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ABSTRACT

Racial and ethnic socialization are integral to the functioning and parenting process in ethnic minorities’ families (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Johnson, Stevenson, & Spicer, 2006). Unfortunately, there is no scholarly consensus with respect to definitions and operations for racial and ethnic socialization which then evidences several conceptual and methodological shortcomings in racial and ethnic socialization research (Brown, 2004). Furthermore, very little empirical research has used these findings in relation to the socialization processes of first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults.

The purpose of this study was to test the roles of both racial socialization and ethnic socialization in promoting social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, ethnic community) and the relationship of social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, ethnic community) and subjective well-being of 307 Afro-Caribbean emerging adults. This research study tested an exploratory model that examined the potential mediating effects of social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, ethnic community) between racial and ethnic socialization and the outcome subjective well-being among first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adult immigrants. Path analysis results revealed that the partially mediated for racial socialization, but fully mediated for ethnic socialization model resulted in being the best fitting model. The indirect effects of ethnic socialization on subjective well-being through social connectedness in mainstream society and ethnic community were statistically
significant and also the indirect effect of racial socialization on subjective well-being through social connectedness in mainstream society was statistically significant. Research and practical implications for researchers, clinicians, and preventionists are considered, limitations and future directions for research are discussed.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Racial and ethnic socialization are integral to the functioning and parenting process in ethnic minorities families (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Johnson, Stevenson, & Spicer, 2006). These constructs are particularly salient in African American families, where Black parents prepare and protect their children through regular transmission of messages regarding what it means to be Black, how to recognize and cope with racism at various levels (individual, cultural, and institutional), and efforts to instruct children regarding their African heritage and African American history (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown & Lesane-Brown, 2006; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Hughes et al., 2006). Within African American families, racial and ethnic socialization consist of distinct child rearing practices that prepare children for survival and success in a racist, prejudiced, and discriminatory world (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). Over the past several years there has been an emergence of research on racial and ethnic socialization processes. This nascent field of literature has been foundational in examining the transmission of cultural values and messages regarding race and ethnicity (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Hughes et al., 2006), exploring the perceptions of racial barriers and stereotypes that influence African American family functioning’s (Stevenson, 1994) and understanding the socio-cultural context in which African American families rear their children (Brown, 2004).
Racial and Ethnic Socialization Theory and Research

The theory of racial socialization was first conceptualized three decades ago by researchers’ who found that parents’ communication to children about ethnicity and race stemmed from concern for their children’s future encounters with racial barriers, thus promoting high self-esteem, instilling racial pride, and preparing children for bias (Hughes et al., 2006). By the 1990’s, quantitative studies began to assess and incorporate parent’s ethnic socialization practices within research in hopes to examine the sociodemographic and ecological correlates of these practices (Hughes, 2003; Stevenson, 1994), and the consequences they place on children and adolescents (Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993). However, research on racial and ethnic socialization has primarily focused on the experiences of African Americans, offering little empirical consideration of the socialization processes of more recent Black immigrants (e.g., Haitians, Jamaicans) to the United States. The lack of scholarship on these groups’ socialization processes warrants research attentive to the racial and ethnic socialization of Afro-Caribbean immigrants.

Several scholars utilize the term African American as a racial category (Richardson, Bethea, Hayling, & Williamson-Taylor, 2010) and often do not delineate between the terms Black and African American. As a result Black and African American are used interchangeably with one another. This is clearly evident in much of mental health and social science literature that addresses Black or African American collectives without regard for ethnicity (Cokley & Helm, 2007). Unfortunately, within psychological literature few analyses have addressed the differences between US-born Blacks who are
the descendants of free and freed people or enslaved Africans in the United States, and recent Black immigrants (1960’s-present) and their descendants (Richardson et al., 2010). Often African and Afro-Caribbean groups have been described by their racial categorization despite the fact that many Black ethnic communities remain distinct and separate in regards to culture and racial and ethnic socializations (Richardson et al., 2010). For the purposes of this study, the terms Black or Black American were used to describe one’s racial category. The Black racial category “is composed of a vastly diverse group of people of African ethnic origins that include Caribbean, African, and the American Black experience” (Richardson et al., p. 228). Regarding ethnic designators, the term African American was defined as Black descendants of free, freed or enslaved Africans within the US, and Afro-Caribbean was referred to more recent Black immigrants and their descendants who have emigrated from a Caribbean country to the US. Parenting practices and family dynamics are important as they play a role in promoting positive development in children (Griffith & Grolnick, 2013). Research describes parental socialization as the preparation of children to accept adult roles and responsibilities in society through the teaching and learning of conventional beliefs, values, and patterns of behavior (Boykin & Toms, 1985). Since Black Americans still deal with the exigencies of racism and oppression, the unique adaptive reactions, coping styles, and adjustment techniques operated within Black families have become part of the social negotiational reality, and are crucial and distinct implications for the socializing process (Boykin & Toms, 1985). It is conceivable that these distinctive ways of responding to racism and discrimination within the United States feature greater
complexity within Black immigrant families. Research finds that diverse families of color engage in various practices of racial and ethnic socialization, and more than two-thirds of parents of minority children participate in these socialization processes to encourage the development of healthy, successful minority children (Thornton, Chatters, Taylor, & Allen, 1990).

Racial socialization is defined by some researchers as the process in which parents raise racial minority children to have positive self-concepts and develop coping mechanisms in an environment that is racist and sometimes hostile (Anglin & Whaley, 2006; Stevenson, 1995; Thomas & Speight, 1999). This socialization process can be explicit or implicit (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Caughy, Randolph, & O’Campo, 2002; Hughes et al., 2006; Thornton et al., 1990), indirect or direct, verbal or nonverbal, and covert or overt (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Thornton et al., 1990). Racial socialization includes exposure to cultural practices, promotion of racial pride, development of knowledge of one’s culture, and preparation for bias and discrimination (Hughes et al., 2006). This socialization practice is especially important for African American families as a way for parents to utilize communication strategies and teaching tools comprised of cognitive skills and tactics about how children should negotiate their cultural heritage, interact, and survive within two cultural contexts (African American and the broader US society) (Greene, 1992, as cited by Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2002).

African American families utilize racial socialization as a strategy in rearing healthy children within an environment where they will be challenged with experiences
of discrimination and oppression (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013; Lesane-Brown, 2006). The types of racial socialization messages and how they are incorporated within the rearing of children varies among African American families (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013; Hughes et al., 2006). Research found that parents use a variety of approaches to teach messages that are related to racial socialization; this includes the presence and reality of racism, preparing for and overcoming bias and racism, learning about cultural heritage, racial pride, self-pride, racial equality and humanistic values, mainstream Eurocentric values, spirituality, and coping (Stevenson et al., 2002; Thomas & Speight, 1999). More specifically, in a study involving African American families, more than 95% of parents reported discussing issues related to racial discrimination with their children and the transmission of preparation for bias messages is present in more than one qualitative study on African American families (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013). In addition, the 2007 National Survey of Black Americans (Jackson & Gurin, 1997, as cited by Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013) reported that 23% of participants received messages of racial pride and another study stated that 96% of parents transmitted racial pride messages in the home environment (Caughy et al., 2002).

The process of racial socialization is an important one to understand for various reasons and integrates diverse topics such as family processes, socialization processes, and identity formation (Lesane-Brown, 2006). One purpose of socialization is to transmit values, beliefs, and ideas around lifestyles based on cultural knowledge of the adult tasks and competencies needed for appropriate functioning in society (Harrison, Wilson, Pine, Chon, & Buriel, 1990). African American parents are tasked with helping their children
develop positive self-concept and identity through socialization around issues of race and racism. Messages about race and racism interact with other socialization messages, such as gender roles, political ideology, and general cultural expectations (Lesane-Brown, 2006). Unlike most research studies, racial socialization research primarily focuses on Black families, a group that is not often the subject of scientific studies. Additionally, research on racial socialization explores the development and stability of racial attitudes, identity, and values across the life course (Lesane-Brown, 2006).

Racial socialization is a complex, multidimensional construct (Hughes et al., 2006). Research regarding racial socialization emerged from scholars’ interest in understanding the ways in which African American parents maintain their children’s high levels of self-esteem while simultaneously preparing them for racial barriers they will likely face, given systems of US racial stratifications (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Hughes et al., 2006; Thornton et al., 1990). Even with burgeoning interest in the concept, racial socialization researchers still struggle to agree upon, produce and maintain a universal definition that can be consistently applied. Some term racial socialization as teaching about race relations and protecting against discrimination (Stevenson et al., 2002), while others emphasize teaching group membership and about one’s particular culture (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013), thus resulting in different meanings and interpretations for research findings that utilize and examine the construct of racial socialization.

Similar issues are apparent within the more recent ethnic socialization research. This research developed from studies involving immigrant experiences, specifically Latino, Asian, and (with less frequency) African and Caribbean groups within the United
States, investigating their competing pressures to maintain a cultural identity and assimilate to the dominant culture. Research on ethnic socialization focused largely on children’s cultural retention, identity achievement, and in-group affiliation while they simultaneously negotiate assimilating to mainstream society (Hughes et al., 2006; Knight et al., 1993). Similar to racial socialization, ethnic socialization is complex and also lacks a universal definition. Marshall (1995) conceptualized it as strategies that parents use to teach their children about (a) African and/or African American culture, (b) minority status of African Americans, and (c) mainstream American values and practices, while Phinney and Chavira (1995) go beyond this definition to incorporate practices through which parents teach their children about getting along in mainstream society, dealing with discrimination, and living in a culturally diverse society (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007).

**Old Methodological Issues and New Approaches to Socialization Research**

In conjunction with the inconsistent findings primarily on racial socialization, there still lacks a consensus of how racial and ethnic socialization is defined, conceptualized, and empirically operationalized (Hughes et al., 2006). The existing literature presents as a challenge as different measurement approaches yield different information, and various conceptualizations of racial and ethnic socialization processes fail to connect and unify the comprehensive nature of these constructs (Brown, Linver, Evans, & DeGennaro, 2009), resulting in a field of research that lacks clear definitions or consensus (Brown, 2004). Across the disciplines of psychology, human development, and sociology, racial and ethnic socialization research remains fragmented as each
discipline seems to work in isolation, contributing to conceptual fragmentation and methodological shortcomings in racial and ethnic socialization research (Brown, 2004).

In research that involves race issues, Cokley (2007) states, “the inconsistent and interchangeable use of ethnicity and race and ethnic and racial identity prohibits researchers from identifying psychological mechanisms that differentiate and distinguish the constructs from each other…” (p. 225). The limited distinction between both racial and ethnic socialization processes results in a unidimensional construct, wherein researchers consider race and ethnicity as overlapping, interchangeable terms, and conflate ethnic and racial socialization within the more commonly used construct of racial socialization (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown, Linver, & Evans, 2010; Hughes et al., 2006; Stevenson et al., 2002). Hughes et al. (2006) suggest that even though both concepts share some common components, they are distinct constructs (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Mohanty, 2013). Understanding these processes as two independent constructs assist in determining the relative influence of messages related to intergroup protocol (racial socialization) and intragroup protocol (ethnic socialization) (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007).

Race and ethnicity are both socially constructed concepts whose definitions and meanings have changed over time and have been influenced by ideology, political climate, and old and new paradigms in society and in social science (Cokley, 2007). To distinguish between race and ethnicity, the present study employs the work of Cokley to explicitly operationalize these two constructs. Race “refers to a characterization of a group of people believed to share physical characteristics such as skin color, facial
features, and other hereditary traits” (p. 225). Ethnicity “refers to a characterization of a
group of people who see themselves and are seen by others as having a common ancestry,
shared history, shared traditions, and shared cultural traits such as language, beliefs,
values, music, dress, and food” (p. 225).

Additionally, this study employs a contemporary approach to analyzing racial and ethnic socialization messages by utilizing Brown and Krishnakumar’s (2007) definitions of racial and ethnic socialization. These definitions make concrete distinctions between racial and ethnic socialization as two distinct, multidimensional constructs (Brown et al., 2009; Brown et al., 2010). Racial socialization refers to parental strategies that convey explicit and implicit messages regarding intergroup protocol and relationships; these include: teaching youth about racial barrier awareness, how to cope with racism and race-related discrimination, and promoting cross-racial relationships (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2009; Brown et al., 2010). On the other hand, ethnic socialization is defined as the explicit and implicit messages regarding intragroup messages about what it means to be a member of a particular ethnic group. This includes the socialization of youth regarding African American cultural values, cultural embeddedness, and history, celebrating African American heritage, and promotion of ethnic pride (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2009; Brown et al., 2010).

With globalization and growing ethnic diversity within our society, new and old issues of race and ethnic relations in the US have emerged (Brown, 2004). This is a reason why approach to investigating racial and ethnic socialization separately provides comprehensive and psychometric soundness to the understanding of these constructs.
There is need for more current research in this area to understand the application of racial and ethnic socialization in Black families (Brown, 2004), especially with more recent Black immigrants living in the United States, specifically Afro-Caribbean first and second-generation immigrants’ who make heightened distinctions between their racial identity (e.g., Black) and ethnic identity (e.g., Jamaican, Haitian American, Trinidadian).

**Socialization and Black Emerging Adults**

The investigation of racial and ethnic socialization processes and messages is important and appropriate to understanding the impact they have on children across the lifespan. In reviewing the socialization literature it may appear that racial and ethnic socialization merely takes place during childhood and adolescence (Lesane-Brown, Brown, Caldwell, & Sellers, 2005). This is because most of the research is focused on the socialization processes of this population and conducted with children, adolescents, and parent groups (Temple, 2011). It is well-known that identity development continues beyond adolescence and it is comprehensible that the factors that impact one’s identity development such as racial and ethnic socialization messages also continue. As individuals age and mature, socialization messages and the types of socialization messages individuals received reflect growth and maturity (Temple, 2011). Within the emerging adulthood stage, ages 18-29 years old (Arnett, 2004), these individuals have developed an ability to think in ways children cannot, this includes one’s perception on racism and prejudice (Steinberg, 2005, as cited by Temple, 2011).

Research on racial and ethnic socialization reflects the evolution of socialization messages as an individual matures. Woods and Kurtz-Costes’s (2007) literature review
on racial socialization within Black families reported communicating racial socialization messages to their children, though not all Black parents discussed openly with their children about race. In their study, Hughes and Chen (1997, as cited by Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007) found that the majority of Black parents think their children should receive racial socialization, however the messages should be age appropriate. This same study reported parents with children of all ages engaged in cultural pride and heritage discussion, though in comparison to parents of older children who reported higher levels, parents of preschoolers and young children reported low levels of messages preparing their children for bias (Hughes & Chen, 1997, as cited by Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). Parents tend to wait until their children are older before engaging conversation about discrimination (Hughes & Chen, 1997, as cited by Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007).

It is important that research reflects racial and ethnic socialization as a continuing developmental process. Socialization does not stop when emerging adults leave home for college. College students return home on breaks and visits, and maintain frequent communication with their parents via phone, texting, social networking, and email (Gentzler, Oberhauser, Westerman, & Nadorff, 2011). Various research studies that sampled emerging adults found that participants and their parents reported racial and ethnic socialization. For example, Lesane-Brown et al. (2005) found in their study that their undergraduate sample was more likely to report experiencing racial socialization than their adolescent sample.
Racial and Ethnic Socialization of First- and Second-Generation Black Immigrants

Within the last few decades, there has been an emergence of cultural, ethnic, and racial socialization literature emphasizing the importance of preserving the cultural background of ethnic minority children. Very little empirical research has used these findings in relation to the socialization processes of more recent Black immigrants and their descendants living in the US. There are increasing demographics of Black people in the US, and a significant proportion of them originated from or has families with origins from the Caribbean or Africa. Empirical studies in ethnic-racial labeling, socialization, acculturation, and racial identity should, but regrettably has not reflected the distinctiveness of each ethnicity within this population (Anglin & Whaley, 2006). The diversity of the Black US population is often overlooked, resulting in conceptions of that population that improperly emphasize racial classification while ignoring ethnic groups. However, racial and ethnic socialization research that involves both African Americans and Black immigrants should consider one’s historical background, condition, and context of immigration to the US, as well as migratory and generational status.

Research studies involving racial and ethnic socialization have predominantly focused on African American’s racial socialization messages and most typically has concentrated on the racial (Black) or ethnic (African American) identity development, terms that are often used interchangeably (Joseph & Hunter, 2011). Black Americans can belong to the same racial group, have different ethnic group membership, and accordingly have very different race-based socialization experiences (American
Psychological Association [APA], 2008, p. 2). Research findings assert that Black immigrants think differently from African Americans in regards to in-group and out-group membership, viewing race and ethnicity as separate identities (Butterfield, 2004), and exhibiting a dominant ethnic conceptualization of group membership (i.e., Caribbean, Haitian, Jamaican) in contrast to racial conceptualization of group membership (Joseph & Hunter, 2011). Very little empirical research has used these findings in relation to the socialization processes of more recent Black immigrants and their descendants living in the US.

For this study, a sample of Afro-Caribbean emerging adults was used. Over the past four decades, Afro-Caribbeans have migrated to the US with great frequency. For example, between 1980 and 2005, the two largest Caribbean groups living in the US grew significantly: the population of Jamaicans more than doubled, and the population of Haitians nearly quadrupled (Kent, 2007). Different from African immigrants, Caribbean immigrants’ avenues to the US has been by cause of close proximity of the islands and one-half of Caribbean immigrants having immediate relatives that are US citizens (Kent, 2007). Typically, Afro-Caribbeans emigrated from their home country for economic reasons (e.g., high unemployment rates in the home country) (Smith, Lalonde, & Johnson, 2004). This population is unique in that there are marked differences in the socio-historical experiences, socialization processes, and cultural practices of persons of African descent from other countries and US born African Americans (Brown, 2004).
Social Connectedness to Mainstream, Racial, and Ethnic Communities

Given the substantial and continual growth of ethnic diversity of Black people within the US, it is imperative that the experiences and perceptions of Black ethnic groups be seriously considered (Hall & Carter, 2006). Contemporary immigration has resulted in a shift in rigidly defined and enforced traditional racial and ethnic categories (Butterfield, 2004). Thus, this helps expand the understanding of social connectedness in ethnic minority mental health (Yoon, Jung, Lee, & Felix-Mora, 2011). Social connectedness stems from the understanding that early in life people express and satisfy their need for belonging through identification and participation with the social world (Lee & Robbins, 1998). Social connectedness reflects this internal sense of belonging and is defined by the subjective awareness of being in a close relationship with the social world (Lee & Robbins, 1998) and emphasizes the independent self in relation to others (Lee, Draper, & Lee, 2001). Social connectedness developed in broad social interactions (Yoon, Hacker, Hewitt, Abrams, & Cleary, 2012) over time along the transition adolescence to adulthood (Lee & Robbins, 1998; Williams & Galliher, 2006, as cited in Yoon et al., 2012), this includes proximal and distal relationships with family, friends, peers, acquaintances, strangers, community, and society (Lee & Robbins, 1998).

Yoon and Lee (2010) state that social connectedness to mainstream and ethnic minority communities are conceptualized mainly from the social connectedness and acculturation/enculturation literature. Despite the fact that social connectedness defined as a global construct of belongingness in the social world (Lee & Robbins, 1995), it is more advantageous to measure social connectedness separately in each community,
mainstream and ethnic community in order to better understand ethnic minorities’ social connectedness and avoid masking minority individuals’ potentially distinct sense of connectedness to each community (Yoon et al., 2012). The authors (Yoon et al., 2012) explain that ethnic minority’s sense of connectedness to each community may differ depending on the psychological (e.g., acculturation and enculturation; national and ethnic identity) and contextual factors (e.g., ethnic density, social acceptance and rejection) (Yoon, Lee, & Goh, 2008). In addition to its impact with ethnic minorities, social connectedness is an important construct specifically with immigrants who are more likely to come from more collectivistic cultural backgrounds in comparison to US mainstream culture and value interpersonal connectedness (Yoon et al., 2012).

Immigrating to a new country, immigrants lose pre-existing networks and connections and are at an increased risk of being marginalized by mainstream society, impeding their sense of connectedness to mainstream society (Yoon et al., 2012). Seeing that social connectedness is important in collectivistic cultures and especially in immigrant groups (Yoon et al., 2012), research involving social connectedness and ethnic minority mental health has primarily focused on specific groups, being limited to Asian international (e.g., Korean immigrants, Chinese), Asian American, and Mexican American populations (Yoon et al., 2008; Yoon et al., 2011; Yoon et al., 2012; Yoon & Lee, 2010; Wei, Wang, Heppner, & Du, 2012). In addition to this research mainly involving specific ethnic groups, a review of literature demonstrates social connectedness research examining largely in relation with acculturation and enculturation research (Yoon et al., 2008; Yoon et al., 2011; Yoon et al., 2012; Yoon & Lee, 2010). Thus, there
remains a dearth of social connectedness research involving first- and second-generation Black emerging adult immigrants in relation to racial/ethnic socialization.

