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ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to examine the relation between implicit and explicit self-esteem on social identity affirmation among Latinos in response to belonging threats from other ingroup members. We predicted a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem, and belonging threat condition predicting social identity affirmation (collective self-esteem), compensatory conviction and ingroup bias. We predicted that individuals with insecure self-esteem (high explicit, low implicit) would affirm their social identity more, offer greater conviction and express more ingroup bias in response to recalled threats as compared to a control condition of non-threatened participants. A total of n=174 Latinos participated in the online study. In the experimental condition (n=78), participants were instructed to recall and write about a time in which another Latino questioned or challenged the validity of their Latino identity. A control group (n=96) was asked to write about the last movie they watched. Regression analyses revealed no significant three-way interactions. However, significant two-way interactions between implicit self-esteem and condition, and explicit self-esteem and condition, on social identity affirmation were found. Implicit and explicit levels of self-esteem uniquely predicted collective self-esteem, conviction and ingroup warmth ratings among threatened individuals. Implications are discussed.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Self-esteem plays an important role in how people respond to threats to their identity. Researchers have examined both explicit (i.e., self-reported, accessible) and implicit (i.e., unconscious, automatic) self-esteem and how they interact to influence people’s behavior and response to threat (Jordan, Spencer, Zanna, Hoshino-Browne, & Correll, 2003; McGregor & Jordan, 2007). Self-esteem, belonging and social identity represent large areas of study within the field of social psychology (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Crocker, McGraw, Thompson, & Ingerman, 1987; Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002; Smart Richman & Leary, 2009). While considerable research exists relating self-esteem to belonging, and there is also a solid body of research exploring various aspects of social identity as they relate to self-esteem, the intersection of all three areas remains less explored. The goal of this research is to examine how the combination of people’s implicit and explicit self-esteem can predict responses to belonging threats, such as having one’s social identity threatened from ingroup members.

Explicit and implicit attitudes regarding high self-esteem that align with each other characterize secure high self-esteem, or stable high self-esteem (Jordan et al., 2003). When there is a difference between implicit and explicit reports, self-esteem is said to be discrepant. Research examining the role of self-esteem in threat response
patterns (such as defensiveness) has tended to focus on one configuration of discrepant self-esteem in which people have high explicit and low implicit self-esteem, referred to as *insecure high self-esteem* (Jordan et al., 2003). Some attention has also been given to discrepant self-esteem characterized by low explicit self-esteem and high implicit, referred to as *damaged self-esteem* (Schröder-Abé, Rudolph, & Schutz, 2007).

Social psychological research on responses to and effects of social identity threat has tended to focus on understanding processes through which majority group members derogue minority group members (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Crocker et al., 1987; Crocker & Major, 1989; McGregor, Haji, & Kang, 2008). The majority of this research is conducted within an African-American and White frame of reference. However, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2010), Latinos are projected to constitute 30% of U.S. population by 2050. Considering current demographic shifts, directing this research within the Latino community seems worthwhile. Additionally, considering the paucity of research directed at social identity threat from ingroup members, this research will address that gap by aiming to explore how Latinos respond to having other Latinos question their ethnic identity and the role of both explicit and implicit self-esteem in those responses.

**Self-Esteem**

**Implicit and Explicit Self-Esteem.** It has been largely accepted that individuals may not be able or willing to articulate certain attitudes and preferences, especially those relating to the self (Koole, Dijksterhuis, & van Knippenberg, 2001). These preferences and attitudes that are considered to be unconscious, automatic and largely operating below our standard threshold of awareness, are deemed implicit preferences and attitudes
(Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). The distinction between implicit and explicit attitudes of the self is central to the understanding of self-esteem and its measurement. While some standard self-report measures purport to measure self-esteem, they are more accurately considered measures of explicit self-esteem. More indirect methods have been developed to assess people’s unconscious, or implicit, self-esteem. Two of the most widely used measures of implicit self-esteem are the Name Letter Measure and the Implicit Association Test (Bosson, Swann, & Pennebaker, 2000; Greenwald, Nosek & Banaji, 2003; Kitayama & Karasawa, 1997; Nuttin, 1987). Researchers have found weak correlations between implicit and explicit measurements of self-esteem, suggesting implicit and explicit evaluations about the self are independent from one another (Bosson et al., 2000; DeHart, Longua, & Smith, 2011). That we can simultaneously hold implicit and explicit, possibly conflicting, evaluations about the self is meaningful—especially when trying to assess the moderating role of implicit self-esteem on outcomes, like responses to threats in interpersonal contexts.

**Secure and Insecure High Self-Esteem.** Overall, a growing amount of research has been directed towards examining both configurations of discrepant self-esteem as it relates to various psychological and physical outcomes, including but by no means limited to, information processing, defensive response behaviors and self-presentational strategies (Briñol, Petty, & Wheeler, 2006; Schröder-Abé, Rudolph, Wiesner, & Schütz, 2007). Self-esteem is one of the most widely studied areas in the self literature (DeHart et al., 2011). Previous research suggests that insecure high self-esteem (i.e., in which explicit levels are high while implicit evaluations are low) can be a strong predictor of defensive threat response patterns (Bosson, Brown, Zeigler-Hill, & Swann, 2003; Jordan
et al. 2003). Insecure high self-esteem has been linked with defensive zeal and compensatory conviction in the face of uncertainty threats (McGregor & Jordan, 2007). Compensatory conviction is considered by McGregor and Jordan (2007) to be a technique used by particularly defensive people to avoid uncertainty and the concomitant anxieties that would be associated with entertaining those uncertainties. Similarly, Jordan et al. (2003) found that individuals with insecure high self-esteem in comparison to those with secure high self-esteem (i.e., high explicit and high implicit self-esteem) were higher in narcissism. Narcissism is associated with more defensiveness in response to threats and higher reactance (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998).

**Damaged Self-Esteem.** In addition to the insecure high self-esteem configuration, another combination of discrepant self-esteem is low explicit and high implicit self-esteem: damaged self-esteem (Schröder-Abé et al., 2007a). This configuration is described as damaged as the lower explicit self-esteem reported is thought to be a reflection of a disturbance—or damage—to an unconsciously high implicit self-esteem that presumably developed early on (DeHart et al., 2011). Some researchers have argued that more recent negative events have left people’s explicit beliefs about the self ‘damaged’ or lower than their implicit beliefs (Bosson et al., 2003). Those possessing damaged self-esteem have also been described as having a *glimmer of hope* about themselves (Spencer, Jordan, Logel, & Zanna, 2005). Those with damaged self-esteem tend to respond less negatively to threats and negative feedback than individuals with stable low self-esteem (i.e., low explicit and low implicit self-esteem). Spencer et al. (2005) suggest that an underlying attributional style that tends to be more positive and optimistic may add a layer of protection against threats and negative
feedback for those with damaged self-esteem.

In total, the above findings suggest that exaggerated explicit self-esteem scores that exist alongside low implicit scores in some individuals may be serving valuable self-enhancing or self-protective functions in the face of threats to self-concept, self-image and group belonging (Briñol et al., 2006; Schröder-Abé et al., 2007b; Spencer et al., 2005). In relation to our research, we would assume those with insecure high self-esteem scores will respond to belonging threats with higher levels of defensiveness and reactivity than those with secure high self-esteem. However, we do not expect people with stable low self-esteem (low explicit and low implicit) to differ from those with damaged self-esteem in highly defensive, reactive or other exceedingly negative compensatory actions.

