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Abstract

The predominant focus of research examining the relation between ethnic discrimination and psychological distress among Black individuals has been on between-group, or interethnic, discrimination. Little is known about the impact of within-group, or intraethnic, discrimination. This study sought to serve as an initial investigation of the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress. Using social identity theory as a framework, it was posited that intraethnic discrimination experiences would result in psychological distress due to experience of in-group (Black) rejection and absence of in-group support for self-enhancement. Additionally, the study assessed the extent to which ethnicity-related identity collective self-esteem and private collective self-esteem moderated the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress in 494 Black American young adults. Results from a multiple regression analysis indicated that private collective self-esteem and identity collective self-esteem each uniquely moderated the discrimination-distress relation, weakening the relation. Study implications, strengths, limitations, and future directions are discussed.
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ......................................................................................................................... ii

Abstract ........................................................................................................................................... v

Table of Contents ........................................................................................................................... vi

List of Tables and Figures .............................................................................................................. ix

Chapter 1: Introduction ................................................................................................................... 1

  Intraethnic Discrimination .......................................................................................................... 3

    Forms of Intraethnic Discrimination .................................................................................. 3

    Experiences of Intraethnic Discrimination ........................................................................ 6

Social Identity Theory .................................................................................................................. 7

Collective Self-Esteem .................................................................................................................. 9

Stigma, Discrimination, and Social Identity Threat ...................................................................... 12

Statement of the Problem ........................................................................................................... 15

Chapter 2: Method ........................................................................................................................ 18

  Design ..................................................................................................................................... 18

  Participants .............................................................................................................................. 19

  Procedure ................................................................................................................................ 20

  Instruments .............................................................................................................................. 21

    The Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version (PEDQ-CV) .......................................................................................................................... 21

    Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Race Specific (CSES-R) ..................................................... 24

    Brief Symptom Inventory-18 (BSI-18) ................................................................. 25

    Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory .................................................................................... 26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic questionnaire</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Analysis</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analytic Plan</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Analyses</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Analyses</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Results</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Analysis and Covariates</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Hypotheses</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: Discussion</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Results</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation and Relevance to Previous Research</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths and Limitations</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Theory, Research and Practice</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Directions for Research</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A. Recruitment Letter for E-Mail and Social Media</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B. Informed Consent</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C. Demographic Questionnaire</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D. Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Scale – Community Version*</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E. Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Race Specific</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F. Brief Symptom Inventory-18................................................................. 92
Appendix G. Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Inventory....................................................... 93
Appendix H. Debriefing Statement........................................................................... 94
List of Tables and Figures

Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram of Hypothesized Model .................................................................17
Figure 2. Hayes’ Conceptual Diagram of Moderated Moderation Model .................................18
Figure 3. Hayes’ Statistical Diagram of Moderated Moderation Model ....................................19
Figure 4. Statistical Diagram of Hypothesized Model .................................................................32
Figure 5. Graph of Conditional Effects at Values of M ...............................................................39
Figure 6. Graph of Conditional Effects at Values of W ...............................................................40
Table 1. Demographic Information ...............................................................................................72
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics ......................................................................................................74
Table 3. Correlations of Study Variables and Demographics .....................................................75
Table 4. Effect Sizes of Potential Covariates in Regression Model .............................................77
Table 5. Regression Coefficients and Statistical Significance of Potential Covariates ..............78
Table 6 Regression Analysis Summary of Full Model .................................................................79
Table 7. Effect Sizes of Covariates in Full Model .......................................................................80
Table 8. Regression Analysis Summary of Second Model .........................................................81
Table 9. Effect Sizes of Covariates in Second Model .................................................................82
Table 10. Regression Analysis Summary of Third Model ............................................................83
Table 11. Effect Sizes of Covariates in Third Model ...................................................................84
Chapter 1: Introduction

Ethnic/racial\(^1\) discrimination, broadly defined as unfair treatment due to ethnic group membership (Contrada et al., 2001), has gained much attention in contemporary psychology literature. Particularly among African Americans/Blacks\(^2\), several studies indicate a “discrimination-distress” relation (Corning, 2002, p. 117), i.e., a direct association between ethnic discrimination and negative outcomes like depression and anxiety (e.g., Banks, Kohn-Wood, & Spencer, 2006), psychological distress (e.g., Bynum, Burton, & Best, 2007; Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk-Cone, & Zimmerman, 2003), trauma-related symptoms (e.g., Pieterse, Carter, Evans, & Walter, 2010), reduced personal and collective self-esteem (e.g., Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999), as well as other negative health outcomes (Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009; Pieterse, Todd, Neville, & Carter, 2012; Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & L’Heureux Lewis, 2006; Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000).

---

\(^1\) In this study, ethnicity is broadly defined to include sociocultural membership based on shared culture (e.g., nationality, ancestry, language) as well as race, which tends to includes sociopolitical groupings based on phenotypical features (e.g., skin color). Race and ethnicity have been used interchangeably within the literature (Betancourt & López, 1993; Brondolo, Gallo, & Myers, 2009; Contrada et al., 2001), however, in this study, ethnicity will be distinctively discussed as the sociocultural identities personally assigned/determined by an individual and co-constructed by them and members of their ethnic group, as opposed to race which is a sociocultural category assigned to others by societal systems.

\(^2\) Due to the lack of ethnoracial clarity in the literature, the terms Black and African American are used interchangeably (Brondolo et al., 2009). For the purposes of this study, Black is used to refer to individuals of color who identify as a member of a racial or ethnic group of African descent (e.g., African American, Nigerian, and Jamaican).
Among minority groups in the U.S., Blacks have an extensive history of maltreatment by Whites due to colonization, slavery and institutional racism, to name a few (Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Price, Darity, & Headen, 2008). According to Fordham and Ogbu (1986), Black Americans are “castelike minorities” (p. 178) due to having been involuntarily introduced and permanently integrated into American society through slavery or conquest. Since emancipation, Blacks remain marginalized by oppressive systemic forces educational, economic, as well as political and continue to experience a significant degree of discrimination in the U.S. (Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1996; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Sellers et al., 2006).

Maltreatment and denigration of individuals of African descent by those of European descent is not isolated to the U.S., as these violations have occurred in many regions around the globe, including African enslavement in both western and eastern hemispheres, European colonization of African countries, and apartheid in South Africa (Iweriebor, n.d.; Williams et al., 2008). Thus, countless groups of African descent have a history of dominance and involuntary subjugation by Europeans that has had a lasting impact on the fabric of Black individuals’ social identity. Due to this extensive history, most authors who examine the impact of discrimination on Blacks have studied ethnic discrimination as a purely inter-group phenomenon, with other groups, especially Whites, as the assumed perpetrators of discrimination (Clark et al., 1999). While studies that investigate the impact of institutional and interpersonal racism on Blacks’ mental health are of critical importance, it does not provide a full picture of discriminatory experiences that affect Blacks’ wellbeing (Brondolo et al., 2005; Clark, 2004; Clark et al., 1999).

Often, an unfortunate residual effect of oppression is its internalization (Pyke, 2010) and the resulting reenactment of interpersonally oppressive patterns (Danzer, 2012; Pyke, 2010) among Black ethnic groups, termed *intraethnic discrimination*. According to Danzer (2012),
oppressed individuals tend to act out their oppression. In other words, they may “think, feel, and act in ways that demonstrate the devaluation of their group and of themselves as members of that group” (Hardiman & Jackson, 1997, p. 21). According to Pyke (2010) intraethnic othering is a form of internalized racial oppression and is a normative, adaptive response to racism rather than its cause. While not an act of racism itself, intraethnic discrimination is a damaging, psychologically injurious byproduct and tool of racism that allows the oppression of Blacks to be self-sustaining (Pyke, 2010; Speight, 2007).

**Intraethnic Discrimination**

Intraethnic discrimination can be defined as experiences of unfair treatment due to one’s ethnicity by members of one’s own ethnic group (Brondolo et al., 2005). Although research on this phenomenon is limited, the notion of intraethnic discrimination is not novel. For example, constructs such as *intraethnic othering* (e.g., Pyke & Dang, 2003) and *intragroup marginalization* (Castillo, Conoley, Brossart, & Quiros, 2007) have been examined among Asian (e.g., Kwon, 2013; Shin, 2012) and Latino/a (e.g., Castillo, 2009; Castillo, Cano, Chen, Blucker, & Olds, 2008) populations, respectively. Both terms have been used to describe interpersonal distancing behaviors (e.g., name calling, isolation) enacted against others of one’s shared ethnic background who are perceived to hold socially devalued attributes. Literature regarding intraethnic discrimination within Black populations also exists (e.g., Clark, 2004). However, much of the literature focuses on specific forms of intraethnic discrimination, with few addressing of intraethnic discrimination experiences more broadly, i.e., the array of experiences which encompass intraethnic discrimination.

**Forms of Intraethnic Discrimination.** The majority of studies on intraethnic discrimination among Blacks have focused on a narrow aspect of bias like *colorism*, which
occurs when people experience differential treatment on the basis of skin complexion (Clark et al., 1999; Hunter, 2007; Sims, 2009). Colorism tends to favor those who are phenotypically less African, since lighter complexion is indicative of racial mixture (Bowman, Muhammad, & Ifatunji, 2004). In general, lighter-skinned Blacks tend to experience more favorable treatment than those with darker skin (e.g., Din-Dzietham, Nembhard, Collins, & Davis, 2004). In the past, Black organizations, including fraternities, sororities, historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), and churches among others, have used skin tone as part of their admissions criteria (Clark, 2004; Clark et al., 1999)—which highlights the historic realities of intraethnic discrimination among Blacks in the U.S.

Although colorism is a form of intraethnic discrimination that is acknowledged and extensively discussed theoretically in the literature, it has not been empirically studied extensively. In addition to its narrow focus of intraethnic discrimination, a scan of various colorism studies (e.g., Harvey, LaBeach, Pridgen, & Gocial, 2005; Thompson & Keith, 2001) show that researchers tend to use respondent’s skin tone as a proxy for the manifestation of colorism, rather than assessing for respondents’ skin tone-related discrimination experiences. Additionally, skin tone is assessed differently across studies, including author-created self-report ratings of one’s skin tone, which often have no psychometric support for validity.

Among the studies assessing the impact of skin tone on mental health, results are mixed. Thompson and Keith (2001), for example, found that skin color predicted self-esteem in lower-income Black women and self-efficacy in Black men, with self-esteem and self-efficacy increasing as skin color lightens for Black women and men, respectively. Harvey et al. (2005) found that Black students at a predominantly Black university placed more emphasis on skin tone than did Black students at a predominantly White university. The authors also found that
darker skin tone was positively associated with peer acceptance and self-esteem solely at the predominantly Black university, suggesting the presence of residual elements of colorism at this institution. On the other hand, other studies using community samples found no significant relation between skin tone and mental health (e.g., Borrell, Kiefe, Williams, Diez-Roux, & Gordon-Larsen, 2006; Keith, Lincoln, Taylor, & Jackson, 2010). These mixed results may be due to the lack of consistent and psychometrically sound measures to assess colorism.

A search of the literature indicated that colorism is the only form of intraethnic discrimination that has been empirically investigated with frequency. However, the literature also suggests several other forms of Blacks’ intraethnic discrimination, including discrimination based on (a) hair texture, i.e., favored treatment of those who chemically relax their hair, appearing less African (Patton, 2006); (b) languages or accents and acculturation level, i.e., Blacks who speak less English or with accents may be treated more poorly (Waters, 1994); and (c) acting White, or engaging in behaviors or sharing interests that are believed to be stereotypical of and salient in the dominant, White culture. For example, enunciation of words, listening to certain genres of music, engagement in certain sports, etc. (Castillo et al., 2007; Durkee & Williams, 2015; Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Petroni, 1970) may be perceived as acting White.

A recent study of Black college students found that frequency of accusations of acting White predicted greater severity in mental health symptoms (i.e., depression, anxiety, and emotional stress) and lower racial/ethnic identity (Durkee & Williams, 2015). Additionally, Durkee and Williams found that participants who reported higher levels of racial/ethnic identity endorsed higher levels of discomfort with acting White accusations. As highlighted in Durkee and Williams’ (2005) findings, mistreatment by members of one’s ethnic group may relate to
one’s sense of belonging to one’s ethnic group and to negative mental health outcomes (Major & O’Brien, 2005).

