Racial Pride). Using a random-effects model to assess overall effect sizes, correlations across studies for each of the eight racial identity dimensions were synthesized by the outcomes. According to Lipsey and Wilson (2001), the Pearson product-moment correlation is a basic statistic to use when calculating effect sizes. However, the Pearson product-moment correlation may be negatively affected by “statistical proprieties” particularly when computing standard-error (Alexander, Scozzaro, & Borodkin, 1989; McCleary, Quillivan, Foster, & Williams, 2011; Rosenthal, 1994). Standard error refers to error resulting from random fluctuations within a sample. Potential problems with standard-error formulations based on product-moment correlations can be offset using Fisher’s $r$ to $z$ -transformation to convert correlations into effect sizes (Hedges & Olkin, 1985). Therefore each correlation was first transformed using Fisher’s $z$ transformation of $r$ according to the formula listed below which was recommended by Lipsey and Wilson (p. 63), in which $r$ represents the correlation coefficient and $\log e$ represents the natural logarithm (universal constant) (McCleary et al., 2011).

$$ESzr = 0.5 \log e \frac{1+r}{1-r} \quad (1)$$

Random-effect analysis assumes that there is variance among studies which adds
additional random influence. A random-effect analysis is more conservative than a fixed-effect analysis because of the consideration of study-level variance as an additional component of error (Wang & Bushman, 1999). The appropriateness of a random effects model in the present context is suggested both by (a) the large variation that is evident in the operationalization of variables (e.g., racial identity) in each study (and hence the potential for these factors to constitute significant sources of random error even after taking into account variance associated with specified moderating variables) and (b) interest in drawing inferences about the effects of racial identity on all African American youth, not just those included in the present review. The individual probability values of obtaining the average random effect sizes was calculated by combining the individual probability values of each correlation coefficient as suggested by Rosenthal (1991). Each effect size estimate was weighted by the inverse of the squared standard error (the inverse variance weight). Effect size weighting using the reciprocal of the variance of each effect size was used to account for differences in study sample size; thus, giving greater weight to studies with larger sample sizes (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). The formula listed below was used to compute the weighted mean effect size ES_i for each set of correlations where w_i is the inverse variance weight (i.e., n-3) and ES_i is the effect size computed for each product-moment correlation included in the meta-analysis. Due to the nature of the random effects model, both the sampling-error variance and random-effects variance are included in the inverse variance weight (w_i ). Once all effect sizes are calculated they were averaged in order to create a composite effect size.

$$ES_r = \frac{\sum w_i ES_i}{\sum w_i}$$

(2)
Directionality of the correlation coefficients was examined for each of the racial identity component/outcome combinations. Correlations less than .10 are considered as small, between .10 and .25 as small to medium, around .25 as medium, between .25 and .40 as medium to large, and greater than .40 as large (based on Lipsey & Wilson, 2001, p. 147).

**Analysis of Potential Moderators**

In order to investigate the existence of the proposed moderators (age, socioeconomic status, and gender), homogeneity estimates (Q) for each relationship were calculated according to the Hedges and Olkin (1985) procedure. These analyses give indication that moderator effects can be tested for these variables. A significant Q rejects the null hypothesis of homogeneity and indicates that the variability among the effect sizes is greater than what is likely to have resulted from subject-level sampling error alone (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). The Q value, which is based on Fisher’s Z scores, is compared to a critical value, which is the x2 for α = 0.05 and k-1 degrees of freedom (k being the number of studies).

For testing the moderating effects of age and gender, and socioeconomic status, meta-analytic regression analyses and analysis of variance were employed, consistent with other recent meta-analytic reviews (e.g., Byron, Khazanchi, & Nazarian, 2010; Lindberg, Hyde, Petersen, & Linn, 2010). Gender was assessed using percentage of children who are female. Age was assessed using mean age of the sample. We used weighted least squares (WLS; Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1989) to estimate the continuous moderators following Steel and Kammeyer-Mueller (2002), who found it the
most accurate method. The weights will be set equal to \( n_j - 3 \) where \( n_j \) is the sample size in sample \( j \). Using weights in the analyses can also correct for differences between samples sizes, as well as unreliability in the variables measured (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). To conduct this analysis, first a variable equal to the reciprocal of the variance of the proposed moderator was created. Next, a weighted regression was performed using the reciprocal of the variance as the case weight. Following this, the standard deviation of the slope was calculated using the following equation:

\[
sb1 = \frac{ub1}{\sqrt{MSE}}
\]  

In this equation, \( ub1 \) is the standard error of the slope (provided by the computer program) and MSE is the mean square error of the model (DeCoster, 2004). Finally the testing statistic:

\[
Z = \frac{b1}{sb1}
\]  

which follows the standard normal distribution was calculated. Large values of \( Z \) indicate that there is a significant linear relationship between effect size and the moderator.

**Publication Bias**

Publication bias is an important consideration during the literature search and analyses. The “file-drawer problem,” states that studies with small or non-significant effect sizes tended to remain unpublished (Rosenthal, 1979). To address this problem, we included unpublished works from fourteen dissertations. To avoid the overestimation of the random-effects estimate, we used the nonparametric trim and fill procedure (Duval & Tweedie, 2000) to assess the sensitivity of results to publication bias. The trim and fill
procedure estimates the number of publications theoretically missing because of funnel plot asymmetry, and then recalculates the random-effects mean and confidence interval to include the imputed missing studies (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Meta-Analysis Literature

Table 1 provides characteristics for each study included in the review. There were 58 independent samples from 34 published journal articles and 14 unpublished papers (dissertations). A total of 14,209 youth were included in the studies. The sample sizes for the studies ranged from 43 to 950 with a mean of 258.35 (SD= 207.97) and a median of 190. The publication years ranged from 1995-2010. The year 2007 had the largest number of studies (k=4). Table 3 provides results effect size results of the meta-analytic review. Table 4 provides results of the moderator analyses.