**Belonging**

It has been posited by Baumeister & Leary (1995) that the fundamental human need to belong has been inherited due to its highly probable evolutionary benefits—mainly organizing people into interpersonal relationships and larger social groups with the aim of increasing survival. In addition, the need to belong is considered integral to the formation of attachments to caregivers, the development of the self, and figures into shaping personality (Anderson & Chen, 2002; Bowlby, 1988). In short, belonging is credited with facilitating social interaction, laying the foundation for the development of much of what makes us human.

Accordingly, unmet belonging needs and threats to belonging are associated with negative outcomes including weakened self-regulation (DeWall, Baumeister, & Vohs, 2008) and emotional and physical distress (Nezlek, Kowalski, Leary, Blevins, & Holgate, 1997). A meta-analysis reviewing social exclusion research from 192 studies supports
the idea that rejection elicits negative affect or dampens positive affect (Blackhart, Nelson, Knowles, & Baumeister, 2009). In light of the negative implications of unmet or threatened belonging needs, the aversion to experiencing rejection can be considered a strong drive, in its own right.

Of central importance to understanding current thought on belonging and belonging threats is Leary and colleagues’ (1995; 2005) sociometer theory which posits self-esteem is a personal gauge of relational value. In essence, self-esteem is one way in which people can measure their sense of belonging. In this vein, when individuals are faced with a belonging threat, this represents a potential loss of relational value. It can be argued, then, that stronger responses to rejection may be related to lower implicit self-esteem or a self-esteem that is weaker, as rejection signals a loss or potential loss of relational value that one would wish to restore. Insecure high self-esteem individuals tend to respond more strongly to threats than those with secure high self-esteem—presumably because exaggerated conviction or zeal is covering for inordinately low implicit self-esteem levels that bring about uncertainty regarding self-worth and a desire to quell that uncertainty (McGregor & Jordan, 2007; McGregor & Marigold, 2003).

In a study by McGregor and Marigold (2003) examining compensatory conviction in response to various certainty threats, participants with insecure high self-esteem demonstrated more defensive zeal in support of their ideological positions on social issues (i.e., capital punishment and abortion) in comparison to those with secure high self-esteem when they were asked to recall and write about personal relationships they perceived as shaky. This research demonstrated a clear link between insecure high self-esteem and increased defensiveness in response to what can be conceived of as a
belonging threat (i.e., shaky relationship). Additionally, other research (Jordan et al., 2003) has shown that the expression of ingroup bias as a form of defensiveness can occur as a function of insecure high self-esteem in minimal group paradigms. Even in the absence of rejection or other threat manipulations, people with insecure high self-esteem have a tendency to self-enhance in a defensive manner through ingroup bias, presumably because they are extending the exaggerated positive regard they hold for themselves to their entire ingroup and its members (Jordan et al., 2003; McGregor & Jordan, 2007).

Interestingly, an examination of how ingroup members respond to rejection from other ingroup members is rare in the literature. There is some research related to discrimination among ingroup members such as ingroup discrimination based on phenotype and skin color among ethnic minorities (Hunter, 2007; Uhlmann, Dasgupta, Elgueta, Greenwald, & Swanson, 2002). However, to our knowledge, there is no research concerning threats to ethnic identity from similarly identified group members. Therefore, the current work will fill an important gap in the literature by examining how people’s self-esteem influences how they respond to threats from ingroup members.

**Social Identity**

The group self (social identity) and personal self (self-esteem) are typically examined separately in the social psychological literature, yet they display important parallels in some respects (Ellemers et al., 2002; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Arguably, the strongest similarity between the group self and personal self are ones that characterize response patterns and negative outcomes to threats. The common thread beneath all threats, according to Smart Richman & Leary (2009), is one of threatened belonging. All negative responses from others represent threats to the motive of being accepted and
esteemed by others. Belonging in this proposed research will be viewed in terms of social identity, specifically ethnicity. A threat to one’s social identity is an explicit threat to belonging. Ethnicity is a particularly salient category to which individuals ascribe their identity. In research conducted with young Latinos and their White classmates, Latinos are more likely than Whites to select their ethnic group (as opposed to gender or age grouping) as the social group upon which their social identity is drawn (Turner & Brown, 2007).

McCoy and Major (2003) argue that threats like prejudice against the ingroup represent threats to the self to the extent to which an individual incorporates the group into the self-concept. Considering that ethnicity can be a strong component in one’s self-concept (like the Latino students mentioned above), individuals experiencing threats against their ethnic group—or, relatedly, rejection from their own ethnic group—may find these threats to be particularly salient threats to the self. That this would be the case is consistent with other research supporting the idea that perceived discrimination against one’s group is a type of social identity threat that results in individuals feeling rejected (Smart Richman & Leary, 2009).

According to research on belonging threats, strategies used to respond to belonging threats and rejection may differ from strategies used to respond to other threats that do not pertain to belonging (Knowles, Lucas, Molden, Gardner, & Dean, 2010). Of note, participants in Study 1 of the Knowles et al. (2010) experiment were asked to write about any topic of their choosing after receiving a belonging threat manipulation that consisted of writing of a time in which he or she was rejected or socially excluded. In comparison to the control group, those in the belonging threat condition demonstrated
greater tendencies to self-affirm post threat with what the authors call *threat relevant* affirmations. These threat relevant affirmations were social in nature. They included writing about the importance of social bonds and belonging to groups (i.e., “write about why friendships are of value to you” or “why belonging to groups is important”). These group based topics were selected as ways to self-affirm over other non-social topics like those related to good grades and the importance of rational thinking. In the current research, we would expect threat relevant affirmations, such as affirming ethnic identity, to be enlisted in service of reducing the negative affect and emotion (i.e., sadness, hurt) associated with experiencing belonging threats operationalized as social identity threats. This would be consistent with the idea posited by some researchers that bolstering group identity may serve a buffering function, protecting individuals from perceptions of discrimination (Crocker & Major, 1989). To the extent that collective self-esteem serves this purpose, it is our main threat relevant affirmation of interest.

Some research indicates that connecting with similar others is instrumental to facilitating other core social motives, like the drive for shared understanding, trusting close others and enhancing of the self (Fiske, 2004). Thus, threats to belonging from ingroup members may result in higher undesirable arousal and anxiety among those with insecure high self-esteem, especially, considering their tendency to self-enhance with ingroup favoritism and bias (Jordan et al., 2003). Therefore, we argue the intensity of perceived social identity threat from another ingroup member could be greater than what one could expect from an out-group member. Specifically, we argue that individuals receiving a threat to their ethnicity will respond as previous research indicates is expected in the face of self and other belonging threats. That is, individuals with insecure high
self-esteem will respond defensively; exaggerating relevant social identity affirmations post threat—mainly, social identity affirmation via collective self-esteem.

**Current Study**

We will examine how implicit and explicit self-esteem moderates the relation between belonging threat and social identity affirmation. The belonging manipulation will be a recall-writing paradigm in which participants will need to recall a time of rejection and write about it. Specifically, participants will be asked to recall and write about a time in which another Latino questioned their ethnic identity and/or challenged the strength and validity of their Latino identity. Participants in the control group will be asked to recall and write about the last movie watched.

