Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity:
A Preliminary Investigation of Reliability and Construct Validity

Robert M. Sellers, Stephanie A. J. Rowley, Tabbye M. Chavous, J. Nicole Shelton, and Mia A. Smith
University of Virginia

The present study presents preliminary evidence regarding the reliability and validity of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI). The MIBI consists of 7 subscales representing 3 stable dimensions of African American racial identity (Centrality, Ideology, and Regard). Responses to the MIBI were collected from 474 African American college students from a predominantly African American university (n = 185) and a predominantly White university (n = 289). As the result of factor analysis, a revised 51-item scale was developed. Evidence was found for 6 subscales. The Public Regard subscale was dropped because of poor internal consistency. Interscale correlations suggest that the MIBI is internally valid. Relationships among the MIBI subscales and race-related behavior suggest that the instrument has external validity. Descriptive statistics for the revised MIBI are provided for the entire sample as well as by school.

Racial identity is one of the most heavily researched aspects of African Americans' psychological lives. Racial identity has been associated with a number of phenomena including self-esteem (Hughes & Demo, 1989; Parham & Helms, 1985; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1996), academic performance (Baldwin, Duncan, & Bell, 1987; Chavous, 1996; Taylor, Casten, Flickinger, Roberts, & Fulmore, 1994), preference for same-race counselor (Morten & Atkinson, 1983; Parham & Helms, 1981), and career aspirations (Helms & Piper, 1994; Parham & Austin, 1994). Despite the prolific nature of this literature, relatively little consensus exists, beyond the belief that racial identity plays an important role in the lives of African Americans. It is unclear, however, as to what the nature of that role may be. Some theorists (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Penn, Gaines, & Phillips, 1993) have argued that strong identification with their racial group can place African Americans at risk for adverse effects associated with the stigma attached to being Black, whereas others have argued that a strong identification with being African American is a protective factor against racism (Azibo, 1992; Baldwin, 1980). One reason for the equivocal nature of the literature is that there has been no consensus on either the conceptualization or the measurement of racial identity for African Americans. Because of the use of different

conceptual and operational definitions of racial identity, it is difficult to interpret inconsistencies of findings across studies.

Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity

The Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) attempts to reconcile the inconsistencies in the research literature on racial identity (Sellers et al., in press). In reconciling these inconsistencies, researchers will have an integrated framework in which to investigate the structure and properties of African American racial identity. The MMRI is consistent in many ways with research on identity theory (Stryker & Serpe, 1982, 1994). Identity theory is an adaptation of the symbolic interactionist perspective that attempts to explain individuals' behaviors as choices in situations in which there are various behavioral options. Identity theory argues that the choices that an individual makes are, in part, a function of the extent to which the behavioral choices are related to a salient (or personally relevant) role-identity. As such, identity theory assumes that individuals have a number of identities that are hierachically ordered (Stryker & Serpe, 1994). Much of the research on identity theory has focused on such identities as religion (e.g., Stryker & Serpe, 1982) and parenting (e.g., Hyde, Essex, & Horton, 1993; Marsiglio, 1993; Simon, 1992). Identity theory has also been used to examine race as an identity in the lives of African Americans (White & Burke, 1987). However, a specific model for African Americans' racial identity had not been developed from identity theory until the MMRI was created.

Like identity theory, the MMRI assumes that African Americans have a number of hierarchically ordered identities, of which race is only one. Additionally, the MMRI argues that racial identity has stable and situationally specific properties. These situational and dynamic properties interact to provide a mechanism for explaining how racial identity can influence behavior at the level of the situation (molecular level) and exhibit consistency across situations (molar level). The MMRI approach to studying racial identity in African Americans adds to research

in identity theory by considering the historical and cultural significance that race has played in the experiences of African Americans. As noted above, much of the research in identity theory has focused on identities and roles for which specific behaviors and attitudes can be identified (e.g., occupations, religion, parenting). Unfortunately, there is no consensus regarding what behaviors and attitudes are typically African American. There is a great deal of diversity and variety with respect to the meaning of being African American. Much of this diversity can be attributed to the unique history of African Americans in this country. The MMRI attempts to accommodate this diversity by not proposing any single set of behaviors and attitudes as definitive of an African American identity. Instead, the model's phenomenological approach allows each individual to determine whether they identify with being African American and what attitudes and behaviors represent such an identity.