Outcome Effect Sizes

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that Racial Pride would be positively related to adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and would be negatively associated to maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) across studies. In line with the hypothesis, there was a significant positive, yet small, effect size for the relationship between Racial Pride and academic adjustment ($r = .07, p = .05, k=12$) across studies. As predicted, there was a significant negative association between Racial Pride and externalizing behaviors across studies. This effect size was medium ($r = -.11, p = .05, k=6$). The effect size for the
association between internalizing behaviors and Racial Pride was medium ($r = .17, p < .01, k=2$), however this relationship was in a direction contrary than what was hypothesized. Contrary to predictions, across studies the effect size for self-esteem and Racial Pride was non-significant ($r = .03, p = .67, k=14$). Lastly, there was a non-significant relationship between Racial Pride and psychosocial outcomes ($r = .17, p = .14, k=5$).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Meta-Analytic Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Internalizing</th>
<th>Externalizing</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Overall Psychosoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Pride</strong></td>
<td>$r=.03$</td>
<td>$r=-.16^{***}$</td>
<td>$r=-.11^{*}$</td>
<td>$r=.07^{*}$</td>
<td>$r=.17$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(SE=.04), k=14$</td>
<td>$(SE=.01), Q=79.94^{***}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.01), k=6, Q=24.24^{***}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.01), k=12$</td>
<td>$(SE=.06), k=5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Mistrust</strong></td>
<td>$r=-.09$</td>
<td>$r=.07$</td>
<td>$r=.11$</td>
<td>$r=-.12^{**}$</td>
<td>$r=-.18^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(SE=.03), k=6, Q=35.99^{***}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.01), k=3, Q=4.74$</td>
<td>$(SE=.01), k=3, Q=6.53^{*}$</td>
<td>$(SE&lt;.01), k=5$</td>
<td>$(SE=.00), k=1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement</strong></td>
<td>$r=-.17$</td>
<td>$r=-.06$</td>
<td>$r=-.20$</td>
<td>$r=.01$</td>
<td>$r=.10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(SE=.79), k=2, Q=69.49^{***}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.03), k=3, Q=6.86^{*}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.06), k=2, Q=4.44^{*}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.09), k=2$</td>
<td>$(SE=.10), k=3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploration</strong></td>
<td>$r=-.15$</td>
<td>$R&lt;.01$</td>
<td>$r=-.02$</td>
<td>$r=-.11$</td>
<td>$r=-.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(SE=.08), k=6, Q=84.60^{***}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.02), k=4, Q=7.95^{*}$</td>
<td>$(SE=.00), k=1, Q=0.00$</td>
<td>$(SE=.06), k=3$</td>
<td>$(SE=.07), k=4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
<td>$r=.07$</td>
<td>$r=-.06^{**}$</td>
<td>$r=-.02$</td>
<td>$r=.03$</td>
<td>$r=.09^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(SE=.01), k=5, Q=24.02^{***}$</td>
<td>$(SE&lt;.01), k=9, Q=16.54^{**}$</td>
<td>$(SE&lt;.002), k=2, Q=.56$</td>
<td>$(SE&lt;.01), k=5$</td>
<td>$(SE&lt;.01), k=3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* **p < .05 ** **p < .01 *** **p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Internalizing</th>
<th>Externalizing</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Overall Psychosoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanism/ Multicultural</strong></td>
<td>$r = .16^*$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$r = -.10^*$</td>
<td>$r = .11^*$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SE=.00)</td>
<td>(SE=.01)</td>
<td>(SE=.01)</td>
<td>(SE=.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k = 1, Q = .00$</td>
<td>$k = 2, Q = .01$</td>
<td>$k = 3, Q = 3.14$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Regard</strong></td>
<td>$r = .14$</td>
<td>$r = -.09^*$</td>
<td>$r = .02$(SE=.00)</td>
<td>$r = .03$</td>
<td>$r = .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SE=.04)</td>
<td>(SE=.01)</td>
<td>(SE&lt;.01)</td>
<td>(SE&lt;.01)</td>
<td>(SE&lt;.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k = 5, p = .1$</td>
<td>$k = 7, Q = 28.94$</td>
<td>$k = 3, Q = 1.2$</td>
<td>$k = 3, Q = 2.99$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Q = 82.50$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assimilation</strong></td>
<td>$r = - .30^{***}$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$r = .02$(SE=.04)</td>
<td>$r = -.07$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SE=.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(SE&lt;.01)</td>
<td>(SE&lt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$k = 2, Q = 5.02^*$</td>
<td>$k = 3, Q = 3.56$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Q = .00$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Racial Identity Score</strong></td>
<td>$r = .01$</td>
<td>$r = -.09^{**}$</td>
<td>$r = -.05$(SE=.01)</td>
<td>$r = .01$</td>
<td>$r = .08$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SE=.02)</td>
<td>(SE=.01)</td>
<td>(SE=.04)</td>
<td>(SE=.04)</td>
<td>(SE=.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k = 15$</td>
<td>$k = 18$</td>
<td>$k = 6,$</td>
<td>$k = 12$</td>
<td>$k = 7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Q = 466.3$</td>
<td>$Q = 159.13^{***}$</td>
<td>$Q = 35.87^{***}$</td>
<td>$Q = 61.22^{**}$</td>
<td>$Q = 114.79^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 stated that Exploration would be negatively related to adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) across studies and positively associated to maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors). Contrary to hypotheses, none of the effect sizes examining the relationship between Exploration and the various outcome measures were significant. The effect size for self-esteem and Exploration was $-.15 (p = .28, k=6)$ across studies while the effect size for Exploration and internalizing behaviors was $.001 (p = .98, k=4).$ The effect sizes for psychosocial adjustment, academic adjustment, and externalizing behaviors
were also all non-significant across studies ($r = -0.01, p = .96, k=4; r = -0.11, p = .45, k=3; r = .02, p = .81, k=1$ respectively).

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that Cultural Mistrust would be negatively related to adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and would have a positive association to maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) across studies. Consistent with hypotheses, the association between Cultural Mistrust and academic adjustment was negative across studies. This effect size was medium ($r = -0.12, p < .01, k=5$). Also consistent with hypotheses, there was a negative relationship between Cultural Mistrust and psychosocial adjustment across studies. The effect size of this association was medium ($r = -0.18, p = .05, k=1$). Further, there was a marginally significant positive relationship between Cultural Mistrust and externalizing behaviors across studies ($r = 0.11, p = .08, k=3$). This effect size was medium. Contrary to hypotheses, the association between self-esteem and Cultural Mistrust was non-significant across studies ($r = 0.09, p = .29, k=6$). Lastly, the relationship between internalizing behaviors and Cultural Mistrust was non-significant across studies ($r = 0.07, p = .25, k=3$).