**Purpose of Study, Research Questions, and Hypotheses**

The purpose of this study was to test this concept that focuses on the roles of both racial socialization and ethnic socialization in promoting social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, ethnic community) and the relationship of social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, ethnic community) and subjective well-being (SWB). This was accomplished by testing an exploratory model that examined the potential mediating effects of social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, ethnic community) between racial and ethnic socialization and the outcome SWB among first and second generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adult immigrants. This exploratory model reflects Caughy, Randolph, and O’Campo’s (2002) claim that racial and ethnic socialization prepare children to succeed in both the majority culture as well as the minority culture. Additionally, a leading theoretical framework by Boykins and Toms (1985) considers three socialization processes for minority children: socialization to mainstream American society, socialization to the child’s ethnic culture, and preparation to be aware of racial bias and prejudice.

Yoon and her colleagues (Yoon et al., 2008; Yoon et al., 2011; Yoon et al., 2012) stated that the global senses of social connectedness may contribute to the mainstream and ethnic connectedness. A new construct was included in the present study, social connectedness to racial community, which is fitting for the Afro-Caribbean population where race and ethnicity are seen as two distinct identities. Therefore, Afro-Caribbean
and other more recent Black immigrants living in the US were considered to encompass triculturalism (e.g., within three cultures: Black, Afro-Caribbean, and White American).

In brief, this research study examined variables such as ethnic and racial socialization and their relationship to one’s sense of connectedness to three communities of mainstream, racial, and ethnic.

The primary research question in the present study was how social connectedness in mainstream society, racial community, and ethnic community mediate the relationship between first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adult immigrants’ racial socialization and ethnic socialization and subjective well-being. This study tested hypotheses that individuals that received high racial socialization messages would feel more connected to and accepted in their racial community, whereas individuals with high ethnic socialization would feel the same way in their ethnic community. It was also hypothesized that individuals who received high racial and ethnic socialization messages were to feel more connected to and accepted in mainstream society. I hypothesized that this social connectedness would, in turn, lead to higher SWB.

The proposed study hopes to demonstrate a significant advancement in the discussions regarding racial and ethnic socialization, social connectedness, and the promotion of SWB for people of African descent living in the United States. The findings of this study were expected to make significant theoretical and empirical contributions to the expansion of racial and ethnic socialization research by providing a more complete understanding of the process as to how racial socialization and ethnic socialization are related to more recent Black immigrants’ and immigrant-descended emerging adults’
SWB via separate paths of social connectedness in mainstream, racial community and, ethnic community. The findings would close the information gap within socialization, social connectedness, identity, and immigration literature. This study was the first line of research and an important step in discussions and research that looked at the significance and relevance of ethnic and racial socializations for ethnically diverse groups of Black people living in the US.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In an increasingly diverse American society, approximately one third of the US emerging adulthood population is of immigrant-origin (Katisiaficas, Suárez-Orozco, & Dias, 2015; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Psychological research must respond to these demographic realities to consider the impact of heterogeneous social and environmental factors on the racial and ethnic socialization of children and young people in geographical and social contexts and across diverse populations (Priest, Walton, White, Kowal, Baker, & Paradies, 2014). This chapter examines the theoretical overview and empirical analysis of research concerning first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults’ racial and ethnic socialization and the ways these socialization processes relate to subjective well-being. This literature assesses Afro-Caribbeans’ adaptation or socialization to majority culture, attitudes toward retention or socialization of their culture, and recognition of discrimination towards their group. This chapter will also explore the literature on the contextual factors that impact this group’s identity development, migratory patterns, sense of belonging, and gaps within this research area. This review provides a summary and critique of existing literature and how the current study will contribute to and expand the field of scholarship on the impact of racial and ethnic socialization messages on the subjective well-being of first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults.
Afro-Caribbean and Black Immigrant’s Experiences in the United States

Analysis of Afro-Caribbean and Black Immigrant’s Experience and

Migratory Patterns in the United States

The Black population within the United States is increasingly large and diverse (Benson, 2006). Over the last five decades the Black population within the United States has grown at a remarkable rate (Kent, 2007). A significant increase in the recent diversity of the Black population in the United States is due to the migration of Black African and Afro-Caribbean individuals and their US-born descendants who ethnically identify with their parents’ countries of origin (Logan & Deane, 2003, as cited by Hunter, 2008). The late 1960s saw significant shifts in the national origins of US immigrants, which immigration experts credited to the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments (Kent, 2007). This legislation consequently altered the racial and ethnic make-up of the United States and fostered increased immigration from Africa and the Caribbean. This amendment loosened restrictions of geographically-based immigration, instituted policies that emphasized family reunification and professional qualifications, and allowed US-born children of immigrants to file petitions for legal admission of their parents (Kent, 2007).

From 1980 to 2005 the Black population nearly tripled in growth and by 2005 first generation Caribbean immigrants made up two thirds of the 2.8 million foreign-born Black people in the United States (Kent, 2007). During these years the foreign origins of all US Blacks increased from less than 1 percent to 8 percent (Kent, 2007). The Black Diversity in Metropolitan America report, based on data from the 1990 and 2000 Census
of Population, states that immigrants accounted for a quarter of the growth in America’s Black population and during this time Afro-Caribbeans increased by more than 65% (Logan & Deane, 2003, as cited by Benson, 2006). Even though non-Black Hispanic and Asian immigrants outnumbered Black immigrants, the latter population grew at a remarkable rate, accounting for at least one-fifth of the growth in the US Black population between 2001 and 2006 (Kent, 2007). Black immigrant populations continue to change the demographic landscape of many US cities and expand the construct of blackness in America (Benson, 2006). This growth has complicated the meaning of race within American society (Kasinitz, 1992, as cited by Benson, 2006; McDermott, as cited by Benson, 2006), and some scholars argue that increased number of immigrants in urban areas will create more space to recognize greater diversity within the US’s Black population (Kasinitz, 1992, as cited by Benson, 2006; McDermott, as cited by Benson, 2006).

Afro-Caribbeans have migrated to the US with great frequency during the past five decades (Hall & Carter, 2006). Between 1980 and 2005, Jamaicans, comprising the largest Afro-Caribbean group living in the US, more than doubled their population and Haitians, the second largest, nearly quadrupled (Kent, 2007). In contrast to African immigrants, Caribbean immigrants originate from islands in close proximity to the United States and are more likely to have family connections, with an estimated one-half of Caribbean immigrants having immediate relatives that are US citizens (Kent, 2007). Economic rationales most frequently underscore emigration from the Caribbean, with resettlement subject to a variety of external factors, such as the labor needs and
immigration policies for destination countries such as the US (Smith et al., 2004). While the racial makeup of the United States might not have factored into many Afro-Caribbeans’ reasoning for immigration, their length of stay within the United States has shaped some Black immigrants understanding of race and its significance within US society (Hall & Carter, 2006). Several metropolitan areas on the East Coast, such as New York City, have become home to heavy concentrations of Afro-Caribbean immigrants. According to the census data more than 500,000 West Indians moved to New York City alone, composing the largest Black ethnic group in the city, in addition more than one million people, approximately one third of Black New Yorkers, indicated being of West Indian descent (Foner, 2001, as cited in Hall & Carter, 2006).

Black immigrants have raised their visibility and influence within the US, bringing a diversity of skills, experiences, rich cultures, and traditions (Kent, 2007) that challenge and expand African-descended people’s conception of race and ethnicity within the United States. Yet, Black immigrants from respected families and professional classes in the Caribbean report difficulty adapting to US society’s racial discrimination because of skin color and ethnic discrimination against their foreign origin (Kent, 2007). Black immigrants’ understanding of their status within the American racial stratification differs by country of origin, examining Black immigrants as a single homogenous group exhibits an incomplete picture of their experience and undermines the considerable variation and diversity within this group (Benson, 2006). Unfortunately, this group’s diverse and complex needs and psychological experiences are sparse and underrepresented within the literature. Yet, the sustained growth of Black immigrants entering the US signals a need
for greater recognition and analysis of their contributions to the growing Black population of the US and the ways their ethnic diversity within the racial group makes the understanding of socialization and identity development of African-descended people more complex and multifaceted.

It is important to acknowledge and consider the challenges and struggle Black immigrants face while adjusting to and finding their place within American society (Benson, 2006; Butterfield, 2004). Immigrating to a new country involves transitions and adjustments that can present a major risk factor and source of stress for these families (Smith et al., 2004). Black immigrants accustomed to life in their home country’s racial majority face the impact of life within a racial minority in American society (Benson, 2006). Beyond tough circumstances involved with migration, they also confront racial and ethnic dynamics vastly different from their home countries (Butterfield, 2004). They are forced to reconstruct and redefine their understanding and identity in terms of the American society’s system of race relations and hierarchies (Benson, 2006). The difficulties experienced by this group in this process of American racialization may adversely affect the emotional health of individual family members as well as the family unit (Smith et al., 2004). In addition to understanding the racial difficulties of the Afro-Caribbean immigration experience, it is crucial to know and understand the migratory patterns of this demographic. The staggered migrations of family members entail repercussions that make the challenges of immigration more severe and pose difficulty for the recovery of the family unit (Smith et al., 2004). Serial migration, a staggered pattern of immigration, is a common feature of the movement of Caribbean families,
whereby parents usually migrate first to the new country and children follow at a later date (Smith et al., 2004). This arrangement can present as a major risk factor and source of stress for these families (Gopaul-McNicol, 1998, as cited by Smith et al., 2004). Serial migration is often related to uncertainties and economic costs associated with starting a family’s life in a new country (Roth, 1970, as cited by Smith et al., 2004). Employing a developmental perspective, scholars have considered serial migration in two stages, wherein the first stage involves the separation of children from parents who emigrate the home country and the second stage features reunification of children and parents in the new country (Smith et al., 2004). A parent’s own adjustment post separation and post reunification will affect children’s well-being. Especially, while in the new country parents may experience feelings of guilt and anxiety related to leaving their child or children behind. Living in the new country, parents may face issues and difficulties with employment, discrimination, and acculturation, these experiences have the potential to create stress and affect the amount and quality of contact parents are able to maintain with their children (Smith et al., 2004).

**Afro-Caribbean and Black Immigrant’s Identity Development in the US**

The condition and context of the individual’s process of immigration affects their worldview and understanding as members of two distinct identification groups, as immigrants and as Black. This process in both ethnic and racial dimensions matters a great deal in the Afro-Caribbean immigrant’s sense of adaptation into the social and economic structure of their new country (Kent, 2007). In the United States, emphasis is placed on racial group membership because it is believed that how individuals identify
with their racial group determines their access to economic and educational opportunities (Waters, 2001, as cited in Hall & Carter, 2006). American society primarily categorizes racial groups by skin color, meaning that regardless of one’s national or ethnic background dark-skinned immigrants are classified as part of the Black racial minority (Portes, 1995, as cited by Benson, 2006; Waters, 1994). Unlike the United States restricted system of racial classification, other countries’ construction of race is not based solely on skin color but takes into account several other identifiers such as nationality, birthplace, socioeconomic status, culture, language, and physical features (Cornell & Hartmann, 1998; Landale & Oropesa, 2002; Rodriguez, 2000; Waters, 1999, as cited by Benson, 2006). Racial classification within Caribbean countries takes into account both skin tone and socioeconomic position (Rodriguez, 1992; Waters, 1999, as cited by Benson, 2006). National identities feature more strongly in some Spanish-speaking countries of the Caribbean, making race a less defining characteristic in the self-conception and social classifications of the population (Mintz, 1974, as cited by Benson, 2006). Boundaries between Black and White racial groups within Caribbean and Latin American countries have a general tendency to be more permeable, recognizing shades of color between black and white identifying for instance at least one mixed or intermediate group (Landale & Oropesa, 2002; Rodriguez, 1992, 2000; Waters, 1999, as cited by Benson, 2006). Unlike African Americans where racial (Black) and ethnic (African American) identities are interchangeable, Black immigrants see these identities as distinct (Butterfield, 2004) and understand race and ethnicity to be separate membership groups. This is evidenced by recent research findings that suggest that in comparison to
African Americans, Black immigrants think differently about the meaning and implications of their minority status (Deaux, Bikmen, Gilkes, Ventuneac, Joseph, Payne, & Steele 2007; Hunter, 2008; Joseph & Hunter, 2011). Black immigrants’ understanding of race and race relations varies by native origin, the meaning of race and ways in which it is constructed vary by country of origin (Cornell & Hartmann, 1998; Degler, 1971; Harris, 1964; Hoetink, 1967; Tannebaum, 1946; Waters, 1999, as cited by Benson, 2006). Due to racial identity being fluid and flexible in nature, it can fluctuate over time and across social constructs. Accordingly, Black immigrants arrive to the US with distinctive conceptions of race originated from their particular country of origin, in result shapes the way in which they respond to the process of racialization (Benson, 2006).

Immigrants make a variety of choices based on a number of factors: immigration status, language barriers, educational attainment, residential segregation and integration, and existing familial and ethnic support networks (Butterfield, 2004). Yet, some researchers postulate that Afro-Caribbeans in the US have a tendency to identify primarily with their nation of origin and oftentimes not their race (Hall & Carter, 2006). The racialization process serves as a key obstacle for the incorporation of black immigrants within the United States (Benson, 2006). Both African and Afro-Caribbean immigrants report holding on to their identity as a voluntary immigrant, in part to distinguish themselves from African Americans (Butterfield, 2004; Kent, 2007) who are the descendants of free, freed people or enslaved Africans in the United States (Richardson et al., 2010). This resistance can be performed by asserting their ethnic origin through the use of language and culturally distinctive dress (Apraku, 1996; Arthur,
The goal is to also distance themselves from the racial discrimination and stigmatization that is often associated with “being Black” in the United States (Butterfield, 2004).

This rejection of adopting a Black racial identity is to avoid as Benson (2006) calls it, “the downward mobility associated with this segment of the US population” (p. 224) Afro-Caribbeans distance themselves from Black racial categorization for a number of reasons. These include their sense of social class and social networks, fear being stigmatized by Whites, belief that Whites respond more favorably to foreign-born Blacks than Black American (Waters, 2001, as cited in Hall & Carter, 2006), perceptions that Whites view Afro-Caribbeans as “model minorities” (Bashi, Bobb & Clarke, 2001, as cited in Hall & Carter, 2006), and awareness of harmful experiences of African Americans (Butterfield, 2004). An alternative explanation is that Afro-Caribbeans have adopted negative stereotypes of what is means to be Black in America (Rogers, 2001) and wish to avoid association with a group that is perceived negatively (Gopaul-McNicol, 1993) which then results in psychological disconnection from one’s shared African heritage (Carter, 1995, as cited in Hall & Carter, 2006).

Several researchers have provided empirical evidence that aids the understanding and offers context to Afro-Caribbean’s ethnic group identity and resistance to identifying primarily with their racial group identity. In one researcher’s investigative study involving 59 first-generation Afro-Caribbean’s he found that while none of the study’s respondents rejected their race, most utilized and preferred to be identified primarily by their ethnicity (Rogers, 2001). In another study that interviewed 99 West Indian
immigrants and US-born children of immigrants, researchers (Bashi, Bobb & Clarke, 2001, cited in Hall & Carter, 2006) discovered the interviewee’s perception of success in education and social mobility was related to their belief that their cultural values and work ethic were “different” from Black Americans. Waters’ (2001, cited in Hall & Carter, 2006) study of second-generation Afro-Caribbean teens revealed that the social class and social networks of their parents (first-generation Afro-Caribbeans) significantly impact teen participant’s level ethnic identification and the amount of distance Afro-Caribbean teens keep from African Americans.

Interviews with second-generation West Indian children in New York revealed that the children's attitudes about Whites, their parents' culture, and their future prospects often reflected their parents' socioeconomic situation (Kent, 2007). Children from poor immigrant families identified most closely with US Black culture, felt racial prejudice more acutely, and were less optimistic about their futures than children from middle-class families. They usually lived in low-income neighborhoods and attended lower-performing schools. In contrast, children from middle-class immigrant families were more likely to feel more connected with their parents' ethnic heritage and have higher educational and professional aspirations. They also are more likely to live in neighborhoods with higher-achieving schools (Kent, 2007).

Some authors (Gopaul-McNicol, 1993; Rogers, 2001) assert that maintenance of an ethnic identity may inhibit racial group identification, hinder the development of more internal racial identity statuses, and weaken Black solidarity. Other authors have argued the contrary, stating that West Indian and/or Afro-Caribbean affiliation with one’s
ancestry to maintain ethnic identification can function for the purpose of psychological health, providing a sense of pride, belonging, and security (Rong & Brown, 2001; Rumbaut, 1994). Deep-seated ethnic identification stems from the fact that Black immigrants can look to and even return to their homeland, an option generally unavailable to the majority of Blacks of African descent in America (Ogbu, 1991; Rogers, 2001).

Interest has grown regarding group identification specifically for first-generation and second-generation Afro-Caribbeans living in the United States. Even though many Black immigrants are intentional about featuring their distinctive difference, they are often thought of as or pressured to identify as Black or African American to deal with racial discrimination (Waters, 2001, as cited by Hall & Carter, 2006). Afro-Caribbeans living in the United States may not identify with their racial identity but may rather claim their ethnic identity or both racial and ethnic identities. Embracing both identities, dual identification among Afro-Caribbean immigrants in the US illustrates the complexity of the racial and ethnic identities and experiences of this group.

The recent influx of first-generation Black immigrants (i.e., born in country of origin) has resulted in an also growing population of second-generation (i.e., born in the United States) Black immigrants residing in the United States and further increasing the ethnic diversity among the Black racial group (Kent, 2007). By 2005, more than one million US-born Black children were immigrants or had at least one foreign-born parent, approximately two-fifths of these children were from African families and three-fifths from Caribbean families (Kent, 2007). Many first-generation Afro-Caribbeans, identify
with a strong sense of ethnic group membership (e.g., Jamaican, Haitian, Trinidadian, Dominican, etc.) composed of various cultural values, traditions, language, meaning and ways of living, and understandings of being Black (Waters, 1994).

Children of immigrants born in the United States have a unique experience in regards to ethnic identification, encountering a far more complex relationship with issues of race and ethnicity (Butterfield, 2004). Many are caught between the immigrant and American culture, and can choose to identify with their parent(s) country of origin or as African American (Hall & Carter, 2006; Kent, 2007). Many immigrant parents want their children to maintain the cultural values and heritage of their ethnic origin, and reinforce this by teaching children their native language and culture, or even sending children to spend time with relatives or attend school in their countries of origin (Kent, 2007). For these children who prefer to identify ethnically, they actively work to assert that identity because they may lack visible markers such as their parents’ distinct accents and customs (Rong & Brown, 2001; Waters, 2001). Hall and Carter (2006) find that second-generation Afro-Caribbeans born in the US experience an advantage over first-generation Afro-Caribbeans in that their socialization in a race-conscious environment fosters development of a higher psychological racial group orientation.

When it comes to their ethnic identification, US-born children of immigrants have the choice to identify with their parent(s) nationality or as African American or both (Hall & Carter, 2006). The authors assert that second-generation Afro-Caribbeans have the best of both worlds, suggesting that they may have a strong ethnic identity and at the same time encompass a more developed and internally defined racial identity status attitude.
(e.g., Internalization) in comparison to this study’s first-generation group members. Second-generation Afro-Caribbean’s may perhaps be well versed in their own ethnocultural ways and are better prepared to understand themselves both as racial and ethnic beings (Hall & Carter, 2006). For those that do desire to identify with their ethnic identity must actively work to assert their identity due to their lack of visible indicators such the distinct accents and customs that their parents’ possess (Rong & Brown, 2001; Waters, 2001). In result, socialization messages received from immigrants parents are important and of great interest as it has significant implications for one’s ability to cope with discrimination and foster well-being (Joseph & Hunter, 2010).