**Experiences of Intraethnic Discrimination.** Clark and colleagues (1999) are among the few researchers who discussed and empirically investigated (Clark, 2004) broader intraethnic discrimination within Black populations, and provided preliminary data supporting intraethnic discrimination as a distinct construct from interethnic discrimination. Clark et al. described intraethnic discrimination as *intragroup racism*, in which “beliefs, attitudes, institutional arrangements, and acts” seek to devalue individuals within one’s own ethnic group “because of phenotypic characteristics or ethnic group affiliation” (p. 805). Investigating the impact of intergroup and intragroup racism on 269 African American college students, Clark (2004) modified instructions on the Life Experiences and Stress Scale of the Racism and Life Experiences Scale (RaLES; Harrell, Merchant, & Young, 1997), prompting participants to identify experiences where the perpetrators of racism were perceived to be a member of (a) a different and (b) the same ethnic or racial group as the respondent. Results of principal component and confirmatory factor analyses suggested that intergroup and intragroup racism were distinct constructs.

While Brondolo et al. (2005) did not empirically investigate intraethnic discrimination, the authors descriptively reported the prevalence of intraethnic discrimination and distress among ethnic minorities, including 174 Black adults. In a survey of perceived ethnic discrimination, participants were invited to report, with regard to their experiences of ethnic discrimination, which ethnic groups caused them the most distress. Among Black adult subsample, 28% reported experiences of ethnic discrimination by other Blacks to be most distressing. Black participants also reported the highest prevalence of intraethnic discrimination
among all ethnic/racial groups (i.e., White, Black, Latino/a, Asian, and Native American) in the sample. These findings support the need for further empirical study of intraethnic discrimination and its impact on psychological distress in the Black population.

The extant research regarding intraethnic discrimination has primarily focused on adolescents (e.g., Fisher, Wallace & Fenton, 2000; Wong, Eccles, & Samaroff, 2003) or college students (e.g., Clark, 2004). However due to the potential developmental nature of the identity, it may be useful to broadly examine the experience of young adults, as young adulthood exists not only in educational, but also community settings and spans beyond traditional college age (i.e., 18-22 years old). Ethnic identity development is theorized to continue well into emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000). In fact, Arnett argued that due to increased opportunities for exploration, most identity formation occurs not during adolescence, but rather during emerging adulthood (i.e., roughly ages 18-25, but can include up to age 30). Thus, emerging adults, with additional life experience and perspective, who are further along the developmental process may identify, understand, and respond to experiences of intraethnic discrimination differently than adolescents. Arnett also argued that identity exploration and formation occur regardless of an individual’s college attendance. Thus, the present study examined the experiences of Black emerging adults, both community and post-secondary student populations, under the age of 30 years old.

Social Identity Theory

The relation of negative treatment and an individual’s social identification, and the impact of these factors on well-being have been proposed by social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982). According to social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982), individuals possess both personal and social identities that shape their self-concept. This theory was used to frame and understand the
potential impact of intraethnic discrimination on the factors (i.e., ethnic group identity, psychological distress) mentioned above.

Personal identity is based on attributes unique to the self (e.g., talents, skills, personality), and social identity relies on group salience, i.e., recognition of and emotional attachment to one’s membership in a social group. There exists an evaluative component in which a person’s self-concept is partly determined by his or her ability to behave in a manner consistent with his or her personal and social identities (Tajfel, 1982). Personal self-esteem (i.e., one’s attitude towards the self/personal identity) and collective self-esteem (i.e., one’s attitude towards the social group/identity) are then determined by a person’s evaluation of his or her self-concept (Tajfel, 1982). With respect to social identity, this evaluative component results in in-group favoritism (or stronger collective self-esteem) tending to be more beneficial and self-enhancing than out-group favoritism (Hogg, 1996).

Individuals belong to various social groups (e.g., ethnicity, gender, age) that comprise their overall social identity (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Social identities are both individual and social in that individuals use their group membership to describe who they personally are (e.g., “I am Black”) and yet the meaning of the identity cannot simply be reduced to an individual level. Identity can only be understood through a social, cultural, and historical context (Reicher, Spears, & Haslam, 2010). For this current study, ethnic identity served as the social identity of focus and was determined by the cultural heritage participants personally identified as their ethnicity.

Smith (1991) posits that ethnic group members share common historical and sociological circumstances such as family structures, gender roles, belief systems, value orientations, language, signs and symbols, and traditions which all work to define and provide meaning to an
ethnic group identity. Consistent with Smith’s description of ethnic group identity, social identity theory posits that social groups describe and determine the normative and stereotypical behaviors for in-group members as well as the behaviors that stereotypically represent non-members, or the out-group. In other words, social identities assign individuals into distinct categories, establishing boundaries and rules of engagement within and between groups (Tajfel, 1982).

Theoretically, intergroup discriminatory practices are believed to occur because in-group beliefs and behaviors serve as a function to maintain intergroup boundaries and preserve in-group benefits, i.e., self-enhancement and increased self-concept (Tajfel, 1982). In other words, stronger ethnicity-related collective self-esteem is theorized to serve as a protective factor in the presence of interethnic discrimination. However, in-group discriminatory practices such as intraethnic discrimination, do not function similarly as these practices are divisive and likely interfere with in-group benefits. It would be worth exploring the potential influence of ethnic group collective self-esteem, in the presence of in-group rejection, or intraethnic discrimination, as it is unclear what patterns exist.

**Collective Self-Esteem**

Collective self-esteem (CSE), or attitudes towards one’s social identity, is theorized to consist of four dimensions: (a) private CSE, which refers to one’s personal appraisal of one’s social group; (b) public CSE, how one perceives others appraise one’s social group; (c) importance to identity3 (or identity CSE), referring to the extent to which one’s group membership is a salient social identity, and (d) membership CSE, appraisal of functioning as a member of one’s social group (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, and Broadnax (1994) identified ethnicity-related CSE, (i.e., attitudes towards one’s ethnic group

---

3 In this proposal, the term identity collective self-esteem (CSE) will be used to refer to Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) importance to identity construct in order to maintain clarity among the various identity terms discussed.
identity) as important to examine for a more comprehensive understanding of ethnicity-related CSE on ethnic minority mental health (Cassidy, O’Connor, Howe, & Warden, 2004).

A pattern of high collective self-esteem has been found in Black young adults. In a study of Black, White, and Asian college students (Crocker et al., 1994), Blacks scored higher than both groups on three of the four subscales of general and ethnicity-related collective self-esteem scale (CSES; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), but lower than both groups on public CSE (Crocker et al., 1994). According to Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, and Chavous (1998), the differences in the CSE correlations between the Black participants and the other racial groups “reinforce the view that it is important to study African American identity within its own cultural and historical context” (p. 27). Thus, a comparison of Blacks’ CSE with other racial groups may not be as meaningful an investigation as are examinations of Black experiences alone.

Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, and Smith (1997) created the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) which has been predominantly used with Black populations, partly assessing Black racial identity, as well as public and private CSE (Casey-Cannon, Coleman, Knudtson, & Velazquez, 2011; Sellers et al., 1998). The MIBI’s racial centrality dimension is similar to Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) identity CSE dimension, $r = .64, p < .001$ (Casey-Cannon, Coleman, Knudtson, & Velazquez, 2011), and centrality is often used interchangeably with identity CSE in the literature (e.g., McCoy & Major, 2003). Additionally, the MIBI’s racial regard (which includes public and private regard), is consistent with and heavily based on Luhtanen and Crocker’s public ($r = .91, p < .001$) and private ($r = .73, p < .001$) CSE dimensions (Casey-Cannon et al., 2011), respectively (Sellers et al., 1998).

While racial identity is not the construct of interest, the findings provide some information on the role of CSE among Blacks. For example, Sellers and Shelton (2003) found
that in 267 self-identified African American college students, centrality was related to perceived racial discrimination ($b = .09, p < .05$) and public regard moderated the direct relation between discrimination and distress ($b = .16, p < .05$), increasing the relation. Burrow and Ong (2010) found that among 174 Black doctoral students and graduates surveyed, private regard was inversely related to perceived racial discrimination ($\beta = -.28, p < .05$) and racial centrality moderated the relation between discrimination and distress such that it exacerbated the direct relation of daily discrimination and negative affect ($\beta = .07, p < .05$), as well as depression ($\beta = .27, p < .05$).

In a study using the race-specific collective self-esteem scale (CSES-R; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) with 139 Black college and community participants, Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey (1999) found that higher perceived racial discrimination was indirectly related to personal self-esteem and private collective self-esteem. However, this relationship was mediated by in-group identification, or identity CSE, and reversed the effects of discrimination, serving as a buffer for personal self-esteem and private CSE. Additionally, private CSE was negatively associated with negative emotions. Branscombe and colleagues’ findings suggest that interethnic discrimination, a social identity threat, can be damaging to self-concept; yet, higher identity CSE may buffer and reverse the negative effects of such discrimination (Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009).

While these studies highlight the influence of identity, private, and public CSE with interethnic discrimination, these constructs would likely apply differently in the face of intraethnic discrimination due to the absence of in-group support for self-enhancement. For example, it can be reasoned that in the context of intraethnic discrimination, public CSE, an estimation of how others view one’s ethnic group, would have less impact on the relation
between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress due to the within-group nature of the discriminatory experiences. In previous literature, private and identity collective self-esteem were associated with mental health correlates among Black participants after controlling for personal self-esteem (Branscombe et al., 1999; Crocker et al., 1994). It can also be reasoned that identity and private CSE may not serve as protective factors when the discrimination is perpetrated by members of one’s own ethnic group. For these reasons, in this study, the relation of identity and private collective self-esteem were investigated in the context of intraethnic discrimination. Membership and public CSE were not analyzed due to their lack of pertinence to the study. While it seems likely that identity and private collective self-esteem would impact the relation between intraethnic discrimination and distress, extant literature does not provide evidence to suggest what levels of collective self-esteem would influence levels of distress among those experiencing intraethnic discrimination. Due to the threat to ethnic identity experienced through intraethnic discrimination, literature on responses to social identity threat may provide clarity on the role of collective self-esteem in the context of intraethnic discrimination.

**Stigma, Discrimination, and Social Identity Threat**

Unique challenges arise when individuals experience discrimination as members of a stigmatized group. Members of stigmatized groups are perceived to possess characteristics that are deemed socially inferior or deviant (Major & O’Brien, 2005). These characteristics are then associated with negative stereotypes used to justify discrimination, ostracism and distancing, and justify devaluing of a group’s social identity (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998). U.S. Blacks represent a stigmatized social group that experience ongoing discrimination and share a lower social identity status than Whites (Crocker & Major, 1989; Gary, 2005).
According to Williams and Williams-Morris (2000), acceptance of the negative stereotypes associated with one’s stigmatized group fosters a belief in the social group’s inferiority and threatens one’s social identity. Social identity threat is defined as risks to one’s self-concept resulting from membership in a stigmatized, devalued social group (Major & O’Brien, 2005). Succumbing to social identity threats may lead to poor self-evaluations that in turn have negative effects on a person’s well-being. Thus, discrimination can be distressing due to the risk of social identity threat (Major & O’Brien, 2005).

Individuals exposed to intraethnic discrimination may experience double stigmatization (Gary, 2005) both from outside and within their ethnic group. While levels of distress associated with interethnic discrimination might be buffered by strong ascription to one’s ethnic group identity (i.e., higher collective self-esteem), levels of distress associated with intraethnic discrimination may be largely contingent on how a person ascribes to his or her ethnic group identity. A person’s ethnicity-related collective self-esteem is likely to impact the extent to which they become distressed in the face of intraethnic discrimination, but in what direction and at what level of collective self-esteem is unclear.

It is inferred that there are six potential possibilities of collective self-esteem impacting the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress:

1. Lower collective self-esteem may serve as a risk factor: Individuals with lower collective self-esteem may attribute experiences of intraethnic discrimination to personal characteristics. Externally attributing the discrimination experience to coping processes of stigmatized group may be difficult for individuals with lower ethnic identity and private collective self-esteem. Thus, the discrimination may be
experienced as a personal attack (Mendes, McCoy, Major, & Blascovich, 2008) and may exacerbate the relation between intraethic discrimination and distress.

(2) Lower collective self-esteem may serve as a protective factor: Individuals with lower ethnic identity and private CSE may selectively devalue certain rules and norms of the ethnic group for which they are being mistreated (Crocker & Major, 1989). Those with lower private CSE may externally attribute the discrimination to prejudice or issues inherent to the group member or ethnic group, reducing their internalization of the mistreatment (Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991; McCoy & Major, 2003). Reduced internalization through detachment (Major & O’Brien, 2005) may help buffer the intraethnic discrimination-distress relation.

(3) Higher collective self-esteem may serve as a risk factor: Individuals with higher ethnic identity and private CSE may attribute the discrimination experience to personal attributes due to their desire to belong to and high valuation of the group and/or its members. They may also perceive members as quality comparisons for one’s fit within the ethnic group (Crocker & Major, 1989). Thus, these individuals may experience greater distress from experiences of intraethnic discrimination.