Specifically, the MMRI focuses on African Americans' beliefs regarding the significance of race in (a) how they define themselves and (b) the qualitative meanings that they ascribe to membership in that racial group. Thus, the primary phenomena that the MMRI attempts to describe are attitudes and beliefs that may influence behaviors or be products of behaviors. In an attempt to delineate the significance and meaning of race in the self-concepts of African Americans, the researchers of the MMRI have delineated four dimensions: identity salience, the centrality of the identity, the ideology associated with the identity, and the regard in which the person holds African Americans. *Salience* and *centrality* refer to the significance of race, whereas *ideology* and *regard* refer to the qualitative meaning that individuals ascribe to their membership in the Black community. Of the four dimensions, only salience is situationally influenced, the other dimensions are believed to be relatively stable across situations (Shelton & Sellers, 1996).

Salience

Racial identity salience refers to the extent to which a person's race is a relevant part of her or his self-concept at a particular moment in time. Salience is dependent on the context of the situation as well as the person's proclivity to define her or himself in terms of race (i.e., centrality). Salience is the dynamic aspect of racial identity. It is also the dimension most relevant to predicting proximal behavioral responses to situations. Salience is conceptualized as operating like a self-relevant schema. Like the activation of self-schemas, when one's racial identity becomes salient it has implications for the way the person construes events and subsequent behavior (Higgins, 1989). In general, salience is the mechanism by which the other three stable dimensions influence the way a person experiences a particular situation.[1]

Centrality

The centrality dimension of racial identity refers to the extent to which a person normatively defines her or himself with regard to race. It is a measure of whether race is a core part of an individual's self-concept. Implicit in the conceptualization of centrality is that there is a hierarchical ranking of different identities, such as gender and occupation, with regard to their proximity to the individual's core definition of self. The dimensions of centrality and saliency are related in the sense that the more often racial identity is salient, the more likely it is to become a more normative way in which the person defines her or himself. At the same time, the more central a person's racial identity, the more likely it is to become salient in racially ambiguous situations.

Ideology

A third dimension of racial identity, ideology, is the individual's beliefs, opinions, and attitudes with regard to the way she or he feels that the members of the race should act. This dimension represents the person's philosophy about the ways in which African Americans should live and interact with other people in society. The MMRI consists of four ideologies: (a) a nationalist philosophy, characterized by a viewpoint that emphasizes the importance and uniqueness of being of African descent; (b) an oppressed minority philosophy, characterized by a viewpoint that emphasizes the commonalties between African Americans and other oppressed groups; (c) an assimilationist philosophy, characterized by a viewpoint that emphasizes the commonalties between African Americans and the rest of American society; and (d) a humanist philosophy, characterized by a viewpoint that emphasizes the commonalties of all humans. These ideologies are manifested across four areas of functioning: political–economic issues, cultural–social activities, intergroup relations, and interaction with the dominant group. Although people can be categorized as predominately possessing one ideology, it is likely that most people hold a variety of philosophies that often vary across areas of functioning. For example, a person could believe that African Americans should primarily patronize African American-owned businesses (nationalist) and at the same time feel that African Americans should have more social contact with White people (assimilationist). A number of existing models of Black identity have focused on ideology as a continuum with a nationalist ideology at one end of the continuum (usually the most desirable) and an assimilationist ideology at the other end (usually the least desirable; e.g., Baldwin & Bell, 1985; Cross, 1971). They do not identify ideology, however, as a distinct dimension of racial identity but instead often consider ideology as synonymous with racial identity.