In a sample of 83 second-generation adolescents, Waters (1994) discovered three types of group identity among West Indian Americans living in New York City: a Black American identity (e.g., African American), a hyphenated identity (e.g., Jamaican-American), and an immigrant ethnic identity (e.g., Jamaican, Trinidadian). Waters concluded that ethnic identity may hinder full understanding of racial realities and consequently might limit full development of a positive more constructive psychological racial identity. For example, adolescents who identify as ethnic West Indians perceived less racial discrimination, and perceived more opportunities and rewards for individual initiative and effort. On the other hand, those who identified as Black Americans tend to perceive more racial discrimination as a factor limiting their opportunities (Waters, 1994). However, another study showed that regardless of their varied backgrounds, African American and Caribbean American youth perceived equal amounts of stereotyping and discriminatory incidents (Seaton, Caldwell, Sellers, & Jackson, 2008).
**Racial Socialization and Ethnic Socialization Theory and Research**

Racial socialization and ethnic socialization are used broadly to refer to the transmission of information regarding race and ethnicity from adults to children, and these terms have historically been applied to somewhat different phenomena in different groups (Hughes et al., 2006). Believing that both terms are too broad and nonspecific to be conceptually or empirically useful, the term ethnic-racial socialization was created to represent the broader research literature and in hopes of being more inclusive of African-descended individuals and people that did not identify as African American. Studies have consistently highlighted that ethnic-racial socialization is a salient aspect of child rearing and refers to the common types of messages that are transmitted to children about their race and/or ethnicity (Hughes et al., 2006). These processes involve both verbal and non-verbal messages about the meaning and significance of race and ethnicity; racial and ethnic group membership and identity; racial and ethnic stratification; and intergroup and intragroup interactions (Hughes et al., 2006; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Neblett, White, Ford, Philip, Nguyên, & Sellers, 2008).

The study of racial and ethnic socialization has highlighted issues concerning ethnic minority families and significantly expanded multicultural research and scholarship. Brown and colleagues (2007) describe familial ethnic/race socialization as “the process by which families teach children about the social meaning and consequence of ethnicity and race” (p. 14). This process is not necessarily about parents pouring ideas and values onto their children, but instead is the process through which children are able to examine and select from an array of messages and information that teach them about
who they are, their place within society, and their relationship to others like and unlike themselves (Brown, Tanner-Smith, Lesane-Brown & Ezell, 2007). Research indicates the importance of young children being exposed to these topics, as they learn how to manage racialized interactions in settings outside of the home, and adequately respond to racism, discrimination, and questions about their ethnic/racial identification.

Children learn about the significance of ethnicity and race in a number of different ways, through observation, modeling, discussions, vicarious reinforcement, and imitation of significant others (Brown et al., 2007). Families are central to this learning process. Through this familial ethnic/race socialization process, “children learn about phenotypic or cultural differences, or both, their in-group’s history and heritage, identity politics, or prejudice, and discrimination, or both others” (p. 14). This is especially true for children of color. Due to the group’s lack of power and privilege in society, minority parents tended to promote a stronger focus of intergroup relations and the importance of their children learning to get along with the dominant majority group (Priest et al., 2014). For example, Hamm (2001) reported that African American parents were more likely than White parents to encourage their children to build relationships with children from other ethnic-racial groups; this was seen as a perceived necessity to form relationships with people from the White majority group in order to effectively participate and achieve in society.

Though almost all parents socialize their children either explicitly or implicitly, Black parents play a unique and pivotal role in educating their children about the structural and psychological implications of race (Brown & Lesane-Brown, 2006;
Lesane-Brown, 2006). Black parents must buffer the information their children receive about race and socialize their children to understand Black culture, heritage, and how to cope within an oppressed minority status (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013). As an important tool for parenting, racial and ethnic socialization represents a set of communications, interactions, and behaviors between parents and youth regarding how African Americans ought to decide about their cultural heritage as well as how to respond to the racial hostility, empowerment, or confusion of American society (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013; Stevenson et al., 2002). These messages are related to positive adaptive outcomes such as healthy coping strategies, increased self-esteem, and decreased anger expression or symptoms of depression (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013; Stevenson, Reed, Bodison, & Bishop, 1997, as cited in Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013).

**Protective Factors and Associations to Racial and Ethnic Socialization**

There are a number of interrelated factors that contribute to the complexity of ethnic-racial socialization, resulting in a number of studies exploring the ways in which different predictors interrelate and impact ethnic-racial socialization (Priest et al., 2014). Hughes et al.’s (2006) research findings identify the ways that recently immigrated individuals tended to focus on practicing cultural traditions than settled parents, and parents who had experienced discrimination were more likely to teach preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust with older children. In addition, studies found that socioeconomic indicators such as level of education and income had an impact on the type of messages used, concluding that African American mothers with a higher level of
education tended to engage in discussion on racial issues and less on egalitarian or negative racial messages in comparison to mothers with a lower level of education (Caughy, O’Campo et al., 2002; White-Johnson, Ford, & Sellers, 2010). Utilizing the Africentric Home Inventory Scale to further explore socioeconomic factors, researchers also discovered that African American families with lower incomes tended to have less Africentric culturally relevant objects suggesting less opportunity for both implicit and explicit cultural socialization (Caughy, O’Campo et al., 2002; Caughy, Randolph et al., 2002).

Empirical studies suggest that Black parents’ messages about race may be associated with a number of positive psychosocial and academic outcomes (Lesane-Brown, 2006). Receiving general racial socialization messages and specific messages about group membership and pride are hypothesized to result in positive racial identity and protection from internalizing negative racial stereotypes (Brown et al., 2007; Lesane-Brown, 2006). A significant body of research has linked higher levels of racial socialization with positive academic outcomes (Bowman & Howard, 1985). Demo and Hughes (1990) assessed the effects of receiving race socialization messages on Black adult racial identity and found that those who received racial socialization messages from parents while growing up were significantly more likely to have stronger feelings of closeness to other Blacks. Consistent with the findings of Demo and Hughes, the relationship between racial socialization and adult racial identity was found that the transmission of race socialization messages from adult family members was positive and
a significant predictor of racial identity dimensions (i.e., psychological and sociopolitical) (Hughes et al., 2006).

Race and ethnic identity exploration is normative during adolescence, with acceleration during transition into and during middle school, and a deceleration of identity searching during high school (Ponterotto & Park-Taylor, 2007). Davis and Stevenson (2006) found that adolescents who received greater cultural pride reinforcement and racism coping messages exhibited more positive emotional outcomes (i.e., less depression, higher self-esteem, and less lethargy). In addition, it has been found that ethnic-racial socialization has also been associated with fewer externalizing behaviors, lower fighting frequency, and better anger management (especially among boys), higher self-esteem among peers, fewer internalizing problems, and better cognitive outcomes (Hughes et al., 2006). In the lives of African American youth and adolescents, racism is still a significant issue (Brody, Chen, Murray, Ge, Simmons, Gerrad, & Cutrona, 2006) and poses as a challenge in their developing a positive sense of racial identity (Lesane-Brown, 2006).

While there is an extensive body of research on how racial socialization is a protective factor that promotes racial identity development and safeguards specifically African Americans from negative costs of discrimination (Stevenson, 1995), a review of empirical research substantiate that existing research on the effectiveness of racial socialization varies (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013) and has resulted in mixed findings (Hughes et al., 2006). Elmore and Gaylord-Harden (2013) present research findings that report how racial socialization may increase problems behaviors such a violence and
aggression (Szalacha, Erkut, García Coll, Alarcón, Fields, & Ceder, 2003) and are associated with lower self-esteem, learned helplessness, and depressive symptoms specifically in African American boys (Stevenson, 1997). This proves that findings related to the effectiveness of racial socialization are ambiguous and contradictory, resulting in lack of consistency and gaps in the literature pertaining to racial and ethnic socialization dynamics and processes within African American families.

**Critique and Limitations within Racial and Ethnic Socialization Research**

Priest et al.’s (2014) systematic literature review of a growing body of research examining ethnic-racial socialization processes with majority and minority children & young people over the past 30 years, utilizes a socio-ecological approach (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) to understand the distinct contextual and societal influences of ethnic-racial socialization processes. Thus far, studies on ethnic-racial socialization have primarily focused on African-Americans (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Lesane-Brown, 2006), immigrants Latino and Asian populations (Brown, et al., 2007; Hughes, Witherspoon, Rivas-Drake, & West-bey, 2009), and more recently the field has expanded to include Asian Americans, Native Americans, and American transracially adopted children (Berberry & O’Brien, 2011; Crolley-Simic & Vonk, 2008; DeBerry, Scarr, & Weinberg, 1996; Johnston, Swim, Saltsman, Deater-Deckard, & Petrill, 2007; Mohanty, 2010, as cited in Priest et al., 2014; Moua & Lamborn, 2010; Tynes, 2007). In addition to this research mainly focusing on certain ethnic groups, research has almost exclusively focused on the socialization messages of older children and adolescents rather than on younger children under 12 years of age (Caughy et al., 2002; Hughes et al., 2006) or
those older than 17 years of age. There have been calls for research that fills in the gap and includes research across diverse ethnic groups, with younger and emerging adult children, different processes, and includes additional sources of ethnic-racial socialization messages beyond parents (Hughes et al., 2006).

In addition to this, there seems to be confusion surrounding the different processes that constitute racial and ethnic socialization. The primary focus of racial and ethnic socialization research have largely centered on specific ethnic-racial socialization messages from one agent rather than on ethnic-racial socialization message as a whole including messages from various multiple agents (Priest et al., 2014). Also, little is known about the mechanisms and contextual processes that facilitate parenting practices that buffer children and young people against the negative effects of racism. For example, there remains a dearth of research on this subject and unfortunately research involving racial socializations too often fails to differentiate between racial socialization beliefs which are what children actually believe about race which stems from how and the way they have interpreted messages they have received from caregivers and racial socialization experiences which are occurrences where children receive messages that influence how they view race (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013; Hughes et al., 2006).

Davis and Stevenson (2006) state the importance of individualizing these racial socialization beliefs and experiences as they distinctively impact children’s perceptions of race (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013). To continue on with this concept regarding the importance of making distinctions when explaining racial socialization, some studies that have coalesced different types of messages creating a global measure for racial
socialization (Scott, 2003; Wilson et al., 2009). While the development and existence of a
global measure may provide a useful framework for understanding racial socialization,
Elmore and Gaylord-Harden (2013) propose the necessity of examining the various
components of racial socialization separately, in preference of combining them all into
one variable.

Within the field, there is ongoing dialogue regarding the consistency of the
operationalization of racial and ethnic socialization, and the conceptualization, definition,
and terminology of race and ethnicity (Cokley, 2007; Helms & Talleyrand, 1997;
Markus, 2008). Many scholars have considered racial and ethnic socialization as merged
concepts, and within these merged models racial and ethnic socialization are viewed as
integrated processes (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014). This is largely due to the
increased use of race and ethnicity as interchangeable concepts despite significant
variation between the two (Brown et al., 2010; Brubaker, 2009). The ways in which race
and ethnicity are conflated contributes to the limiting monolithic ethnic grouping of all
Blacks as African American, assuming general homogeneous cultures and backgrounds
(Hall & Carter, 2006; Phelps, Taylor, & Gerard, 2001; Rong & Brown, 2001). Many
Black Americans and Black immigrants are born in different countries or come from
families who migrated to the US (Thomas, Caldwell, Faison, & Jackson, 2009).
However beyond theoretical conceptualizations, in actual research practice separation of
race and ethnicity can present some difficulties (Cokley, 2007; Quintana, 2007, as cited
in Syed & Mitchell, 2013), for this reason many authors use the hybrid term race/
ethnicity to acknowledge the distinctness of race and ethnicity (Syed & Mitchell, 2013).
Early research on socialization processes in African American families was originally termed racial socialization and focused on parenting practices that African American parents use to prepare their children to cope with prejudice and discrimination (Bowman & Howard, 1985; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Lesane-Brown, 2006; Phinney-Chavira, 1995). Later ethnic socialization was introduced to the research field and defined as proactive coping strategies (i.e., cultural practices, ethnic pride, religion, and extended family ties) (Marshall, 1995; Stevenson, 1994; Stevenson et al., 2002) used to promote racial pride and positive racial identity in a society where race is relevant for social stratification and marginalization (Miller & MacIntosh, 1999; Stevenson, 1994). This understanding embeds cultural practices and ethnicity within the broader model of racial socialization, and blurs the distinction between socialization to ethnicity and race (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014). Limited distinction between racial and ethnic socialization processes has conceptualized these two constructs as an interchangeable, unidimensional construct, overlapping with one another; most commonly ethnic socialization being classified as racial socialization (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2010; Hughes et al., 2006; Stevenson, et al., 2002). This has resulted in considerable ambiguity concerning the exact meaning of the term and the optimum method of measuring the process (Lesane-Brown, 2006). Evidence for this is provided in Hughes et al.’s (2006) proposal of the all-encompassing term ethnic-racial socialization, which has been utilized by other authors (Priest et al., 2014). Within the current field of research, socialization behaviors or practices can be termed ethnic, racial, cultural, or ethnic-racial (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014). The fact that researchers use a vast
array of terms to refer to similar processes in different ethnic or racial groups, demonstrates fragmentation within the literature, it’s difficult to integrate different terms (Hughes et al., 2006) leading to confusion regarding the conceptualization and measurement of these constructs (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014).

For example, Hughes et al.’s (2006) overarching model of ethnic-racial socialization consists of four components: cultural socialization, preparation for bias, promotion of mistrust, and egalitarianism/silence about race (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014; Priest et al., 2014). With the use of ethnic-racial socialization there remain some inconsistencies in terminology used to describe this socialization and types of messages and behaviors. Studies tend to define cultural socialization as practices that teach children cultural traditions and promote cultural prides, whereas racial socialization is defined as intercultural relations using messages such as preparation bias and promotion of mistrust (Priest et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2011; Stevenson et al., 2002). Often within research practice, ethnic socialization is measured with the single component of cultural socialization and racial socialization with the single component of preparation for bias, resulting in the loss of dimensionality within each form of socialization (Elmore & Gaylord-Harden, 2013; Friend, Hunter, & Fletcher, 2011; Rivas-Drake, Hughes, & Way, 2009; Wang & Huguley, 2012).

Prior racial socialization and ethnic socialization research generally blurs the social constructs of race and ethnicity (Passch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014). To date, critical examination of socialization research suggests that combining the conceptualization and measurement of racial and ethnic socialization may mask the
important distinctions between these socialization processes (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2009; Brown et al., 2010). This oversight has the potential to lead to other problems connected to researcher’s examination of socialization’s relations to adjustment and researchers’ implementation of strategies for optimizing developmental outcomes (Passch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014). Research’s examination of racial and ethnic socialization as discrete yet related processes is a newer concept that stems from the important differentiation between race and ethnicity (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2010; Passch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014; Ponterotto, Utsey, & Pedersen, 2006).

The importance of racial and ethnic socialization in the lives of Black and African American children, adolescents, and emerging adults reinforces the importance of addressing methodological issues that are related to the conceptualization and measurement of these constructs (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). This notion led to the development of the Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS). Brown and Krishnakumar worked to provide a scale that offered a comprehensive definition on racial and ethnic socialization. Their new conceptualization of racial and ethnic socialization was drawn from themes obtained from focus group discussions, existing definitions, and relevant theoretical discussions. Recent empirical evidence suggests that racial socialization and ethnic socialization are conceptually distinct constructs and should be studied as such (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). Paasch-Anderson and Lamborn (2014) similarly utilize the newer conceptualization of racial and ethnic socialization in their research by examining these two socialization processes as distinct
constructs. The authors (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014) employed a semi-structured interview with African American adolescents’ to assess message content within both forms of socialization in hopes to see whether adolescents distinguish between socialization to ethnicity from socialization to race.

The separation of racial and socialization and ethnic socialization as two distinct multi-dimensional constructs (Brown et al., 2010) establishes and represents a more consistent terminology and measurement of these processes, in addition it allows for a better understanding of the relative influence of messages related to intergroup protocol (racial socialization) and messages related to intragroup protocol (ethnic socialization) (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2010). Given the important differentiation between race and ethnicity, this study addresses previously explained methodological issues within socialization research by utilizing Brown and Krishnakumar’s (2007) definition to examine racial and ethnic socialization practices within Afro-Caribbean emerging adults. Racial socialization refers to parental strategies that convey explicit and implicit messages regarding intergroup protocol and relationships; these include: teaching youth about racial barrier awareness, how to cope with racism and race-related discrimination, and promoting cross-racial relationships (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). Ethnic socialization, on the other hand, is defined as the explicit and implicit messages regarding intragroup messages about what it means to be a member of a particular ethnic group. This includes the socialization of youth regarding African American cultural values, African American cultural embeddedness, African American history, celebrating
African American heritage, and promotion of ethnic pride (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007).

**Racial and Ethnic Socialization of Black Immigrant Descended Afro-Caribbeans**

The continual growth of Black immigrants in the United States has required many researchers to reconsider and utilize a new multidimensional approach when examining how individuals identify with their racial group and ethnic group(s) and what messages these immigrants teach their children about their racial and ethnic identities (Butterfield, 2004; Joseph & Hunter, 2011). Scholars who study ethnicity agree that ethnic and racial categories are socially constructed and are given concrete expression by specific social relations and historical context in which they are embedded (Butterfield, 2004). Indeed, Benton (2006) explains that since racial identities are fluid and alter over time and across different social contexts, an individuals’ understanding of race relations, its meaning and significance varies by country of origin. Appropriately, Black migrants arrive to the United States with a unique and already developed concept of race from their country of origin, which therefore shapes their response to racialization process (Benson, 2006).

The transmission and retention of cultural values and messages regarding race and ethnicity, and the perceptions of racial barriers and stereotypes influence the functioning African American families (Stevenson, 1994). In the last few decades, there has been an emergence of cultural, ethnic, and racial socialization literature, emphasizing the importance of preserving the cultural background of ethnic minority children. Most research in this area has primarily focused on select ethnic groups of Asian American and Latino American, and Asian American, Native American and Latin American as a whole,
rarely applying acculturation to African Americans (Snowden & Hines, 1999). Yet, studies have found that since many Blacks hold culture-specific values that may clash with those of the wider American society, they experience emotional stress which may result in depression, mental health distress, and a variety of psychological symptoms such as somatization, low self-esteem, and anxiety (Anderson, 1991; Joiner & Walker, 2002; Klonoff & Landrine, 1999). Socialization messages that children and young adults receive from their parents play a major role in the formation of their worldview, racial and ethnic identity development, sense of belonging in their communities, and subjective well-being. The present research explores how this might hold true for second-generation Black immigrants.

Social and demographic shifts present new challenges and further complicate the field of research on racial and ethnic socialization (Priest et al., 2014). The combination of population movements and existing histories of marginalization and exclusion of minority groups from African, Caribbean, and indigenous backgrounds have resulted in multifaceted intercultural contexts and challenges related to multiculturalism and social cohesion (Hage & Bennet, 2008; Priest et al., 2014). Global ethnic diversity in American society encourages children and young people to acquire skills and capacities concerning ways to think positively about racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity (including racism and prejudice), negotiate multicultural contexts, promote positive attitudes, and enable effective responses to racism when it occurs; in hopes of fostering supportive and nurturing environments for all people (Hughes et al., 2006; Levy & Killen, 2008; Neblett et al., 2008; Priest et al., 2014). Black immigrant parents may provide socialization
messages that are mainly aimed at ethnic identity, while overlooking and providing no messages involving race (Joseph & Hunter, 2011). Given the increasing demographics of people of African descent within the US, a significant proportion of them originating or have families with origins in the Caribbean or Africa, empirical studies in ethnic-racial labeling, socialization, and racial identity should reflect the diversity of this population (Anglin & Whaley, 2006). The work of Cokley and Helms (2007) is consistent with this idea asserting that instead of collapsing ethnic subgroups into one group for collective analysis it would be wise to disaggregate data from African Americans, Caribbean Americans, and African internationals, all whom share the same “Black” racial designation but vary on the socially constructed nature of their racial identity and ethnicity-specific experiences in the United States.

The separation of racial and ethnic socialization as two distinct processes for this current study is appropriate as it will provide a clear understanding of emerging adult Afro-Caribbean’s perceptions of message content for both forms of socialization, thus seeking to understand the multi-dimensional aspects of both racial and ethnic socialization (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014). This model of racial socialization and ethnic socialization as distinct processes (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014) is guided by Boykin and Toms (1985) dimensions of triple quandary framework (Black cultural, minority, mainstream) demonstrating three potentially conflicting socialization agendas that ethnic minority parents negotiate: (a) ensuring children’s success in mainstream settings, (b) preparing children for experiences based on their minority status, and (c) teaching children about their cultural history and heritage (Hughes, 2003). In addition to
this, this study incorporates Paasch-Anderson and Lamborn’s (2014) expansion of ethnic-racial socialization models that clearly distinguishes between socialization to ethnicity (Black cultural: Afro-Caribbean) and race (minority-Black), and includes multidimensionality to the separate to Black cultural and minority socialization.