(4) Higher collective self-esteem may serve as a protective factor: Individuals with higher ethnic identity and private CSE may attribute the discrimination experience to historical oppression, which may buffer against significant distress (Crocker, 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989). Additionally, individuals may accept qualities of their ethnic identity where other members seek to create distance (Sellers et al., 1998).

(5) Mixed collective self-esteem may serve as a risk factor: Individuals with higher identity CSE and lower private CSE may experience dissonance or shame related to
their ethnic group identity. Thus, these individuals may experience increased levels of psychological distress in the context of intraethnic discrimination (Chavous et al., 2003).

(6) Mixed collective self-esteem may serve as a protective factor: Individuals with lower identity CSE and higher private CSE may engage in distancing or denial of ethnicity as a central aspect of their identity in the presence of social identity threat. This distancing may buffer the relation between intraethnic discrimination and distress (Major & O’Brien, 2005).

These six potential relationships depict manners in which collective self-esteem may moderate the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress. As Blacks in the U.S. experience ongoing interethnic discrimination, intraethnic discrimination, adds experiences of rejection from both in- and out-group members. It can be reasoned that members of a double stigmatized group may have more difficulty benefitting from strong identity CSE. Black individuals cannot rely on intraethnic identification (identity CSE) and favoritism (private CSE) for self-enhancement. For this reason, intraethnic, as opposed to interethnic, discrimination is potentially more detrimental to Black individuals (e.g., Major, O’Brien, & Simon, 2012; Sanchez, Chavez, Good, & Wilton, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

Considering social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982), as well as the direct relation commonly found between interethnic discrimination and psychological distress (e.g., Banks, Kohn-Wood, & Spencer, 2006), it can be reasoned that intraethnic discrimination will directly relate to psychological distress. It can also be inferred that how much one identifies with one’s ethnic group (i.e., in-group identification or identity CSE), and how one’s feels about being a member
of one’s ethnic group (i.e., in-group favoritism or private CSE) may moderate the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress.

Thus far, studies that have focused on intraethnic discrimination, or acceptance and rejection among Black samples have mostly used author-created measures. None of these measures have established psychometric support in terms of validity and some do not fully assess the construct (e.g., skin tone), assess racial rather than ethnic discrimination (e.g., Clark, 2004), or lack real-world applicability (e.g., Mendes et al., 2008; Postmes & Branscombe, 2002).

Additionally, no other study has empirically investigated the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress. This study sought to uniquely examine the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress. Additionally, since Black individuals generally report higher personal self-esteem (Twenge & Crocker, 2002) yet the influence of personal self-esteem on discrimination and distress in Black samples has generated mixed results, i.e., with higher self-esteem exacerbating the relation, having no moderation effect, or being moderated by gender (Cassidy, O'Connor, Howe, & Warden, 2004), this study controlled for personal self-esteem.

The present study attempted to extend the current literature on discrimination and distress by examining intraethnic discrimination. The study: (1) examined whether a relation between intraethnic discrimination and distress and exists and if so, (2) for whom (in relation to ethnicity-related identity and private collective self-esteem), while controlling for personal self-esteem. It was hypothesized that intraethnic discrimination would negatively contribute to psychological distress. Additionally, it was hypothesized that identity and private collective self-esteem would both moderate the intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress relation, such that the interaction of intraethnic discrimination (independent variable), identity collective self-esteem
(moderator), and private collective self-esteem (moderator) would be related to changes in psychological distress (dependent variable), with higher levels of the moderators increasing the relation of the independent and dependent variables. Thus, it was hypothesized that proposition 3 would occur, such that individuals with higher identity and private CSE would report greater psychological distress from experiences of intraethnic discrimination. The order of the moderator variables, as shown in Figure 1, is inferred from social identity theory. According to Tajfel (1982), the salience of one’s social group membership to one’s identity (i.e., Identity CSE), will likely influence one’s appraisal of the social group (i.e., Private CSE). Thus, it can be reasoned that private CSE would more likely have direct influence on the discrimination-distress relation, while identity CSE would further interact with private CSE to influence the relation.

**Figure 1.** Hypothesized conceptual diagram in which identity and private collective self-esteem interact to jointly moderate the relation between intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress. Diagram is adapted from Hayes’ (2013) moderated moderation model template for PROCESS. PEDQ-CV = Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version (Brondolo et al., 2005); ID = Importance to Identity and PR = Private collective self-esteem subscales of The Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Race Specific (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992); GSI = Global Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory-18 (Derogatis, 2001).
Chapter 2: Method

Design

An *ex post facto* non-experimental design was used to assess relations of intraethnic discrimination with psychological distress, and collective self-esteem. The observed study variables were measured through self-report and involved no manipulation of the independent variable. The general linear model (GLM) was used as the basis for conducting a moderated moderation analysis using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, to examine the hypothesized associations among intraethnic discrimination, identity collective self-esteem, private collective self-esteem, and psychological distress. According to Hayes (2013), a moderated moderation model, also known as a three-way interaction, is one in which the predictor variable’s ($X$) effect on the criterion ($Y$) is moderated by a primary moderator ($M$) which is itself moderated by a secondary moderator ($W$) as depicted below in Figures 2 and 3. Thus $M$’s moderation effect on $X$ and $Y$ is conditional on $W$.

![Diagram](image_url)

*Figure 2.* Hayes’ (2013) conceptual diagram of a moderated moderation model (Model 3) for PROCESS (p. 308).
Figure 3. Hayes’ (2013) statistical diagram of a moderated moderation model or Model 3 for PROCESS (p. 308).

The independent or predictor variable (i.e., intraethnic discrimination) was measured using a modified version of the Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version (PEDQ-CV; Brondolo et al., 2005). The dependent variable or criterion, psychological distress, was measured using the Global Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory-18 (BSI-18; Derogatis, 2001). The moderating variables, identity and private collective self-esteem, were measured using their corresponding subscales on the Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Race Specific (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Control variables included personal self-esteem, measured using Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1979) and attendance at a historically Black college or university (or HBCU Attendance), measured using one Yes/No item on the demographic questionnaire (see Appendix C).

Participants
Due to this study’s examination of experiences of intraethnic discrimination and collective self-esteem on psychological distress within the broader Black young adult community in the U.S., this study sought the inclusion of the diverse representation of Black identity amongst the U.S. American populace. Thus, participants of various gender, ethnic, religious and sexual orientation identities, and socioeconomic statuses were invited and included in the study. The inclusion criteria for participation in this study comprised: (1) identifying as Black, (2) being born in the U.S., (3) being between the ages of 18 and 29, and (4) identifying Black as their sole racial identity (i.e., monoracial).

The study sample consisted of a total of 494 U.S.-born African American/Black young adults between the ages of 18 and 29 (\(M = 25.04; SD = 2.94\)), currently residing in the U.S. Participants were recruited for a study examining the lived experiences of Black young adults. Individuals who identified with multiple races or did not identify as Black or African American, were under age 18 or aged 30 and above, and/or were foreign-born were excluded. A majority of participants identified as African American (68.8%), women (53.0%), Christian (64.6%), heterosexual (88.1%), middle class or higher (61.7%), and had completed a two-year college degree or more (63.1%). Complete demographic data is available in Table 1.

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited through flyers posted in the community, i.e., public libraries, bus stops, and college campuses. Recruitment for participation was also sent to graduate teaching assistants and various departments at the University at Albany to announce the research participation opportunity to students. Participants were additionally recruited online through email (see Appendix A) submissions on various listservs (i.e., University at Albany’s Graduate Student Association, Association of Black Psychologists, and American Psychological
Association Divisions 17, 35, and 45 student listservs), social media posts (i.e., Facebook and Twitter) and through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Additionally, a snowball sampling procedure was used, in which participants were asked to pass along the recruitment email or flyer to any others who may fit the criteria.

Data was collected through a secured survey available online for participation on www.psychdata.com. The online survey first included the general purpose of the study and an informed consent form (see Appendix B), notifying participants of the benefits and potential risks of the study, confidentiality, compensation, voluntary nature of the study, right to withdraw, inclusion criteria, and contact information for the principal investigator, faculty advisor, and Office of Research Compliance. The demographic questionnaire (see Appendix C) followed the informed consent to determine whether participants met the inclusion criteria. All other instruments were counterbalanced to control for order effects. Four survey versions (i.e., study measures arranged in four unique orders), were randomly assigned to participants via psychdata.

Participants who took part in the study via recruitment methods outside of MTurk (non-MTurk) had the opportunity to enter a drawing for fifteen $15 Amazon e-gift cards following completion of the study by providing their email address on a separate page. Participants’ e-mail addresses were not linked to their survey data. Participants who took part in the study via MTurk and met inclusion criteria received $0.50 following completion of the study.

Instruments

The Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version (PEDQ-CV). To measure ethnic discrimination, the Brief PEDQ-CV (Brondolo et al., 2005; see Appendix D) was used. The Brief PEDQ-CV is a 17-item self-report measure used to assess the frequency of ethnic discrimination over one’s lifetime in the social/interpersonal context. It
should be noted that ethnicity is broadly defined by the author to include both cultural heritage and social groupings, i.e., both race and ethnicity. The Brief PEDQ-CV is a shortened version of the full 34-item PEDQ-CV and was constructed for use in time constrained circumstances or other instances in which administration of the full measure may be procedurally less practical. The PEDQ-CV is a revised version of the original 70-item PEDQ (Contrada et al., 2001), which was validated with college students. The PEDQ-CV revisions included use of simpler language and item adaptations that better reflect life experiences of non-student adults.

Items on the PEDQ-CV\textsuperscript{4} are rated on a 5-point scale, 1 (never happened) to 5 (happened very often), to indicate the frequency with which participants have encountered ethnic discrimination in their lifetime. Scores can range from 17 to 85, with higher scores indicating more experiences of lifetime ethnic discrimination. Items begin with the statement “Because of my ethnicity…”. The measure uses a full, Lifetime Discrimination scale score, but also consists of four subscales: Exclusion/Rejection (e.g., “made you feel like an outsider because of appearance”), Stigmatization/Disvaluation (e.g., “hinted you must not be clean”), Work/School Discrimination (e.g., “treated unfairly by teachers”), and Threat/Aggression (e.g., “actually hurt you”). The full Lifetime Discrimination scale score was analyzed in this study.

The PEDQ-CV was chosen for the current study due to its specific assessment of ethnic discrimination and study participants were able to identify and acknowledge ethnic discrimination as an experience that can occur intra-ethnically, in the process of completing the measure and thus may be best suited for modification as a measure of intraethnic discrimination. Additionally, it has been psychometric validated with ethnic minority samples, including Blacks of varying education levels, both U.S.- and foreign-born. The authors reported a Cronbach’s $\alpha$

\textsuperscript{4} From this point forward, PEDQ-CV will be used to mean the Brief PEDQ-CV
for the PEDQ-CV Lifetime Discrimination Scale was .87 in a community sample and .88 in a student sample. Reliabilities reported by the authors for the overall sample ranged from .69 (Discrimination at Work/School) to .80 (Threat/aggression) for the subscales. The authors reported similar Cronbach’s α levels of the subscales among Black participants in the sample (Brondolo et al., 2005).

In terms of convergent validity, Brondolo et al. (2005) reported that the Lifetime Discrimination scale of the PEDQ-CV was positively associated with Perceived Racism Scale scores ($r = .61$, $p < .001$), threatening ($r = .45$, $p < .001$) and harmful ($r = .43$, $p < .001$) appraisals of racism among Black participants. The PEDQ-CV was also positively associated with trait anxiety scores on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale ($r = .34$, $p < .02$), and hostility ($r = .51$, $p < .0004$) and cynicism ($r = .48$, $p < .0008$) subscale scores on the MMPI-based Cook and Medley hostility scale among black Participants. The Lifetime Discrimination scale was not significantly correlated with scores on the Crowne-Marlowe scale ($r = -.11$, $p < .44$) among Black participants (Brondolo et al., 2005).

For this study, the instructions for the PEDQ-CV was modified with the author’s approval (E. Brondolo, personal communication, September 10, 2015) so that participants responded to items considering their interactions with members within their ethnic group (intraethnic discrimination). Clark (2004) modified instructions in a similar manner with Black college students using the STR (Harrell et al., 1997), a measure of perceived racism and reported Cronbach’s αs of .94 and .93 for interethnic and intraethnic discrimination, respectively. In a study on ethnic discrimination in a Chinese immigrant sample, similar instruction modifications to measures of social anxiety and acculturation generated Cronbach’s αs ranging from .83 and
.95 (Fang, Friedlander, & Pieterse, 2015), suggesting that modifications may be reliable. For the current study, the Cronbach’s α for the PEDQ-CV Lifetime Discrimination Scale was .94.

**Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Race Specific (CSES-R).** The Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Race Specific (CSES-R; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Crocker et al., 1994; see Appendix E) is a 16-item self-report measure used to assess individuals’ evaluation of the ethnic or racial group to which they belong. The CSES-R (Crocker et al., 1994) was modified from the general CSES (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) which does not specify the social group. The CSES-R allows participants to consider their self-identified ethnic group, rather than externally-assigned racial groups, when responding to scale items and specifically assesses for ethnicity-related collective self-esteem based on the respondent’s identified ethnicity.

The CSES-R uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) to rate items in four subscales – Private, Public, Membership CSE, and Importance to Identity (otherwise referred to as Identity CSE). Private CSE measures how one feels about one’s ethnic group; Public CSE assesses perceptions of how others feel about one’s ethnic group. Identity CSE measures the salience of one’s membership in the ethnic group, and membership CSE assesses how well one functions as a member of one’s ethnic group (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). The private and identity CSE subscales were used in this study.

For this current study, the full measure was administered since no studies using only identity and private CSE subscales could be identified in a review of the literature. The authors however do not recommend use of a composite score for the overall scale since each subscale measures a distinct construct (Crocker, 2015; Crocker et al., 1994), thus only subscale scores are analyzed. Sum scores on each subscale range from 4 to 28, and then divided by 4 for a subscale total ranging from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating greater collective self-esteem in the
particular domain. In a study of Black, White, and Asian young adults, the authors reported alpha coefficients of reported of .72 for Private CSE and .84 for Identity CSE for race-specific versions of the CSES (Crocker et al., 1994). The Cronbach’s α for Identity and Private CSE were .75 and .82, respectively, in this study.

To demonstrate construct validity, Crocker et al. (1994) found significant positive correlations between RSE scores and race-specific Membership CSE ($r = .55, p < .01$) and Private CSE ($r = .43, p < .01$) within a sample of Black college students, reflecting theorized relationships between personal and collective self-esteem, but suggesting measurement of distinct constructs.

**Brief Symptom Inventory-18 (BSI-18).** The BSI-18 (Derogatis, 2001; see Appendix F) is an 18-item self-report measure commonly used to assess recent levels of anxiety, depression, somatization, and overall psychological distress. The BSI-18 is a shortened version of the original 53-item BSI (Derogatis, 1993), which was reduced to increase brevity and structural validity. Participants are asked to report the extent to which they have been distressed by a particular symptom in the past seven days. The BSI-18 items are rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely*). The anxiety, depression, and somatization subscales each consist of six items. Subscale scores can be calculated by summing the items so that each subscale, can range from 0-24. The Global Severity Index within the BSI-18, which assesses overall psychological distress, was analyzed in this study.

The Global Severity Index (GSI), is calculated by summing all of the BSI-18 subscale scores. Higher GSI scores (range from 0 to 72) indicate greater levels of psychological distress. The GSI is considered to be indicative of an individual’s current level of emotional adjustment and psychological functioning. The GSI has been highly correlated with the BSI-18 subscales
(i.e., $r$s of .91-.96) and had a Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$ (Derogatis, 2001). Similar alpha levels have been reported in studies with Black young adults, $\alpha = .91$ (Utsey, Giesbrecht, Hook, & Stanard, 2008). The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the GSI was .96 in the current study.

Initial construct validity was established using the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1994). The somatization, anxiety, and depression subscales and GSI composite score highly correlated with corresponding scores on the SCL-90-R, with $r$s ranging from .91 to .96 (Derogatis, 2001). The GSI was used in this study due to its strong psychometric properties and its wide use in measurement of psychological distress in a variety of studies, including those investigating discrimination (e.g., Bynum et al., 2007).

**Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory.** The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (RSE; Rosenberg, 1979; see Appendix G) is a 10-item self-report measure that assesses global self-worth, both positive (e.g., “I feel that I have a number of good qualities”) and negative evaluations of the self (“I feel I do not have much to be proud of”). Due to expected and observed moderate correlations between RSE scores and private CSE scores (see Table 3), scores on this measure served as a covariate in this study.

The RSE, initially validated with a sample of high school juniors and seniors, has become the most widely used measure of personal self-esteem. The RSE has strong psychometric properties, with Cronbach’s $\alpha$s ranging from .74 to .92 in studies of Black young adults (Harvey et al., 2005; Postmes & Branscombe, 2002). For the current study, the RSE had a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of .91. The RSE uses a 4-point scale from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 3 (*strongly agree*) with scores ranging from 0 to 30. Higher scores on the RSE indicates higher, more positive global self-esteem.
In terms of construct validity, Robins, Hendin, and Trzesniewski (2001) found the RSE to be positively associated with various positive personality characteristics such as dispositional optimism ($r = .48, p < .01$) on Life Orientation Test-Revised scale (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994), and negatively associated with measures of depression ($r = -.34, p < .01$) and perceived stress ($r = -.39, p < .01$).

**Demographic questionnaire.** Participants were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix C) to identify their gender, age, sexuality, race (e.g., Black or African American, etc.), ethnicity (e.g., African American, Jamaican, Nigerian, etc.), religion, religiosity, country of origin, and parents’ country of origin (which provided additional information on ethnicity, if needed), social class, education, HBCU attendance, and ethnic composition of one’s local environment. Race and country of origin were used as screening criteria. Participants who did not endorse Black or African American as their race or United States as their country of origin were excluded from the study. Participants who identified as multiracial were also excluded.

The demographic information was also used to describe the study’s sample and to identify if any demographic variables should be included in the major analyses as covariates. For example, gender was identified as an a priori potential covariate due to some research findings (e.g., Clark, 2004; Constantine, Donnelly, & Myers, 2002) suggesting differences in perceptions of discrimination, collective self-esteem and coping among Black young adults such that men reported higher levels of discrimination and distress. Additionally, Harvey et al. (2005) examined racial composition of local environment (e.g., college) and found differential experiences of intraethnic discrimination and psychological outcomes, such that individuals in racially diverse environments experienced lower levels of intraethnic discrimination and distress.
Lastly, Brondolo et al. (2005) found significant differences in reports of discrimination based on education level. Thus, the demographic questionnaire provided an opportunity to identify whether these variables served as significant covariates in the current study’s sample. Among the demographic variables, gender, HBCU Attendance, education level, ethnicity, religiosity, social class and age were correlated with one or more of the main study variables (see Table 3). The correlated demographic variables were entered into a hierarchical linear regression (see Tables 4 and 5) to identify covariates in the regression model. A Bonferroni adjustment was performed to minimize Type I error rates, at a preset $\alpha$ of .05, in a test of the multiple predictors in the regression analysis. Thus, $\alpha$ was set to .0024 (.05/21 = .0024). HBCU Attendance was the only significant demographic predictor variable ($\Delta R^2 = .015$, $p = .002$) and thus served as a covariate in the study due to its correlation with all of the study variables (see Table 5).

**Power Analysis**

A minimum sample size was needed to attain the desired power of .80 for the study, with $\alpha = .05$. Currently, no studies have assessed the relation between intraethnic discrimination and the outcomes of interest in this study to assist in determining an appropriate effect size. However, in-group rejection has been inversely associated with membership and private collective self-esteem ($r = -.20, p < .05$; $r = -.24, p < .01$) and personal self-esteem ($r = -.18, p < .05$; Postmes & Branscombe, 2002). With regard to interethnic discrimination, Bynum et al. (2007) found a direct association between perceived racism and psychological distress ($r = .31, p < .01$). Additionally, a meta-analysis on perceived racial discrimination and mental health found an effect sizes ranging from .12 and .24 for self-esteem and psychological distress, respectively (Pieterse, Todd, Neville, & Carter, 2012). Therefore, based on previous research, a small effect size was used for the power analysis. According to Cohen (1988), a small effect size of .03 can
be used for tests of moderation. Using Cohen (1992) and WebPower (Zhang & Yuan, 2018) to calculate the sample size minimum, it was determined that a minimum of \( n = 327 \) participants would be needed for the desired \( \beta \) of .20 at \( \alpha = .05 \).

**Data Analytic Plan**

**Preliminary Analyses.** Of the 535 surveys completed meeting inclusion criteria, participants missing more than 5% of items per measure (i.e., more than one item) were removed from further analysis (\( n = 40, \ 7.5\% \)). Values were imputed for participants (\( n = 99, \ 20\% \)) with < 5% of missing data (\( M = 1.2 \) missing values, \( SD = 0.3 \)) on any measure using mean substitution, which Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) described as a conservative, commonly used procedure.

Preliminary analyses were completed prior to the major (regression) analysis to assess whether underlying assumptions of a multiple regression were met. The Durbin-Watson test was used to assess the independence of the error terms. A value of 2 indicates uncorrelated residuals (Field, 2009). The Durbin-Watson test statistic of 2.1 in this study, along with the study’s design and data (i.e., participant data were neither paired nor repeated), suggests independence. Collinearity diagnostics were reviewed to assess for multicollinearity. According to Field (2009), a tolerance > .2 and VIF < 10 among the study variables, is deemed acceptable. For this current study, tolerance ranged from 0.44 (Private CSE) to .90 (HBCU Attendance), and VIF ranged from 1.12 (HBCU Attendance) to 2.29 (Private CSE), suggesting reduced concerns related to multicollinearity.

Normality was assessed via a graphical view of the histogram of the standardized residuals as well as the normal probability (P-P and Q-Q) plots. The distributions suggested an approximately normal distribution of the error terms. An optical scan of the scatterplots of standardized residuals by the standardized predicted values suggested a linear but funnel-like
distribution, indicating a violation of homoscedasticity. According to Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003), heteroscedasticity does not bias the regression coefficient estimates, but may affect standard errors. Thus, Hayes’ option for heteroscedasticity-consistent standard error estimators in his PROCESS procedure (Hayes, 2013; http://www.processmacro.org) was selected in the major analysis of the data.

Casewise diagnostics were to identify substantial outliers, i.e., studentized deleted residuals (SDR) > ± 3, high leverage cases (i.e., centered leverage > 2k/n = 0.02), highly influential cases (i.e., Cook’s distance > 1), or dfBetas (i.e., ±2/√n = ±0.09), based on the recommended cutoff values provided by Cohen et al. (2003). One case was removed due to having a higher SDR of -2.54, high leverage (h*ii = 0.78), influence (D = 2.58), |dfBetas| > 0.09 on the intercept, HBCU Attendance, and the interactions of the moderator variables.

To test the efficacy of the counterbalanced measures, or order effects, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted for the combined datasets, assessing whether differences in measure scores existed in the survey versions. The order of instrument presentation (or survey version) served as the independent or fixed factor variable, and the outcome measures served as the dependent variables. Results were not significant (Wilk’s λ = .965, F (15, 1342.03) = 1.18, p = .285). Additionally, the correlation analyses demonstrate nonsignificant correlations (rs ranging from -.02 to .06, p > .21) among the survey versions and the study variables.

**Major Analyses.** A moderated moderation using multiple regression analysis was used to investigate the hypothesis that intraethnic PEDQ-CV scale score’s prediction of GSI scores is moderated by the importance to identity scale scores and private CSE scale scores. A statistical analysis program known as PROCESS macro version 2.16.3 (Hayes, 2013;
http://www.processmacro.org) was used to conduct the analysis. PROCESS is a computational tool for SPSS and SAS which allows for simple to complex moderation, mediation, and combined analyses commonly conducted among behavioral scientists.

PROCESS is free with a “simple-to-use procedure” (Hayes, 2012, p. 3), often eliminating the need for conducting multiple statistical tests or using various computational tools. PROCESS also uses the Johnson-Neyman technique for moderation analyses, which identifies regions of significance (i.e., values for which the moderator significantly effects the relation between the focal predictor and the criterion) for each continuous moderator. This allows for more accurate selections, rather than arbitrary estimations, for probing, examining simple slopes, and interpreting interactions (Hayes, 2012; 2013). The comprehensive nature of the PROCESS procedure protects against an inflated Type I error as it uses a single test for the multiple variables in the analysis.