Regard

The fourth dimension of the MMRI, regard, refers to a person's affective and evaluative judgment of her or his race. It is

---

[1] Our use of the term *salience* differs significantly from the way Stryker and his colleagues (Stryker, 1980; Stryker & Serpe, 1982, 1994) use the concept. Their usage of the term attributes transsituational properties that are contradictory to our position that salience is situationally specific. In actuality, their conceptualization of salience is closer to our conceptualization of racial centrality, except that we are less inclined to focus on behaviors as indicators of salience (or centrality) than are Stryker and Serpe. Instead, we focus on the individual's own self-definition.

the extent to which individuals feel positively or negatively towards African Americans and their membership in that group. The regard dimension is based heavily on Crocker and Luhtanen's work on collective self-esteem (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Including regard as a dimension of our model of racial identity rather than simply using Crocker and colleagues' scale provides researchers with an integrated framework for assessing the totality of racial identity. Like Crocker and colleagues' model of collective self-esteem, our regard dimension consists of a private and a public component. *Private regard* refers to the extent to which individuals feel positively or negatively toward African Americans and their membership in that group. This component of regard is consistent with the concept of psychological closeness and racial pride in other models (e.g., Demo & Hughes, 1990; Hughes & Demo, 1989). *Public regard* refers to the extent to which individuals feel that others view African Americans positively or negatively. A number of researchers have argued that other groups' perceptions influence individuals' views about their own group (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Horowitz, 1939; Lewin, 1936, 1941; Mead, 1934; Stryker, 1980; White & Burke, 1987).

The Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) was created as a measure of the three stable dimensions (centrality, ideology, regard) of the MMRI. The salience dimension was not included in the MIBI because of its susceptibility to situational influences. The MIBI consists of a Centrality scale, four ideology subscales (Nationalist, Oppressed Minority, Assimilationist, Humanist), and two regard subscales (Public Regard and Private Regard). The MIBI can make several contributions to the literature on African American racial identity. Because the conceptualization of the MMRI was used as the blueprint for selecting items, the MIBI has some measure of face validity. The MIBI also produces several scores that reflect different aspects of an individual's racial identity. Thus, researchers can be more precise in their examination of specific aspects of racial identity as well as examine the ways in which these various aspects interact. In addition, the MIBI includes elements of African American racial identity that have been measured by other instruments that were designed to assess both universal aspects of group identity (such as centrality and regard) and cultural and historical references that are consistent with the unique African American experience (Sellers et al., in press). Finally, because it is based on a conceptual model (the MMRI) that differs significantly from those already present in the African American racial identity literature, the introduction of the MIBI answers the criticisms of a number of authors who have called for new scales derived from alternative models (Ponterotto, 1989; Smith, 1989, 1991). Taken together, these advantages of the MIBI will allow researchers to gain a better understanding of African American racial identity and resolve some of the discrepant findings in the literature. Moreover, results using the MIBI can be interpreted within the context of existing research on universal processes associated with group identity and with the existing literature that specifically focuses on African American racial identity.

The present article reports on research in which we used data from a sample of African American college students from two institutions (one predominantly White American and one predominantly African American) to investigate the reliability and validity of the MIBI. The present article examines the construct and predictive validity of the MIBI. Construct validity was assessed through examination of the properties of the MIBI scales and subscales as well as their underlying factor structure. We examined the predictive validity of the MIBI by investigating the relationship between the MIBI and several behavioral indicators of race-related activity.

Relationships Among Dimensions of the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity

Racial identity in African Americans is a multifaceted phenomena. As a result, a good measure of racial identity must be multidimensional to capture the complexity of the construct. Although the MIBI is multidimensional, some interrelationships can be proposed on the basis of the MMRI theory. Thus, interrelationships among the various subscales of the MIBI can be hypothesized, a priori, on the basis of the conceptualization of the MMRI and other theories regarding the self. These interrelationships can be used as a basis for testing the construct validity of the MIBI. Identity theory (Stryker & Serpe, 1982), cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), and self-integrity theory (Cooper & Fazio, 1984; Steele & Spencer, 1992) would all predict that African American individuals who define race as an important part of their self are likely to have more positive feelings about African Americans than are African Americans who do not define race as important. Thus, a positive correlation between measures of racial centrality and private regard was expected.