**Social Connectedness of Mainstream, Racial, and Ethnic Communities for Afro-Caribbeans**

Social connectedness research, proposed by Lee and Robbins (1998) maintains that early in life people express and satisfy their need for belonging through identification and participation with the social world. A sense of connectedness begins to emerge during adolescence and extends throughout adult life. The maturing self has successfully maintained companionship and affiliation and is able to feel comfortable and confident within a larger social context beyond family or friends. This sense of connectedness allows people to maintain feelings of being "human among humans" and to identify with those who may be perceived as different from themselves (Lee & Robbins, 1995). Social connectedness is known as the internal sense of belonging, and defined as the subjective sense of interpersonal closeness and togetherness with the social world (Lee & Robbins, 1995). Ones experience of interpersonal closeness in the social world includes proximal and distal relationships with family, friends, peers, acquaintances, strangers, community, and society. The enduring sense of connectedness provides people with a social lens with which to perceive the world in which they live (Lee & Robbins, 1998).

Given that ethnic minorities live within the mainstream as well as within specific ethnic communities (Liao, Weng, & West, 2016), social connectedness is essential in
collectivistic cultures, especially in the settlement of immigrants (Yoon et al., 2012), and may be important in understanding African American and Black immigrant mental health in the US. Ethnic social connectedness measures closeness to one’s ethnic community and mainstream social connectedness measures one’s sense of belonging to mainstream society play an important role in ethnic minorities adjustment (Liao et al., 2016; Wei et al., 2012; Yoon et al. 2012). Ethnic social connectedness is consistent with African American and more recent Black immigrants and their descendant’s traditions of communalism, familialism, and a worldview focusing on connectedness with the social environment (Coon & Kemmelmeier, 2001). This supports the viewpoint that ethnic social connectedness may be a protective factor (Liao et al., 2016) for Black people in the United States. Hunter and Schmidt’s (2010) model demonstrates that a sense of belongingness to one’s ethnic group (e.g., ethnic identity, extended family networks) is suggested to buffer against anxiety in Black Americans, and Harrell’s (2010) study explained that ethnic social connectedness mitigates the impact of racism on psychological outcomes. Additionally, in both their studies involving Chinese international students, Wei et al. (2012) reported that ethnic social connectedness reduced the association between discrimination and posttraumatic stress symptoms, Ye (2006) found that perceived online emotional support from their ethnic group (e.g., knowing others were also facing similar problems) was positively associated with life satisfaction, but negatively associated with perceived discrimination, perceived hatred, and negative feelings caused by change.
Group identification may have positive and negative functions for group members (Yap, Settles, & Pratt-Hyatt, 2011). Research findings suggest that individuals who more strongly identified (i.e., higher centrality) or who felt more positively (i.e., higher private regard) about their racial group may experience a greater sense of belonging and acceptance by other group members, and may seek out other group members through individual relationships and organizations (Yap et al., 2011). Furthermore, racial-ethnic socialization (Rivas-Drake et al., 2009) increases in psychological well-being have been associated with a sense of belongingness (Yap et al., 2011). This supports this notion that when people experience positive social interactions they are more likely to feel a sense of belonging (Steger & Kashdan, 2009).

Traditionally, acculturation research has shifted from only focusing on immigrant’s engagement with mainstream American culture, with now several researchers are shifting from a two-culture framework (e.g., culture-of-origin and mainstream American culture) to account for multiple cultural influences (Joseph, Watson, Wang, Case, & Hunter, 2013). Understanding multiple cultural influences is especially critical and important to understanding Afro-Caribbean immigrants’ acculturative process. Often being categorized with African Americans who are racially similar but ethnically different, may provide them with a sense of flexibility regarding to the degree in which they need to engage with African American culture (Joseph et al., 2013). Afro-Caribbean immigrants’ group membership may be functional as they may incur potential unfavorable consequences if they engage in African American culture (Joseph et al., 2013). The authors (Joseph et al., 2013) found that Afro-Caribbean
immigrants’ level of engagement in African American culture may function to enhance their ethnic group solidarity, maintain their positively viewed group membership, and avoid racial discrimination.

There are some differences between first-generation second-generation immigrants in regards to their experience of racial identity, group membership and engagement, and social connectedness. First-generation Afro-Caribbean immigrants’ (i.e., those individuals born in their country of origin) ethnic identity may be more salient than their racial identity (Rong & Brown, 2001), resulting that they may experience a less cultural connection to African Americans because of differences in language, immigration history, and experience (voluntary vs. involuntary) despite being perceived as racially similar (Hine-St. Hilaire, 2006; Waters, 1994). Second-generation Afro-Caribbeans (i.e., those born in the United States) report a strong cultural connection to their Caribbean culture and traditions, similar to the connection felt by first-generation Afro-Caribbeans. But the second-generation’s adoption of US American customs (i.e., language, dialect, speech, dress style, and other behaviors), shared experiences and spaces with other Blacks in the US, and some degree of assimilation to African American culture in order to “become” American (Portes & Zhou, 1993), may contribute to a shifting emphasis on racial identity (Hall & Carter, 2006; Waters, 1994). Many second-generation Afro-Caribbeans lack fluency in the language of their parents’ home country (e.g., Creole, French, Spanish) and lack an accent that differentiates them from their African American peers (Hine-St. Hilaire, 2006).
The constructs of mainstream and ethnic social connectedness are extremely important and relevant to first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults because when this group moved to the United States or were born as US citizens, they had to negotiate their identities, their sense of belonging, and the ways they will retain both their heritage culture as well as adapt to the mainstream culture (Wei et al., 2012). Due to the significance of one’s racial identity, a new construct is included in this study, social connectedness to one’s racial community, which is appropriate for the Afro-Caribbean population where race and ethnicity are seen as two distinct identities. That is, one’s feeling of social connectedness to mainstream culture, racial community, and ethnic community perhaps may be related to the degree to which a person received messages from their caregivers about what it means to be a person of African descent as well as a person with familial origins in the Caribbean.

This notion is supported by Boykin and Toms (1985) research. According to their triple quandary framework, African American parents prepare children to function effectively in three distinct social-cultural contexts, based on Black cultural, minority, mainstream experiences. This framework is also critical and relevant to the parenting and socialization practices of Afro-Caribbean parents, especially as it relates to social connectedness within the mainstream, racial community, and ethnic community (Boykin & Toms, 1985). Ethnic socialization is represented by the Black cultural dimension (culturally patterned behaviors and practices) and racial socialization is represented by the minority experience dimension (coping with instances of discrimination) (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014). Previously, many researchers have used the Boykin and
Toms (1985) triple quandary framework as an experimental method, though it has not been effectively used consistently across studies often due to the lack of distinction between racial and ethnic socialization being maintained in the conceptual constructs or measurement of the separate dimensions (Anglin & Wade, 2007; Marshall, 1995; Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014; Thornton et al., 1990).

African Americans are met with complexity of living biculturally; they have to cope within the American social context dominated by White Americans, in order to maintain and embrace their heritage and culture (Temple, 2011). However, Afro-Caribbeans make identity choices based on an even greater variety of factors such as immigration status, language barriers, education attainment, residential segregation, and integration and existing familial or ethnic support networks (Sanchez, 2013). Boykin and Toms (1985) triple quandary framework is suitable to understanding Afro-Caribbeans’ experience of triculturalism (e.g., within three cultures: Black, Afro-Caribbean, and White American). In addition to their socialization to mainstream American society, preparation of racial bias and prejudice awareness, and beyond the bonds of a biological Blackness or a homogeneous ethnic culture, Afro-Caribbeans’ maintain communities. They do this through circulating Black and Caribbean cultural forms that feature connections and divergences, unities and disunities; they are re-interpreted, transformed, and creolized in planned and accidental ways, depending on the ideas of the population (Joseph, 2012). The author (Joseph, 2012) states that the American diaspora is a social form of community and refers to the process of dispersion from a central location and the ongoing maintenance of both a homeland (e.g., nation of origin) and a homespace (e.g.,
sense of belonging). This process is accomplished through social networks, memory sharing, economic strategies, communication and transportation technologies, and institutional policies. These modes of cultural production help to develop a sense of belonging to one’s ethnic group (Joseph, 2012).

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the foundation of socialization messages, sense of belongingness, and subjective well-being among Afro-Caribbean emerging adults, it is important to understand the intersection of race, ethnicity, and immigration. The role of nativity and immigration adds a complex, yet important dimension to the examination of exposures to different social contexts (Porter, 2013). Over the years, researchers have increasingly become familiar with the theory of intersectionality, defined as the ways in which different social identities such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, etc. intersect with one another to create unique social contexts and life experiences (Cole, 2009; Shields, 2008, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013). In their research, Cole (2009) suggested that intersectionality theory considers the ways in which one’s race and gender may jointly affect psychological outcomes.

Unfortunately, current models operate as single identity factors, either race or ethnicity, or examine the multiple identity factors separately, neglecting to acknowledge how complex identity is or the ways in which multiple identity factors intersect with one another (Cross & Cross, 2008). This present research study encourages an intersectional approach by providing a holistic understanding to recognizing race, ethnicity, and immigration status as distinct social constructs and processes instead of categories (Cole, 2009). This study strengthens intersectionality research by acknowledging and may
explaining Afro-Caribbeans’ differing level of awareness and the salience of identity factors (i.e., race, ethnicity, and immigration status).

**Emerging Adulthood**

In the previous two sections, racial and ethnic socialization and social connectedness were described, and the following section will turn its attention to emerging adulthood theory. The review of recent literature on emerging adulthood is necessitated by the general tendency within racial and ethnic socialization research to focus exclusively on childhood and adolescence (in their more traditional constructions). More recent conceptions of emerging adulthood reveals a more mature developmental locus whereby these constructs might be more clearly articulated by the subjects of this research, and wherein (especially for second-generation Afro-Caribbeans) the role of family and cultural processes might still be dynamic. The theory of emerging adulthood as defined by Arnett (2000), is a new and distinct period of life course that have come to characterize the experiences of 18-29-year-olds in industrialized societies over the past half-century (Arnett, 2004). This distinct developmental life stage distinguishes individuals from childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (Arnett, 2000, 2004, 2007; Tanner & Arnett, 2011). This aligns with human development theorists, such as Erikson, who theorized that exploration is a healthy concomitant of human growth (Erikson, 1959, as cited in Sharon, 2016). At the turn of the millennium, with rapid maturational changes, shifting societal demands, conflicting role demands, complex romantic and peer relationships, and the pathways to adulthood becoming less clear, these changes in the lives of young people are said to be best understood by a new stage of development:
emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2010; Orth, Robins, & Roberts, 2008; Sharon, 2016; Tanner 2006). Some researchers view this stage as positive development overall, where young adults have the opportunity to focus on themselves, explore their freedom relatively free from adult role obligations and restraints, and engage in, but not expected to commit to social institutions (Arnett, 2000; 2007; Sharon, 2016).

For individuals living in developed countries where the growing trend involves young people graduating from high school, continuing on to college, and who have not yet entered into adult roles concerning family (e.g., marriage and parenthood) and work (e.g., established career) this is a time they are faced with complex challenges, patterns of adaptation, and considerable cognitive flexibility, change, and exploration (Arnett, 2000; Blackemore, 2008; Juang & Syed, 2010; Orth et al., 2008; Temple, 2011). This developmental process of becoming an adult often entails questioning one’s identity and subsequent reformulation of conceptions and evaluations of the self, likely to produce changes and impact subjective well-being (Orth et. al., 2008). As Arnett (2004, 2007) describes, this stage features the five pillars known as identity exploration, the age of instability, self-focus, feeling in-between, and possibilities. Here emerging adults develop the ability to think abstractly, multidimensionally, more advanced, efficient, and effective in regards to understanding and making complicated decisions involving one view of self and their worldview, interpersonal relationships, philosophy, politics, work, and social constructs like race and oppression (Arnett, 2000; Blackemore, 2008; Steinberg, 2005).
There is great variation in how this developmental period is navigated with multiple pathways that differ for diverse youth. An individual’s understanding of what constitutes becoming an adult is subject to various definitions by cultures (Arnett & Taber, 1994, as cited in Katsiaficas et al., 2015) and will influence and be influenced by several important factors such as, demographic shifts, ethnic and racial groups, immigration, generational status, familial socioeconomic status (SES), setting, and gender (Bynner, 2005; Syed & Mitchell, 2013). In their 2013 article, Syed and Mitchell question the universality of the emerging adulthood developmental phase cross-culturally and assert that emerging adulthood theory may not adequately attend to the diversity in the developmental pathways or take into account the unique experiences of diverse populations. Several authors (Bynner, 2005; Hendry & Kloep, 2007; Rosenberg, 2001, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013) criticized this theory suggesting that emerging adulthood only represents the experience of specific cultural groups- White, middle class, college students in industrialized societies, thus reflecting only Western and individualistic schemas of adulthood that may not fully encompass the diverse experiences of all emerging adults (Bynner, 2005). The extant body of emerging adulthood literature has been critiqued for overlooking the heterogeneity and cultural factors that contribute to providing some young adults living in Western, industrialized societies this transitional extension (Bynner, 2005). Thus, criticisms are most accurately directed at the definition and inclusiveness of emerging adulthood, rather than the idea of emerging adulthood itself (Hendry & Kloep, 2007). Amid the growing demographic diversity of the emerging adulthood US population it is important that emerging adulthood research reflect that
diversity and include analyses with non-White samples outside of and beyond four-year college settings (Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Syed & Mitchell, 2013; van Dulman, 2013, as cited in Katsiaficas et al., 2015).

The need for diverse research is very important as nearly a quarter of emerging adults in the United States are either first- (foreign born) or second- (US born to foreign parents) generation immigrants (Batalova & Fix, 2011, as cited in Katsiaficas et al., 2015). This growing population contends with dual forces of acculturation and enculturation, and often negotiates multiple and competing roles and responsibilities such as family obligation and community involvement (Fuligni, 2007, as cited in Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Jenson, 2008, as cited by Katsiaficas et al., 2015), together with the demands of work and/or school (Katsiaficas et al., 2015). These different background characteristics and experiences are likely to impact the subjective sense of what constitutes reaching adulthood and contends with cultural messages about what it means to be a “culturally-valued adult” (Quinn, 2005, as cited in Katsiaficas et al., 2015). For immigrant-origin youth, these cultural messages about adulthood may be multiple, divergent, and even conflicting and reflect the values of both the home community (of individual or parent) and host country (Katsiaficas et al., 2015).

In exploring the five pillars within the theory of emerging adulthood with racial and ethnic minority populations from immigrant-origin backgrounds, unfortunately there still remains little research providing evidence regarding the degree to which these developmental issues are similarly experienced across racial ethnics remains unclear (Syed & Mitchell, 2013). The age of identity exploration is unquestionably the largest
and most central pillar to emerging adulthood theory (Arnett, 2004; Arnett, 2006, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013). Among the largest body of research including identity research of racial and ethnic minority is ethnic identity heavily linking it to psychological functioning and well-being (Quintana, 2007; Smith & Silva, 2011, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013). A more recent collection of research on ethnic identity during emerging adulthood indicates that this domain of identity is far from complete following adolescence. However, there still remains a need for research that focuses on the ways in which race and ethnicity is related to broader identity processes (Syed & Mitchell, 2013) and racial and ethnic socialization messages.

The age of instability is marked by three observable domains – work, residential mobility, and romantic relationships – where significant changes create a sense of instability (Syed & Mitchell, 2013). During this developmental phase, immigrant-origin emerging adults contend with acculturation and enculturation, and many immigrant-origin families bring with them collectivistic values of familialism and family interdependence from home country which stand in stark contrast to mainstream US individualistic schemas (Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Syed & Mitchell, 2013; Tseng, 2004). One area that has been recently researched among racial and ethnic immigrant-origin minorities emerging adults is family conflict, highlighting that this value-based intergenerational conflict occurs in the context of acculturation (Lee, Choe, Kim, & Ngo, 2000, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013) and is linked to negative outcomes suggesting greater instability (Syed & Mitchell, 2013).
The age of self-focus encompasses emerging adults’ newfound sense of freedom, responsibility, and independence (Arnett, 2004). Scholars have shown that these markers of independence are linked to “Western” values and represent individualistic cultures that privilege autonomy as expression of the self, in contrast to collectivistic cultures that value interdependence, duties, and obligation to others (Fuligni & Flook, 2005, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013; Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder et al., 2006, as cited in Katsiaficas et al., 2015). Research on immigrant populations, particularly with Asian and Latino families document the importance of family interdependence, also referred to as “social responsibility,” where these responsibilities are rooted in relationships with others and defined as a sense of responsibility to family members, peers, and the immediate community (Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Wray-Lake & Syversten, 2011). These values require juggling multiple and competing responsibilities, such as contributing to family expenses at home and abroad, caring for siblings and extended family members, translating for family members, and assisting them with navigating institutions among other tasks (Fuligini & Pederson, 2002; Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Orellana, 2009; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). The centrality of family obligation (Fuligni, 2007) and family interdependence (Tseng, 2004) draws attention to the fact that for many cultural contexts, this age may not be a time solely focusing on oneself, but instead a time that includes the complexity of assuming responsibility for oneself as well as others (Katsiaficas et al., 2015).

The age of feeling in-between is the least complex of the five pillars of emerging adulthood (Syed & Mitchell, 2013). As stated by Arnett (2004), it is described as the
period where the individual is neither an adolescent nor an adult, on the way to adulthood but not there yet. In their research on Afro-Caribbean and Latino immigrant-origin community college student experiences of emerging adults, Katsiaficas et al. (2015) reported that many students felt held back from adulthood due to cultural messages they received at home from their families (Katsiaficas et al., 2015). They perceived fundamental tensions between the different messages about adulthood provided at home and at school. Students felt the daily commute between home and school required navigating between conflicting realizations of adulthood, or embraced a sense of adulthood merely as a necessary survival mechanism in their community college setting (Katsiaficas et al., 2015).

Lastly, the age of possibilities marks the individual’s first opportunity to make their own life-shaping decisions believing they will get what they want from life, optimistic about their futures, and most expecting that their lives will be better than those of their parents, especially emerging adults from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Arnett, 2004; Arnett & Schwab, 2012; Syed & Mitchell, 2013). This unbridled optimism within emerging adulthood has often been characterized as a luxury only available to those with sufficient means (Bynner, 2005; Hendry & Kloep, 2007; Syed & Mitchell, 2013), suggesting that due to their overrepresentation among the poor and working class, racial minorities make up a smaller share of emerging adults (Syed & Mitchell, 2013). Though this might not be the case for all racial and ethnic minorities, this group faces a greater number of societal barriers than their White peers, such as succeeding in school, negative teacher interactions, institutional racism (Syed & Mitchell, 2013). More
specifically, immigrant-origin students may face unique challenges of less optimal pre-collegiate education, poverty, first-generation college student, managing a second language on top of constraints of institutions that might not be equipped to meet their needs (Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Suárez-Orozco, Gaytan, & Kim, 2010). Nevertheless, research suggests that many racial and ethnic minorities take challenges and turn them into opportunities for growth and development (Syed & Mitchell, 2013).

Only recently has scholarship highlighted the unique and key differences between first-generation and second-generation immigrant-origin emerging adults (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Katsiaficas et al., 2015). There are significant differences in the social processes of each generation. First-generation immigrants often go through the difficult transition of learning a new language and unable to communicate their thoughts with ease (Rumbaut, 2004). Many contend with prolonged family separation during migration which may invoke emotional and financial stress (Katsiaficas et al., 2015). These challenges and social responsibilities can propel first-generation immigrants to take on adult roles more quickly than their second-generation and native-born peers (Katsiaficas et al., 2015). Supporting this claim is Rumbaut and Komaie’s (2010) research study which suggests a shortened period of emerging adulthood. The authors (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010) found that first-generation immigrant emerging adults had a greater tendency to move through the five major conventional transitions to adulthood—leaving home, completing school, entering workforce, getting married, and having children. Conversely, second-generation immigrants were least likely to have
transitioned into these conventional markers indicating that they experienced a period of emerging adulthood were more like their native-born peers than their first-generation peers (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010).