We predict a three-way interaction between explicit self-esteem (high versus low), implicit self-esteem (high versus low) and belonging threat condition predicting identity affirmation (collective self-esteem). In the belonging threat condition, we expect that individuals with insecure high self-esteem would report higher collective self-esteem compared to individuals with secure high self-esteem in response to the threat. That is, individuals with insecure high self-esteem would report more defensive responses via relevant identity affirmations when their group identity is threatened. In contrast, we do not expect that people with damaged self-esteem would differ from stable low self-esteem in their reports of their identity affirmations after their group identity is threatened. This interaction is not expected to happen in the control condition.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

A total of 194 participants completed our online survey. Participants were asked whether they identified as Latino as an eligibility requirement. Two (n = 2) individuals were removed from the analysis for failing to respond affirmatively to the question “do you identify as Latino?” Individuals who left the open-ended manipulation question blank (n = 18) were removed from the data set, as well. Removal of the above cases left the total number of participants at n = 174 with n = 96 in the control condition and n = 78 in the belongingness threat condition. For completing the survey, participants were given the option of entering a lottery to win one of ten $50 cash prizes.

Overview of Procedure

This study was programmed as a computer-based survey hosted by Loyola University’s Opinio online survey platform. The survey link was shared online in various social media forums targeting Latinos (e.g. Latino news Facebook pages, Latino related hashtags via Twitter, etc.). Opinio’s programming of the link was configured to allow for random assignment: each individual clicking into the link either was randomly routed to either the belongingness threat online survey or the control survey. After indicating consent, participants were asked demographic questions regarding their age, gender and the racial/ethnic identity of themselves and their families. They were then asked to
complete measures of implicit and explicit self-esteem. Next, they completed either the belongingness threat condition or the control condition which were followed by a set of manipulation check questions. Participants were then asked to complete measures of social identity affirmation including: 1) a measure of collective self-esteem; 2) compensatory conviction questions regarding ethnic identity; and, 3) ingroup bias ratings. Finally, participants were asked to provide their first and last initials just prior to the end of the survey. Participants interested in being entered into the lottery were asked to provide their contact information.

Measures

**Demographic information.** The participants were first asked to provide us with some demographic information, including date of birth and gender. Individuals had to be at least 18 to participate. We then asked participants a dichotomous one item measure of ethnic identification (“Do you identify as Latino?”). To refine this, participants were also asked to indicate their ethnic nationality as well as that of their mother and father (“What is your ethnic nationality? Select the group with which you most closely identify.”) from a list of the most common Latin American nationalities (*Mexican, Puerto-Rican, Cuban, Salvadoran, Guatemalan*, etc.). Participants were then asked to describe their racial identity (“How would you describe your race?”) by selecting from a list including Black, White, Latino, Asian, Native-American/Indigenous, and Bi-racial/Multi-racial or other. In addition to ethnicity and race, we asked participants to tell us how long they’ve lived in the United States in years and months. Next, participants were instructed to select a category that best describes their generational status from a set of four category descriptions (*1st generation = You were born in a country other than the USA; 2nd*
generation = *You were born in the USA, but either or both of your parents were born in another country; 3rd = You and both of your parents were born in the USA, but all your grandparents were born in another country; and, 4th = You and both your parents were born in the USA, all or some of your grandparents were born in the USA.* Participants were also asked about their first language (*English, Spanish, Both equally, or some other language*).

**Implicit Self-esteem.** We used a task derived from research on the name-letter effect to assess implicit self-esteem (Kitayama & Karasawa, 1997; Nuttin, 1987; see Koole & DeHart, 2007 for a review). This task provides a measure of participant liking of his or her first and last name initials on an automatic level. Ostensibly, participants were informed the task concerned the development of future stimuli for language and pictorial preference research. During the task, participants were instructed to work as quickly as possible (e.g., “…work quickly and trust your gut impressions.”) in reporting their liking for each letter of the alphabet. Their liking for each letter was indicated on a 9-point scale (1 = *dislike very much*, 9 = *like very much*). To compute a letter liking score, we calculated the difference between each individual participant’s ratings for liking of the letters associated with his or her first and last initials and the average liking of those letters from individuals whom do not have those letters in their initials. Higher values indicate a greater preference for those letters associated with the participant’s own name and are used as an expression higher implicit self-esteem. Amongst our participants, the correlation between liking score of first initial and last initial was $r = .45$, $p < .01$. 
Explicit self-esteem. For the purpose of obtaining explicit self-esteem scores from participants, Rosenberg’s (1965) 10-item measure was used (e.g., “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself” and “At times I feel that I am useless”). Participants indicated agreement with each item on a seven point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). After reverse coding negative items, the participant’s explicit self-esteem score was derived from the average of all ten items so that higher numbers represent higher explicit self-esteem ($\alpha=.85$).

Belonging Threat Manipulation. To manipulate belongingness threat, we used a recall-writing paradigm. In the belongingness threat condition, participants were prompted to write about a time an ingroup member (i.e., another Latino) made them feel rejected or excluded from their group (“Can you think about a time when another Latino questioned your ethnicity and/or suggested you were not Latino ‘enough’? In the space below, please briefly describe in two or three sentences what happened, who said it, and how it made you feel.”). Examples of possible belongingness threat instances were given in the instructions, as well (“This could take the form of grandparents criticizing your mannerisms, friends or neighbors indicating you do not look or sound Latino, or other comments or actions that made you feel excluded from your ethnicity”). The most frequently mentioned threats included being disparaged over not speaking Spanish (39.7%), “acting White” (32.1%), not looking Latino/phenotypic traits (29.5%), and being born and or living in the United States (17.9%).\footnote{Some participants described events with more than one threat. All threats mentioned were coded.} Participants were also asked to identify who perpetrated the threat and how it made them feel. Perpetrators of threat were identified most often as peers, classmates or acquaintances (52.6%), followed by
family (30.8%) and less frequently, friends (16.8%). Those participants in the control condition were instructed to write about the last movie they saw with a friend.

**Manipulation Check.** Directly following the belongingness threat manipulation, participants were asked to report how they felt when the event happened (e.g., “Now that you have described this event, please report how severe and negative the event was to you.” and “How excluded did this event make you feel?”). Participants used a seven point scale in responding to these two items on negativity and exclusion (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *extremely negative*; and 1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very excluded*). Higher scores on these two items indicated a greater sense of rejection, which is expected in the belonging threat condition. Additionally, participants were asked to complete a perceived rejection measure (adapted from Murray, Derrick, Leder, & Holmes, 2008). Participants were instructed to indicate their current feelings (happy, hurt, appreciated, rejected, sad, angry, accepted, loved, included and annoyed) on a seven point scale (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *extremely*). Positive items (happy) were reverse coded such that higher scores indicate greater perceived rejection. The initial ten perceived rejection items along with exclusion and event negativity formed a reliable composite and were subsequently combined to create a 12 item scale representing total perceived rejection (α=.91).