Specifically, an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis was conducted to estimate the parameters of the hypothesized statistical model (see Figures 2 through 4), which included: a) the independent variable, Intraethnic Discrimination (X), assessed by scores on the PEDQ-CV; b) the primary moderator variable, Private CSE (M), assessed by scores on the Private CSE subscale of the CSES-R; c) the secondary moderating variable, Identity CSE (W), assessed by scores on the Importance to Identity subscale of the CSES-R and d) the dependent variable, Psychological Distress (Y), assessed by scores on the GSI of the BSI-18. Additionally, as seen in Table 3, due to the moderate to strong correlations of the above variables with personal self-esteem (assessed by RSE scores) and HBCU attendance, the two variables will serve as covariates, C₁ and C₂, respectively.
Figure 4. Statistical diagram of study’s full hypothesized conceptual model including covariates adapted from Hayes (2013) moderated moderation model.

**Hypotheses**

All hypotheses include controlling for RSE scores and HBCU Attendance. Figure 4 provides a visual depiction of the study’s statistical hypotheses. It was hypothesized (i.e., hypothesis 1) that Identity CSE (W) scores and Private CSE (M) scores would jointly moderate the relation between Intraethnic PEDQ-CV scores (X) and GSI scores (Y) such that higher identity and private CSE scores would strengthen the relation between PEDQ-CV and GSI
scores (i.e., $b_7$ in Figure 4). Secondly, if a three-way interaction was not found, Private CSE and Identity CSE scores would each uniquely moderate the relation between Intraethnic PEDQ-CV scores and GSI scores. Lastly, if no support for a moderation effect was found, it was hypothesized (i.e., hypothesis 4) that Intraethnic PEDQ-CV scores would uniquely contribute to GSI scores, such that higher intraethnic PEDQ-CV scores would be associated with higher GSI scores (i.e., $b_1$ in Figure 4).

Hayes’ (2013) PROCESS Model 3 was selected to conduct the analysis for hypothesis 1 (i.e., the three-way interaction of intraethnic discrimination, private and identity CSE) and Model 1 was selected to analyze hypotheses 2 and 3 (i.e., the unique moderation effect of private CSE and the unique moderation effect of identity CSE, respectively). See Figs. 1-5 for clarity on the conceptual and statistical diagrams which inform selection of the moderator variable in their respective fields, and the model number. The predictor variables (i.e., $X$, $M$, $W$) were mean-centered prior to computation of the products via PROCESS in order to provide meaningful interpretation of the regression coefficients (Hayes, 2013), since a zero score does not exist on the measures (i.e., PEDQ-CV, Identity CSE, and Private CSE) and thus would not be meaningful to interpret.
Chapter 3: Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analyses were performed for participants’ age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, religiosity, education level, HBCU attendance, environmental ethnic composition, and social class as seen on Table 1. Additionally, mean scores, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis for this study’s variables are reported in Table 2. Internal consistency reliability estimates were calculated for all measures and are included in Table 3.

Correlation Analysis and Covariates

Intercorrelations were computed to determine the direction and magnitude of the relation between the major variables (see Table 3). Personal self-esteem (RSE) was correlated with all of the study’s variables, ranging from weak, positive correlations with Identity CSE ($r = .17, p < .01$) to strong negative correlations with Psychological Distress ($r = -.54, p < .01$). These correlations support the a priori hypothesis that personal self-esteem would serve as a covariate in alignment with social identity theory. Thus, personal self-esteem served as a covariate for this study. Additionally, the independent and moderating variables appeared to be correlated with the dependent variable (psychological distress). Psychological distress was found to be positively correlated with Intraethnic discrimination ($r = .56, p < .01$), and negatively correlated with Identity CSE ($r = -.20, p < .01$) and Private CSE ($r = -.41, p < .01$).

Significant correlations were also found between study variables and demographic variables. Gender was positively correlated with identity ($r = .25, p < .01$) and private collective self-esteem ($r = .23, p < .01$), personal self-esteem ($r = .09, p < .05$) and negatively correlated with intraethnic discrimination ($r = -.18, p < .01$), such that women tended to report higher levels of personal self-esteem, identity CSE, private CSE, and lower levels of intraethnic
discrimination. HBCU attendance was found to be directly associated with intraethnic discrimination \((r = .21, p < .01)\) and psychological distress \((r = .18, p < .01)\), such that participants who attended an HBCUs were more likely to report higher levels of intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress. Additionally, HBCU Attendance was negatively associated with private collective self-esteem \((r = -.19, p < .01)\) and personal self-esteem \((r = -.11, p < .05)\). Age was negatively associated with psychological distress \((r = -.09, p < .05)\) and positive associated with personal self-esteem \((r = .17, p < .01)\). Education level was directly associated with identity collective self-esteem \((r = .21, p < .01)\) and personal self-esteem \((r = .18, p < .01)\). More specifically, participants who at most attained a high school diploma reported lower identity collective self-esteem \((r = -.13, p < .01)\) and personal self-esteem \((r = -.14, p < .01)\), while graduate degree holders reported higher levels of personal self-esteem \((r = .14, p < .01)\), identity \((r = .26, p < .01)\) and private collective self-esteem \((r = .14, p < .01)\).

Religiosity was positively correlated with identity collective self-esteem \((r = .13, p < .01)\) such that individuals who reported having a salient religious identity tended to report higher identity collective self-esteem. Social class was negatively associated with intraethnic discrimination and positively correlated with personal self-esteem. Specifically, participants who selected “Poverty level” as their social class tended to report higher levels of psychological distress \((r = .10, p < .05)\) and lower levels of personal self-esteem \((r = -.11, p < .05)\). Sexuality was directly associated with personal self-esteem \((r = .13, p < .01)\), such that participants who identified as heterosexual tended to report higher personal self-esteem. Ethnicity was negatively correlated with identity collective self-esteem \((r = -.11, p < .05)\), suggesting that participants who identified as ethnically African American or Black American, were more likely to endorse lower levels of identity collective self-esteem. Partial correlations performed, controlling for RSE,
found nonsignificant correlations between age, sexuality and social class, and the study’s variables.

**Test of Hypotheses**

To test the study’s hypotheses, a Bonferroni adjustment was used in order to avoid inflation of Type I error rates while performing multiple tests. Thus, $\alpha$ level was set at 0.016 (i.e., $0.05/6 = 0.0083\overline{3}$). In testing Hypothesis 1, review of the overall significance of the regression analysis was performed. A significant overall $F$-test of the regression model was found (see Table 6). The $R^2$ indicated that the model explains 53.1% of the variance in GSI scores. To identify the contribution of the study variables on the dependent variable above and beyond the covariates, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed (see Table 7). Personal Self-Esteem ($C_1$) was entered as the predictor in Step 1. HBCU Attendance ($C_2$) was entered as the predictor in Step 2. Intraethnic Discrimination ($X$), Private CSE ($M$), Identity CSE ($W$), and the interaction terms ($XM$, $XW$, $XMW$) were entered into Step 3. The $\Delta R^2$ in Step 3 indicated that the main study variables accounted for approximately 23% of the variance in GSI scores beyond the covariates. Examination of the three-way interaction term ($XMW$, $b_7$) was not statistically significant ($B = .048$, $t (483) = 1.35$, $F (1,483) = 1.81$, $\Delta R^2 = .004$, $p = .179$). Thus, Hypothesis 1, i.e., that Private and Identity CSE scores would jointly moderate the relation between PEDQ-CV scores and GSI scores while controlling for RSE and HBCU Attendance, was not supported by the sample data. See Table 4 for further results.

In support of Hypothesis 2, a significant conditional interaction effect was found in the overall regression model of the two-way interaction term ($XM$, $b_4$) of Private CSE and PEDQ-CV scores on GSI scores ($B = -.13$, $t (483) = -2.99$, $p = .003$), at the mean of Identity CSE. A follow-up regression analyses was performed to identify the unique contribution of Private CSE
on the relation between PEDQ-CV and GSI scores, while controlling for Identity CSE (see Table 8). In the follow-up regression analysis, the model remained significant, accounting for 52.4% of the variance in GSI scores ($F(6,486) = 71.14, p = .000$).

Review of the hierarchical regression analysis, as shown in Table 9, indicated that above and beyond the 31.5% explained by the covariates and controlled Identity CSE, the model accounted for about 20.9% of the variance in GSI scores. Additionally, the interaction accounted for 3.8% of the variance in GSI scores ($F(1,486) = 23.32, p = .000$). Review of the regression coefficient indicated a negative moderation effect ($B = -.16, t(486) = -4.83, p = .000$), such that the positive relation ($B = .44, t(486) = 9.77, p = .000$) between PEDQ-CV and GSI scores weaken as Private CSE scores increase. Implementation of the Johnson-Neyman technique found no statistically significant transition points within the observed range of the moderator, indicating that statistical significance existed along the full continuum of the moderator (Hayes, 2013). See Table 8 and Figure 5 for review of the results.

To test Hypothesis 3, assessing the unique contribution of Identity CSE as a moderating variable, while controlling for Private CSE, a follow-up regression analysis was conducted. The model of the follow-up regression analysis was significant, accounting for 50.6% of the variance in GSI scores. As shown in Table 11, review of the hierarchical regression analysis indicated that 33.9% of the variance in the model was accounted for by the covariates and controlled Private CSE, while 16.7% of the variance in GSI was accounted for by the remaining variables, i.e., PEDQ-CV ($X$), Identity CSE ($W$), and the interaction term of PEDQ-CV by Identity CSE ($XW$). Specifically, the two-way interaction accounted for 1.9% of the variance in GSI scores ($F(1,486) = 9.97, p = .002$). Review of the regression coefficient indicated a negative moderation effect ($B = -.12, t(486) = -3.16, p = .002$), such that the positive relation between PEDQ-CV and
GSI scores weaken as Identity CSE scores increase. Once again, implementation of the Johnson-Neyman technique found no statistically significant transition points within the observed range of the moderator, indicating that statistical significance existed along the full continuum of the moderator (Hayes, 2013). See Table 10 and Figure 6 for additional review of the results.

Due to the significant overall regression model, conditional and unconditional interaction effect of Private CSE scores, as well as the significant unconditional interaction effect of Identity CSE scores on the relation between PEDQ-CV and GSI scores, no main effects were examined between PEDQ-CV (X) and GSI (Y) scores to test Hypothesis 4. However, review of the significant regression coefficients of X in Tables 6, 8, and 10, indicate a positive relation between PEDQ-CV and GSI scores at the mean levels of the moderators.

Finally, significant effects were found for RSE (or personal self-esteem) scores as a covariate in the analyses. In the overall regression model, RSE scores were negatively associated with GSI scores (B = -.87, t (483) = -7.64, p = .000). Similar patterns were found in the follow-up regression models (see Tables 8 and 10). HBCU Attendance was not significant in the regression models.
Figure 5. Graph of the conditional effect of $X$ (intraethnic discrimination) on $Y$ (psychological distress) at values of $M$ (private collective self-esteem). Simple slopes of mean-centered intraethnic discrimination predicting psychological distress for 1 $SD$ below the mean (low), the mean (average), and 1 $SD$ above the mean (high) of private collective self-esteem.
Figure 6. Graph of the conditional effect of $X$ (intraethnic discrimination) on $Y$ (psychological distress) at values of $W$ (identity collective self-esteem). Simple slopes of mean-centered intraethnic discrimination predicting psychological distress for 1 $SD$ below the mean (low), the mean (average), and 1 $SD$ above the mean (high) of identity collective self-esteem.
Chapter 4: Discussion

Summary of Results

Findings of the current study appear to be consistent with previous research on the discrimination-distress relation, such that greater reported experiences of intraethnic discrimination were directly related with higher levels of reported psychological distress among Black young adults. These findings support social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982), which posits that in-group rejection would likely result in distress (Major & O’Brien, 2005; O’Brien, Major, & Simon, 2012). Results also indicated moderation effects, such that private collective self-esteem buffered the intraethnic discrimination-distress relation, while controlling for identity collective self-esteem, accounting for 3.8% of the unique variance in psychological distress. Specifically, for every unit increase in reported intraethnic discrimination experiences and private collective self-esteem from their respective sample means, reported psychological distress decreased by 0.16 units.

Likewise, identity collective self-esteem buffered the intraethnic discrimination-distress relation, while controlling for private collective self-esteem and uniquely accounted for 1.9% of the variance in psychological distress. For every unit increase in reported intraethnic discrimination experiences and identity collective self-esteem from their respective sample means, reported psychological distress decreased by 0.12 units. While statistically significant, the small effect size suggests that identity collective self-esteem was less meaningful in the discrimination-distress relation, within this study’s sample. The observed unique moderation effects suggest that the level of distress associated with intraethnic discrimination among Black young adults is contingent upon ethnicity-related private collective self-esteem, with higher levels serving as a protective factor, similar to theory and some empirical findings in the
psychology literature on interethnic discrimination (e.g., Lee & Ahn, 2013; Branscombe et al., 1999).