Predictions also can be made regarding the relationship between centrality and the ideology subscales. By definition, a person with a racial ideology that emphasizes the importance and uniqueness of being African American (nationalist) should view race as a central part of his or her identity. Such a person is also likely to hold positive feelings and attitudes toward African Americans (private regard). On the other hand, a person who has a racial ideology that focuses on the commonalties of all people regardless of race (humanist) is not likely to have race as a central characteristic of his or her personal identity. Also, a number of predictions can be made with respect to the interrelationships among the four ideology subscales. For instance, nationalist ideology should be inversely related to both humanist and assimilationist ideologies. A nationalist ideology emphasizes the uniqueness of the African American experience from other groups, which is inconsistent with an emphasis on the commonalties among all people (humanist ideology). Also, a nationalist ideology suggests developing institutions, relationships, and activities that are specifically for Blacks, whereas an assimilationist ideology suggests greater participation in mainstream American life. We made no a priori hypothesis for the relationships between the Oppressed Minority subscale and the other ideology subscales or for the association between the Humanist and Assimilationist subscales.

Relationship Between the MIBI and Race-Related Behaviors

Identity theory argues that the prominence of a particular identity within the self-concept should be accompanied by behaviors that are associated with the identity (Stryker & Serpe, 1982; 1994). Racial identity has been linked to childhood experiences with race (Bowman & Howard, 1985; Parham & Williams, 1993; Sanders-Thompson, 1994), socialization patterns with other African Americans (Broman, Jackson, & Neighbors, 1989), participation in African American organizations (Baldwin, Brown, & Rackley, 1990), and efforts to seek knowledge about African American culture (Baldwin et al., 1990). Taken as a whole, the findings suggest that African Americans who hold a strong identification with their race are more likely to engage in race-related activities. Unfortunately, there has been some concern that some of the racial identity measures have been confounded with items that are too similar to the behavioral outcomes in question (see Sellers, 1993).

It is important that any assessment that examines the relationship between the MIBI and race-related behaviors include only those behaviors that are relevant to the individuals' life circumstances. In other words, it is important that the behaviors that are used are ones that the individuals could easily choose to perform in their environment (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). One such behavioral correlate that is relevant to African American college students is the amount of social contact they have with persons within and outside of their racial group (Gurin, Hurtado, & Peng, 1994). Social contact with African Americans and members of other ethnic groups can either be close (i.e., a best friend) or more distal (i.e., informal acquaintances). Similarly, college students have a great deal of flexibility in courses in which to enroll. Often, the courses that they select reveal information about themselves. Baldwin, Brown, and Rackley (1990) found that African American students who scored higher on the African Self-Consciousness Scale were more likely to enroll in Black studies courses than those with lower scores.

In the present investigation of the reliability and validity of the MIBI we set forth a number of hypotheses based on the MMRI. With respect to construct validity, we hypothesized that the MIBI would be stable, internally consistent, and have a factor structure in keeping with the MMRI theory. We hypothesized that Centrality scores would be positively associated with high private regard and Nationalist scores but negatively correlated with Humanist scores. A positive association was also predicted between Private Regard and Nationalist scores. With respect to ideology, we expected a negative association between scores on the Humanist and Nationalist subscales. (Although other interscale correlations may be possible, they were not predicted directly by the conceptualization of the model.)

We hypothesized that the MIBI would demonstrate evidence of predictive validity through the correlation of particular subscales with particular race-related behaviors and experiences. We expected Centrality and Private Regard scores to be positively related to enrollment in Black studies courses and having an African American best friend. With respect to ideology, we expected high Nationalist scores to be positively associated with enrollment in a Black studies course and having an African

American best friend. In contrast, we predicted a negative relationship between those race-related behaviors and Assimilationist and Humanist scores. We also hypothesized associations between the MIBI subscales and social contact with Whites and African Americans. Specifically, we anticipated higher Centrality and Private Regard scores would be related to greater contact with African Americans, but we expected no relationship between these two dimensions and contact with Whites. This is because embracing race as an important identity and feeling positive about African Americans does not necessarily mean that one will isolate oneself from other races (Cross, 1991). However, we predicted that high Assimilationist scores would be associated with greater contact with Whites and less contact with African Americans, whereas high Nationalist scores would be positively correlated with contact with African Americans and negatively associated with contact with Whites. This is because the definitions of these ideologies involve a movement toward a particular group that often results in a concomitant movement away from another group.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 474 African American college students who were enrolled in introductory psychology courses at two medium-sized universities in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Participants described themselves as being African American, Black, or Negro. One hundred eighty-five were enrolled at a predominantly Black university, and 289 were enrolled at a predominantly White university. The sample was 68% female. The sample consisted of 286 freshmen, 111 sophomores, 39 juniors, and 18 seniors (20 participants did not report this information). The median reported family income was between $45,000 and $54,999.