**Social Identity Affirmation.** Luhtanen & Crocker’s Collective Self-Esteem (CSE-R) Scale was used to measure the extent to which subjects affirm their Latino identity post belongingness threat. All items were scored on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) and negative items were reverse scored and averaged with positive items such that higher total scores were indicative of greater collective self-esteem and social identity affirmation (α=.83).
**Conviction.** As an additional measure of social identity affirmation, we examined compensatory conviction in a two item measure aimed at assessing defensive zeal post belongingness threat (adapted from McGregor & Marigold, 2003). Participants were asked to indicate their agreement to the following statements: “I seldom experience conflict between the different aspects of my ethnic identity”; and, “In general, I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am.” These items were designed to assess compensatory conviction with respect to social identity and personal identity compensatory conviction, respectively. Both items were scored on a 7-point scale (1 = **strongly disagree**, 7 = **strongly agree**). Higher scores on the identity conviction items indicate greater defensiveness in response to a belongingness threat. However, the two items were weakly correlated with each other and therefore analyzed separately ($r=.25$, $p<.01$).

**Ingroup favoritism.** As a measure of ingroup favoritism in this study, participants were asked to indicate their feelings of warmth for four different ethnic groups (i.e., Blacks/African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, Whites/European Americans, and Asian Americans) on a feelings thermometer that ranged from 1 to 100 (1 = **most negative**, 100 = **most positive**). Feelings thermometers of this sort have been used to gauge attitudes towards different racial groups (e.g., Bobo, 1988; Craig, Fiedorowicz, DeHart, & Richeson, 2012; Sears, 1988). Participants in our study were asked to enter in a number for each of the four ethnic groups on screen (“Please indicate your feelings towards each of the groups below on a thermometer that runs from zero (0) to one hundred (100). The higher the number, the warmer or more favorable you feel towards the group. The lower the number, the colder or less favorable you feel. If you feel neither
warm nor cold towards, rate the group at fifty (50).”). Higher scores for Latinos as a
group relative to other groups were considered a measure of ingroup favoritism. Because
ratings of Asians and Blacks were moderately correlated ($r = .58, p < .01$), an average
Non-White/Other Minority Score was computed combining the average ratings given for
Blacks and Asians. Two main difference scores were then computed to assess the
relative preference, or ingroup bias, for Latinos relative to other minorities (Latino score
minus averaged score for other minorities) and Latinos relative to Whites (Latino score
minus score for Whites).
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Random Assignment Check

We first examined whether random assignment between our control and belongingness threat conditions was effective by conducting t-tests on our pre-manipulation measures of implicit and explicit self-esteem. Our control group did not differ in comparison to our belongingness threat group in terms of implicit self-esteem ($t(165) = -0.292, p = .77$) or explicit self-esteem ($t(164) = .363, p = .72$). Chi-square tests were conducted to determine whether gender, generational status, first language and ethnic nationality were distributed equally across study conditions. Test results indicated there were no differences between the control condition and the belongingness threat condition on any of those demographic items (all $\chi^2$s < 6.47 and all $p$s > .27).

Manipulation Check

We performed a manipulation check predicting total feelings of perceived rejection from condition (control = -1, belongingness threat = +1), implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and all two and three-way interaction terms. Our results indicated that participants in the belongingness threat condition ($M = 4.6$) expressed significantly elevated levels of perceived rejection compared with participants in the control condition ($M = 2.7$). This difference was not moderated by implicit self-esteem or explicit self-esteem (see Table 1). This suggests our writing recall manipulation was effective in
Table 1. Multiple Regression Results for Implicit Self-esteem, Explicit Self-esteem and Condition predicting Perceived Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>10.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>&lt;-.01</td>
<td>&lt;-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, *p < .10
priming a sense of exclusion and related constructs (e.g., hurt, rejection, anger) and was the same for our participants regardless of their levels of implicit and explicit self-esteem.

**Collective Self-esteem**

To assess the effects of implicit and explicit self-esteem and perceived threat on social identity affirmation, a multiple regression analysis was performed. Using the procedures detailed by Aiken and West (1991) regarding testing interactions in multiple regression, we centered our continuous self-esteem predictors (by subtracting the means) and inputted the centered predictors into our model. Effects coding was used on the categorical variables of condition (control = -1, belongingness threat = +1) and gender (female = -1, male = +1) for ease of interpretability. The predictors in this model were (a) explicit self-esteem, (b) implicit self-esteem, (c) condition, (d) all two-way interactions among these variables, (e) the three-way interaction term for condition by implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem, and the covariates (f) gender, (g) and two dummy-coded generational status variables; one comparing second generation Latinos to first generation Latinos and one comparing third and fourth generation Latinos to first generation. The criterion variable was social identity affirmation expressed through participants’ scores on the collective self-esteem measure.

As summarized in Table 2, there was a significant main effect of explicit self-esteem, indicating that individuals with higher explicit self-esteem tended to also score higher on the collective self-esteem scale. There was also a marginally significant \(p = .08\) main effect of gender such that women indicated higher collective self-esteem scores than men. Additionally, marginally significant Condition x Explicit self-esteem \(p = .07\) and Condition x Implicit self-esteem \(p = .06\) interaction effects were detected.
Table 2. Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem x Condition on Collective Self-esteem Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 1</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 2</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-1.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .01, †p < .10
The predicted three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and condition on collective self-esteem scores was not found ($p = .76$). That is, the interaction between both implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem predicting collective self-esteem did not significantly differ by condition.

A trimmed model was run dropping both the (a) non-significant three-way interaction term between Condition x Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem and (b) the Explicit Self-esteem x Implicit Self-esteem 2-way interaction. Using the trimmed model, a statistically significant ($p = .05$) Implicit self-esteem x Condition interaction on collective self-esteem was found. Additionally, a marginally significant ($p = .07$) Explicit self-esteem x Condition interaction on collective self-esteem was detected. So, both implicit and explicit self-esteem uniquely moderated the effect of condition on collective self-esteem. To determine the nature of the significant Implicit self-esteem x Condition 2-way interaction on collective self-esteem, we separately examined the continuous relation between implicit self-esteem and collective self-esteem in the control condition and belongingness threat condition. As per the regression lines in Figure 1, the simple slopes tests suggest that implicit self-esteem was associated with collective self-esteem for those in the belongingness threat condition such that lower implicit self-esteem scores are related to higher collective self-esteem scores, but this effect was only a trend, $B = -.10$, $\beta = -.19$, $t(138) = -1.65$, $p = .10$. For those in the control condition, no relation

---

2 This trimmed model dropping the (a) non-significant three-way interaction term between Condition x Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem and (b) the Explicit Self-esteem x Implicit Self-esteem 2-way interaction term was used for all regression analyses.

3 Additional regression models were run to determine whether gender or generational status moderated the interaction of condition and self-esteem (explicit and implicit) on collective self-esteem. Gender ($p = .55$) or generational status (all $ps > .24$) did not moderate the interaction of explicit self-esteem on condition or the interaction of implicit self-esteem on condition (Gender, $p = .28$; Generational status, all $ps > .35$).
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between implicit self-esteem and collective self-esteem was detected, $B = .07, \beta = .13, t(138) = 1.12, p = .26$. Apparently, people low in implicit self-esteem tended to express greater collective self-esteem only when their social identity had been threatened.

To examine the marginally significant Explicit Self-esteem x Condition interaction on collective self-esteem scores, we separately tested the continuous relation between explicit self-esteem and collective self-esteem in the control condition and belongingness threat condition. As demonstrated by the regression lines in Figure 2, the simple slopes tests indicated explicit self-esteem was significantly associated with collective self-esteem both in the belongingness threat condition ($B = .45, \beta = .52, t(138) = 4.09, p < .001$) and control condition ($B = .19, \beta = .22, t(138) = 2.12, p = .04$). High explicit self-esteem scores were related to high collective self-esteem scores in both conditions, although this effect was stronger in the belongingness threat condition.