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that Achievement would be positively related to adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) while it would be negatively associated to maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors). Contrary to hypotheses, the association between Achievement
and each of the outcomes variables was non-significant across studies. The effect size for the association between self-esteem and Achievement was -.17 ($p = .75, k=2$) while the effect for Achievement and internalizing behaviors was -.06 ($p = .48, k=3$). The associations of Achievement to psychosocial adjustment, academic adjustment, and externalizing behaviors were also all non-significant across studies ($r = .10, p = .57, k=3; r = .01, p = .97, k=2; r = -.20, p = .18, k=2$).

**Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 stated that the overall effects of racial identity would be positively related to adaptive outcomes (i.e., self-esteem, academic adjustment, and overall psychosocial adjustment) and would have a negative association to maladaptive outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) across studies. Consistent with the hypothesis, overall racial identity was negatively associated to internalizing behaviors ($r = -.09, p < .01, k = 18, Q = 159.13, p < .0001$) across studies. The effect size for this relationship was small. However, overall racial identity did not have a significant relationship with the other outcome variables studied (Academic, $r = .01, p = .84, k = 12, Q = 61.22, p < .0001$; Externalizing, $r = -.05, p = .22, k = 6, Q = 35.87, p < .0001$; Psychosocial, $r = .08, p = .20, k = 7, Q = 114.79, p < .0001$; Self-Esteem, $r = .01, p = .82, k = 15, Q = 466.30, p < .0001$).

**Research Question 6**

Research question 6 related to how Salience was associated with the various outcomes. There was a small, positive effect size for Salience and overall psychosocial outcomes ($r = .08, p < .01, k=3$) across studies. There was also a small, positive effect size
for Salience and internalizing behaviors ($r = -.06, p = .01, k=9$) across studies. The relationships between Salience and self-esteem, academic adjustment as well as with externalizing behaviors were non-significant ($r = .07, p = .19, k=5$; $r = .03, p = .32, k=5$; $r = -.02, p = .58, k=2$) across studies.

**Research Question 7**

Research question 7 related to how Public Regard would be associated the various psychosocial outcomes. There was small positive effect size between Public Regard and internalizing behaviors ($r = -.09, p = .03, k = 7$). However the relationships between the remaining psychosocial variables was non-significant (Self-esteem, $r = .14, p = .17, k=5$; Externalizing behaviors, $r = .02, p = .65, k=1$; Academic, $r = .03, p = .32, k=3$). There were no studies that examined Public Regard and overall psychosocial effects.

**Research Question 8**

Research question 8 related to how Humanism/Multiculturalism would relate to the overall psychosocial outcomes. There was medium, positive effect between self-esteem and Humanism/Multiculturalism ($r = .16, p < .05, k=1$) across studies. There was also a medium positive association between Humanism/Multiculturalism and academic adjustment ($r = .11, p = .03, k=3$). Finally, there was a medium, negative association between Humanism/Multiculturalism and externalizing behaviors ($r = -.10, p = .03, k=2$). None of the studies included examined the relationship between Humanism/Multiculturalism and internalizing behaviors or overall psychosocial adjustment.
Research Question 9

Research question 9 described how Assimilation would relate to the various psychosocial outcomes. The effect size for the association between self-esteem and Assimilation was large ($r = .30, p < .01, k=1$). There were no significant effects for the relationship between Assimilation and externalizing behaviors or academic adjustment ($r = .02, p = .85, k=2; r = -.07, p = .17, k=3$). None of the studies included examined the relationship between Assimilation and internalizing behaviors or overall psychosocial adjustment.

Moderator Analysis

Hypothesis A

Hypothesis A stated that the relationship between racial identity and psychosocial adjustment would covary more for males rather than females across studies. The current analysis revealed significant heterogeneity between gender and academic outcomes indicating that gender was a moderator of the association between racial identity and academic outcomes ($\beta = -.01; Q = 13.06, p < .001$). Consistent with the hypothesis, this indicates that in studies of racial identity and academic outcomes, as the number of male participants increased, academic adjustment increased across studies.

Table 4. Effects of Moderator Variables for Total Data Set on the Associations between Racial Identity and Psychosocial Well-being Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The current literature also revealed significant heterogeneity between gender and self-esteem indicating that gender was a moderator between racial identity and self-esteem ($\beta = -.01; Q = 6.22, p = .01$). Again consistent with hypotheses, as the number of males increased, self-esteem also increased. The current analysis did not reveal significant heterogeneity between gender and internalizing outcomes indicating that gender was not a moderator between studies of racial identity and academic outcomes ($\beta = .01, Q = 1.4, p = .23$). Also, the current analysis did not reveal significant heterogeneity between gender and externalizing outcomes indicating that gender was not a moderator between racial identity and externalizing behaviors outcomes ($\beta = -.01; Q = 1.17, p = .28$). Finally, the analysis did not reveal significant heterogeneity between gender and overall psychosocial outcomes indicating that gender was not a moderator between studies of racial identity and overall psychosocial outcomes ($\beta = -.01; Q = .03, p = .87$).

**Hypothesis B**

Hypothesis B stated that the relationship between racial identity and psychosocial adjustment would vary more for older rather than younger participants across studies. As
predicted, the current analysis revealed significant heterogeneity between age and internalizing outcomes indicating that age is a moderator between racial identity and externalizing behaviors across studies ($\beta = -.02; Q = 4.93, p = .03$). Consistent with hypotheses, in studies of racial identity and externalizing behaviors, externalizing behaviors decreased as age increased. The current analysis also revealed significant heterogeneity between age and self-esteem indicating that age was a moderator between studies of racial identity and self-esteem ($\beta = .01; Q = 4.68, p = .03$). As predicted, this indicates that in studies of racial identity and self-esteem, self-esteem increased as age increased. The current analysis also revealed significant heterogeneity between age and overall psychosocial outcomes indicating that age was a moderator between studies of racial identity and psychosocial outcomes ($\beta = -.06; Q = 43.95, p < .001$). This indicates that in studies of racial identity and psychosocial outcomes, as age increased, other adaptable psychosocial outcomes decreased. This direction is contrary to the hypothesis. The current analysis did not, however, reveal significant heterogeneity between age and internalizing outcomes indicating that age was not a moderator between racial identity and internalizing outcomes across studies ($\beta = .01; Q = .13, p = .72$). The current analysis also did not reveal significant heterogeneity between age and academic outcomes indicating that age was not a moderator between racial identity and academic outcomes ($\beta = .01; Q = .14, p = .71$).