Measures

Scale construction of the MIBI. The MIBI is a theoretically derived instrument based on the constructs within the MMRI. We included items from existing scales on African American racial identity, ethnic identity, and social identity (e.g., Baldwin & Bell, 1985; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Milliones, 1980; Phinney, 1992; Terrell & Terrell, 1981) to the extent to which the items represented the conceptualization of a particular dimension of the MMRI. We also nominated items. In all instances, we used the conceptual definitions of the dimensions in the MMRI as the criteria for evaluating whether an item was included in the MIBI. Also, all behavioral references were excluded from items to ensure that the MIBI could be used to predict race-related behaviors without fear of confound.

As a result, the original MIBI was a 71-item measure of the three stable dimensions proposed by the MMRI for African Americans. The MIBI consists of three scales (Centrality, Regard, and Ideology) that yield a total of seven scale and subscale scores. The Centrality Scale consists of 10 items measuring the extent to which being African American is central to the respondents' definition of themselves. The Regard Scale is made up of two subscales, Private Regard and Public Regard. The Private Regard subscale consists of 7 items measuring the extent to which respondents possess positive feelings toward African Americans in general. The Public Regard subscale consists of 4 items measuring the extent to which respondents feel that others have positive feelings toward African Americans. The Ideology Scale consists of 50 items measuring four philosophies (Assimilationist, Humanist, Nationalist,

Oppressed Minority) associated with the way African Americans view political–economic issues, cultural–social issues, intergroup relations, and attitudes toward the dominant group. Nationalist and Oppressed Minority Ideology subscales each consist of 13 items, whereas the Assimilationist and Humanist Subscales consist of 12 items each. The subscales were generated by reverse coding negatively worded items and then averaging across all items within a particular scale. Participants were asked to respond regarding the extent to which they endorse the items on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7).

Race-related behaviors. Participants' race-related behaviors were measured in a variety of ways. Participants were asked to indicate how many Black studies courses they had taken while they were in college. Because of a severe floor effect, the variable was dichotomized into those who had taken Black studies courses and those who had not. To assess social contact with other African Americans and White Americans, we asked participants to identify the racial–ethnic background of their best friend. A dichotomous variable was also created that indicated whether the participant's best friend was African American. Finally, the Interracial Contact Scale (Wegner & Shelton, 1995) was administered to a portion of the sample to measure their contact with both Whites and Blacks. The Interracial Contact Scale assesses the amount of contact individuals have had with White Americans and with Black Americans. The questions assess the amount of contact with acquaintances, close friends, teachers, neighbors, and coworkers. Two subscales, Contact With Whites and Contact With Blacks, were created from the Interracial Contact Scale.

Procedure

Data collection occurred over five academic semesters. Participants were administered a copy of the MIBI along with a series of other questionnaires during a pretesting session of the introductory psychology participant pool in which students were required to complete a number of questionnaires. Participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and were given course credit toward their research requirement for their participation in the study. During the different semesters, some questionnaires were not used in the pretesting session, thus not all participants received all of the measures. Consequently, the sample size varies for different analyses according to the obtained measures. In all instances, after completing the packets, participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed on the goals of the study.

Results

Factor analysis was performed to provide support for the proposed factor structure of the three dimensions of the MIBI (i.e., Centrality, Regard, and Ideology) for the entire sample. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) test was used to evaluate the factor solution (Norusis, 1985). The KMO is a measure of the appropriateness of the factor analysis given the correlation matrix associated with a set of variables. A value of at least .60 (KMO values can vary between 0 and 1) is deemed acceptable (Norusis, 1985). Although the KMO for a factor solution for the items from all three scales together was not adequate, separate analyses for each scale were found to be adequate (KMO = .86, .83, and .61 for Ideology, Centrality, and Regard, respectively). This suggests that the MIBI represents three interrelated constructs as opposed to one single construct with three interrelated factors. Thus, the factor structure for each scale was investigated separately. Once adequate correlations among items were established, we used maximum likelihood extraction with a pro-