**Compensatory Conviction**

The two items on compensatory conviction were weakly correlated with one another and thus were analyzed separately (“I seldom experience conflict between the different aspects of my ethnic identity” and “In general, I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am”). Table 3 summarizes the results of the analysis for ethnic identity conviction. The main effect of explicit self-esteem on ethnic identity conviction score trended toward significance ($p = .10$). Those with higher explicit self-esteem reported that they seldom experienced conflict between the different aspects of their ethnic identity. Also, there was a significant main effect of implicit self-esteem ($p = .03$) on ethnic identity conviction score. Individuals with higher implicit self-esteem indicated they seldom experienced conflict regarding their ethnic identity in comparison to those
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Table 3. Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem x Condition on Social Identity Conviction Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 2</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-1.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, + $p < .10$
with lower implicit self-esteem. Moreover, a significant Implicit Self-esteem x Condition 2-way interaction predicting ethnic identity conviction scores \((p < .05)\) was found. So, implicit self-esteem did moderate the effect of condition on ethnic identity conviction expressed. We did not find the anticipated three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and condition predicting ethnic identity conviction \((p=.28)\).

The simple slopes tests (Figure 3) indicated that implicit self-esteem is only related to the level of agreement regarding not being conflicted over one’s ethnic identity for those in the belongingness threat condition \((B = -.42, \beta = -.35, t(150) = -2.84, p < .01)\). That is, after the threat manipulation, individuals with low implicit self-esteem indicated higher levels of agreement on this item in comparison to those with higher implicit self-esteem. No relation between implicit self-esteem and ethnic identity conviction was found for those in the control condition, \(B = .02, \beta = .02, t(150) = .17, p = .86\). This suggests that, for those with low implicit self-esteem, higher levels of ethnic identity conviction may be compensatory in the face of having one’s ethnic identity threatened by other ingroup members. Alternatively, those with higher levels of implicit self-esteem indicate reduced ethnic identity conviction in the face of belongingness threat. Or, put differently, those with higher implicit self-esteem may be more likely to more readily admit to being conflicted regarding the different aspects of their ethnic identities when faced with belongingness threat based on ethnic identity.

A regression analysis identical to that ran for ethnic identity conviction was run for personal identity conviction (Table 4). There was a significant \((p < .001)\) main effect of explicit self-esteem on agreement to the personal identity conviction item such that participants with higher explicit self-esteem were more likely to report having a clearer
Figure 3. Predicting Social Identity Conviction from Implicit SE and Condition
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Table 4. Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem x Condition on Personal Identity Conviction Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 1</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 2</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-2.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$,  ** $p < .01$,  '+ $p < .10
sense of who they were in comparison to those with lower levels of explicit self-esteem.

Similarly, there was a marginally significant ($p < .08$) main effect of implicit self-esteem on agreement to the personal identity conviction item, as well, such that those with higher levels of implicit self-esteem also indicated greater agreement to having a clear sense of self. A marginally significant ($p = .07$) Implicit self-esteem x Condition interaction predicting agreement to personal identity conviction was detected. As with the other analyses conducted, the hypothesized three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and condition was not significant ($p = .85$).

To better examine the Implicit Self-Esteem x Condition interaction, a simple slopes test was performed to assess the continuous relation of implicit self-esteem on personal identity confirmation within both conditions. As the regression lines in Figure 4 indicate, the simple slopes test shows that implicit self-esteem was only associated with agreement to the personal identity conviction item for those in the control condition ($B = .21, \beta = .26, t(150) = 2.74, p < .01$) and not in the belongingness threat condition ($B < -.01, \beta < -.01, t(150) = -.04, p = .97$). In other words, in the control condition—in the absence of social identity threat—individuals with high implicit self-esteem reported a clearer sense of self compared to those with lower implicit self-esteem. For individuals in the belongingness threat condition, there were no differences in reported personal identity conviction based on level of implicit self-esteem.

**Ingroup bias**

An additional dependent measure in our study used to assess ingroup bias post social identity threat was a racial feeling thermometer (Craig, DeHart, Richeson & Fiedorowicz, 2012). We obtained and examined scores, on a scale of 1-100, of how
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positively or negatively participants felt about four individual ethnic groups: Whites, Blacks, Latinos/Hispanics and Asians.\(^4\) To understand each racial attitude score as a function of implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and condition, several multiple regressions were performed (Table 5). There was a significant main effect of generational status on ratings of Whites such that more acculturated Latino participants reported less warmth towards Whites as a group \((B = -15.22, \beta = -.24, t(150) = -2.52, p < .05)\). There was a significant main effect of implicit self-esteem on ratings for Blacks indicating lower ratings for them as a group as implicit self-esteem of participants increased \((B = -2.38, \beta = -.17, t(150) = -1.99, p < .05)\). A main effect of explicit self-esteem was detected, as well; participants with higher explicit self-esteem were significantly more likely to rate Latinos \((B = 4.47, \beta = .25, t(149) = 3.00, p < .01)\), Whites \((B = 4.85, \beta = .19, t(150) = 2.34, p < .05)\) and Asians \((B = 4.83, \beta = .21, t(151) = 2.52, p < .05)\) more favorably, but not Blacks \((B = 2.63, \beta = .11, t(150) = 1.27, p = .21)\). Additionally, there was a significant Condition x Explicit self-esteem interaction for participant ratings of Latinos \((B = 4.38, \beta = .24, t(149) = 2.95, p < .01)\). No significant three way interactions were uncovered in any of the regression models.

As the regression lines in Figure 5 indicate, the simple slopes test showed that explicit self-esteem was only associated with higher Latino group warmth ratings for those in the belongingness threat condition \((B = 8.85, \beta = .49, t(149) = 3.85, p < .001)\) and not in the control condition \((B = 0.08, \beta = .01, t(149) = .04, p = .97)\). In the presence of social identity threat, individuals with higher explicit self-esteem demonstrated more ingroup bias as reflected in higher ratings for Latinos. Warmth ratings were not

\(^4\) Belongingness threat and control condition mean ethnic group warmth scores were compared for each ethnic group, as well. No significant differences were found.
Table 5. Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem x Condition on Racial Attitudes Regression Analysis: Individual Group Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latinos</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Asians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 2</td>
<td>-5.98</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.77**</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, † p < .10
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associated with explicit self-esteem in the control condition.