By comparison, second-generation immigrants experience a different challenge in maintaining communication and navigating relationships at home with parents due to their limited facility of their parent’s native language (Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova; 2008). Moreover, they may feel more comfortable with the cultural practices of the new host country, making it more likely for them to be in conflict with their parents’ desire to observe homeland practices and values (i.e., how to be a successful adult) (APA, 2012; Katsiaficas et al., 2015). Second-generation immigrants were more likely to be employed, pursue a higher degree, and live at home with their parents. Yet, were less likely to be married and have children, signifying a value in family interdependence that is much greater than that expressed among than non-immigrant populations (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010; Tseng, 2004).

Recently, there has been a substantial increase in the number of Afro-Caribbean students in colleges and universities in the United States (Bennett & Lutz, 2009) which is commensurate with national statistics indicating that Afro-Caribbeans are the largest Black immigrant group in the US, a population more than 1.5 million people (Logan & Deane, 2003). Despite this ever increasing ethnic diversity among Blacks in higher education settings there still remains a considerable shortage of scholarly research that includes Afro-Caribbeans (Sanchez, 2013), specifically research that explores racial and ethnic socialization during emerging adulthood. Katsiaficas et al.’s (2015) research study
on Afro-Caribbean and Latino immigrant-origin emerging adult community college students is one of the few studies that highlights the experience of this population and provides noteworthy insights into the contextualized conceptualization of emerging adulthood. Their research study brings light to the complexity and tension between individualistic goals and responsibility for oneself to interdependence or collectivistic goals and responsibility in service of others for low-income Afro-Caribbean and Latino immigrant-origin emerging adults (Katisiaficas et al., 2015). In addition, this study makes evident the challenge of navigating between cultural expectations and the ways in which this period of feeling “in between” may be a luxury not always afforded to first-generation and unauthorized immigrants. This is often due to abruptly feeling pushed towards adulthood, highlighting distinct generational circumstances that can potentially alter the experiences of emerging adulthood (Katisiaficas et al., 2015).

**Racial Socialization and Ethnic Socialization and Subjective Well-Being in Emerging Adulthood**

**Racial socialization and ethnic socialization.** Priest et al.’s (2014) comprehensive review of ethnic-racial socialization research found that overall a child’s age was a significant predictive factor for parent ethnic-racial socialization messages and behaviors. The importance of studying racial and ethnic socialization in families is its relevance to the lives of adolescents (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Hughes et al., 2006) and emerging adults. A significant body of research has linked higher levels of ethnic-racial socialization messages, more specifically with an emphasis on ethnic-racial pride and egalitarianism (in terms of equal status) messages and less messages on the
promotion of mistrust or preparation for bias with the college-aged adults (Lesane-Brown et al., 2005). This finding is also true for Rivas-Drake’s study (2011) which found that students reported recalling that they received more messages involving cultural socialization than preparation for bias from their parents. Furthermore, for 18-22 years old African American students attending a predominantly White university, students reported their parents communicating more protective messages (i.e., preparation for bias, promotion of mistrust and providing counter-stereotypes of Black people) than proactive ethnic-racial socialization messages (i.e., egalitarian status and values, ethnic-racial pride and self-development) which then resulted in a higher tendency to reject color-blind racial attitudes (Barr & Neville, 2008).

Unfortunately, scholarly findings on socialization within emerging adulthood have been underdeveloped and minimal. Most theory and research involving socialization has predominantly focused on the ways parents socialize their children (Bornstein, 2002, as cited in Arnett, 2007) during childhood and adolescence (Arnett, 2007). Although literature on ethnic-racial socialization attends to its role in childhood and adolescence (particularly early and mid-adolescence), the college years may be an important period to examine such socialization as well given the wealth of opportunities to examine these messages in light of new experiences on campus (Rivas-Drake, 2011). Research findings suggest that Latino college students are actively embracing their ethnic identities or exploring new ones (Syed, Azmitia, & Phinney, 2007). Given the conceptual and empirical significance of ethnic and racial socialization in younger adolescence, it seems
appropriate to investigate its relationship with youths’ identity and worldview as well as psychological well-being during college years (Rivas-Drake, 2011) and beyond.

Since identity development continues beyond adolescence it is understandable that factors such as racial and ethnic socialization that impact identity development would continue in emerging adulthood. In a review literature on racial socialization within Black families, Wood and Kurtz-Costes (2007) found that parents believe that racial socialization messages, especially conversations around discrimination should be age appropriate. For the first time, parents may feel that their adolescent child have developed the cognitive and emotional skills necessary to deal with the complexity and difficulties of associated with race in America (Neblett et al., 2008). Since parents often engage in racial socialization in response to particular situations that take place with their children, resulting that some normative social and activities also trigger greater racial socialization behavior (Hughes & Chen, 1997). Specifically within immigrant families, age may also affect how parental racial and ethnic socialization is perceived, especially as emerging adult children continue to make meaning of their experiences growing up with immigrant parents (Kang, Okazaki, Abelmann, Kim-Prieto, & Shanshan, 2010, as cited in Juang, Shen, Kim, & Wang, 2016). Early emerging adulthood (18-21 years) may view parental racial and ethnic socialization differently compared to later emerging adulthood (22-25 years) as children continued to mature and gain perspective (Min, Silverstein, & Lendon, 2012).

Several theorists have contributed ideas regarding socialization in emerging adulthood. In his psychosocial theory of development, Erikson (1950, as cited in Arnett,
implied that socialization was largely over during the young adulthood stage of intimacy vs. isolation. Keniston (1971, as cited in Arnett, 2007) viewed youth (described as period between adolescence and young adulthood) as a time of “refusal of socialization” and rejection of what the adult world has to offer to the young. Levinson (1978, as cited in Arnett, 2007) called the ages 17-33 “the novice phase” of development and emphasized the primacy of mentors as socialization influences during these years. Grusec (2002, as cited in Arnett, 2007) proposed that socialization involves three specific outcomes: (1) the development of self-regulation of emotion, thinking, and behavior, (2) the attainment of a culture’s standards, attitudes, and values, (3) and the development of role-taking skills, strategies for resolving conflicts and ways of reviewing relationships. This conceptualization makes clear those important developments in socialization take place in emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2007).

Emerging adulthood can be a pivotal time of intergenerational relations and the renegotiation of parents and young people’s relationship now as young people experience increased autonomy. Being away from home, encompassing increased social cognition and perspective taking abilities, and experiencing less parent control may facilitate emerging adult’s reevaluation of past experiences, influence the new ways they relate to their parents and gain appreciation for their parents’ perspective (Arnett, 2004; Hood, Riahinejad, & White, 1986; Kang, Okazaki, Abelmann, Kim-Prieto, & Lan, 2010). This may be associated to a more relaxed and amiable relationship between parents and their young adult children. Changes in this relationship result in a bidirectional attribute of socialization, wherein both parents and their children respond to the changes taking place
in the other (Arnett, 2004; Fingerman, 2000, as cited in Arnett, 2007). Arnett and Schwab’s (2012) study highlights the ways in which many emerging adults remain in close contact with their parents after they leave home. The authors (Arnett & Schwab, 2012) reported that 55% of emerging adults are talking, texting, e-mailing, or visiting the parents on a daily basis.

In their research, Juang et al. (2016) note several factors that impact the ways in which parental racial socialization is perceived by emerging adults. One factor is gender, as parents have greater expectations for females to preserve and continue cultural traditions than males (Dion & Dion, 2001; Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006) and males experience more racial discrimination than females (Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006). Nativity may also impact emerging adults’ perception of parental racial socialization. In Umana-Taylor and Yazedjian’s (2006) research, the distinct ways in which Latino mothers promoted cultural socialization to their children varied between those mothers that were foreign-born or U.S.-born. Even as children grow older and mature they continue to gain perspective and make meaning of their experiences growing up with immigrant parents even as emerging adults (Kang et al., 2010).

**Well-being.** The core developmental tasks of this life stage focuses on developing a sense of mastery and competence which is closely linked to self-esteem, and possibly aspects of adjustment and adaption. Emotional self-regulation improves substantially in the course of emerging adulthood, thus overall emotional well-being steadily rising early on in emerging adulthood (Schulenberg & Zarrett, as cited in Arnett, 2007). Due to historical and systemic racism within society, racial and ethnic minorities experience
discrimination and social barriers to realizing their dreams (Syed & Mitchell, 2013). Racial and ethnic minorities perceive greater discrimination which has been consistently linked to lower well-being, greater psychological distress, and poorer physical health (Okazaki, 2009; Paradies, 2006; Pascoe & Richman, 2009, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013). In Sharon’s (2016) research that investigated the markers of adulthood and well-being among emerging adults, the strongest predictor of both well-being and self-esteem for both genders was conceptualization and attainment in the domain of relational maturity. This is supported by other research that has repeatedly displayed the importance of feeling a sense of control in one’s life for emerging adults (Sharon, 2016).

Ethnic identity has been significantly linked to racial and ethnic socialization and well-documented within the research literature of racial and ethnic minorities. There is strong evidence and a consistent link which establishes the importance of ethnic identity with regard to positive psychological functioning and well-being (Quintana, 2007; Smith & Silva, 2011). There is collective research that states that ethnic identity during emerging adulthood indicates that ethnic identity exploration and commitment substantially increased over four years for Black, Latino, Asian American, and White college students (Syed & Azmita, 2009). Other research links strong ethnic identity to positive well-being, psychological health, and positive psychological adjustment (Phinney, 1989). Among these positive measures, researchers found strong ethnic identity resulting in greater life satisfaction, happiness, and self-esteem, as well as less loneliness and depression (Juang & Syed, 2010; Meeus, Iedema, Helsen, & Vollebergh, 1999, Schwartz et al., 2011, as cited in Sumner, Burrow, & Hill, 2015; Phinney &
Chavira, 1992; Phinney & Kohatsu, 1997). Yip, Seaton, and Sellers’s (2006) research study found that college students with diffused ethnic identities reported higher levels of depressive symptoms (which were their measure of psychological functioning) than their peers with achieved ethnic identities.

Present Study

This literature review has featured research related to the historical context and analysis of immigration, identity development, and socialization for Afro-Caribbeans and more recent Black immigrants in the US. The theories and empirical research related to the social constructs of racial and ethnic socialization, social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, and ethnic community), and subjective well-being were presented and critiqued. Existing research has never examined racial and ethnic socialization as a predictor to subjective well-being. To summarize, solid theoretical foundation and empirical research supports the notion that the racial and ethnic socialization variables influence social connectedness (i.e., mainstream, racial community, and ethnic community) and subjective well-being.

Given these points, understanding how Afro-Caribbean emerging adults absorb, understand, and reinterpret their racial and ethnic socialization messages communicated to them by their parents and/or guardians is important and crucial to the growing field of psychological research. Additionally, examining the relationship between racial and ethnic socialization and subjective well-being among emerging adults is exceptionally important as this developmental life stage is a time where all persons of different racial and ethnic backgrounds increase in autonomy and begin to consider issues related to
identity in a more meaningful way (Arnett, 2000; Arnett & Brody, 2008). Research investigating racial identity and prosocial development of African American college students finds that, as African American emerging adults endure the challenges of young adulthood and continue with the process of identity development, they may develop a strong desire to be involved in activities and organizations with other African Americans. These pursuits and groups tend to focus on African American issues and interests that deepen the black emerging adults’ knowledge about their racial heritage and racial group, and also encourage their contribution to their racial community (White-Johnson, 2012).

This finding may very well be true to for Afro-Caribbean emerging adults also.

Many studies have reported on the important role of social relationship variables (e.g., social connectedness, social acceptance, social support) in relation to subjective well-being (Yoon et al., 2008) and the positive impact it has on ethnic minorities facing discrimination in society (Wei et al., 2012). Inclusion of positive psychological functioning outcomes, such as subjective well-being will expand our understanding of the impact that racial and ethnic socialization play as a protective factor and as an aid in optimal psychological functioning. This study has the potential to produce new information regarding these processes of racial and ethnic socialization within Afro-Caribbean emerging adults. It hopes to bridge the fragmentation and information gaps in the research on socialization, social connectedness, and identity, bringing these fields into conversation to explore their significance in the experiences of an understudied Afro-Caribbean subset of the Black population of the United States.
The proposed study examines the unique developmental context of emerging adulthood and a diverse sample of Afro-Caribbean immigrants of various socio-cultural regions, and levels of education. It includes the experiences of those attending community college, four year colleges and beyond, and also those known as the “forgotten half” representative of those who do not attend college, but have entered the workforce (Katsiaficas et al., 2015; Rosenbaum, 2001, as cited in Syed & Mitchell, 2013). This study expands the field’s understanding of emerging adulthood, the unique challenges faced by first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults, and the ways this group recognizes racial and ethnic socialization messages and the important role it plays within this developmental period.

With this, social connectedness in mainstream society, social connectedness in the racial community, and social connectedness ethnic community were hypothesized to partially mediate the relationship of both racial socialization and ethnic socialization and subjective well-being. Partial mediation is demonstrated by the direct paths from racial socialization and ethnic socialization to subjective well-being, additional to the paths from racial socialization and ethnic socialization to subjective well-being through social connectedness in mainstream society, social connectedness in the racial community, and social connectedness ethnic community. This empirical study addresses the methodological gaps within socialization literature, advances literature regarding Afro-Caribbean emerging adult’s understanding of implicit and explicit socialization messages and family practices passed down through successive generations, highlights ways in which intergroup and intragroup relations are constructed, and draws attention to the
ways emerging adults articulate the ways that race and ethnicity were represented and communicated to them by their parents. Additionally, this study illuminates additional features of racial and ethnic socialization processes and the mechanisms through which they operate (Hughes et al., 2006). Identity, socialization, social connectedness, and subjective well-being are complex concepts and require further investigation. All things considered, the need for this research is significant as it expands the knowledge on racial and ethnic socialization messages of first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults and families, social connectedness, and subjective well-being.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants and Procedures

An a priori power analysis (Cohen, 1988) was conducted utilizing an on-line computer software that generated R code that computed the minimum sample size required to achieve a given level of power (Preacher & Coffman, 2006) and to detect sufficient overall model fit. It was determined that a minimum of 184 participants were needed to detect a minimum effect size of 0.3 detectable at 80% power at alpha = .05. Within the research literature, many scholars have provided several rules of thumb for sample size (Kahn, 2006). Generally, there are two categories of recommendations in terms of minimum sample size in Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). It has been suggested that a minimum of 100 participants are poor, 200 are fair, 300 are good and 500 or more are very good (Comrey & Lee, 1992).

Another useful method that was also employed in this study concerns the relation between sample size and model complexity (Kline, 2011). This rule of thumb is known as the N:q rule where the minimum sample size is thought of in terms of the ratios of cases (N) to the number of model parameters that require statistical estimates (Jackson, 2003; Kline, 2011). For example, several researchers suggested at minimum five participants per variable (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995; Gorsuch, 1983), while others have recommended that a 10:1 ratio of participants to estimated parameters in the model represents a
reasonable target to be tested on complex models (Arrindell & van der Ende, 1985; Velicer & Fava, 1998). An ideal sample size-to-parameters ratio was proposed 20:1 (Kline, 2011). This study’s most complex model, the partial mediation model contains 15 paths to be estimated. Resulting in the final sample of 307 exceeds the 20:1 target suggested by Kline (2011). Larger sample sizes provide greater power to detect lack of fit, compared to small sample size (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).

A total of 307 adults residing in various regions in the United States participated in the study. The sample consisted of 69 men (22.5%), 238 women (77.5%); ages ranged from 18 to 29 years (M = 23.25, SD = 3.77). Of the 307 participants from this ethnically diverse sample, 23.1% self-identified as Haitian or Haitian American, 20.6% as Jamaican or Jamaican American, 12.4% as Afro-Dominican or Afro-Dominican American, 12.4% as Multiethnic, 7.2% as other Afro-Caribbean Ethnicities, 6.5% as Afro-Puerto Rican, and the remaining 17.9% included Afro-Trinidadian, Afro-Trinidadian American, Barbadian American, Bahamian, Bahamian American, Afro-Cuban, Afro-Cuban American, Biracial and Multiracial, and unreported. Nativity status included 72 (23.5%) foreign-born and 234 (76.2%) US-born, and one unreported individual. Participants resided across the nation: 196 (63.8%) from the Northeast, 33 (8.1%) from the Midwest, 54 (17.2%) from the South, 9 (2.9%) from the West, 1 (.3%) from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and 14 (4.6%) unreported individuals. The sample consisted of 149 (48.5%) individuals reported completing some college, 77 (25.1%) current college student, 66 (21.5%) college graduate, and 15 (4.9%) high school/secondary school graduate. Approximately three-fifths of participants 85 (27.7%) reported that their father’s highest level of education was a high school diploma and similarly, a little over two-fifths of
participants 67 (21.8%) reported their mother’s highest level of education was a high school diploma. In addition, about 64 (20.8%) of participants reported their father’s level of education as a college graduate and 76 (24.8.2%) reported their mother’s level of education as a college graduate. Forty-nine (16.0%) of participants’ father had an advanced degree(s) and 59 (19.2%) of participants’ mother had an advanced degree(s).

Self-identified social class breakdown was as follows: 48 (15.6%) lower class, 98 (31.9%) lower middle class, 131 (42.7%) middle class, 29 (9.4%) upper middle class, and 1 (.3%) upper class. Less than one-fifth of participants, 44 (14.3%) participants, reported their approximate household income as under $20,000, 84 (27.4%) between $20,000-$40,000, 70 (22.8%) between $40,000-$60,000, 45 (14.7%) between $60,000-$80,000, and 64 (20.8%) above $80,000. As for religious identification, the majority of participants 237 (77.2%) reported their religion as Christian.

Table 1. Sample Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afro-Caribbean Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian/Haitian American</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican/Jamaican American</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidadian/Trinidadian American</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbadian American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamian/Bahamian American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro-Dominican/Afro-Dominican American</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro-Cuban/Afro-Cuban American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro-Puerto Rican</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Afro-Caribbean Ethnicities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Region of Residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generations in the US</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was born outside the US and moved to the US.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was born in the US but both parent(s) immigrated.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent and I were born in the US (other parent immigrated).</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents and I were born in the US.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents, parents, and I were born in the US.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great-grandparents and beyond were born in the US.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic/Muslim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/Secondary School Graduate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Student</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Formal Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Graduate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Graduate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/Secondary School Graduate</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Student</td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Father's Level of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>No Formal Education</th>
<th>Elementary School Graduate</th>
<th>Middle School Graduate</th>
<th>High School/Secondary School Graduate</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>College Student</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
<th>Advanced Degree(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Lower Class</th>
<th>Lower-Middle Class</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Upper-Middle Class</th>
<th>Upper Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family Income (in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20-40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40-60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80+</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Total sample = 307.*

Following IRB approval by the Loyola University Chicago IRB Review Committee, first and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adult (18-29 years of age) immigrants were enlisted from multiple recruitment sites with the goal of attaining a sufficiently diverse sample. Eligibility criteria for this research project were for participants who self-identified as Black and reported their ethnic group membership as Afro-Caribbean, Afro-Caribbean American, or a specific Caribbean country (e.g., Haitian/Haitian American; Afro-Cuban/Afro-Cuban American) between the ages of 18-29 years old. For the purposes of this study and its statistical findings, all participants
who reported being Afro-Caribbean, Afro-Caribbean American, or for example Haitian were all combined and classified as first and second-generation Afro-Caribbean immigrant emerging adults.

A web-based survey program called SNAP 10 was used to recruit participants from the general public. This software program allows researchers to post survey questionnaire for participants to complete electronically. The invitation and survey link were distributed nationally via online community bulletin boards (e.g., culture-focused organizations, psychology research sites, The Inquisitive Mind online research database, etc.), volunteer classifieds (e.g., Craigslist), social networking sites (e.g., Facebook), professional listservs (e.g., Caribbean Alliance of National Psychology Associations, Haitian Studies Association, Caribbean Psychology Students' Association, The Association of Black Psychologists, etc.), University and City College departments, Multicultural student offices, and student organizations, and personal and professional contacts (e.g., recruitment emails to family, friends, professional colleagues, etc.) over an 11-month period.

For those participants who elected to participate in the study, they completed an on-line consent form and survey questionnaire which included demographic information, racial socialization and ethnic socialization, social connectedness in mainstream society, racial community, and ethnic community, and subjective well-being (life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect) (see Appendix C). At the completion of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to email the researcher in order to be compensated $10 for their participation in the study. All participants were treated in
accordance to the American Psychological Association’s ethical guidelines (American Psychological Association, 2010).