It was hypothesized that the theorized benefits of collective self-esteem would not be maintained for Black young adults as a double stigmatized group who experience both interethnic and intraethnic discrimination. Thus, there was a directional hypothesis, that the moderators (i.e., identity and private collective self-esteem) would jointly serve as a risk factor, with higher levels of collective self-esteem strengthening the relation between discrimination and psychological distress. In contrast with the aforementioned theory and hypothesis, the three-way interaction (or joint moderation) was not found to be significant, despite the significant overall moderated moderation model which accounted for almost 26% of the variance in psychological distress above and beyond personal self-esteem.

Based on previous research and theory, personal self-esteem (RSE), was identified a priori as a covariate. There were significant correlations between personal self-esteem and all of the study’s major variables. It was found to be significantly negatively associated with psychological distress in the present study. Additionally, personal self-esteem was negatively correlated with reported intraethnic discrimination, positively correlated with both forms of collective self-esteem and accounted for 29% of the variance in psychological distress. Since social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982) posits that both collective and personal self-esteem encompass one’s self-concept, this study controlled for personal self-esteem to help provide clarity regarding the specific contributions of collective self-esteem on discrimination and distress. Among the demographic variables, HBCU Attendance was identified as an additional covariate, correlating with intraethnic discrimination and collective self-esteem, and accounted for 1.5% of the variance in psychological distress.
Interpretation and Relevance to Previous Research

A significant positive relation between discrimination and distress was found in this study’s sample ($B = .39$, $t (483) = 7.60$, $p = .000$), supporting previous psychology literature on discrimination. This finding suggests that like interethnic discrimination, intraethnic discrimination is painful and significantly distressing (Brondolo et al., 2005; O’Brien, Major, & Simon, 2012; Speight, 2007) among Black young adults. As little has been empirically investigated in the literature regarding intraethnic discrimination, this finding adds to the literature by assessing various forms of intraethnic discrimination experiences and its relation to distress. Additionally, the significant unique moderation effects of private collective self-esteem and identity collective self-esteem in the study’s sample provide initial insight into the protective nature of ethnicity-related collective self-esteem in the context of intraethnic discrimination.

The significant correlations between the study’s variables and demographic variables provide valuable information regarding the study’s sample. The correlation between gender and intraethnic discrimination is consistent with previous research on gender differences and intraethnic discrimination (i.e., Clark, 2004). Participants who attended HBCUs tended to report higher levels of intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress, which may be due to greater exposure to members of their ethnic group or indicative of discriminatory dynamics, e.g., colorism, that may have sustained as relics of the HBCU admissions criteria (Clark et al., 1999). Participants who identified as poverty level social class reported higher levels of distress and lower personal self-esteem, which appears to be consistent with research on mental health and poverty (Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000). Education level was indirectly associated with personal and identity collective self-esteem for high school graduates, and directly associated with personal, private and identity collective self-esteem for graduate degree holders, but was
uncorrelated with any study variables for college (Associate’s or Bachelor’s) degree holders. This appears to be consistent with Crocker et al. (1994) and Twenge and Crocker (2002) who proposed that increased education provides greater awareness and exposure to information on Black history, contributions, and experiences, positively impacting self-esteem. Religiosity was positively correlated with identity collective self-esteem. Blank, Mahmood, Fox, and Guterbok (2002) note that churches historically are divided by racial and ethnic groupings. Thus, participants with salient religious identities may attend more religious services, which may facilitate ethnic community-building and greater ethnic collective identity.

The unexpected direction of the observed unique moderation effects of private collective self-esteem and identity collective self-esteem each appear to be consistent with the aspect of social identity theory that discusses out-group rejection as well as some empirical findings on interethnic discrimination and distress (e.g., Lee & Ahn, 2013; Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009). Thus, perhaps having higher levels of collective self-esteem allows individuals to externally attribute experiences of intraethnic discrimination (Major & O’Brien, 2005) to systemic factors such as historical oppression, providing context surrounding negative behaviors from members of one’s ethnic group. Major and O’Brien posited that externally attributing experiences of stigmatization and devaluation to oppression rather than to qualities true to one’s personhood or social group, aid in protecting one’s personal and collective self-esteem. Thus, with Black Americans, identifying negative experiences as discriminatory may cause distress but protect self-esteem. At the same time, the negative moderation effect is inconsistent with other studies that found collective self-esteem positively moderated the discrimination-distress relation (e.g., Burrow & Ong, 2010; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). The mixed results in previous studies on interethnic discrimination may be due to lack of clarification of the group membership of the
perpetrators of discrimination, and the assumption that all perpetrators were members outside of participants’ ethnic group (i.e., outgroup members). The present study may aid in providing preliminary information regarding the impact of intraethnic discrimination on distress, as well as the effect of collective self-esteem in that relation.

Another possible explanation for the unexpected directions of the moderators may be due to the impact of extraneous variables that were not tested and may have affected the direction. For example, some studies have examined the coping strategies towards discrimination in Black young adults (Clark, 2004; Constantine et al., 2002) and its impact on psychological well-being (Outten, Schmitt, Garcia, & Branscombe, 2009). Thus, differential coping strategies, e.g., Africultural coping styles (Constantine et al., 2002), or emotion-focused versus avoidant coping (Clark, 2004), may contribute to levels of psychological distress.

The theorized relation between internalized racial oppression and discrimination (Bailey, Williams & Favors, 2014; Pyke, 2010; Speight, 2007), suggest that it may also serve as an extraneous variable influencing the study’s variables. For example, Bailey, Chung, Williams, Singh and Terrell (2011) posited that Black individuals who hold higher levels of internalized racial oppressive attitudes are more likely to hold negative beliefs about Black people while devaluing Black cultural perspectives and experiences due to absorption and acceptance of White cultural oppressive beliefs. Thus, it can be reasoned that an individual’s Black ethnic collective self-esteem (i.e., the extent to which one identifies with, connects to, and holds affinity to one’s Black ethnic group), may be shaped by their level of internalized racial oppression (i.e., the extent to which one has internalized oppressive beliefs of the dominant White culture). Thus, it can be reasoned, for example, that a Black American who holds strong internalized racial oppressive attitudes may seek distance from their African American ethnic identity, identifying
solely as American. Additionally, an individual who holds similar oppressive attitudes regarding Blacks in the U.S., and has at least one foreign-born parent, may seek to distance themselves from African Americans and strongly identify with a parent’s non-American Black ethnicity, e.g., Nigerian (Hunter, Case, Joseph, Mekawi, & Bokhari, 2017).

The non-significant three-way interaction effect in the significant overall regression model among intraethnic discrimination, private collective self-esteem and identity collective self-esteem may be interpreted in various ways. The finding suggests that identity collective self-esteem does not moderate private collective self-esteem’s moderation effect of the discrimination-distress relation among Black participants. Thus, the moderating effect of private collective self-esteem, i.e., how one personally appraises one’s ethnic group, is not further enhanced by the importance of one’s ethnic identity. There are a few potential reasons for this non-significant finding.

One potential explanation is that how one attributes experiences of intraethnic discrimination may be influenced by how one regards one’s ethnic group and, by extension, other members of one’s ethnic group and their negative behaviors. For example, as mentioned in an earlier proposition, participants with lower identity and private collective self-esteem may attribute experiences of intraethnic discrimination to personal characteristics, due to a lack of ethnic salience, viewing the events as personal attacks (Mendes, McCoy, Major, & Blascovich, 2008). Participants with higher identity and private CSE may similarly attribute the same discrimination experience to personal attributes however, it may be due to the desire to belong and their high valuation of the ethnic group and/or its members’ opinions (Crocker & Major, 1989). Another explanation may be that due to the small effect sizes of the unique moderations, the joint (or multiplicative) moderation effect was small to observe. Thus, further research with
larger samples may help clarify whether a joint moderation effect exists in the relation between intraethnic discrimination and distress.

**Strengths and Limitations**

The observed relations among the major variables of this study should be interpreted in light of both the study’s strengths and limitations. While one of the strengths of the study is the large sample size, with nearly 500 participants, the sample demographics appear to identify predominantly as African American, Christian, heterosexual, college-educated or higher, middle to upper class, and women. Thus, the experiences reported may not be generalizable to other Black young adults, particularly individuals of other Black ethnic groups or those with different religious, sexual orientation or gender identity. Selection bias was present in the study, as access to and comfort with a computer was necessary to complete the survey, and thus community members who do not have computers or mobile phones with internet access were limited in their ability to participate in this study. As the sample was not random, the findings in this sample are not necessarily reflective of the experience of general population of Black young adults.

Although snowball sampling was included in the sampling procedures, individuals who participated in the survey through Non-MTurk methods were initially recruited largely through college campuses or higher education-related listservs due to the investigator’s access to those populations. Thus, those who participated via snowball sampling may have also shared similar identities to initially solicited participants. Given the limited to no financial incentive (i.e., drawing entry), individuals recruited through Non-MTurk may have had self-selection bias due to their possible valuing of Black issues and engaging in research to expand knowledge. Participants recruited through MTurk, though perhaps more heterogenous, were provided a small
financial incentive ($0.50) and may regularly participate in research for payment, which may have differentially contributed to their motivation to participate.

The current study sample appears to both strengthen and limit the potential inferences which can be made based upon the study’s results. Two-thirds of the study’s participants used MTurk. However, use of MTurk may have served as a strength in expanding the sample’s heterogeneity. Previous research with Black participants (i.e., Branscombe et al., 1999; Burrow & Ong, 2010; Clark, 2004; Crocker et al., 1994; Durkee & Williams, 2015; Harvey et al., 2005; Postmes & Branscombe, 2002; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003) have frequently used college and graduate student samples to examine the study variables. While a majority of this study’s participants attended at least some college, participants who had not attended any college comprised 10% of the study’s sample. Considering that approximately 48% of Black young adults (i.e., 18-29 years old) in the U.S. attained a high school diploma or less (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017), studies that exclusively obtain samples from university students neglect the experiences of a considerable proportion of Black young adults. Although this study only comprises a fraction of the respective population, the use of MTurk assisted in this study’s attempt to include a broader sample of the Black young adult U.S. population than commonly found in previously published study samples.

This study’s use of participant-identified social class, appears to be relatively consistent with current data on Black American adults in the U.S. population. According to Pew Research Center (2015), approximately 43% of Black American adults comprise lower income class, 45% comprise middle class, and 12% comprise upper class. In the current study, 45.5% participants identified as lower income (i.e., working class or poverty level), 46.6% identified as middle class, and 7.9% identified as upper middle class or upper class. Of the previous studies that
assessed for socioeconomic status (Clark, 2004; Crocker et al., 1994; Harvey et al., 2005) authors reported the median income ranges of study participants, and thus the socioeconomic status of participants is unclear.

Of the eight studies listed above, only half (Branscombe et al., 1999; Clark, 2004; Crocker et al., 1994; Swim et al., 2003) reported approximately equal numbers of men and women participants as is present in this current study (46% men, 53% women). The remaining studies reported notably fewer (i.e., < 40%) male participants. Additionally, with the exception of Durkee & Williams (2015), who limited participants’ ages to 18-23, no other study listed above reported age limits of participants, with ages spanning from 17 to 67, and no other study focused exclusively on young adults. Thus, this study may better capture self-esteem (i.e., collective and personal), intraethnic discrimination, and reactivity to such experiences (i.e., psychological distress) in ways which are unique and specific to the developmental period of emerging, young adult men and women than previous research.

Although the diversity of this study’s sample serves as a strength, it can also be reasoned that starting with a more homogenous group may have been beneficial in clarifying the relation among variables in this initial investigation. The inclusion criteria, i.e., U.S.-born, monoracially Black, and between 18-29 years of age, helped to restrict the sample as best as possible while allowing for variance. While homogeneity may have been helpful for an initial investigation, homogeneity may be difficult to achieve, even in narrower samples such as college students, since Black people are not monolithic (Robinson-Wood, 2009). Thus, the current sample may provide a partial reflection of the diversity of Black Americans, particularly African Americans, increasing ecological validity. As mentioned previously, much of the extant research has examined experiences of Black post-secondary students (e.g., Clark, 2004), while the present
study is more inclusive (with 45.5% working class or below; and 36.8% having attained less than a college degree), and attempts to attend to the experiences of less commonly examined Black subgroups.