Regression models identical to those used for examination of individual group scores were also run for difference scores (Table 6). In one difference score model, we examined implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and condition on Latino vs. Other Minority difference scores. In a second difference score model, we examined Latino vs. White difference scores as a function of implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and condition. The analyses revealed no main effects of implicit self-esteem, explicit-self-esteem or condition nor any 2-way interactions. Similarly, the anticipated 3-way interactions in either model were not found.
Table 6. Implicit Self-esteem x Explicit Self-esteem x Condition on Racial Attitudes
Regression Analysis: Difference Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Latino - Asian and Black</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Latino - White</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B )  ( \beta ) ( t )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( B )  ( \beta ) ( t )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 1</td>
<td>.09  &lt;.01  .02</td>
<td>2.44  .05  .46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status 2</td>
<td>-1.58 - .03 - .34</td>
<td>9.26  .13  1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.68 - .08 - .95</td>
<td>-2.26 - .07 - .86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-.84  -.05  -.56</td>
<td>-2.81  -.11  -1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>.74  .04  .45</td>
<td>-.62  -.02  -.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>1.06  .10  1.09</td>
<td>-1.80  -.11  -1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>2.11  .11  1.30</td>
<td>2.69  .09  1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Implicit Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.30  -.03  -.30</td>
<td>.12  .01  .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-.23  -.02  -.24</td>
<td>-.94  -.05  -.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Explicit SE x Implicit SE</td>
<td>-1.13  -.10  -1.14</td>
<td>-1.21  -.07  -.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \)
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

This research investigated how Latinos experienced belonging threats from other Latino ingroup members. Specifically, this research explored the relation between implicit and explicit self-esteem in moderating social identity affirming responses (i.e., expression of collective self-esteem, compensatory conviction, and ingroup bias) to belonging threats operationalized as social identity threats. The overall findings did not fit our specific predictions regarding secure and insecure high self-esteem predicting defensive responses to belonging threats. That is, no significant three way interactions between implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem and condition were detected for any of our three dependent variable measures of social identity affirmation. However, our findings did uncover separate and meaningful associations between explicit self-esteem and implicit self-esteem on measures of social identity affirmation. Importantly, too, participants recounting events in which other Latinos questioned their ethnic identity did report elevated rates of perceived rejection, regardless of implicit or explicit self-esteem levels. This in and of itself is consistent with our assertion that a threat to one’s social identity is akin to a threat to belonging, complete with its attendant feelings of rejection, exclusion and negativity.

Latinos with higher explicit self-esteem reported higher collective self-esteem scores in the belonging threat condition. This effect was also observed in the control
condition, however the effect was stronger in the belongingness threat condition. In addition, Latinos with higher explicit self-esteem scores in the belongingness threat condition indicated greater warmth towards Latinos than those with lower explicit self-esteem. This was not observed in the control condition. These findings indicate that explicit self-esteem is related to increasing both collective self-esteem and greater warmth towards Latinos after the belonging threat manipulation.

We observed a different pattern of results with implicit self-esteem. In the belongingness threat condition, Latinos with higher implicit self-esteem reported lower collective self-esteem scores in comparison to those with lower implicit self-esteem—although this effect was a trend \( (p = .10) \). No such differences were observed in the control condition. Individuals with higher implicit self-esteem also indicated having a clearer sense of self when in the control condition but no such differences were observed for those in the threat condition. With respect to social identity conviction, participants in our threat condition with higher implicit self-esteem scores were significantly less likely to say they seldom experienced conflict between the different aspects of their ethnic identity. This was not detected in the control condition. The above findings suggest higher implicit self-esteem is related to a clearer sense of self in the absence of a belonging threat (in the control condition), but also to a more conflicted ethnic identity and a trend toward decreasing collective self-esteem in the presence of a belonging threat.

As mentioned previously in the literature review, weak correlations between implicit and explicit measurements of self-esteem are found throughout the social psychological literature, which suggests implicit and explicit evaluations about the self are independent from one another. Explicit attitudes, including those of the self, may
involve a more deliberative process whereas implicit attitudes may be automatically invoked (Petty, Fazio, & Briñol, 2008). The automaticity of implicit self evaluations related to self-esteem is believed to develop from repeated associations of evaluations with the self over the course of one’s life, beginning in childhood (Koole & Dehart, 2007; DeHart, Pelham, & Tennen, 2006). As such, implicit measures of self-esteem may be measuring a deeply-engrained, more firmly fixed evaluation of the self. Furthermore, explicit measures of self-esteem are prone to social desirability biases and explicit responses to such measures can be enlisted for near-term, self-enhancing purposes. In short, the implicit and explicit self-esteem measures may be tapping somewhat independent constructs.

To what extent should discrepant self-esteem be reliably predictive of compensatory actions and defensive response behaviors in response to threat if some divergence on implicit and explicit self-esteem measures is to be expected? Gregg and Sedikides (2010) argue this point eloquently in a criticism of some models of interrelations between implicit and explicit self-esteem: if implicit and explicit measures of self-esteem are measuring independent constructs, the discrepancies between the two should not necessarily signal intrapsychic conflicts in need of resolution. After all, some divergence between implicit and explicit self esteem could be reasonably expected. So, it may be the case that damaged or insecure high self-esteem is associated with certain response patterns to the extent that underlying levels of implicit and explicit self-esteem independently relate to those same response patterns. The present research adds to the literature documenting the unique predictive ability of implicit self-esteem in comparison to explicit self-esteem on outcomes related to social threats in interpersonal contexts.
Independent of explicit self-esteem, low implicit self-esteem has been linked to defensive zeal in the face of threats (McGregor & Jordan, 2007). McGregor and Jordan (2007) argue that defensive zeal shifts motivational focus toward promotion ideals and away from avoiding threats. Daily diary research in the area of self-esteem and interpersonal experiences has demonstrated that individuals with low implicit self-esteem, experiencing interpersonal rejection drank more alcohol and did so in the company of others (DeHart, Tennen, Armeli, Todd, & Mohr, 2009). The authors suggest low implicit-self esteem is associated with greater reactive feelings in response to rejection, and also a tendency to seek connection to and acceptance from others. In other research examining implicit self-esteem, Gregg and Sedikides (2010) point to implicit self-esteem being a unique global marker of ego fragility negatively related to narcissism, which is also associated with more reactance and defensive responses to various threats.

Explicit self-esteem, independent of implicit self-esteem, has also been studied extensively with respect to its enhancement and protective functions (DeHart et al., 2011; Leary, 2005; Leary et al., 1995). According to the sociometer hypothesis of self-esteem, individuals with high explicit self-esteem are more inclined to feel accepted by others (Leary et al., 1995). Individuals with high explicit self-esteem are likely to maintain that sense of acceptance even in the face of social exclusion (Nezlek et al., 1997). These perceptions of social acceptance are believed to have a buffering effect on self-esteem and feelings of rejection. In a related vein, amplified importance of group memberships and social bonds have also been shown to reduce feelings of exclusion and rejection (Knowles & Gardner, 2010).
The findings above can be used to interpret the unique effects of explicit and implicit self-esteem on social identity affirmation in this study. First, with respect to collective self-esteem, we see that higher explicit self-esteem was related to higher collective self-esteem in the belonging threat condition. This was not the case in the control condition. The greater collective self-esteem scores among those with higher explicit self-esteem scores may reflect an attempt at bolstering social bonds in order to further enhance the self in the presence of threat. By more positively evaluating the ingroup, feelings of rejection and exclusion may be lessened. Similarly, Latinos with low implicit self-esteem also reported higher collective self-esteem in the belonging threat condition, although this effect was just a trend ($p = .10$). Such an effect was not found in the control condition. That those with low implicit self-esteem scores reported higher collective self-esteem scores than those with low implicit self-esteem suggests they, like those with high explicit self-esteem, may be attempting to bolster the value of the ingroup for personal gain. While the starting points may be different, the outcome is the same. It is the difference between an individual earning income to pay off a deep debt and another individual earning the same income to add to his comfortable savings. Both seek increased socio-relational income for different reasons.