**Research Question C**

Analyses of socioeconomic status as a moderator between racial identity and outcomes were not performed due to the low number of studies providing adequate
information regarding socioeconomic status.

**Publication Bias**

Duval and Tweedie’s (2000) trim and fill procedure was used to address publication bias. This procedure revealed that for studies examining racial identity and academic outcomes, there were no studies trimmed (ES = .01). For studies of psychosocial outcomes, one study was trimmed (Adjusted ES = .04). In terms of studies on racial identity and externalizing behaviors, no studies were trimmed (ES = -.05). For studies of internalizing behaviors, one study was trimmed (Adjusted ES = -.09). Finally for studies examining the relationship between self-esteem and outcomes, 6 studies were trimmed which changed the observed effect size in direction (ES = .01; Adjusted ES = -.13).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Modern theorists suggest that racial identity has positive effects on academic and psychosocial development in African American youth (Jones, Cross, & Defour, 2007; Mandara, Gaylord-Harden, Richards, & Ragsdale, 2009). However, the results across studies have been inconsistent, highlighting the need for a systematic review of the literature on the effects of racial identity. As expected, results of the current meta-analysis revealed that a small negative effect size for the association between the overall racial identity construct and internalizing behaviors. However, the overall racial identity construct was not significantly related to any of the other outcomes variables included in this study. The lack of findings for the overall racial identity construct may be due to the inconsistencies in the racial identity literature, including the multitude of racial identity instruments and sub-factors, which have different effects on various outcomes. Thus, an examination of the effects of racial identity on psychosocial functioning may require the use of specific sub-factors of racial identity, rather than an overall racial identity construct. In the current study, the major models and measures of racial identity were reviewed and then organized into a comprehensive conceptual framework. This framework classified the sub-factors of the major racial identity measures into the following eight dimensions: (1) Racial Pride, (2) Racial Exploration, (3) Cultural Mistrust, (4) Race Salience, (5) Public Regard, (6) Humanistic/Multiculturalist identity (7) Achievement, and (8) Assimilation. The 8 dimensions were also used as variables in
the meta-analysis to determine the effects of the individual components of racial identity on various outcomes.

**Effects of Racial Identity Dimensions on Psychosocial Outcomes**

**Racial Pride**

Racial pride, which refers to one’s positive feelings about their racial group and themselves as a member of that group, was the most widely studied racial identity dimension across studies. Racial Pride showed a significant, medium effect on internalizing behaviors; however the direction of this relationship was contrary to hypotheses. This finding suggests that higher levels of racial pride are related to more internalizing behaviors, such as depression and anxiety. Mandara and colleagues (2009) suggested that measures of racial pride may be related to African American youths’ internalizing behaviors because the affective aspect of racial pride, such as “feeling” positive about one’s race and believing that being a member of the African American racial group, is something to be proud of. It seems likely that strong positive feelings of racial pride increase African-American youths’ positive feelings about themselves as individuals and their ability to overcome obstacles. However, the idea of racial identity assumes that African American children exist in a context of racism, discrimination and oppression (McCreary, Slavin, & Berry, 1996; Stevenson & Arrington, 2009). When these children experience obstacles due to racism, they may be more likely to be depressed because the way they are treated by society does not match their feelings of how they should be treated.

Consistent with hypotheses, Racial Pride was also positively associated with
academic outcomes. This effect was small, however. The small magnitude of this effect may be due to a more indirect association between racial pride and academic outcomes. A number of studies demonstrate that the association between racial pride and academic outcomes is mediated or moderated by other variables. For example, one study revealed that racial pride provides youth with the confidence to achieve academically and enhances their self-concept (Smith et al., 1999). Also, a positive bond with one’s racial group may buffer against the negative effects of discrimination on academic outcomes (Wong, 2003). Youth with racial pride may have greater school attachment, which may enhance their motivation to perform well in school (Chavous et al., 2003). This implies that having strong racial pride may be especially useful in academic settings so that youth are not so negatively affected by discrimination that they are academically disengaged which allows them to excel academically despite racial-specific stressors. In sum, racial pride may have an indirect association with academic outcomes such that it enhances variables that are directly related to academic adjustment which then leads greater academic success.

Racial Pride was not significantly related to the other outcomes included in the current meta-analysis. Mandara and colleagues (2009) also argued that racial pride does not have as strong an effect on other less emotionally-based aspects of mental health such as externalizing behaviors. He states that because racial pride examines the extent to which one “feels” positive about their racial group and “emotional experiences” it may not be as strongly related to symptoms that are less emotionally focused (Mandara, 2009). Thus, feeling positive about one’s racial group and their association with that
group relates to one’s feelings about themselves as an individual and their life chances, but it may have less influence on behavioral problems such as aggression. Future longitudinal and especially experimental studies will need to help clarify the direction of the racial pride effect on outcomes without an affective component.

**Cultural Mistrust**

As mentioned previously, the literature implies that feeling mistrust towards Whites seems to be related to more deleterious outcomes (i.e., Greig, 2003; Helms, 1985). This inverse effect may be due to previous discrimination that African American youth have witnessed from other cultures, especially the White majority. This component of identity does not include the idea of coping with discrimination, but simply negative attitudes towards its daunting effects. Consistent with hypotheses, our review found that across studies, Cultural Mistrust had a medium negative effect on academic adjustment. People who embrace the Cultural Mistrust component of racial identity may feel a disconnect between themselves and a perceived “White” education system (Witherspoon, Speight, & Thomas, 1997). This disconnect may lead youth to then begin to mistrust this education system. In addition, youth with a Cultural Mistrust identity may have a heightened sensitivity to racial discrimination and thus their experiences with racial discrimination in the education system may be more detrimental to their academic adjustment than youth without a heightened sensitivity to discrimination (Whaley, 2001).