The study’s instrumentation may have introduced social desirability bias. This is especially concerning with respect to intraethnic discrimination, as participants may have been less inclined to report negative experiences within their ethnic group so as to not “air the dirty laundry” to an unfamiliar source or as a means of coping through dissonance of in-group rejection. One item on the PEDQ-CV discusses police mistreatment. Due to the salient current issues involving the use of lethal force by police within the Black community, there may have been some history and reactivity effects to the items. It is possible that items like #5 (“Have policeman or security officers been unfair to you?”) resonated strongly with participants and yielded increased endorsements of intraethnic discrimination experiences or may have increased a desire for a sense of Black solidarity and yielded reduced endorsements of intraethnic discrimination experiences and distress. However previous studies testing the correlation of various social desirability measures have been nonsignificant (e.g., Clark, 2004) or negatively correlated to perceived discrimination (e.g., Brondolo et al., 2005).

The measure used to assess intraethnic discrimination may have also influenced the study’s findings. The PEDQ-CV measure, while comprehensive, does not fully encompass all forms of within-group discrimination experiences within Black communities, as it was a modified instrument originally developed for interethnic discrimination. For example, development of a measure that incorporates intraethnic discrimination and othering experiences that may be unique to members of Black ethnic groups such as mistreatment due to hair texture (Patton, 2006), skin tone (Harvey et al., 2005); Thompson & Keith, 2001), language and
communication style (Castillo et al., 2007; Waters, 1994), and perceptions of "acting White" (Durkee & Williams, 2015; Fordham & Ogbu, 1986), may help better capture the construct. A mixed-method study including a qualitative component regarding intraethnic discrimination experiences may also help in augmenting or supplementing the quantitative components of the study and address issues of mono-method and social desirability bias.

As discussed earlier in the interpretation of results, an additional threat to the study may have been the use of the CSES-R to assess for forms of collective self-esteem among Black participants. While the CSES-R is psychometrically sound and is appropriate for use with various ethnic groups, the measure conflates ethnicity and race by pairing both constructs in each item (e.g. “I am a worthy member of my race/ethnic group.”). While racial and ethnicity identity tend to be related, the two constructs are distinct. For example, Hall and Carter (2006) found that differences in perceived racial discrimination by racial identity and ethnic identity among Afro-Caribbean adults. The current study sought to examine ethnicity, and due to the measure’s items, it is unclear whether participants responded to items based on race, ethnicity, or both. The conflation of race/ethnicity in the measure however, is consistent with the interchangeable use of race and ethnicity in the literature (Betancourt & López, 1993; Brondolo, Gallo, & Myers, 2009; Contrada et al., 2001).

Despite the study’s limitations, the additional strengths are offered in this study. All measures used in this study were psychometrically sound and were previously used with Black samples, strengthening the study’s internal validity. Additionally, the present study begins to address an empirical gap in the literature and the results of the study highlight the possible protective factors of collective self-esteem among Black young adults who may, due to racism and its byproducts, experience double stigmatization and ultimately psychological distress.
Lastly, this study’s inclusion of HBCU attendance as a covariate offers new information regarding potential differences between HBCU attendees and non-HBCU attendees, as previous studies (Brondolo et al. 2005; Clark. 2004) recruited Black participants from predominantly White universities (PWUs).

**Implications for Theory, Research and Practice**

The significant findings of this study add to the literature by offer empirical support for intraethnic discrimination experiences among Black young adults, the relation of intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress, and the potential influence of private and identity collective self-esteem on that relation. The findings also illuminate the complexity of collective self-esteem in the presence of in-group rejection as posited by social identity theory. These findings may help to inform future research on intraethnic discrimination and Black psychological well-being. Additionally, this study may begin to inform treatment and prevention efforts as it relates to racism and its byproducts, internalized racial oppression and intraethnic discrimination.

Review of the American Psychological Association (APA; 2017) *Multicultural Guidelines: An Ecological Approach to Context, Identity, and Intersectionality* suggests that psychologists should seek to identify and understand both historical and contemporary issues related to power, privilege and oppression and seek to address systemic inequities and mental health disparities therein. Psychologists should aim to engage in culturally-adaptive advocacy, intervention and prevention – using a strength-based approach with clients to reduce trauma and increase resilience – and are encouraged to engage in culturally-informed research and dissemination. Additionally, according to the *Multicultural Guidelines*, psychologists are to
develop understanding of how individuals develop within biosociocultural contexts as well as how such contextual development and socialization affect identity.

Based on these Guidelines, further research, prevention and treatment of intraethnic discrimination as well as its psychosocial/sociocultural contextual correlates (i.e., stemming from internalized racial oppression, but rooted in historical and contemporary racism) and mental health outcomes among Black Americans are essential. Pyke (2010) posited that a lack of research on or attention to intraethnic discrimination maintains the power structure and privilege of Whites due to lack of attention to how racial inequality is insidiously reproduced in oppressed communities. Further research on intraethnic discrimination may help identify, understand, and address racism and its reach more deeply. As discussed earlier, racism extends its reach through the internalization of racist beliefs by members of oppressed groups (Pyke, 2010). Though not racism itself, it is posited that internalized racial oppression is a byproduct of racism which can be reflected in attitudes and beliefs, as well as intraethnic discriminatory behaviors (Bailey et al., 2011; Danzer, 2012), serving as a tool that may sustain racism (Speight, 2007). Thus, exploring intraethnic discrimination events may facilitate deeper discussion and discovery on racism and its impact within Black communities. Additionally, a strengths-based approach, attending to collective self-esteem, may be beneficial in increasing resilience and healing the impact of race and ethnicity-related stress and trauma.

Due to the focus and attention provided to interethnic discrimination, clients may not have a safe space to openly discuss distressing issues occurring within their ethnic group, such as intraethnic discrimination, and psychologist may have not been assessing for it. Increased research on and awareness of intraethnic discrimination can help therapists to identify and explore opportunities for intervention in counseling. Psychologists can begin to create
opportunities for such discussions in therapy, validate Black clients’ experiences of intraethnic discrimination as distressing and detrimental to their wellbeing, and can use post-modern constructivist approaches such as narrative therapy to help clients deconstruct, untangle, and externalize the dominant cultural narrative that contributes to discriminatory behavior and collective self-esteem, and re-author experiences and empower themselves (Bailey et al., 2014). Experiences of interethnic discrimination and racism may sometimes leave Black clients feeling powerless against oppression. However, exploration of intraethnic discrimination can help clients develop insight into intraethnic discrimination as a tool to sustain racial and ethnic oppression, and gain awareness into their role in experiencing and sustaining ethnic oppression in their communities. Such insight may help clients feel increasingly empowered to directly improve their lives and communities. Lastly, due to the buffering potential of collective self-esteem, therapists would benefit from developing skills on cultivating ethnicity-related collective self-esteem. In doing so, they may better encourage and/or facilitate clients towards developing a greater sense of connection with their ethnic group, and help reduce the negative effects of intraethnic discrimination on clients’ well-being.

Future Directions for Research

Developing a psychometrically sound measure which fully encapsulates the myriad of intraethnic discrimination experiences among Blacks is critical to the expansion of the research in this area. While the PEDQ-CV provides initial data, it does not capture all of the experiences of intraethnic discrimination that are unique to Black Americans. As mentioned earlier, performing a qualitative investigation of intraethnic experiences for initial scale construction may facilitate further clarity in the nuances of experiences of intraethnic discrimination and offer ideas for initial item generation for developing a quantitative measure. For a richer qualitative
investigation, interviewers with knowledge regarding internalized racial oppression, intraethnic oppression, and who identify as Black may help to create a sense of safety and trust among participants when engaging in these challenging discussions (Pyke, 2010).

Future research should continue to investigate intraethnic discrimination and psychological distress among Black Americans and the moderation effect of collective self-esteem. Replication of the current study with other diverse samples, such as community populations, is essential as previous research has primarily studied college populations. Due to the correlations found in this study, it may be worthwhile to discover whether the findings of this study are consistent in Black samples with limited education. Additionally, examining patterns based on academic institutions (e.g., HBCUs versus PWUs) would be worthwhile due to the findings among HBCU attendees in the current sample. Experiences of first-generation Americans (i.e., children of immigrant parents) would benefit from further exploration as they encompassed less than 10% of the study’s sample, and ethnicity (i.e., identifying as African American or Black American) was related to lower levels of identity collective self-esteem when compared to those who identified with other ethnicities (mostly first-generation Americans). First-generation Americans may have experiences (e.g., acculturation, bicultural identity) that shape collective self-esteem and experiences of intraethnic discrimination. In doing so, further research can provide greater clarity regarding the nature of the relations observed, expected and unexpected, among this study’s variables.

To address the conflation of race and ethnicity in the CSES-R, future research using the CSES-R would benefit from adding a question following completion of the CSES-R, in which participants are asked to clarify whether they considered their race, ethnicity, or both when responding to the questions. This may also illuminate how participants relate to their ethnicity
and race. Lastly, as discussed in the section above, studies including internalized racial
oppression may provide a more comprehensive, interrelated understanding of the relations
among the major variables in the present study, i.e., intraethnic discrimination, private collective
self-esteem, identity collective self-esteem, and psychological distress.
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# Tables

**Table 1**

**Demographic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Woman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Man</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black American</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican or Jamaican American</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian or Nigerian American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Hispanic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian or Haitian American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean American or West Indian American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American &amp; Jamaican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian &amp; African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyan or Kenyan American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American &amp; Nigerian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American - Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Guyanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenadian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian &amp; Bahamian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican &amp; African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican &amp; Nigerian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberian &amp; Ghanaian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian &amp; Ghanaian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidadian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer/ Pansexual/ Demisexual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (unspecified)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (diploma)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year college (Associate’s degree; certification)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college (Bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree or Certificate of Advanced Study</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree (e.g., MD or JD)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic composition of local environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very few people of my ethnic background</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people of my ethnic background</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About half are people of my ethnic background</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most are people of my ethnic background</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All or almost all people are of my ethnic background</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intraethnic Discrimination</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Collective Self-Esteem</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Collective Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self-Esteem</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Correlations Between Study Variables and Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</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>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intraethnic Discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identity Collective Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Private Collective Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Psychological Distress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HBCU Attendance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Education Level</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Religiosity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ethnicity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s α  
0.94  0.75  0.82  0.96  0.91
Note. $N = 494$. $^* p < .05$, $^{**} p < .01$. Gender was coded as Male = 1, Female = 2, Genderqueer = 0. HBCU attendance was coded as Yes = 1, No = 0. Education level was coded as Some high school = 1, High school (diploma) = 2, Some college = 3, Two-year college (Associate’s degree; certification) = 4, Four-year college (Bachelor’s degree) = 5, Master’s degree or Certificate of Advanced Study = 6, Doctoral degree = 7, Professional degree (e.g., MD or JD) = 8. Social class was coded as Poverty level = 1, Working class = 2, Middle class = 3, Upper middle class = 4, Upper class = 5. Religiosity was coded as Yes = 1, No = 0. Ethnicity was coded as African American or Black American = 1, Other ethnicities = 0.
Table 4

*Incremental Validity and Effects Sizes of the Potential Covariates in the Regression Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$Adj\ R^2$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>df1, df2</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>198.63</td>
<td>1, 490</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>13, 477</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>7, 470</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 492$; Personal Self-Esteem ($C_1$) was entered as the predictor in Step 1. HBCU Attendance ($C_2$) and all other potential covariates (i.e., Age, Gender, Social Class, Ethnicity, Education, Religiosity) were entered as predictors into Step 2. Intraethnic Discrimination ($X$), Private CSE ($M$), Identity CSE ($W$), and the interaction terms ($XM$, $XW$, $XMW$) were entered into Step 3. Due to Gender having three levels, two dummy variables were included: Male (1/Else 0), and Female (1/Else 0). Three dummy variables were included for Social class: Poor (1/Else 0), Working Class (1/Else 0), and Middle class (1/Else 0). Four dummy variables were included for Education: No diploma (1/Else 0), HS Diploma (1/Else 0), College Degree (1/Else 0), Master’s (1/Else 0).
Table 5
Regression Coefficients of Potential Covariates in Step 2 of Hierarchical Linear Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU Attendance</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>-6.31</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 492$. 