Our results on the items of compensatory conviction were interesting, too. First, those with high implicit self-esteem in the belongingness threat condition more readily reported experiencing conflict over their ethnic identity. Individuals in the belongingness threat condition with lower implicit self-esteem reported the highest level of agreement to the idea that they seldom experience conflict with regard to their ethnic identity. In other words, those with lower implicit self-esteem in the belongingness threat condition
reported greater conviction (or greater certainty) regarding their social identity. This seems counterintuitive considering the belongingness threat manipulation calls for a recounting of a time in which participants’ ethnic identity was called into question; an event that could be construed as being inherently characterized by the experience of conflict over one’s ethnic identity. While speculative, it could be that individuals in the belongingness threat condition with higher implicit self-esteem are answering this question more honestly. If the claim by those with low implicit self-esteem in the belongingness threat condition regarding the rarity with which their ethnic identity conflicts is exaggerated and false, this would be consistent with the patterns of more defensive responses to threats exhibited by individuals with low implicit self-esteem—such as the tendency of individuals with low implicit self-esteem to seek validation for threatened self-views (Jordan, Spencer, & Zanna, 2005) and to do so with defensive zeal that masks troubling uncertainty (McGregor, & Jordan, 2007).

In terms of personal identity conviction, non-threatened individuals with high implicit self-esteem reported the highest amount of agreement with the idea that they generally know who and what they are on a personal level compared to those with lower implicit self-esteem. No such differences by level of implicit self-esteem were found in the belongingness threat condition. On the face of this single personal identity conviction item, the state of responses in the control condition seems plausible and reflects what we should expect if implicit self-esteem is indeed measuring an evaluation of the self: higher implicit self-esteem is associated with higher certainty of self. But again, low implicit self-esteem has been associated with defensive responses and compensatory zeal in the face of threats (McGregor & Jordan, 2007). So, in the belonging threat condition, it may
be possible that compensatory defensive zeal has inflated scores among low implicit self-esteem participants, making them indistinguishable from those with high implicit self-esteem. This is admittedly speculative.

For the most part, the findings with respect to ratings of ingroup bias and outgroup derogation were inconsistent with initial predictions based on patterns of discrepant self-esteem. However, seeing as how ingroup bias and outgroup derogation have most often been examined together in response to perceptions of prejudice and discrimination, the phenomenon of being discriminated against from an ingroup member as explored here is perhaps markedly different than being discriminated against from outgroup members. It could be that outgroup derogation is more driven by a need to attain distinctiveness and ingroup bias is driven by a need to affirm social identity (Brewer, 1991; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). At the same time, individuals with higher explicit self-esteem are believed to self-enhance more and enhance ingroup more to compensate for both self-threats and threats associated with social categorization (Bosson et al., 2003; Long & Spears, 1997; Pelham & Hetts, 1999). Viewed with that in mind, our high explicit self-esteem participants’ higher ratings of Latinos may be explained.

There are limitations to this work. One limitation is the possibility that the name letter measure task may not reliably capture implicit self-esteem among Latinos given the structure of the task and the structure of Latino surnames. The name letter measure task we employed derives a measure of implicit self-esteem from averaged liking scores of first and last name initials. However, many Latinos abide by a different system of naming that commonly includes three names—a first name, a paternal first surname and a
maternal second surname—but can also result in four to five total surnames depending on gender, marital status and hyphenation of combined paternal and maternal surnames (Pérez-Quiñones, 2002). So, it could be the case that our two-letter measure of implicit self-esteem may be weaker than a fuller three to four letter measure designed for use with Latino surnames. If the name letter task we employed was not appropriate for a Latino population, this may explain our findings falling short of our predictions: with a stronger measure of implicit self-esteem, we may have been more reliably able to assess where individuals fall in terms of their unique configuration of implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem. Indeed, the validity and reliability and type of measure have been long implicated in contradictory findings found in the literature regarding the moderating role of self-esteem on various outcomes (Bosson et al., 2000; Buhrmester, Blanton, & Swann, 2011.)

Content of the social identity threats and perceived fairness and intent may also influence defensive response patterns (Branscombe et al., 1999) yet perceptions of the fairness and intent of the threat were not assessed in our study. Pelham and Hetts (1999) argue that the need for positive regard and the need for coherence, in epistemic terms of categorization of self and groups, are two underexplored principles of social identity theory that underlie self-enhancement, ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation. One limitation to our study is that we failed to assess how need for coherence may moderate responses to threat differently in relation to our participants’ level of self-esteem. Our study could also have benefited from inclusion of implicit group regard measures, which have been demonstrated to differ from explicit measures of group regard like collective self esteem—especially for Latinos (Pelham & Hetts, 1999).
Also, generalizability is limited considering participants were recruited from sites frequented by Latinos interested in learning more about Latino culture and connecting to other Latinos. Our sample may have been more highly identified than others. But, there was no assessment of identity centrality or identity insecurity, which have been shown to moderate defensive responses to threats and ingroup bias (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Jetten, Branscombe, & Spears, 2002; Jordan et al., 2005). Furthermore, our sample closely mirrored the national origin demographics of the United States’ Latino population, hence generalizing findings from this study to Latino populations in Latin America or specific nationalities should be done with caution.

Still, this work contributes to an under-investigated area of the social psychology literature: namely, the experience of and response to belonging threats operationalized as social identity threats. One of the central aims of this research was to understand similarities between belonging threats and social identity threats in an underrepresented minority population. Yet, the implications of these findings on future research efforts go beyond understanding these similarities. A large body of research indicates that chronic rejection can lead to emotional and physical distress and this can be especially problematic for some minorities and members of stigmatized groups (McCoy & Major, 2003; Smart Richman & Leary, 2009) and individuals with maladaptive self-esteem systems (Schroder-Abe et al., 2007a). But, in terms of a rejection-identification model (Branscombe et al., 1999b), the negative consequences of perceived discrimination may be reduced by increased minority group identification. However, it may be the case that there are individuals who might not be able to benefit from such a model due to feelings of perceived rejection and exclusion from their own ethnic ingroup members and/or
individual difference variables such as self-esteem. How these individuals forge their sense of self in relation to the group self will continue to represent an important area of future research.

Judging from the reality that Latino culture in America today is far from monolithic, ingroup conflict of this sort is bound to be occurring and possibly impacting the identities and well-being of many individuals. Considering that belonging and affiliation are considered core motives of being (Fiske, 2004), understanding these types of threats to belonging should figure prominently in the literature moving forward. It is also imperative to better understand, from integrated theoretical perspectives, all possible impediments to reducing any negative outcomes associated with being a rejected or excluded member of a stigmatized group—especially if those whose acceptance may be needed most (i.e., other ingroup members) are threatening or otherwise disrupting belongingness needs in the first place.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT
Research Participant Consent Form  
[PROGRAMMED INTO ONLINE SURVEY]  
Self and Identity Study

This is a graduate research study being conducted by Reyna J. Peña for her master’s thesis. For questions about the research, contact Reyna J. Peña, rpena3@luc.edu, (773) 508-3042, or Dr. Tracy DeHart, Department of Psychology, Loyola University Chicago, (773) 508-3281. This consent form explains the research study. Please read it carefully. Contact the researcher about anything you do not understand. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research project, you may contact Loyola University’s Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Purpose: You are invited to participate in research on self and identity. The purpose of this study is to better understand how Latinos think about their identity.