A total of 404 participants responded to the online survey and 97 participants were removed due to missing 33% or more of the items on one of the scales or noticeably suspicious responses (e.g., “3’s” for all items). The number of participants with missing items was expected given the developmental level of the sample and the anonymity provided when completing an on-line survey. Therefore, a total of 307 participants remained for data analyses, and of this remaining data only seven variables had between 4.6 to 6.2% of missing items, all the remaining variables did not have any missing items. Since there was such a low percentage of missing data in the remaining data, for those variables with 6.2% or less missing items, a scale mean for all participants was imputed. Some researchers suggest that more than 10% (Bennett, 2001, as cited in Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2010) or 20% (e.g., Peng et al., 2006 as cited by Schlomer et al., 2010) of missing data becomes problematic as statistical analyses are likely to be biased (Schlomer et al., 2010).

**Instruments**

**Demographic Information**

Participants were asked to complete a single page of demographic information, including ethnicity, age, gender, year in school, mother’s and father’s education levels, religious affiliation, social class, and household income. A question regarding the generational status after immigration was asked of the respondents to determine basic descriptive information of the sample.
Racial and Ethnic Socialization

The Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS; Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007) was used to assess racial and ethnic socialization. Brown and Krishnakumar’s new conceptualization of racial and ethnic socialization were drawn from themes obtained from focus group discussions with eight African American undergraduate college students between the ages of 18 and 21 years old, existing definitions, and relevant theoretical discussions. This bilinear measure of racial socialization (13 items) and ethnic socialization (22 items) items drew originally from Stevenson’s et al. (2002) Teenagers Experiences of Racialization Scale (TERS), from content themes and modes transmission highlighted in Coard, Wallace, Stevenson, and Brotman’s (2004) qualitative analysis, and from the authors own conceptualization of racial and ethnic socialization (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007).

For this study, each item was scored on a 4-point frequency response format ranging from 0 (never) to 3 (always) with higher scores representing a higher level of racial socialization or ethnic socialization. The ARESS consisted of 13 items on the Racial Socialization Scale (RS) which assesses three dimensions: (a) racial barrier awareness, (b) coping with racism and discrimination, and (c) the promotion of cross-racial relationships. A sample item for racial socialization included: “My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that racism is present in America.” The ARESS Ethnic Socialization Scale was modified for adaptation with individuals of Afro-Caribbean descent. It consisted of 22 items and assessed five dimensions: (a) Afro-Caribbean cultural values, (b) Afro-Caribbean cultural embeddedness, (c) Afro-Caribbean history, (d) celebrating Afro-Caribbean heritage and (e) promotion of ethnic pride. A sample item
on this scale would read, “My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to have pride in my Afro-Caribbean culture.”

In the original study, the ARESS was administered to 218 African American adolescents. After factor analyzing the ARESS, it was concluded that most of items that loaded above .30 were found to be a good fit on the specified factors loading on Racial and Ethnic Socialization. Findings supported the multidimensional nature of racial and ethnic socialization and had moderate reliability (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). The Cronbach’s alpha for factors on racial socialization were .63 or higher and Cronbach’s alpha for factors on ethnic socialization were .66 or higher. In this study, total scores of racial socialization and ethnic socialization were used, and the Cronbach’s alphas were .84 for RS and .97 for ES.

**Social Connectedness in Mainstream Society, Social Connectedness in the Racial Community and Social Connectedness in the Ethnic Community Scales**

The Social Connectedness in Mainstream Society and Social Connectedness in the Ethnic Community Scales (SCMN and SCETH; Yoon, 2006) were used to measure these social connectedness in mainstream society and social connectedness in ethnic community. The SCMN and SCETH were two sets of five parallel items assessing respective connectedness to mainstream and ethnic communities. Their development was based on R.M. Lee and Robbins’s (1995) Social Connectedness Scale. The items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) with higher scores representing a greater sense of connectedness. A sample item of the SCMN reads, “I feel a sense of belonging to U.S. society” and a sample item of the SCETH reads “I feel connected with the _____ community.” It was recommended that
researchers should plug in a specific ethnic group in the blank. The recent scale validation studies supported construct, convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity within the samples of Mexican Americans and Asian international students (Yoon et al., 2012). In relation to other relevant constructs of acculturation, enculturation, ethnic identity, other group orientation, and general social connectedness, Yoon et al.’s (2012) investigation supported incremental validity of the SCMN and the SCETH in the prediction of well-being. Since race and ethnicity are seen as two distinct identities by Afro-Caribbeans’, scale items from SCETH were modified to measure a new construct, Social Connectedness in Racial Community (SCRAC). In this study, a total of three Social Connectedness (i.e., in Mainstream Society, Racial Community, and Ethnic Community) scales were used. The Cronbach’s alphas for the Yoon et al.’s (2012) sample were .94 for the SCMN and .95 for the SCETH. The Cronbach’s alphas for this study were .93 for the SCMN, .95 for the SCRAC, and .96 for the SCETH.

**Subjective Well-being**

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) (Diener et al., 1985) and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) were used to measure subjective well-being (SWB). These three scales together have been most widely used to measure SWB. The decision to use these three scales together was based on subjective well-being being conceptualized as “a person’s evaluative reactions to his or her life, either in terms of life satisfaction (cognitive evaluations) or affect (ongoing emotional reactions)” (Diener & Diener, 1995, p. 653).

The SWLS is a self-report measure intended to assess respondents’ global judgment of life satisfaction. Life satisfaction has been interpreted as *a perceived quality*
of life or the subjective appraisal of one’s life (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). As a subjective construct, life satisfaction differs according to one’s values and beliefs, which ultimately shape perceived “quality of life.” The total five items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Total SWLS scores ranged from 5 to 35, with higher scores being associated with greater life satisfaction. The mean of the raw score was used to determine the degree of satisfaction with higher scores indicating greater global satisfaction. Sample items include, “In most ways my life is close to my ideal,” “I am satisfied with my life.” SWLS has been found to demonstrate strong internal reliability with alpha coefficients ranging from .72 to .89, and have been positively correlated with other measures of subjective well-being and negatively associated with psychopathology scales (Diener et al., 1985). The Cronbach’s alpha for the present sample was .85.

The PANAS (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) is a 20-item scale intended to examine predominant affective states, or the emotional components of SWB, positive and negative affect (10 items each). Utilizing a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely), participants were asked how often they feel emotions such as excitement, anger, sadness, and happiness over a certain period of time. Scores range from 10-50 for each subscale with higher scores reflecting more frequent emotions in each category. Past research has shown that the PANAS has adequate construct validity (Watson et al., 1988) and acceptable reliability. The internal consistency reliability for scores from the Watson et al.’s sample was estimated to be .85 for positive affect and .80 for negative affect. The Cronbach’s alphas for the present sample were .88 for the PANAS-P and .89 for the PANAS-N.
Preliminary Analysis Procedure: Data Cleaning, Normality, Correlations

Soon after data was collected and cleaned, each subscale was evaluated to detect the normality of score distribution. All values of skewness and kurtosis were within acceptable range of <2 and <7, respectively, thus providing evidence of univariate normality within the data. The mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and Cronbach’s alpha for each scale were reported. Multivariate normality was confirmed by examining the bivariate combinations among the eight measured variables. Results of this analysis verified that linearity and homoscedasticity were present within the relationships. Thus, the bivariate correlations between the eight measured variables were reported as Pearson $r$ values.

Main Analysis Procedure: Test for Mediation in Path Analysis

The hypothesized relationships were evaluated and analyzed by using SPSS and LISREL 8.8 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2001). This analysis determined if a significant basic relationship existed between social connectedness and other variables within the study such as racial socialization, ethnic socialization, and subjective well-being. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used in the main analysis to test and estimate relations between the study variables (i.e., racial and ethnic socialization, subjective well-being, and social connectedness). The maximum likelihood method in the LISREL 8.8 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2001) software package was used.

Baron and Kenny (1986) assert that there are four necessary conditions that must exist in order to establish the presence of mediation. First, the researcher determines whether the predictors (RACSOC & ETHSOC) are related to the outcome variable (SWB). Second, the researcher determines whether the predictors (RACSOC &
ETHSOC) are related to the mediators (SCMN, SCRAC, & SCETH). Third, the researcher determines whether the mediators (SCMN, SCRAC, & SCETH) are related to the outcome variable (SWB) when controlling for the effect of the predictors (RACSOC & ETHSOC) on the outcome variable (SWB). The last condition involves the establishment of mediation, in which the effects of the predictors (RACSOC & ETHSOC) on the outcome variable (SWB) is significantly reduced when the mediators (SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH) added to the model (Frazier, Tix, & Barron, 2004).

In the pursuance of answering the primary research question, four different models were tested (see Figure 1): a partially mediated model for both racial socialization and ethnic socialization (Model A); a fully mediated model for both racial socialization and ethnic socialization in which the two direct paths from racial socialization and ethnic socialization to SWB were constrained to zero (Model B); a partially mediated model for racial socialization but fully mediated for ethnic socialization model (Model C); and a partially mediated model for ethnic socialization but fully mediated for racial socialization model (Model D). Included in these four models was the latent variable Subjective Well-Being (SWB) which contained three measured indicators (SWLS, PANASP, and PANASN) where three factor loadings and three error terms were estimated. In addition, all the observed variables: predictors (i.e., RACSOC and ETHSOC) mediators (i.e., SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH) each had only one measured variable with standardized factor loadings of 1 and error variance of 0.

In the specified hypothesized model (see Figure 1), social connectedness in mainstream society (SCMN), social connectedness in the racial community (SCRAC), and social connectedness ethnic community (SCETH) were hypothesized to partially
mediate the relationships of both racial socialization (RACSOC) and ethnic socialization (ETHSOC) and subjective well-being (SWB). Partial mediation (Model A) in the figure was demonstrated by the direct paths from RACSOC and ETHSOC to SWB, in addition to the indirect paths via SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH. An alternative model of complete mediation (Model B) was tested. This model included only the paths from RACSOC and ETHSOC to SWB through SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH without direct paths from RACSOC and ETHSOC to SWB. Another alternative model of partial mediation (Model C) was demonstrated by the direct path from RACSOC to SWB in addition to the indirect paths via SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH; the direct path from ETHSOC to SWB was constrained to zero. This last alternative model of partial mediation (Model D) was demonstrated by the direct path from ETHSOC to SWB in addition to the indirect paths via SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH, and the direct path from RACSOC to SWB was constrained to zero. Additionally, considering the theory of social connectedness which evidences the potential influence of the global construct of social connectedness on specific connectedness to mainstream, ethnic, and now racial communities, connectedness to the three communities were allowed covary (Lee et al., 2001; Yoon et al., 2011).
Note. The hypothetical model displays all study variables and estimated parameters for the partial mediation model for both racial and ethnic socialization (Model A), the full mediation model (Model B), the partially mediated model for racial socialization but fully mediated for ethnic socialization model (Model C); and the partially mediated model for ethnic socialization but fully mediated for racial socialization model (Model D). Filled lines represent path coefficients estimated in all four models. Dotted lines represent path coefficients estimated in select models. When a parameter is only included in a select model(s) the path is marked with the corresponding letter. The rectangles depict observed variables and the oval depicts a latent construct.

Figure 1. The hypothetical model

In order to assess the “fit” of the estimated models and to determine to what degree the model fits the data, several fit indices were used. Model estimation analyzed the four hypothesized structural models for overall goodness-of-fit to the data. Metrics for the structural models were verified by examining the chi-square ($\chi^2$) difference test for each hypothesized model, as well as a combination of three absolute and comparative fit indices was used to estimate the overall goodness-of-fit to the data fit. The Bentler Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is an incremental fit index that measures the relative improvement in the fit of the researcher’s model over that of a baseline model (Kline, 2011) with a good fitting model has CFI $\geq .90$ and .95 representing a best fitting model (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) is a measure of
the mean absolute correlation residual, an acceptable fit the threshold was suggested
SRMR ≤ .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Finally, the Root Mean Square Error of
Approximation (RMSEA) is scaled as both a badness-of-fit index where a value of zero
indicates the best fit and a parsimony-adjusted index that does not approximate a central
chi-square distribution (Kline, 2011). It is suggested that a value of .05 represents a close
fit; .05 < RMSEA ≤ .08 represents “reasonably close fit”, and RMSEA < .10 represents
an acceptable fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; MacCallum et al., 1996).

Next, the fit of the four models were compared and assessed by a sequence chi-
square difference scores (Δχ²). These scores were calculated by subtracting the chi-square
(χ²) of the more complex model (i.e., Model A) from the chi-square (χ²) of the more
parsimonious model. A significance test for the chi-square (χ²) helped determine if a
significant decrease in fit was present between models. The parsimony principle
maintains that if given two models similar fit to the same data, the simpler model is
preferred, assuming the model is theoretically plausible (Kline, 2011). The preferred
“best fitting” model was then selected on accounted of the overall goodness of fit, the
comparative fit between the four models, and the parsimony principle.

Finally, the most parsimonious model’s parameters were examined and reported.
As part of the model’s evaluation, unstandardized path coefficients were used to analyze
the statistical significance of each parameter and standardized path coefficients were
calculated for each parameter. Following this, the proportion of variance and the unique
proportion of variance was computed and reported, and finally the indirect effect of the
mediators SCMN, SCRAC, SCETH was computed and tested the statistical significance
of the indirect effect by using the Sobel test.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis: Normality, Frequencies, Correlations

Before main analyses were conducted, the mean scores, standard deviations, skewness, kurtosis, Cronbach’s alphas, and zero-order correlations for the Adolescent Racial Socialization Scale (RACSOC), Adolescent Ethnic Socialization Scale (ETHSOC), Social Connectedness in Mainstream Society Scale (SCMN), Social Connectedness in Racial Community Scale (SCRAC), Social Connectedness in Ethnic Community Scale (SCETH), Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) were calculated (see Table 2). Univariate normality was established for all variables as the degree of skewness and kurtosis were considered acceptable (skew < 2.0 and kurtosis < 7.0) to meet assumptions of normality. Therefore, all nine variables were included in all the following analyses.

As expected, the two socialization variables (RACSOC and ETHSOC) indicated (a) highly positive correlations with each other, \( r = .70 \) and (b) slightly positive correlations with SWB measures, \( r \) ranging from .13 to .29, with the exception that was not a statistically significant bivariate correlations between PANAS-N (SWB measure) and both the socialization (RACSOC and ETHSOC) measures. The bivariate correlations between three social connectedness measures (SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH) indicated slightly to moderately positive correlations with each other, \( r \) ranging from .13 to .42,
with the exception of a non-significant correlation between the SCMN and SCETH measures. SWB measures indicated (a) mixed results of slightly positive correlations with each other, \( r \) ranging from -.24 to .37, and (b) a non-statistically significant bivariate correlation the PANAS-P and PANAS-N measures.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix, Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness, Kurtosis, and Cronbach’s Alphas for Study Variables

<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>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RACSOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ETHSOC</td>
<td>.667**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SCMN</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SCRAC</td>
<td>.252**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SCETH</td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SWLS</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.151**</td>
<td>.163**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PANAS-P</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.210**</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PANAS-N</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.124*</td>
<td>-.138*</td>
<td>-.242**</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean    | 37.18 | 98.06 | 23.07 | 26.40 | 28.48 | 23.11 | 39.08 | 20.92 |
Standard Deviation | 7.52  | 27.77 | 7.03  | 6.79  | 6.79  | 6.63  | 7.01  | 8.15  |
Skewness  | -.277 | -.161 | -.401 | -.843 | -1.01 | -.309 | -.596 | .812  |
Kurtosis   | -.430 | -.830 | -.474 | .311  | .484  | -.509 | .383  | .191  |
Cronbach’s alpha | .84   | .95   | .93   | .95   | .96   | .85   | .88   | .89   |

Note. \( N = 307. \) * \( p < .05. \) ** \( p < .01. \) (2-tailed)

Main Analysis

Structural equation modeling (SEM) analyses were examined using the maximum likelihood method in the LISREL 8.8 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2001). Prior to conducting the SEM analyses, statistical assumptions were examined. The eight study variables demonstrated normal distribution (see Table 2). Dubin-Watson tests supported independence of residuals of endogenous variables (i.e. SCMN, SCRAC, SCETH, SWLS, PANAS-P, and PANAS-N), with test statistics ranging from 1.91 to 2.17 (values within the range of 1.5- 2.5 indicate independence observations of studentized residuals;
Garson, 2012). An examination of scatterplots revealed homoscedasticity of these variable’s residuals.

In analyzing the hypothesized meditational effect, four hypothetical path models of full versus partial mediation were tested to find the best fitting model: a partially mediated model for both racial socialization (RACSOC) and ethnic socialization ETHSOC (Model A), a fully mediated model for both RACSOC and ETHSOC in which the two direct paths from RACSOC and ETHSOC to Subjective Well-Being (SWB) were constrained to zero (Model B), a partially mediated for RACSOC but fully mediated for ETHSOC model in which the direct path from ETHSOC to SWB was constrained to zero (Model C), and a fully mediated for RACSOC but partially mediated for ETHSOC model in which the direct path from RACSOC to SWB is constrained to zero (Model D). The overall goodness-of-fit were examined for the four hypothetical models. Three primary fit indices (see Table 3) were used to test model fit: comparative fit index (CFI; .9 for acceptable fit, best if .95 or greater) (Hu & Bentler, 1999), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; best if ≤.08 or less) (Hu & Bentler, 1999), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; .05 represents a close fit; .05 < RMSEA ≤ .08 represents “reasonably close fit”; RMSEA < .10 is an acceptable fit) (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; MacCallum et al., 1996).

Results from the path analyses indicated that all four models: Models A, B, C, and D did produce adequate fit indices (see Table 3). In the case of the $\chi^2$ statistic, smaller chi-square ($\chi^2$) values and larger p-values reflect better goodness-of-fit. Since the $\chi^2$ is sensitive to sample size, the information that it provides is limited to larger data sets regarding the fit of the model. In order to address potential sample size bias in $\chi^2$ a $\chi^2$/df
ratio was calculated. Smaller ratios reflect better-fitting models, for example ratios approaching 2 are considered excellent and ratios from 2-5 are acceptable. All four models: Model A $\chi^2/df= 4.24$, Model B $\chi^2/df= 3.97$, Model C $\chi^2/df= 3.91$ and Model D $\chi^2/df= 4.19$ and did indicate adequate overall absolute and relative fit to the data.

Table 3. Summary of Model Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Overall $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CI for RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>42.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.070-.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model B</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.069-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model C</td>
<td>43.04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.066-.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model D</td>
<td>46.08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.071-.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 307. CFI = comparative fit index; NNFI = non-normed fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval; Model A= partially mediated for both RACSOC and ETHSOC; Model B= fully mediated for both RACSOC and ETHSOC; Model C= partially mediated for RACSOC and fully mediated for ETHSOC; Model D= fully mediated for RACSOC and partially mediated for ETHSOC.

Next, the four competing models were compared and assessed by analyzing a sequence chi-square difference scores ($\Delta \chi^2$) in order to determine the best fitting model for the data. The incremental fit indexes also known as the comparative fit indexes indicate that the competing models be nested within the least restrictive model (Kline, 2011), Model A. Within the comparative fit test, each comparison was produced by subtracting the $\chi^2$ and df of the more parsimonious models from the $\chi^2$ and df of the least parsimonious model. Specifically Model A (the least parsimonious model) was compared with the nested models of Model B, C, and D (more parsimonious models) and the results
for all three comparative fit tests are displayed in Table 4. As shown below in Table 4, non-significant chi-square differences between Model A and B, $\Delta \chi^2 (2, N= 307) = 5.24$, $p = .07$, between Model A and C, $\Delta \chi^2 (1, N= 307) = .61$, $p = .43$, between Model A and D, $\Delta \chi^2 (1, N= 307) = .365$, $p = .06$ indicated that adding direct paths from RACSOC and ETHSOC to SWB (Model A) did not significantly improve the model fit.