There was also a medium negative effect size on the relationship between cultural mistrust and overall psychosocial adjustment. The variables included in these studies, which were coded as overall psychosocial adjustment included hope, coping, resilience,
etc. Entanglement in one’s own culture without comingling with others could be detrimental in that individuals are excluding the mainstream culture, which is surrounding them. This exclusion of the mainstream culture could lead to a reduction in positive attributes, such as hope for the future and a lack of understanding in how to cope with these feelings. Further, our study found that the effect size on the relationship between externalizing behaviors and cultural mistrust was medium and positive across studies. Again, instead of being related to positive outcomes youth may feel more distress when around other racial/ethnic groups and less efficacy for coping adaptively with these feelings. Cultural mistrust may lead to more avoidant and suppressive styles of coping, which may, in turn, lead to these acting out and aggressive behaviors.

**Salience**

Salience refers to how relevant one’s race is to his/her self-concept during a specific event (Sellers et al., 1998). It is a dynamic process that fluctuates across situations more than the other racial identity components across situations. The salience subfactor showed few significant findings, but was positively associated with overall psychosocial outcomes and internalizing behaviors. The magnitude of the effect size of salience on overall psychosocial outcomes and internalizing behaviors was also small, however. Perhaps high racial salience is associated with adaptive psychosocial outcomes only under certain circumstances (i.e., when a student is the only African-American in school, having strong racial salience may help them to withstand the pressure of being the “only one”). For example, in a study comparing White women to African American women, African American women had elevated race centrality (coded in the current
review as salience) when they were the only African American in their professional context (Sekaquaptewa, Waldman, & Thompson, 2007). Therefore, not including the context in which race is salient to a person may fail to capture the true nature of this process. One way to do this is too if for future racial identity research to take into account theories of intersectionality. Intersectionality refers to “the interaction of fixed variables such as gender and race in analyses of relationships between important constructs” (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2002). Research on intersectionality better allows research to include the simultaneous and various influences of the diverse identities which individuals may hold (Ecklund, 2012). Multiple identities may reciprocally influence outcome variables and so the salience of race may vary based on this interaction. For example, when a Black child is in a classroom of all white male and female students, his/her race may be more important to them. However, in a room of all black students, his/her gender may be more important. Future racial identity theories and studies must take this into account.

**Humanism/Multiculturalism**

The Humanist/Multiculturalist dimension refers to a well-developed sense of racial identity where the person is able to embrace his/her Blackness as part of his/her identity, and is also able to embrace other social identities. Results revealed that this dimension was positively related to several adaptive variables including academic adjustment and self-esteem. The effect sizes were medium, indicating that this dimension had a larger effect size than some of the other racial identity variables previously discussed, notably racial pride. The difference between this dimension and racial pride is
that it also takes into account the other identities a person may hold, as well as other cultural identities they may encounter and helps them to feel good about who they are in racially-diverse contexts. Thus, those who have a more multicultural racial identity may tend to appraise discrimination as less stressful, which in turn, leads to fewer distressful outcomes (Jones, Cross & Defour, 2007). Another possible explanation is that those who embrace their own race and are also able to appreciate others may be more open to multicultural experiences, which may be helpful especially if they are in an environment where there are few African Americans (Awad, 2007). Humanism/multiculturalism also implies an appreciation for one’s own race as well which may enhance self-esteem.

Humanism/multiculturalism was also negatively related to externalizing behaviors with a medium effect size. Again, as youth feel good about, not only their culture, but other cultures around them, they are less likely to act out because they still feel a part of mainstream society. Externalizing behaviors are less likely to appear as in other dimensions (e.g., cultural mistrust) because individuals feel a part of the group rather than feeling ostracized by it. This dimension of racial identity is interesting because of its conceptual meaning and because of the current findings. In general, the dimension is based on the measures derived from the Nigrescence models (Cross, 1971; 1991) In those models, it refers to the degree to which an individual has attained a mature level of identity, which is indicative of security and pride with one’s own racial heritage, as well as an appreciation for other groups (Cross, 1971, Parham & Helms, 1981). Further, research suggests that being bicultural and having flexibility to navigate across and within cultures would improve youth outcomes and resiliency (Parham & Helms,
This dimension is very different from assimilation, which is probably based on an individual’s need to feel a part of something other than his or her heritage because of a low sense of racial pride. The humanistic/multiculturalist dimension is a measure of one’s comfortableness with themselves, to such a degree that they can appreciate and relate to others without being reactive. The individual has no underlying insecurity about his or her blackness. The overall pattern of findings for this meta-analysis may have important implications for research on racial identity. Specifically, racial pride has been regarded as a positive component of identity and measured more frequently than other components, however, findings of this study suggest that racial pride may have unintended negative effects on youth outcomes. In contrast, although measured less frequently, the humanist/multiculturalist dimension may actually be a more adaptive component than racial pride and perhaps more research should be devoted to understanding its effects.

**Assimilation**

The Assimilation scale refers to one’s sense of identity related to being American rather than being African-American and/or denying one’s Blackness in order to blend in with White society (Scottham, Sellers, Nguyen, 2008; Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002). Assimilation had the largest effect size in relation to self-esteem. Further, this relationship was negative. As mentioned previously, Blacks who endorse an Assimilation identity remove themselves from associating with being an African American and attempt to fit in with racial groups that are perceived as having a higher status (Tajfel & Turner, 2004). However, being African American is an identity which is “visible” and thus society will view these individuals as African American whether they
embrace an African American identity or not. Consequently, their self-esteem is likely to be negatively impacted because they are not able to successfully achieve the efforts to separate from the group and join a group with perceived higher status in society.

**Public Regard**

There was a small positive effect size between Public Regard and internalizing behaviors. Public regard refers to how individuals feel that others regard their race. However, there were no findings related to any other outcomes. Other studies show this same pattern and have found little to no direct relations between public regard and outcomes (e.g., Rowley et al., 1998; Sellers et al., 2006). Those who believed that other groups had negative views towards African Americans were buffered against the negative impact of discrimination on psychological well-being in one study (Sellers et al., 2006). This means that those with high public regard may indirectly experience internalizing behaviors due to the negative effects of discrimination. Further the MIBI measure is the only measure that included public regard. Because this construct is not well defined in other measures it may be less salient to racial identity or there may be a dearth of research on how public regard affects outcomes.