Table 6

Regression Results for the Conditional Effect of Private and Identity Collective Self-Esteem on Intraethnic Discrimination and Psychological Distress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df₁, df₂</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Summary</td>
<td>51.83</td>
<td>9, 483</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private collective self-esteem (M)</td>
<td>-85</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraethnic discrimination (X)</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Private CSE (XM)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity collective self-esteem (W)</td>
<td>- .89</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Identity CSE (XW)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private CSE x Identity CSE (MW)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Private CSE x Identity CSE (XMW)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1, 483</td>
<td>Δ = .004</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self-Esteem (C₁)</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-7.64</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU Attendance (C₂)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 493.
Table 7

**Incremental Validity and Effects Sizes of the Covariates in the Overall Regression Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>df1, df2</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>198.62</td>
<td>1, 491</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>1, 490</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>7, 483</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 492; Personal Self-Esteem ($C_1$) was entered as the predictor in Step 1. HBCU Attendance ($C_2$) was entered as the predictor in Step 2. Intraethnic Discrimination ($X$), Private CSE ($M$), Identity CSE ($W$), and the interaction terms ($XM, XW, XMW$) were entered into Step 3.*
Table 8

Regression Results for the Moderation Effect of Private Collective Self-Esteem on Intraethnic Discrimination and Psychological Distress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1, df2</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Summary</td>
<td>71.14</td>
<td>6, 486</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>35.26</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private collective self-esteem (M)</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraethnic discrimination (X)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Private CSE (XM)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>1, 486</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity collective self-esteem (Cw)</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self-Esteem (Ci)</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-7.99</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU Attendance (C2)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 493.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$df_1$, $df_2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>106.30</td>
<td>2, 490</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>1, 489</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>71.31</td>
<td>3, 486</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 493$; Personal Self-Esteem ($C_1$) and HBCU Attendance ($C_2$) were entered as the predictor in Step 1. Identity CSE ($W$) was entered as the predictor in Step 2. Intraethnic Discrimination ($X$), Private CSE ($M$), and the interaction term ($XM$) were entered into Step 3.*
Table 10

*Regression Results for the Moderating Effect of Identity Collective Self-Esteem on Intraethnic Discrimination and Psychological Distress*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1, df2</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Summary</td>
<td>71.70</td>
<td>6, 486</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity collective self-esteem (W)</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraethnic discrimination (X)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Identity CSE (XW)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>1, 486</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private collective self-esteem (CM)</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self-Esteem (Ci)</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-7.64</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU Attendance (C2)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 493.*
Table 11

Incremental Validity and Effects Sizes of the Covariates in the Regression Model, Controlling for Private CSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$df_1$, $df_2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>106.30</td>
<td>2, 490</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>1, 489</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>3, 486</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 493$; Personal Self-Esteem ($C_1$) and HBCU Attendance ($C_2$) were entered as the predictor in Step 1. Private CSE ($M$) was entered as the predictor in Step 2. Intraethnic Discrimination ($X$), Identity CSE ($W$), and the interaction term ($XW$) were entered into Step 3.
Recruitment E-Mail

Subject: Recruiting Black Young Adults for Online Research Study

Hello!

Are you between the ages of 18 and 29?

Do you self-identify as Black or African-American?

Were you born in the U.S.?

My name is Abigail Nicolas, and I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology at the University at Albany. As a Black woman, it is both personally and professionally meaningful to explore experiences that may impact the Black community. I am writing to kindly invite you to participate in my dissertation study examining the lived experiences of Black young adults and its impact on well-being.

Participation in the study is online, voluntary (you may withdraw at any time or not answer questions), and anonymous. The survey should take you no more than 20 minutes. Participants will be eligible to win one of fifteen $15 Amazon gift cards. If you would like to be entered into the drawing, remember to must submit your e-mail address at the end of the study.

If you said “yes” to the three questions above and are interested in participating in this study, please follow the included link to the survey: https://www.psychdata.com/s.asp?SID=175927

Please also forward this email to anyone you know who may meet the criteria and be interested in participating in the study.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Abigail Nicolas
Appendix B. Informed Consent

Dear Participant:

Thank you for your consideration in participating in this study. You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ms. Abigail Nicolas under the supervision of Dr. Alex Pieterse, from University at Albany’s Counseling Psychology program.

**Purpose of the study**

This study aims to examine factors that shape the lived experiences of Black young adults. To be eligible to participate in this study, you must be between the ages of 18 and 29 years of age, born in the U.S., and must self-identify as Black and/or African American.

**What Will I Be Doing? How Long Will It Take?**

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete demographic information along with questions surrounding beliefs, feelings, and events experienced as a Black individual. It is estimated that the study will take approximately ___ minutes to complete. Please note that your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time. You also retain the right to not answer any question or portions of the survey.

**What are the risks/discomforts of participating in the study?**

There is minimal foreseeable risk to the participants of this study. There is a potential risk you may experience minor psychological discomfort as you reflect on various experiences and how they may have affected you a person of color. If you encounter discomfort, please remember that you may exit the survey at any time. Should you experience serious discomfort or other risks, please contact your local counseling center or seek support from loved ones.

**What are the benefits of participating in the study?**

The benefits to participation may include an opportunity to reflect on and perhaps gain insight into your experience as a Black individual. Findings from this study may contribute to greater understanding of Black young adult experiences in the counseling field.

**Will I receive payment for participation?**

You will have the opportunity to enter into a random drawing for a chance to win one of __ $15 Amazon gift cards following the completion of the study.

**Will my responses be confidential? How will my personal information be protected?**

Due to the online nature of this survey, absolute confidentiality of participants’ information cannot be guaranteed. However, this is an anonymous survey and so no personally-identifiable information (e.g., name, email, IP address) will be stored in the survey. In order to enter the random drawing for the gift cards, participants will be asked to provide an email address on a separate, unconnected page, after completing the survey. It is not anticipated that any additional
threats to privacy over and above that which already exists in regular internet use will be present in this survey.

Information collected from the study may be published in a professional journal or presented at a professional conference. Any information collected will be analyzed, reported and presented in a group aggregate format, therefore no individual participant will be identified.

**Whom do I contact if I have questions about the study?**

If you have any questions about this study, please contact me (Abigail Nicolas) at anicolas@albany.edu or my faculty advisor of this study, Dr. Alex Pieterse at apieterse@albany.edu or (518) 437-4423.

**Whom do I contact if I have questions about my rights as a study participant?**

Research at the University at Albany involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research project has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. If you have questions concerns you may contact University at Albany Office of Regulatory & Research Compliance at 1-866-857-5459 or hsconcerns@albany.edu.

Thank you again for your help!

Sincerely,

Abigail Nicolas, MSEd
Doctoral Candidate, Counseling Psychology
University at Albany, Albany, NY

Alex L. Pieterse, PhD
Associate Professor, Counseling Psychology
University at Albany, Albany, NY

**By clicking "Continue" below, you are:**
(a) indicating that you have read the information about this study;
(b) providing consent to participate in the study;
(c) indicating that you racially self-identify as Black; and
(d) indicating that you are between the ages of 18 and 29

If you do not wish to participate in this study, please decline participation by closing the window.
Appendix C. Demographic Questionnaire

Please take a moment to describe yourself.

1. What is your age? _________

2. How do you identify your race? Please select all that apply.
   a. Hispanic or Latino(a) (including Central and South America)
   b. Native American or First Nation
   c. Black or African American (including Africa and Caribbean)
   d. White, non-Hispanic/Latino(a)
   e. Asian or Pacific Islander (including Indian subcontinent, Philippines, Hawaii)
   f. Other (please specify: ___________________)

3. Were you born in the U.S.? (Yes/No)

4. Please indicate your gender. (Note: Cisgender means that you identify with the gender associated with your biological sex)
   a. Cisgender Male
   b. Cisgender Female
   c. Transgender Male
   d. Transgender Female
   e. Other (please specify): ____________

5. Please specify your ethnicity (e.g., African American, Jamaican, Nigerian, etc.): ________.

6. In what country was you mother born? __________.

7. In what country was you father born? __________.

8. Please select your religious orientation.
   a. Catholic
   b. Protestant (e.g., Adventist, Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, Pentecostal, Presbyterian)
   c. Jehovah’s Witness
   d. Buddhist
   e. Hindu
   f. Muslim
   g. Jewish
   h. Agnostic
   i. Atheist
   j. Other (please specify: ___________________)

9. Is your religious orientation important to you? (Yes/No)

10. How would you identify your sexual orientation?
    a. Heterosexual
b. Bisexual
c. Gay
d. Lesbian
e. Other (please specify: ________________)

11. What is your highest educational level completed (US or abroad)?
   a. Some high school
   b. High school (diploma)
   c. Some college
   d. Two-year college (Associate’s degree; Certification)
   e. Four-year college (Bachelor’s degree)
   f. Master’s degree or Certificate of Advanced Study
   g. Doctoral degree
   h. Professional degree (e.g., JD or MD)
   i. Other. Please specify ____________.

12. Have you ever attended or do you currently attend a historically Black college or university?
   a. Yes
   b. No

13. How could you describe the ethnic composition of your local environment?
   a. Very few people of my ethnic background
   b. Some people of my ethnic background
   c. About half are people of my ethnic background
   d. Most are people of my ethnic background
   e. All or almost all people are of my ethnic background

14. How would you describe your social class?
   a. Poverty level
   b. Working class
   c. Middle class
   d. Upper middle class
   e. Upper class
Appendix D. Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Scale – Community Version*

Think about your **ethnicity/race**. What group do you belong to? **Do you think of yourself as:**

**Your Ethnicity/Race:** ________________________________

How often have many of the things listed below ever happened to you because of your ethnicity **BY PEOPLE OF YOUR OWN ETHNIC OR RACIAL GROUP?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never happened</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Happened very often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BECAUSE OF YOUR ETHNICITY/RACE...**

How often...
1. Have you been treated unfairly by teachers, principals, or other staff at school?
2. Have others thought you couldn’t do things or handle a job?
3. Have others threatened to hurt you (ex: said they would hit you)?
4. Have others actually hurt you or tried to hurt you (ex: kicked or hit you)?
5. Have policeman or security officers been unfair to you?
6. Have others threatened to damage your property?
7. Have others actually damaged your property?
8. Have others made you feel like an outsider who doesn’t fit in because of your dress, speech, or other characteristics related to your ethnicity?
9. Have you been treated unfairly by co-workers or classmates?
10. Have others hinted that you are dishonest or can’t be trusted?
11. Have people been nice to your face, but said bad things about you behind your back?
12. Have people who speak a different language made you feel like an outsider?
13. Have others ignored you or not paid attention to you?
14. Has your boss or supervisor been unfair to you?
15. Have others hinted that you must not be clean
16. Have people not trusted you?
17. Has it been hinted that you must be lazy?

*Modified with permission from the author to assess Intraethnic Discrimination
Appendix E. Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Race Specific

INSTRUCTIONS: We are all members of different social groups or social categories. We would like you to consider your race or ethnicity (e.g., African-American, Latino/Latina, Haitian) in responding to the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the following scale from 1 to 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am a worthy member of my race/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often regret that I belong to my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall, my racial/ethnic group is considered good by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall, my race/ethnicity has very little to do with how I feel about myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel I don’t have much to offer to my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In general, I’m glad to be a member of my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most people consider my racial/ethnic group, on the average, to be more ineffective than other groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The racial/ethnic group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am a cooperative participant in the activities of my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall, I often feel that my racial/ethnic group is not worthwhile.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In general, others respect my race/ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My race/ethnicity is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I often feel I’m a useless member of my racial/ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel good about the race/ethnicity I belong to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In general, others think that my racial/ethnic group is unworthy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In general, belonging to my race/ethnicity is an important part of my self-image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F. Brief Symptom Inventory-18

Listed below is a list of problems that people sometimes have. Please read each one carefully, and choose the number from the scale below that best describes how much that problem has distressed or bothered you during the past 7 days, including today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little bit</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the past 7 days, how much were you distressed by…?

1. _____ Faintness or dizziness
2. _____ Feeling no interest in things
3. _____ Nervousness or shakiness inside
4. _____ Pains in heart or chest
5. _____ Feeling lonely
6. _____ Feeling tense or keyed up
7. _____ Nausea or upset stomach
8. _____ Feeling blue
9. _____ Suddenly scared for no reason
10. _____ Trouble getting your breath
11. _____ Feelings of worthlessness
12. _____ Spells of terror or panic
13. _____ Numbness or tingling in parts of your body
14. _____ Feeling hopeless about the future
15. _____ Feeling so restless you couldn’t sit still
16. _____ Feeling weak in parts of your body
17. _____ Thoughts of ending your life
18. _____ Feeling fearful
Appendix G. Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Inventory

**Instructions:** Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you strongly agree, circle \( \text{SA} \). If you agree with the statement, circle \( \text{A} \). If you disagree, circle \( \text{D} \). If you strongly disagree, circle \( \text{SD} \).

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>At times, I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>( \text{SA} )</td>
<td>( \text{A} )</td>
<td>( \text{D} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H. Debriefing Statement

You have just participated in a research study examining how within-group ethnic discrimination experiences, importance of ethnic identity, and psychological distress are related. If you have any questions about this research, please contact the primary researcher Abigail Nicolas at anicolas@albany.edu. Thank you for your participation!