Table 4. Comparative Fit Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Comparison</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model A &amp; Model B</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model A &amp; Model C</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model A &amp; Model D</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model C was decided to be the best fitting model in consideration of the following points: (a) the significant direct effect between RACSOC and SWB in Model C, in spite of the marginally non-significant p-value for this path in Model A (b) the relatively large p-value for the chi-square difference test for A versus C, contrary to the other two comparisons (A vs. B and A vs. D both almost reaching statistical significance), and (c) the principle of parsimoniousness (C being more parsimonious than A). Given these results, social connectedness in mainstream society (SCMN), social connectedness in racial community (SCRAC), and social connectedness in ethnic community (SCETH) only partially mediated the relationship between RACSOC and SWB, but fully mediated the relationship between ETHSOC and SWB (see Figure 2).
Note. N= 307. All values are standardized. *p < .05. ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Figure 2. The structural model

For Model C, RACSOC showed a statically significant relationship with SCMN (unstandardized path coefficient=-.079, z= -2.14, SE=.37, p=.03, standardized path coefficient = -.12.) and WB (unstandardized path coefficient=.01, z= 2.25, SE=.05, p=.02, standardized path coefficient = .11), but a slightly negative and non-statically significant relationship with SCRAC (unstandardized path coefficient=.04, z= -1.31, SE=.49, p=.19, standardized path coefficient = -.08) and a slightly positive non-significant relationship with SCETH (unstandardized path coefficient=.04, z=.11, SE=.42, p=.90, standardized path coefficient = .01). ETHSOC showed a positive and statically significant relationship with SCMN (unstandardized path coefficient=3.13, z= 8.01, SE=.39, p<.00, standardized path coefficient = .46) and SCETH (unstandardized path coefficient=1.45, z= 3.47, SE=.42, p=.00, standardized path coefficient = .21), but a slightly negative and non-statically significant relationship with SCRAC (unstandardized path coefficient=-.82, z= -1.64, SE=.49, p=.09, standardized path coefficient = -.10).
SWB showed a statically significant relationship with SCMN (unstandardized path coefficient = .05, z = 6.89, SE = .01, p < .00, standardized path coefficient = .34) and SCETH (unstandardized path coefficient = .04, z = 5.85, SE = .01, p < .00, standardized path coefficient = .29), but a non-statically significant relationship with SCRAC (unstandardized path coefficient = -.00, z = -.23, SE = .01, p = .82, standardized path coefficient = -.01).

An examination of the factor loadings showed for Model C that PANAS-N did not load significantly on the latent variable SWB while SWLS and PANAS-P did. The predictor and mediator variables included in the model were based on single indicators and therefore not subjected to measurement modeling. When examining the variance of the latent predictor variables, the correlation between the RACSOC and ETHSOC factors was moderate (.33 (z = 6.39)), indicating that the two factors shared about 11% of their variance (.33 x .33 = .11). These findings demonstrate that RACSOC and ETHSOC shared a moderate amount of variance. The proportion of variance in SWB explained by SCMN, SCRAC, and SCETH was as follows. SCMN explained 19.4% of the variance in SWB, SCRAC explained 2% of the variance in SWB, and SCETH explained 4.5% of the variance in SWB.

Next, a Sobel test was calculated to determine whether the indirect effect is statistically significant. A Sobel test revealed that the indirect effects of ETHSOC on SWB through SCMN and ETHSOC on SWB through SCETH were both statistically significant. Indicating that both SCMN and SCETH were significant mediators of the influence of ETHSOC on SWB, but that SCRAC was not a statistically significant mediator. Also, a Sobel test revealed that the indirect effects of RACSOC on SWB
through SCMN were statistically significant. Indicating that SCMN was a significant mediator of the influence of RACSOC on SWB, but that SCRAC and SCETH were non-statistically significant, indicating that both SCRAC and SCETH were not significant mediators. Thus, the percentage of mediation accounts for (\(-0.036\))/(0.076) = 0.474, or 47.4% of the influence of RACSOC on SWB. These results support the conclusion that SCMN is a statistically significantly mediator of the influence of RACSOC on SWB.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

The present study explored the nature and complexity of the relationship between racial and ethnic socialization and subjective well-being in a sample of first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults. This study’s purpose was to propose and test a conceptual model of racial and ethnic socialization and subjective well-being in relation to three mediators: social connectedness to mainstream society, racial, and ethnic communities. As in other recent research studies (Blackmon & Thomas, 2014; Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2009; Brown et al., 2010; Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2014), this study utilized separate measures of racial and ethnic socialization, to avoid the conceptual and methodological problem of conflating these into a single construct for measurement. Additionally, both variables were included in the study to predict social connectedness and subjective well-being variables in favor of illuminating the unique contributions by racial socialization and ethnic socialization. Given that in this study the correlation between racial and ethnic socialization was relatively high (r = .67), the need to control for each construct’s effect on the other endogenous variables within the study was important. Finally, this study sought to expand mental health theory by examining the relationship between racial and ethnic socialization and subjective well-being. Instead of using a pathological measure, this study’s use of a positive measure of mental health such as subjective well-being hopes to deepen the field’s knowledge of the
full spectrum of psychological functioning and incorporates a collective perspective where social ties obligations are more relevant to well-being than is individual happiness (Lent, 2004).

**Implications of Primary Analysis Results**

The results partially supported the study’s hypotheses. Findings indicated that social connectedness in mainstream society significantly mediated the effects of racial socialization on subjective well-being (SWB), yet social connectedness in racial and ethnic communities did not significantly mediate when all three of the mediators were examined together. Resulting in 47.4% of the total effect of racial socialization and SWB is directed social connectedness in mainstream society. Interestingly, though the zero-order correlations between racial socialization and social connectedness in mainstream society was significantly positive, yet this positive association vanished with the inclusion of ethnic socialization and after controlling for each of the predictors effect in the structural equation model. In fact, racial socialization was negatively related to social connectedness in mainstream society, as messages that teach emerging adults about racial barriers, coping with race-related discrimination, and promoting cross-racial relationships increased, individuals felt less connected to and accepted in mainstream society.

This new finding is noteworthy, considering that a sizable amount of research has traditionally focused on acculturation and immigrant’s engagement with mainstream American culture (Joseph et al., 2013). The experience for Afro-Caribbeans’ differ from many other immigrant populations in that they face specific racial discrimination as Blacks (Aman, 2002, as cited in Thornton et al., 2013). For example, social connectedness in mainstream society significantly mediated the effects between
acculturation and SWB in a sample of Korean, first-generation immigrants (Yoon et al., 2008) and also in a sample of Asian American students (Yoon et al., 2012). Korean-immigrant and Asian American acculturation and social connectedness in mainstream society evidenced a significant positive relationship, in contrast to this study. The difference in acculturation and social connectedness across these different immigrant and non-white American populations, however, highlights the differences between Asian and Black immigrants’ experience of acceptance and belonging in mainstream society and by difference experiences on discrimination.

Other research on mainstream social connectedness’s impact on negative measures of psychological functioning among black students resulted in findings that provide an inverse compliment to the present study’s measure of social connectedness and positive measures. That study reported that the association between perceived discrimination and depressive symptoms was the strongest among Black integrationist students (i.e., those who reported a strong desire to connect with American mainstream society), suggesting that these students were significantly affected because they sought to seek connection but experienced rejection from the group of individuals from the mainstream society (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007).

Because in the present study, higher degree of racial socialization among first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean adults bore a statistically significant connection to subjective well-being, the current study is situated among other studies that find racial socialization to be a protective factor. In recent studies with adolescents, preparation for bias has been found to demonstrate more effective strategies for coping with discrimination and more likely to describe proactive strategies such as seeking support
and utilizing direct problem-solving strategies (Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Given these results, the significant direct effect between racial socialization and subjective well-being highlight how racial socialization may play a more important role than ethnic socialization on the subjective well-being of first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbean emerging adults.

The negative association between racial socialization and social connectedness in mainstream society highlights the importance of racial socialization and the ways Black parents prepare their children to face the devaluation of their own worth and future potential in school and future careers (McAdoo, 2002). Afro-Caribbeans now residing in the United States find a society racially unlike their native countries that feature Black demographic majority and Black leadership in all aspects of society. These immigrants find themselves denied privileges and cultural status they previously enjoyed, and, like African Americans, belonging to a minority racial group in the US (Hine-St. Hilaire, 2006). The process of assimilation into a racialized American society becomes part of the overall Black American narrative, where assimilation into American society introduces Blacks to a heightened racial consciousness (Shaw-Taylor, 2007).

Heightened racial consciousness is especially true for second-generation Afro-Caribbeans who unlike their first-generation parents lack a distinctive accent and tend to identify as American Black adopting speech, dress styles, ways of behavior (Hine-St. Hilaire, 2006), and taking on the cultural form of African American culture in order to “become” American (Joseph et al., 2013). In addition, they believe that distancing themselves from African Americans has little effect on the way they are treated by Whites (Hine-St. Hilaire, 2006). This group’s engagement in African American culture
was stronger among those experiencing less cultural race-related stress and that becoming behaviorally involved with African Americans they may learn adaptive strategies for managing experiences or racial discrimination (Joseph et al., 2013; Vickerman, 1999, as cited in Joseph et al., 2013).

African American and Black immigrant parents must help prepare their children to cope with racism their entire lives, particularly in mainstream society. Black children in the US develop a “double consciousness” which describes the individual sensation of feeling as though one’s identity is divided into several parts (Dubois, 1903), where the “call for the Black American only to be American required an erasure of the self in a world that already collapsed Americanness into whiteness and white views of the self, including of the black self” which they then become invisible when viewed within a White lens (Gordon, 2007, p. 80). This reflects the inclusion/exclusion dilemma where Blacks feel both detached from and attached to mainstream culture and therefore attain the ability to “code switch” among different contexts and communities (McAdoo, 2002). The ability to “code switch” in various situations enables children to understand that certain behaviors are acceptable only in specific situations. The skill at being bicultural is essential and through the transmission of racial socialization messages from parent to child, children are able to function effectively amid the complexities that exist within society (McAdoo, 2002). Given the positive psychological impact of racial socialization, the use and incorporation of racial socialization within a therapeutic setting can assist in the specific tools of motivation interviewing such as building rapport and information gathering, and the formulation of culturally-relevant interventions and strengths-based
approaches that highlight the strengths that already exist within the Afro-Caribbean
family and community (Brown, Blackmon, Schumacher, & Urbanski, 2013).

This notion could be understood by Charles (2003) explanation of being “black
twice” where Black immigrants cannot escape being black in the US due to
commonalities of black histories. The author explains that

at the root of the process of reshaping and expanding meanings of blackness by
immigrants of African ancestry in the United States. The identities and negotiated
presence that emerge from such a process are displayed in public and private…It
is in this way that the presence of black immigrants contributes to the building of
black resistance and the development of new forms of black consciousness. It is a
black subjectivity that exhibits a tenuous, tension-filled, and anxious relationship
with African America. At the same time, however, bridges are being built
between the African American and black immigrant communities. (Charles, 2003,
p. 173)

This could be specified to Afro-Caribbeans who hold dual minority statuses and
encounter dual stigmatization, in terms of bias regarding their ethnic and racial group.

There is research that documents that being dual stigmatized may hold negative
implications for one’s psychological well-being (Ramos, Jaccard, & Guilamo-Ramos,
2003), likewise Afro-Caribbeans’ experience of dual stigmatization may have
implications for the positive psychological outcomes such as subjective well-being.

Despite all of these issues and experiences of alienation and disenfranchisement
particularly on account of Black racial identity in mainstream society, racial socialization
evidenced a statistically significant direct positive relationship with SWB. It appears that
Afro-Caribbean emerging adults considered racial socialization as a strength that
positively impacts and increases one’s subjective well-being. These findings are
consistent with the ways in which racial socialization has been widely documented in
research and predominantly found to be a protective factor for African American
children, adolescents, and young adults against the harmful effects of discrimination and also linked to various indicators of adaptive social-emotional development such as decreased depressive symptoms and increased anger management and control (Hughes et al., 2006).

There are a number of unique factors that may impact Afro-Caribbeans sense of subjective well-being. The experiences of Afro-Caribbeans who voluntarily immigrated to the US and who may have arrived with substantial social capital (Thornton et al., 2013) stand in stark contrast to African Americans who bear a legacy of forced passage the United States, and generations of enslavement within the nation they call home. These differences certainly shape the way that Afro-Caribbeans’ receiving messages about racial barrier awareness and the promotion of cross-cultural relationships (i.e., encouraging relationships with individuals of other races), contributing to their sense of hope, optimistic beliefs in what America has to offer, and feeling that they have a greater sense of control in achieving educational, financial, occupational and social advancement (Hine-St. Hilaire, 2006; Thornton et al., 2013). Additionally, even though Afro-Caribbeans face racism, they experience White bias and preferential treatment where they are portrayed as a “model minority” and perceived more favorably by the mainstream public (Gordon, 2007; Joseph et al., 2013; Shaw-Taylor, 2007; Thornton et al., 2013). This narrative is that Afro-Caribbeans possess distinct attitudes and traditional work values from their African American peers that support their ability to succeed in America despite structural barriers or racial prejudice and discrimination (Shaw-Taylor, 2007).

For Afro-Caribbeans it appears that ethnic socialization’s relationship with SWB is clear and unambiguous, generally supporting this study’s hypothesis. Social
connectedness in mainstream and ethnic communities fully mediated the relationship between ethnic socialization and SWB. The association between ethnic socialization and SWB can be explained completely in terms of the indirect effects of social connectedness in both mainstream and ethnic communities. This finding suggests that if Afro-Caribbean’s sense of belonging in mainstream and ethnic communities can be strengthened, their sense of well-being might also increase regardless of their level of ethnic socialization. These findings are in line with Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) social identity theory that suggests that when individuals experience prejudice from out-group members, to protect one’s well-being is to strengthen connections with one’s ethnic group. This was supported by recent findings that identified ethnic social connectedness as a moderator, where high ethnic social connectedness weakened the association between perceived racial microaggressions and anxiety symptoms (Liao et al., 2016).

Additionally, other research studies highlight the positive strength of closeness to one’s own ethnic community, a social support network that was described as a mediator and moderator within Harrell’s (2000) model of racism was found to mitigate the impact of racism on psychological outcomes, and within Hunter and Schmidt’s (2010) anxiety model a sense of belonging to one’s ethnic group (e.g., ethnic identity, extended family networks) was suggested as a buffer to anxiety symptoms in Black Americans.

The present study’s results demonstrate that as ethnic socialization messages increase one’s sense of belongingness to ethnic communities is strengthened. There are several possible explanations for this. Black immigrant and African American parents share similar motivations for transmitting socialization messages, but the nature and content of these messages reflect subtle distinctions that may have implications for the
racial and ethnic identity development of Afro-Caribbean immigrant youth (Joseph & Hunter, 2011). For recent immigrant parents the extent to which they communicate socialization messages are guided by their own experience. Accordingly, socialization about ethnicity occurs naturally as these families partake in the routines and practices of their home country, native language, and traditions (cultural socialization) (Barr & Neville, 2008; Hughes et al., 2006). Another study supporting this idea argues that ethnic identification begins with the application of a label to oneself in a cognitive process of self-categorization, involving not only a claim to membership in a group or groups or categories. Such self-definitions also carry affective meaning, implying a psychological bond with others that tends to serve psychologically protective functions. (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, p. 151)

As a result, the relationship between ethnic socialization and social connectedness to ethnic community should come as no surprise. As parents pass down cultural values and beliefs, Afro-Caribbean heritage and history to their children the more connected they feel to their ethnic community.

Afro-Caribbean parents’ primary focus on ethnic socialization messages may be one of the reasons why when examining both the relationships of racial and ethnic socialization with subjective well-being, social connectedness to one’s racial community was not statistically significant. It is important to also note that in comparison to racial socialization, the mean for the ethnic socialization scale was much higher indicating that they endorse ethnic socialization messages at a higher degree. Accordingly, clinicians should assist Afro-Caribbean clients in cultivating cultural competence in mainstream, Black, and Afro-Caribbean culture in hopes of deepening their connectedness to the three communities.
As well, the increase of one’s connectedness to mainstream society is positively impacted by the ethnic socializations they receive. This is also highlighted in the nature and types of messages that Afro-Caribbean parents may communicate to their children. Specifically, along with encouraging Afro-Caribbean cultural values, history, heritage, and promotion of ethnic pride, it could be that Afro-Caribbean parents engage in a type of ethnic-racial socialization called egalitarianism and silence about race (Hughes et al., 2006) or coined mainstream socialization by Boykin and Toms (1985) where they explicitly encourage individual qualities over racial group membership or avoid any mention to race in discussions with children (Spencer, 1983). This socialization strategy which reflects the perspectives of many immigrant parents and is prevalent across multiple ethnic groups orients youth towards developing skills needed to thrive in settings that are part of the mainstream or dominant culture instead of orienting youth towards their native culture or minority status (Hughes et al., 2006). In a similar study comparing egalitarian attitudes, it was found that first-generation Black immigrants were more likely to minimize racism reporting that they did not view their minority status as an impediment to their social mobility (Bobb & Clarke, 2001). Black immigrant parent’s minimization of racial experiences in majority countries may have implications for the type of racial and ethnic socialization messages communicated to their children (Joseph & Hunter, 2011). This understanding is extremely important given that parents’ views regarding race and racial group membership predict their socialization practices (Scottham & Smalls, 2009).

Alongside other previous research studies that analyzed the complex association between racial and ethnic socialization and mental health, this study contributes unique
and meaningful discoveries to the growing area of racial and ethnic socialization research. In addition, it utilizes a mediational model which features the complex relationship between racial and ethnic socialization, social connectedness, and subjective well-being. This present study has taken the first step toward understanding the ways in which socialization messages play an important role to the positive psychological outcome of Afro-Caribbean emerging adults.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study provides important findings and represents the advancement of understanding racial and ethnic socialization, but has distinct limitations. First, although Afro-Caribbean participants were recruited across the US from diverse demographic backgrounds, the generalizability of this present study’s finding may be limited taking in consideration the methods and locations from which these participants were recruited. For example, there was a disproportion between the number of women and men (77.5% of the participants identified as women), and between first-generation and second-generation Afro-Caribbean immigrants (only 9.1% of participants stated that they were born outside of the US) in the study’s sample. In addition given this present study’s demographic variables, the outcomes for the model within the main analysis might differ in regards to statistical significance or size of path coefficients. Unfortunately, a reduced sample size did not allow for the use of invariance tests. In result, disaggregating subgroups and performing multigroup comparisons of the demographic variables were not carried out (Kline, 2011). Second, this sample consists of heterogeneous groups of Afro-Caribbeans with regard to ethnicity and nativity, therefore within-group variability
(e.g., British colonized Caribbean vs. Spanish colonized Caribbean countries) among this sample should be given due consideration in understanding the findings of this study.

Third, while online surveys have proven to be a beneficial tool in expanding the geographic boundaries of data collection, reducing human data entry error rates, and increasing participants’ feeling of privacy, it also entails sampling biases. This is caused by, excluding participants who do not have access to the internet or who may have limited access to high-speed internet which then impacts respondent’s familiarity with internet technology and features, low response rates, and language-related communication difficulties that in fact is evident in research with immigrant populations (Kraut, Olson, Banaji, Bruckman, Cohen, & Couper, 2004; Suarez-Balcazar, Balcazar, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2009). Fourth, some recruitment methods (e.g., recruiting from academic institutions, psychological research sites and professional listservs) may influence the saturation of more educated individuals in the sample. In addition to this, the study design utilized referral sampling. This recruitment strategy could have potentially led to self-selection bias by oversampling family and friends who may have experienced similar socialization messages and hold similar values and attitudes. Since many participants were recruited from academic institutions, professional sites and listservs, referrals, and personal relationships primarily on the East Coast, the results may have limited implications for Afro-Caribbeans who do not live in this or other large metropolitan areas (Hunter, 2008). Consequently, study results might have been amplified and future studies should investigate the generalizability of these results.

Fifth, the use of only self-report measures raises some questions and highlights participants’ susceptibility to retrospective recall bias (e.g., participants might
imprecisely report a higher amount of racial socialization messages than they actually experienced), and possible inaccuracy between participants’ responses and their true values and attitudes. In addition, this study investigated the socialization provided only by primary caregivers. Future studies should include the relative contribution and outcomes of multiple agents (i.e., parents, siblings, extended family members, etc.) of racial and ethnic socialization in order to understand the complexities and provide an in depth and more comprehensive portrait of racial and ethnic socialization messages within Black families across different setting, environments (e.g., home, school, community), contexts, and countries (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown et al., 2009; Priest et al., 2014). This is supported by researchers acknowledging the importance of recognizing that parental behaviors only represent one aspect of the racial and ethnic socialization process, and racial and ethnic socialization messages are transmitted from a number of socialization agents which then provide a broader perspective on racial and ethnic socialization practices (Lesane-Brown et al., 2005).