**Exploration and Achievement**

Contrary to hypotheses, none of the effect sizes examining the relationship between Exploration and the various outcome measures were significant in the current study. Exploration, again, refers to the *process* by which individuals seek out information related to their race and culture to gain better understanding of their culture. Exploration is an action process that occurs largely in adolescence, but continues over time (Parham,
1989; Phinney, 2006). It is a part of racial identity that is not as stable as other dimensions because of its likelihood to change with new experiences (Phinney & Ong, 2007). In line with this idea, as youth began to actively seek out opportunities to learn more about their race and focus on developing feelings about their own race, they may have more mild feelings about Whites. Discrimination may be less salient to youth at this time which may cause this process to be less directly related to outcomes (Tatum, 1992). Perhaps Exploration would be best studied in relation to how the process works, rather than what happens to youth as a result of the process.

Another problem with the literature on Exploration is that many of the items in measures related to this variable are written in the present tense (e.g., “I think about…”), thus if subjects are not currently engaged in the Exploration process, their experience may not be accurately captured. Recently, however, some measures have begun to change item wording to present perfect tense (e.g., “I have thought about…”), which may aid participants in reporting about this process (Phinney & Ong, 2007). On the whole, due both to the static nature of the Exploration process, as well as the difficulty in capturing this process through paper and pencil measures, we may have been limited in our ability to capture the possible effects of Exploration on youth outcomes.

Achievement, which is when individuals have a clear sense of what their race means to them, also showed a lack of significant findings. There are several possible reasons for the lack of relations to the psychosocial outcomes measured. First, Achievement refers to a mature or final stage of racial identity. Therefore, Achievement is usually measured as a concept that occurs after one has explored their ethnic group and
has eventually committed to their ethnic identity (e.g., “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me”), but also has positive feelings towards their ethnic group (e.g., “I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to”).

Achievement, as it is usually measured, implies that the dynamic process of Exploration process has occurred. However, as individuals continue to explore their racial identity throughout their lifetime, the valence of their feelings toward their racial group when they are in the Achievement stage may change. Consequently, the current method of measurement of racial identity may not adequately capture the process of Achieved identity because it is confounded with other racial identity developmental processes (Umâna-Taylor et al., 2004).

Further, the earliest racial identity models did not include the concept of Achievement (e.g., Cross’ model). Only Phinney’s (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure and Umâna-Taylor and colleagues’ (2004) Ethnic Identity Scale currently measure the concept of Achievement, thus there are fewer studies which analyze this dimension. Meeus and colleagues (1999) describe identity development as a continuum rather than a stage process with an endpoint. They state that one can move from “higher” statuses such as Achievement back down to “lower” identity statuses like Exploration and back up again several times. Therefore, it remains unclear in the literature how Achievement is manifested in daily life and how it should be measured given that the current measures conceptualize Achievement as a “final” stage of racial identity development. Additionally, it is possible that many youth have not yet reached the Achievement phase and there may be limited variability in responses. The mean age of
the samples examined in the current study was 11 years old, suggesting that perhaps the youth included in the studies included have not yet made it to this process. This idea aligns with a study conducted by Yip and colleagues (2006) in which they examined racial identity and depressive symptoms and found a relation between Achievement and depressive symptoms in a college student sample (ages 18-22), but not in an adolescent sample. The researchers discussed that racial identity Achievement may be more of a primary task for college students rather than younger students which may cause Achievement to have more “psychological consequences” for college students (Yip et al., 2006). Overall, while there were no significant findings for Exploration and Achievement in the current review, it may be difficult for researchers to capture these concepts in paper and pencil measures. Perhaps the measures may not capture youths’ actual feelings on these constructs. Even so, Exploration and Achievement are important concepts in the race literature. For example, in Phinney’s model of development, Exploration in childhood helps to develop Achievement in late adolescence and early adulthood (Phinney, 1989, 1993). Future studies should examine more multidimensional methods of assessing should the effects of Exportation and Achievement.

Implications of the Current Findings for Internalizing Behaviors

A noticeable trend among the variables was observed with internalizing behaviors. Across studies, several of the individual racial identity dimensions including Racial Pride, Public Regard, and Salience were significantly related to internalizing behaviors above other outcomes studied. Further, the overall racial identity variable was only significantly related to internalizing behaviors out of all the other outcome variables
included. Therefore, it appears that internalizing behaviors are a critical area that should be addressed in relation to studying racial identity. As noted, this importance may be due to the fact that when individuals have high levels of racial identity, they are distraught by the nature of discrimination in society and are offset when their beliefs about their race do not match society’s view. Further, internalizing behaviors such as depression and anxiety may be more strongly related to racial identity than other externalizing behaviors because youth may not always be able to express the anger associated with racial discrimination in settings such as work, school, etc. Therefore, instead of exhibiting acting-out behaviors or having poorer academic outcomes when discriminated against, they may internalize the feelings related to oppression. Crocker and Luhtanen (1990) examined self-esteem in relation to ingroup bias and found that those with high esteem of their race (e.g., racial pride) are more protective of their African American identity, but that their personal self-esteem is not affected by these threats. Therefore, a variable such as self-esteem would be less likely to be affected because individuals may still have strong positive beliefs about their race even when society does not substantiate these beliefs.

The racial identity variables that were most consistently and strongly related to internalizing behaviors are ones such as Racial Pride which is having a sense of pride in your race; Salience, which is the importance of race to an individual; and Public Regard which Sellers and colleagues (2006) refer to as a person’s “affective and evaluative judgment of his/her race.” This affective component is precisely why emotionally-focused outcomes like anxiety and depression would be more indicated in relation to those who have significant affect in relation to their race. The combination of the
aforementioned dimensions illustrate a person who feels proud of being Black, whose race is very important to their identity and who believes that society holds positive ideas about their culture as well. Unfortunately, when these beliefs are threatened through society’s negative portrayal and treatment of African-Americans, an individual may become anxious because their beliefs have been challenged and/or may become hopeless/depressed because they do not know how to rectify their personal beliefs with how they are portrayed in society. Sellers and colleagues’ (2003), who introduced the idea of Public Regard into the racial identity literature, discussed how African American with high Public Regard are less likely to believe that their race would cause others to be prejudiced against them. Once they experience racism it is inconsistent with how they view themselves and society’s perception of their group which leads to psychological distress.