Procedures: During this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey about your feelings about yourself and identity.

Time Commitment: The survey will take no longer than 10 minutes to complete.

Risks and Benefits: There are minimal risks of any stress beyond a level that you may encounter during your normal days activities. There are no direct benefits of participating in the research; aside from furthering psychological research on this topic. Additionally, some participants will be awarded cash prizes for their participation via our lottery.

Confidentiality: Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study. Your name and identity will not be connected to the data collected nor will any of your individual responses be identified in any research reports describing the study. We are asking you to provide your contact information should you wish to participate in the cash lottery. Also, we are asking for your first and last initials. This information will be deleted from the file when data analyses are completed. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. You participation in this online survey involves risks similar to a person’s everyday use of the internet. If you complete an anonymous survey and submit it to the researcher, the researcher will be unable to extract anonymous data from the database if you wish it withdrawn at a later date.

Compensation: You will receive one entry into our cash drawing for one of ten $50 prizes in appreciation of your time.

Joining of your own free will (volunteering for the study): Your participation is voluntary. You may withhold any information that you do not wish to disclose, and you do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer. You may choose not to serve as a participant or withdraw from this study at any time by closing out of the survey.

Participant Statement: I have read the explanation provided to me. I have had all of my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Clicking the next button indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and agree to participate in the study.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
Self-Esteem, Belonging and Identity Study Questionnaire - Spring 2012

Thank you for your participation in this survey. We greatly appreciate your time and cooperation. Please answer all questions as honestly as possible. All of your responses and information will be held in the strictest of confidence. The data collected in this study will be handled as a group. Your individual responses will not be tied to you personally in any way.

As a thank you to our participants, we will be awarding ten $50 cash prizes to individuals completing the survey. To be included in the lottery, you will be asked at the end of the survey to provide your email address and name.

This survey will take 8-12 minutes. Click START button to continue.

1. What is your date of birth?
(Pull down menu) Month - Day - Year

2. What is your gender?
Male     Female

3. Do you identify as Latino/Latina?
Yes     No

4. What is your ethnic nationality? (Select the group with which you most closely identify. If more than one, select OTHER and specify your response.)

5. What is your MOTHER'S ethnic nationality? (Select the group with which she would most closely identify. If more than one, select OTHER and specify your response.)

6. What is your FATHER'S ethnic nationality? (Select the group with which she would most closely identify. If more than one, select OTHER and specify your response.)

   Mexican     Puerto-Rican
   Cuban       Salvadoran
   Dominican   Guatemalan
   Columbian   Ecuadorian
   Peruvian    Other (If you selected Other, Please Specify _______________ )
7. How would you describe your race? (Select the group with which you most closely identify.)

Black
White
Latino
Asian
Native-American, Indigenous
Bi-racial, Multi-racial, Other
(If you selected Bi-Racial, Multi-Racial or Other, Please Specify ________________)
REFUSE TO ANSWER

8. Please indicate your generational status below.

1st generation = You were born in a country other than USA.
2nd generation = You were born in USA, but either or both of your parents were born in another country.
3rd generation = You and both your parents were born in USA, but all your grandparents were born in another country.
4th generation & greater = You and both your parents were born in USA, all or some of your grandparents were born in USA.

9. How long have you lived in the U.S.?

________ Years _______ Months

10. What was your first language?

English
Spanish
Grew up speaking both English and Spanish equally
Other
11. We would like you to help us develop some stimuli for future studies. In particular, we would like you to rate some letters, numbers, or symbols for how much you like them. By getting this information, we will be able to develop stimuli for future studies of linguistic and pictorial preferences.

Please use the following scale to report how much you like each letter, number, or symbol that appears in the set below. Simply trust your intuitions, work quickly, and report your gut impressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>☹️</td>
<td>☹️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The next measure is a global measure of your feelings about yourself. Please answer the next ten items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
I am able to do things as well as most other people.
I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
I take a positive attitude toward myself.
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
I wish I could have more respect for myself.
At times I feel that I am useless.
At times I think I am no good at all.
13. Some people can be made to feel excluded or unaccepted by groups they belong to. Groups that most people consider themselves a part of include nationality, racial and ethnic groups. Can you think about a time when another Latino questioned your ethnicity and/or suggested you were not Latino “enough”? This could take the form of grandparents criticizing your mannerisms, friends or neighbors indicating you do not look or sound Latino, or other comments or actions that made you feel excluded from your ethnicity. In the space below, please briefly describe in a two or three sentences what happened, who said it, and how it made you feel.

________________________________
________________________________
________________________________

14. Who was the person(s) making you feel excluded?

________________________________
________________________________

15. As a part of another survey, we'd like you to describe an event from your social life. Please list the name of the last movie you watched with a friend? Also, please briefly describe the plot and name the place you watched it.

________________________________
________________________________

16. Now that you have described this event, please report how severe and negative the event was to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Very Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How excluded did you feel during the event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Please indicate how the event you just recalled makes you feel RIGHT NOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ Happy       ____ Accepted
____ Hurt        ____ Sad
____ Appreciated ____ Loved
____ Rejected    ____ Included
____ Angry       ____ Annoyed
We are all members of different social groups or social categories. We would like you to consider your **Latino/Latina identity** in responding to the following statements. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am a worthy member of my race/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I often regret that I belong to my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Overall, my racial/ethnic group is considered good by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Overall, my race/ethnicity has very little to do with how I feel about myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel I don't have much to offer to my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>In general, I'm glad to be a member of my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Most people consider my racial/ethnic group, on the average, to be more ineffective than other groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The racial/ethnic group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am a cooperative participant in the activities of my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Overall, I often feel that my racial/ethnic group is not worthwhile.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In general, others respect my race/ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My race/ethnicity is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I often feel I'm a useless member of my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I feel good about the race/ethnicity I belong to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>In general, others think that my racial/ethnic group is unworthy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>In general, belonging to my race/ethnicity is an important part of myself image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Please read both statements below carefully, and indicate your agreement using the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

I seldom experience conflict between the different aspects of my ethnic identity.
In general, I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am.

21. Please indicate your feelings towards each of the items below on a thermometer that runs from zero (0) to one hundred (100). The higher the number, the warmer or more favorable you feel towards the item. The lower the number, the colder or less favorable you feel. If you feel neither warm nor cold towards, rate the item at fifty (50).

Blacks/African-Americans
Hispanics/Latinos
White/European-Americans
Asian-Americans

22. Please report your own FIRST INITIAL and LAST INITIAL below:

FIRST INITIAL _________
LAST INITIAL _________

23. Thank you for participating in our survey! As mentioned, we are raffling off ten $50 cash prizes to our participants. If you would like to enter the raffle, simply fill out the fields below. If you would rather not participate in the raffle, you may move to the next screen. [Collect 23.email, 24.phone, 25.name and 26.mailing address]

24. This concludes our survey. Should you have any questions or comments regarding this questionnaire or this research, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher directly. Contact information is below.

Reyna J. Peña
Self and Social Interaction Laboratory, Graduate Research Assistant
Department of Psychology, Loyola University Chicago
Office: 773-508-3042
rpena3@luc.edu

[END]
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