Sixth, within this present study of racial and ethnic socialization messages transmitted to Afro-Caribbean emerging adults was measured employing a modified version of a racial and ethnic socialization scale originally designed for African American adolescents (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). Unfortunately, the modification of this scale, limits our ability to fully understand the nature of racial and ethnic socialization within a different ethnic group and developmental stage. Another limitation of the ARESS scale is whether the scale items are actually measuring racial and ethnic socialization. The ARESS scale items does not provide specific information on the ways messages were “encouraged” or “taught.” For instance, the scale item “my maternal/
paternal caregiver encourages me to be proud of the accomplishments of Afro-Caribbeans communicates the caregiver’s emphasis on pride in Afro-Caribbean’s accomplishments, but fails to provide specific information regarding the ways in which that message was encouraged (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). In addition beyond the direct transmission of these socialization messages, the ARESS scale items does not fully explore the potential ways racial and ethnic socialization messages can be indirectly transmitted to children (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007).

Lastly, a limitation of this study is its cross-sectional design and it being correlational. Thus the statistical analyses used to explore the associations among racial and ethnic socialization, social connectedness, and subjective well-being discourages the determination of causation. Therefore, it is important to understand the magnitudes of the relationships among the variables included in the structural model as it provides significant empirical findings. This issue of causality could be resolved by utilizing experimental and longitudinal research designs; this would give researchers the ability to assess for causal associations between racial and ethnic socialization, social connectedness, and subjective well-being. But within the present study it is not possible to determine the directions of each of the hypothesized paths with certainty. This assumes bidirectional influences do not take place among variables, for example social connectedness in racial community to racial socialization. In fact, there may be a bidirectional relationship between racial and ethnic socialization and social connectedness (i.e., mainstream society, racial community, and ethnic community). Regardless of these limitations, researchers should further examine some of the original questions raised in this study and follow-up studies should include and examine the
bidirectional paths between racial and ethnic socialization and social connectedness (i.e., mainstream society, racial community, and ethnic community).

**Implications for Research and Practice**

This study’s findings toward a deeper understanding of racial and ethnic socialization processes might inform and assist researchers and clinicians to deepen and apply this field of knowledge. This work evidences and further expands the complexities of multiculturalism and multicultural counseling, demonstrating the need to analyze and discuss multiple identities and the intersection of the many cultural facets of individuals (Richardson et al., 2010). For Afro-Caribbeans who daily negotiate a tripartite experience that involves navigating White American mainstream culture, being a Black minority, and retaining their own specific Afro-Caribbean ethnic cultures (Boykin & Toms, 1985). This complex experience speaks not only to multicultural identities, but also to under-researched aspects of intersectionality (APA, 2012). Expanding the framework of intersectionality promises meaningful ways that researchers, educators, and practitioners might deepen their understanding of the ways multiple intersecting identities are related to socialization processes, group membership and belonging, and psychological well-being.

The widespread mainstream assumption that all Blacks in the US are African American disregards the diversity of cultural backgrounds of other Black ethnic groups, whose families immigrated to the United States from the Caribbean and Africa. Where these common misconceptions operate in higher education, administrators, faculty, and staff remain uninformed about Caribbean cultures and the full breadth of diverse historical, social, and cultural characteristics of their Black students (Greenidge & Daire,
2010), and the way these factors may influence their racial and ethnic socialization differently than in African Americans and other students of color. These factors and dual stigmatization may influence their racial and ethnic socialization. In addressing these issues researchers, educators, and clinicians should utilize strategies that incorporate a critical consciousness framework that assist Afro-Caribbeans in understanding their role in an oppressive system as members of a stigmatized group (Thomas, Barrie, Brunner, Clawson, Hewitt, Jérémie-Brink, & Rowe-Johnson, 2014) and provide opportunities for reflection and critical analysis. The incorporation of critical consciousness would positively impact educator’s development of critical thinking skills and global competence, prevention scientist’s assessment of cultural enrichment programs, and practitioner’s utilization of empirical evidence in clinical training and practice of multicultural counseling competence (Richardson et al., 2010; Thomas et al., 2014).

The National Survey of American Life (NSAL), a comprehensive psychological study that includes a representative sample of African Americans and Blacks of Caribbean descent used formal mental health care services at relatively low rates, due to stigma, language barriers, cultural incompetence clinical staff members, ethnocentric stereotyping, and poor prior experiences within the mental health system (Jackson, Neighbors, Torres, Martin, Williams, & Baser, 2007). Clinicians who work with Afro-Caribbean emerging adults can explore the relationship between their experiences of racial and ethnic socialization and subjective well-being. The incorporation of racial and ethnic socialization processes is an important social justice tool within psychotherapy and serves as important multiculturally competent work with Black individuals and families (Brown et al., 2013). Clinicians may also serve as socializing agents helping Black clients
understand the messages they receive from the outside world regarding race and ethnicity and providing them with protective and proactive coping strategies (Brown & Tylka, 2011; Greene, 1992, as cited in Brown et al., 2013).

In addition, it is important that mental health providers engage in culturally competent practice when working with Afro-Caribbean populations, aware of the ways intersectionality, stereotypes, and oppression impact this group. There is great need that clinical practice among this population maintain awareness of Afro-Caribbean family functioning and family forms, strengths of this community, critical analysis of contemporary issues and problems faced by this group, differential impact of social policies on Afro-Caribbean families (McRoy, 2007). Clinicians can encourage the concept of empowerment, assessing and applying a strengths perspective in the evaluation of strengths in this community. Culturally specific strengths include collectivism, strong kinship bonds, spiritual orientation, work orientation, adaptability or fluidity of family roles, high tolerance of environmental stress, ambiguity and ambivalence, and high achievement orientations (Hill, 1972; Jones, 1983, as cited in McRoy, 2007).

Additionally, the findings of this study provide important practical implications for parenting within Afro-Caribbean, immigrant families. This study that refers to racial and ethnic socialization processes as distinct processes clarifies the methodological or conceptual problems existing in the area of socialization research and in result provides a valid and reliable measure that could be used in direct work with Afro-Caribbean families (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). Racial and ethnic socialization which is widely known as a family-based source of protection delivered through parent-child communication has
the potential to increase the intergenerational family solidarity within Black immigrant families. More recent research has revealed that the increase of parent’s utilization and transmission of racial socialization messages are likely to report more general positive parenting, consisting of parental involvement, cohesion, and monitoring (Berkel et al., 2009; Caughy et al., 2002; Henry, Lambert, & Bynum, 2015). This further demonstrates that racial and ethnic socialization and general positive parenting practices most likely co-occur (Henry, Lambert, & Bynum, 2015). Moreover, in regards to parent education and support programs, the ARESS scale can be beneficial in assessing the current levels of racial and ethnic socialization in families. Given the US’s current political and social climate regarding the experiences of Black people young adults, this measure can help identify target areas of racial and ethnic socialization that would best benefit youth.

In conclusion, continued increase in the immigration rates of Blacks to the United States also expands the cultural diversity and ethnic composition of the Black racial group. Clinicians, psychologists, and other professionals must be mindful of these multicultural issues and engage in sensitive topics of interracial and intraracial relations for this group (Hall & Carter, 2006). Recognizing the significance of socialization messages and the role of identity for this particular group can, therefore, aid in helping professionals develop a better understanding of ethnic- and racially-based intervention strategies when working with these individuals (Hall & Carter, 2006). Understanding how racial and ethnic group identification operates for Afro-Caribbeans is essential, as it allows for a better understanding of intragroup dynamics among American Black racial groups. Studying within-group differences of Black people can help mental health professionals better serve and explore the complex within-group racial and ethnic identity
diversity, rather viewing the group as monolithic. The findings of this study compliment other recent studies of this demographic, and have implications for how psychologists can work best with first- and second-generation Afro-Caribbeans (Hall & Carter, 2006).

Conclusion

The findings of this research is an important first step in greater understanding of the role that racial and ethnic socialization messages play in understanding one’s social connectedness and the promotion of the positive psychological construct, subjective well-being. This exploration of multicultural counseling knowledge is especially significant in exploring the experiences and shaping research and clinical practice concerning growing Afro-Caribbean populations in the United States, specifically among first- and second-generation emerging adults. This research hopes and intends to promote positive intercultural relations, reduce racism, promote harmony in diverse societies, and better understand the processes by which both children and young people learn and negotiate racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity, processes known as racial and ethnic socialization (Priest et al., 2014). Psychologists, preventionists, educators, and clinicians can develop programs and assist these individuals in becoming aware of the unique ways that different systems, messages, migratory patterns, and family functioning positively and negatively impact a person’s evaluative reactions to his or her life. These factors may help mitigate internalized oppression, build critical consciousness, and increase their subjective well-being, and therefore might provide fruitful sites of exploration within the clinical setting and in future psychological research. Additionally, clinicians may also play a role in educating individuals concerning the role social connectedness (e.g., mainstream, racial, and ethnic communities) between racial and social socialization and
subjective well-being. Particularly, clinicians and mental health programming should encourage Afro-Caribbean emerging adults to establish and deepen meaningful relationships within their ethnic and racial groups.
Demographics

1. Age: __________

2. Gender: _____ Man _____ Woman _____ Other

3. State of Residency (e.g., MA, IL): __________

4. Ethnic/Racial Background (e.g., Haitian, Jamaican American, Afro-Cuban, Afro-Caribbean, West Indian, etc.) ______________________________

5. Generations in the U.S. (check most applicable one)
   _____ I was born outside the U.S. (e.g., Jamaica) and moved to the U.S.
   _____ I was born in the U.S. but both parent(s) immigrated.
   _____ One parent and I were born in the U.S. (other parent immigrated).
   _____ Both parents and I were born in the U.S.
   _____ Grandparents, parents, and I were born in the U.S.
   _____ Great-grandparents and beyond were born in the U.S.

6. If you were born outside the U.S. (e.g., Haiti) and moved to the U.S., how old were you when you moved to the U.S.? (if you were born in the U.S., please skip to question 7) __________

7. Religious Identification:
   _____ Catholic _____ Protestant _____ Islamic/Muslim
   _____ Agnostic _____ Atheist _____ Other (please specify)

8a. Highest level of education completed:
   _____ No formal education _____ Elementary school graduate
   _____ Middle school graduate _____ High school graduate
   _____ College student _____ College graduate
   _____ Advanced degree(s)

8b. Highest level of mother’s education completed:
   _____ No formal education _____ Elementary school graduate
   _____ Middle school graduate _____ High school graduate
   _____ College graduate _____ Advanced degrees

8c. Highest level of father’s education completed:
   _____ No formal education _____ Elementary school graduate
   _____ Middle school graduate _____ High school graduate
   _____ College graduate _____ Advanced degrees
9. What is your approximate household income before taxes?
   ______ Under $20,000
   ______ $20,000 to less than $40,000
   ______ $40,000 to less than $60,000
   ______ $60,000 to less than $80,000
   ______ $80,000 or more
Research Study: Racial and Ethnic Socialization and Well-Being

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology Program at Loyola University Chicago. I am conducting a survey study related to racial and ethnic socialization and well-being. I need your help in the completion of this important task. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

You must be an adult (18 years old or above) residing in the United States in order to participate in this study.

If you are interested in this research, please click the link below.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Your help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gihane Jérémie-Brink, MA
Doctoral Candidate
Counseling Psychology, Loyola University Chicago
APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
Survey Questionnaire

**Directions:** Following are a number of statements that reflect various ways in which we may view ourselves. Rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the given scale. There is no right or wrong answer. Do not spend too much time with any one statement and do not leave any unanswered.

**Please take a moment to respond to the following statements as truthfully and accurately as you can, and also please remember that these are very subjective questions and that there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer according to the scale below:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a few times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lots of times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that if I work hard I can over barriers in life.
2. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that a belief in God helps with life struggles.
3. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me the importance of getting a good education.
4. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me what to do if I’m called a racist name.
5. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to stand up for myself.
6. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to have White friends.
7. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to get along with Whites.
8. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to have Black friends.
9. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that racism is present in America.
10. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver shares with me their experiences of racism and discrimination.
11. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that Blacks don’t always have the same opportunities as Whites.
12. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to be cautious when dealing with White people.
13. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that a Black teen will be harassed because he or she is Black.
14. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver has Black magazines like Essence, Ebony, or Jet in the home.
15. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to be proud of the accomplishments of Afro-Caribbeans.
16. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver has Black (i.e. newspapers, magazines, websites literature in the home).
17. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to have pride in my Afro-Caribbean culture.
18. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver watches Black television shows.
19. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me the importance of Afro-Caribbean people helping one another.
20. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver has Black art, sculptures, and pictures.
21. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that Afro-Caribbeans should give back to the Afro-Caribbean community.
22. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver reads books written by Black writers.
23. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver does things to celebrate Afro-Caribbean history.
24. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me about slavery in this country.
25. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to watch documentaries or movies about Afro-Caribbean history.
26. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that knowing about African history is important.
27. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to go to Afro-Caribbean cultural events (e.g., parades, festivals, plays, etc.).
28. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that Black slavery is important to never forget.
29. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to go to Afro-Caribbean museums.
30. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to learn about the history of Blacks.
31. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to learn about the history of Afro-Caribbeans.
32. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to never forget my heritage.
33. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that Afro-Caribbean slavery is important to never forget.
34. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to go to Black museums.
35. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver reads books written by Afro-Caribbean writers and/or books written in my native language.
36. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to go to Black cultural events (e.g., parades, festivals, plays, etc.).
37. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to watch documentaries or movies on Black history.
38. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver has Afro-Caribbean art, sculptures, and pictures.
39. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver does things to celebrate Black history month.
40. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me the importance of family loyalty.
41. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to respect authority figures like teachers, elders, and police.
42. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that Blacks should give back to the Black community.
43. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver watches Afro-Caribbean television shows.
44. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me the importance of Black people helping one another.
45. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to never be ashamed of my skin color.
46. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to have pride in my Black culture.
47. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver has Afro-Caribbean literature in the home (i.e. books, newspapers, magazines, websites, etc.).
48. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to be proud of my background.
49. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that my skin color is beautiful.
50. _____ My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to be proud of the accomplishments of Blacks.

In answering these questions what person(s) would you consider to be your maternal/paternal caregiver? (You may only choose a maximum of two choices)

_____ Both my biological mother and my biological father
_____ Only my biological mother
_____ Only my biological father
_____ My biological mother and step-father
_____ My biological father and step-mother
_____ Other guardians (e.g. aunt, uncle, grandparent(s))
_____ Guardian or foster parent who is not a relative
_____ Other

**Please write the number from the scale that best corresponds to your answer.

1. _____ I feel a sense of closeness with U.S. Americans.
2. _____ I feel a sense of belonging to U.S. society.
3. _____ I feel accepted by U.S. Americans.
4. _____ I feel like I fit into U.S. society.
5. _____ I feel connected with U.S. society.

1. _____ I feel a sense of closeness with Blacks.
2. _____ I feel a sense of belonging to the Black community.
3. _____ I feel accepted by Blacks.
4. _____ I feel like I fit into the Black community.
5.____ I feel connected with the Black community.

1.____ I feel a sense of closeness with Afro-Caribbeans (e.g., Haitian, Trinidadian-American, Afro-Cuban American, etc.).
2.____ I feel a sense of belonging to the Afro-Caribbean community.
3.____ I feel accepted by Afro-Caribbeans.
4.____ I feel like I fit into the Afro-Caribbean community.
5.____ I feel connected with the Afro-Caribbean community.

**Directions:** We are all members of different social groups or social categories. We would like you to consider your status as a member of your racial and/or ethnic group in responding to the following statements. “Group” in the questions refers to your membership in your racial and/or ethnic group. There is no right or wrong answer to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and circle your response using the following scale from 1 to 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly 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 group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I often regret that I belong to my group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Overall, my group is considered good by others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Overall, my group status 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel I don’t have much to offer my group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>In general, I’m glad to be a member of my group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Most people consider my 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The group that 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am a cooperative participant in the activities of my group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Overall, I often feel that my group is not worthwhile.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In general, others respect my group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My group status is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I often feel I’m a useless member of my group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I feel good about the group I belong to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>In general, others think that my group is unworthy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>In general, belonging to my group is an important part of my self-image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please indicate your agreement with the following items using the 1-7 scale below. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be open and honest in your responding.**

1.____ In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2.____ The conditions of my life are excellent.
3.____ I am satisfied with my life.
4.____ So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5.____ If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
**This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then write the number that indicates to what extent you **feel this way in general.** Use the following scale to record your answers.

1 = very slightly  
2 = a little  
3 = moderately  
4 = quite a bit  
5 = extremely  
or not at all

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td>interested</td>
<td>distressed</td>
<td>excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>guilty</td>
<td>alert</td>
<td>hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>irritable</td>
<td>alert</td>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determined</td>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>jittery</td>
<td>inspired</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you wish to be compensated a $10 gift card for your participation, please send an email to gjbteam@gmail.com. Type in “study compensation” in the subject heading and your name in the text. Do not include any other information or questions in the text. All questions about this study should be directed to gbrink@luc.edu. Participants will be compensated at the completion of data collection.

Thank you again for your time and effort!
APPENDIX D

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

**Project Title:** Social Connectedness as a Mediator to Racial and Ethnic Socialization and Well-Being  
**Researcher:** Gihane Jérémie-Brink, M.A., Ph.D. Candidate  
**Faculty Sponsor:** Anita Jones Thomas, Ph.D.

You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Gihane Jérémie-Brink, M.A, a doctoral candidate under the supervision of Dr. Anita Thomas in Counseling Psychology department at Loyola University Chicago. You are being asked to participate because I would like to examine the relation of racial and ethnic socialization and well-being of Afro-Caribbean American adults. Approximately 200-300 individuals will be asked to participate in this study. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study is to examine the relation of racial and ethnic socialization and well-being.

**Procedures:** If you agree to participate in the study, you will be asked to answer a set of questions about your demographic information, racial and ethnic socialization, social connectedness, and your well-being. It should take you only 15-20 minutes to complete the survey. Your honest and complete response to the survey questions will be highly appreciated for valid research results.

**Risks/Benefits:** There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Your participation in this online survey involves risks similar to a person’s everyday use of the Internet. There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but you may gain a greater understanding about your racial and ethnic identity and well-being. You will also be helping counseling/psychology professionals and their future clients.

**Compensation:** As a token of my appreciation, survey respondents will have the chance to be compensated a $10 gift card. You can find the directions to be compensated at the completion of the study.

**Confidentiality:** Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Please do not indicate your name on the questionnaire. Information obtained as a result of this survey will be kept confidential. There is no way an individual participant can be identified in this study. All data will be kept in a password protected file for five years after completion and publication of the study. Only the listed researchers will have access to the data.

**Voluntary Participation:** Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Even if you decide to participate, you are
free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty. If you complete an anonymous survey and then submit it to the researcher, the researcher will be unable to extract anonymous data from the database should you wish it withdrawn.

Contacts and Questions: If you have questions about this research study, please contact Gihane Jérémie-Brink at (773) 217-0626 or gbrink@luc.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Statement of Consent: By completing the survey you are agreeing to participate in the research. Your completion of the survey will indicate consent for an informed participation. If you decide not to participate in this study, you may simply disregard this survey. Thank you very much for your time and effort.

Sincerely,
Gihane Jérémie-Brink, M.A.
REFERENCE LIST


VITA

Gihane Emeline Jérémie-Brink grew up in Waltham, Massachusetts and was raised by Haitian immigrant parents whose values reflected inclusion and service to others. She received her B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies from Calvin College in 2005. While at Calvin College, Gihane studied abroad in Ghana and Washington, D.C. In 2010, Gihane received her M.A. in Community Counseling from Loyola University Chicago and entered Loyola’s Counseling Psychology Ph.D. program in the fall of 2010. While at Loyola, Gihane was involved in the Graduate Students of Color Alliance, Doctoral Advisory Committee, the Student Development Committee, and the Faculty Award Committee.

Gihane is a member of the American Psychological Association, Illinois Psychological Association, and the Association of Black Psychologists. Gihane completed her APA-approved pre-doctoral internship at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Counseling Center. Prior to her internship placement, Gihane served as an Albert Schweitzer Fellow and as an APA Minority Predoctoral Fellow through the American Psychological Association. In conjunction with her fellowship, during the summer of 2011, she interned in Washington D.C. for SAMHSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration) with the Administrator’s Office of Policy, Planning, and Innovation within the Office of Behavioral Health Equity.
Gihane will begin her academic career as a Clinical Scholar Postdoctoral Fellow with The Family Institute at Northwestern University receiving advanced training in couple, adult, and family therapy.