Measurement Issues in Racial Identity Literature

It is clear from the results of the current study that there are several issues related to how racial identity is measured, especially in youth. A large implication of the small effect sizes and differences in conceptualizations in racial identity research is that the current salience of race for an individual is important in determining how racial identity impacts his/her functioning. Future studies should include a screener for current racial salience before measuring or racial identity as well as utilize more qualitative measures in tandem with quantitative ones. The primary problem with previous racial identity theories and current measurement techniques is that studies are attempting to capture a multidimensional process quantitatively. This limits the amount of information we can
learn about the complex, frequently changing nature of racial identity. The findings of this study provide implications that a qualitative design may better capture this process or at least be included with quantitative measures to understand which measures best capture the African American racial experience. This may better account for the developmental process of childhood. It is also possible that different methods of measurement may work differently at different developmental stages. Few studies included young children in their research, although there is research supporting the idea that African American youth are aware of and think about their race prior to ten years old. A conceptual study on issues in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity describes how reliability is impacted in studies of racial identity because of the multidimensional nature, especially in dynamic processes like Exploration, which in the current study had no significant findings, most likely due to the way it was measured (Cokely, 2007). Further there are several problems with reliability in these scales. Problems with measurement reliability “compromise the ability of the scores to measure intended constructs” as well as “compromise the ability of a study to yield noteworthy effects” (Thompson, 2003, p.5). Another problem is with using a composite score for these constructs. Helms and colleagues (2006) caution researcher in using alpha coefficients in multidimensional scales which also implicates that qualitative methods may be more appropriate in this research.

**Implications of the Current Findings for Stage versus Multi-dimensional Models**

Another distinction in the reviewed literature is the conceptualizations of racial identity. The original theories of racial identity were based on Erikson’s (1968) stage
model of identity development in that African American identity occurs through linear stages with an endpoint (e.g., Cross, 1991; Helms, 2007, Phinney, 1989). However, more recent conceptualizations of racial identity have implicated more process or multidimensional ideas of racial identity (e.g., Demo & Hughes, 1990; Sellers et al., 1998). In these theories racial identity is conceptualized as a process and focuses on one’s status at the present time rather than sequential linear development. The current analysis supports that idea of the latter conceptualization.

Early theories of racial identity were derived from a deficits perspective where there were supposed “healthy” and “unhealthy” components of racial identities (e.g., Allport, 1954; Cross, 1991). Multidimensional models do not assign valence to the different types of racial identity. These models measure racial identity based on the qualitative significance of race to an individual. It aims to discover how important one’s race is to their overall identity at a specific time (Sellers et al., 1998). This idea better aligns with the findings of this review because many of the racial identity components with significant effect sizes were positively related to both adaptive and maladaptive outcomes. For example, Racial Pride was positively related to both academic adjustment and externalizing behaviors, while Salience was related to both overall psychosocial well-being and internalizing behaviors. Therefore, the idea of which component is healthy or if someone has achieved a racial identity endpoint is not as critical for theory. Rather, racial identity theory should be analyzed from a framework of how it helps to explain a person’s experience during a specific situation. Further, several modern studies have confirmed the idea that racial identity is multidimensional (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue,
1998; Phinney & Ong, 3007; Smith & Silva, 2011; Umâna-Taylor, 2004). However, a recent meta-analysis done by Smith and Silva (2011) does not completely eliminate the idea of linear theories of racial identity or operationalizing racial identity is not one dimension (e.g., using total scores), but state that the utility of linear ideas of racial identity should be further assessed.

Due to the process nature of racial identity, another recommendation is to use a mixed methods approach in measuring identity. While multidimensional theory takes into account the qualitative significance of race to individuals, quantitative methods alone cannot capture such an individual process. Further, this process was captured in mostly older youth. Perhaps qualitative measures will be especially useful to capturing the true nature of the process. One innovative task which innovatively captures in childhood is with the work done by Alarcón, Szalacha, Erkut, and García Coll (2000). Their study utilized a label selection task where presented with several labels including nationality, racial, panethnic, and hyphenated (e.g., African-American), gender, religion, etc. Youth were asked to choose which labels most applied to them and put in order which is most important to them. The researcher then asks the child why it is most important and records this information in order to capture the nature of this process for them. This would also determine the salience of race for them. Although this does not account for various contexts in which the order of importance may change, it is an importance step in capturing salience appropriately.

**Moderators of the Relationship between Racial Identity and Psychosocial Outcomes**

Both gender and age were examined as possible moderators of the relationship
between racial identity and the psychosocial outcomes studied. It was hypothesized that outcomes would covary more for males than females and in studies of samples of older youth.

**Gender**

The meta-analysis also revealed interesting differences in outcomes based on gender. Across the significant racial identity subfactors, there were more significant differences for males. Specifically, gender was a moderator between the association of racial identity and academic adjustment to self-esteem. There was a positive relationship between racial identity and academic adjustment and self-esteem for males, but not for females across studies. These relationships were not apparent in with other outcomes, however. A similar relationship was found between racial identity, self-esteem and gender in previous research (e.g., Mandara et al., 2009). Perhaps race is more important for males than it is for females at this age. According to the U.S. Department of Justice (2000), African American boys are more likely to be racially profiled and are disproportionately at-risk for incarceration and homicide due to racial prejudice. These experiences may make racial identity more salient to them. Also, boys are more likely to receive more racial socialization messages preparing them for societal racial discrimination, which may also make race more salient for them than for girls (Bowman & Howard, 1985; Thomas & Speight, 1999), likely due to the higher likelihood of racial profiling in boys mentioned above. However, there are direct links between racial socialization and racial identity, suggesting that the gender differences in racial socialization efforts by parents may translate into gender differences in the salience of
racial identity found in the current review (Hughes et al., 2006; Neblett et al., 2009; Thomas & Speight, 1999).

Age

When examining age as a potential moderator of the relationship between racial identity and various psychosocial outcomes, the current analysis revealed that age was indeed a moderator between studies of racial identity and externalizing behaviors. As age increased, externalizing behaviors decreased and self-esteem increased in studies of racial identity. Further, age was found to be a moderator between studies of racial identity and psychosocial outcomes. However, as age increased, overall psychosocial adjustment decreased in studies of racial identity. This finding is consistent with the literature that discusses how racial identity may become more important as children become older possibly because they do not have cognitive understanding to process the daunting effects of discrimination until they are older (Fisher et al., 2000; Sellers et al., 2006). However, other research shows that racial discrimination may decrease as youth age, complicating our understanding of the issue (Adams & Dressler, 1988; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999). Other research states that that general exploration begins in adolescence and may end in early adulthood (Erikson, 1968; Yip, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2008). Another theory is that youth may be socialized to race at an early age but may explore this for themselves later once they have a racial encounter (Plummer, 1996). Also possible is that, because discrimination is so pronounced in American culture against African Americans, youth explore race at every age, but the outcomes may change based on age.
Publication Bias

This study analyzed the sensitivity of results to publication bias. With most outcomes, one or fewer studies had to be trimmed to address publication bias. However across studies of racial identity and self-esteem, six studies were trimmed to address publication bias. Further, once bias was addressed the direction of the relationship changed. Specifically, without adjusting for publication bias there was a small positive relationship between racial identity and self-esteem across studies, however once adjusted this effect size was medium and had a negative relationship. While further research is warranted, this finding implies that there is a bias in the literature towards racial identity being associated with greater self-esteem despite the fact that when bias is removed, there is a negative relationship between greater racial identity and self-esteem.

There are several possible reasons for this finding. First, using a total score of racial identity does not take into account the various components/stages of racial identity and may confound data so that the effect of “types” of racial identity on self-esteem is not differentiated. Another explanation is that the finding of racial identity to be negatively related to self-esteem may be too controversial to be published in the literature. Early theory related to racial identity originated from the idea that those who did not have strong racial identities would suffer from low self-esteem in a white-privileged society (Clark & Clark, 1947; Horowitz & Murphy, 1938; Marks et al., 2004). However, upon finding that in fact the opposite occurs, researchers may have difficulty publishing as it may appear from this finding that racial identity is not helpful to African Americans. However, this finding does not necessarily imply that racial identity is not important for
African Americans; it simply may imply that a third variable also affects these results. The true relationship between racial identity and self-esteem still requires further exploration to obtain a comprehensive picture of the nature of this relationship.

**Strengths and Limitations**

Limitations of the current study should be noted. The first lies in the general limitations associated with meta-analytic review (Smith & Silva, 2011). For our study, only studies with quantitative findings were included, which may limit our understanding of these topics. Second, meta-analytic results are influenced by the methods in which the included studies were conducted. Many of the measures of racial identity have low reliabilities, which may impede consistency among samples. Further, inconsistencies such as those we have previously discussed (e.g., different operational definitions, theoretical orientations, etc.) in these studies may skew results. Third, since meta-analytic studies utilize effect sizes based on correlation, causal relationships cannot be inferred from the results. Also, a potential limitation is that the current review may have inadvertently missed some other important information on other psychosocial outcomes that may be influenced by racial identity, such as social skill development, self-control, or substance use. Research shows the link between racial identity and some of these outcomes, and components that were not associated with the outcomes included in the current study may be associated with the other psychosocial outcomes that were not included (Borrell, 2005; Townsend & Belgrave, 2000). For the current review, many of the effect sizes found were small or medium, thus the more critical variables associated with racial identity still may require further explanation. Finally, future research should
explore these topics as socioeconomic status may play an important role in racial identity processes.

Despite the limitations, the current study has several strengths. Several important findings were derived from the conceptual framework we developed and the subsequent meta-analysis. Second, published peer-reviewed journal studies, as well as dissertations studies and unpublished works were included. Most importantly, this study not only synthesizes muddled literature on racial identity, but also introduces a conceptual framework that can be used when researchers and the general public aim to understand the importance of racial identity but cannot reconcile different methods of measuring it. Finally, this study introduces important ideas about moderators the relationship between racial identity and outcomes, and informs the field about constructs that should be explored in future research.

**Summary and Implications**

Overall, the findings from this study support the notion that developing positive feelings about one’s racial group as well as other groups is most strongly related to psychosocial and academic success. As mentioned previously, racial pride may prevent African-American youth from internalizing negative stereotypes, which may result in less negative mental health outcomes (McLoyd et al., 2000; Spencer, 1995). Additionally, racial pride may protect against the deleterious effects of racial discrimination (Caldwell et al., 2002; Cross, Parham, & Helms, 1998). However, positive feelings alone about one’s race does not have as strong of an impact as the Humanism dimension which includes have positive feelings about your race as well as respecting and appreciating
other ethnicities and valuing other personal identities (e.g., gender, religion, etc.). The primary implication is that, for the most part, Racial Pride and Humanism are the dimensions of racial identity that matters most for the types of questions typically addressed by social scientists interested in African American children. We are usually concerned about how to best develop resilience in African American children to support them in coping with racism and the multitude of trials and tribulations they will have to endure. We are also concerned with enhancing their mental health and their performance in academic environments, and ultimately being positive forces in their families and communities.

Towards those ends, the implications of this study are strikingly clear. African American children must develop a sense of comfortableness and pride in their “blackness”, or more accurately, their “Africaness.” However, despite the prevalence of racism and prejudice in America, youth of African descent must also not be so angry and affected to the degree that they do not feel some connection to the general human race. The studies of racial pride included in the current review support this assertion. Therefore, prevention and intervention efforts should aim to highlight racial pride and appreciation of diversity in their efforts with this population (McMahon & Watts, 2002; Wills et al., 2007). For example, an intervention may incorporate the use of both implicit and explicit racial pride socialization messages in such as exposing youth to Black art, movies, and music which positively showcase their race to enhance racial pride. Promotion of other aspects of racial identity, such as the salience of one’s race and preparing for racial discrimination are not likely to be as useful with this demographic.
Interestingly, few studies have included children in their samples. This article aims to begin to help researchers organize the literature into something that can be translated to meaningful intervention and more cohesive theory. Therefore, the complex role of racial identity in protecting against negative outcomes should continue to be explored in among African-American youth.
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