max rotation for each scale. A promax rotation is a form of confirmatory factor analysis that allows the investigator to design a fixed target matrix, based on the theoretical structure, and maximize its similarity with a pattern on the basis of a previous varimax rotation (McDonald, 1985; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). This method diminishes the arbitrariness of the rotations from separate analyses. The promax rotation was also used as a way to reduce the number of MIBI items. All items with factor loadings below .30 were eliminated from the scale. The target matrix created gave a 1 for each loading for each item and the factor to which it was expected to be related and a 0 to each loading that was expected to be close to 0. In the cases in which an item loaded adequately on more than one factor, we made decisions about where to place the item on the basis of MMRI theory. Approximately 56% of the variance was explained by the four factors.

Table 1 presents the four-factor solution from the factor analysis for the ideology subscales. Because of the manner in which the Ideology Scale was operationalized, we hypothesized that

Table 1

Factor Loadings of Items From the Four Ideology Subscales

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Assimilation 5	**.74**	.43		
Assimilation 4	**.72**	.35		
Assimilation 6	**.57**	.41		
Assimilation 7	**.42**	.63		
Assimilation 2	**.37**			
Assimilation 3	**.36**			−.30
Assimilation 1	**.33**	.48		
Assimilation 9	**.32**			
Assimilation 8	**.30**	.41		−.50
Humanist 7	.41	**.65**		
Humanist 1	.31	**.62**		
Humanist 6	.36	**.57**		
Humanist 2		**.50**		−.32
Humanist 8		**.42**		
Humanist 4		**.38**		−.53
Humanist 5		**.37**		−.40
Humanist 3		**.31**		−.52
Humanist 9		**.22**		
Minority 8			**.72**	
Minority 3			**.60**	
Minority 9			**.58**	
Minority 5			**.50**	
Minority 1			**.42**	
Minority 4		.34	**.42**	
Minority 7		.31	**.40**	
Minority 2			**.38**	
Minority 6		.35	**.33**	
Nationalist 7				**.70**
Nationalist 6				**.63**
Nationalist 1				**.62**
Nationalist 3		−.40	.30	**.54**
Nationalist 4		−.33		**.50**
Nationalist 5		−.54		**.45**
Nationalist 2		−.51		**.40**
Nationalist 9		−.50		**.32**
Nationalist 8		−.51		**.28**

Note. Only loadings above .30 are listed, with the exception of Humanist 9 and Nationalist 8. Boldface values are those that were predicted by the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity.

each ideology subscale would hang together as a unique factor but that there should be some overlap in the final solution, and loadings would be moderate. Promax rotation is ideal for this situation in that it is an oblique rotation, and the factor structure is not forced. The factor matrix is rotated toward the logical solution, which is represented by the target matrix. Each ideology subscale measures attitudes about the way that the individual feels African Americans should behave across several domains: politics–economics, cultural interests, intergroup relations, and relations with the dominant group. An individual, for instance, may have assimilationist views regarding politics and intergroup relations, but nationalist views about issues of culture. Still, we expected that the four ideology subscales would constitute four distinct, but related, factors. For consistency and as a method of item reduction, the top nine loadings for each subscale were retained. All resultant loadings except two were above .30, with most loadings falling in a moderate range (from .40 to .65). In many cases, items loaded on two factors, but the set of factors from the final solution had adequate loadings for each of the items in the subscale. Approximately 56% of the variance was explained by the four factors. In a few instances, items that had adequate loadings on the factor consistent with our model actually loaded higher on another factor (e.g., Assimilation 7, Assimilation 8). Examination of the item content suggests that these items represent political attitudes that are consistent with our conceptualization of both ideologies and are likely to load highly on both factors in subsequent studies.

The second factor analysis was designed to investigate the one-factor structure of the Centrality subscale. Maximum likelihood factor analysis with a promax rotation was also used in this analysis. A one-factor target matrix was created. All 10 Centrality subscale items were included in the factor analysis. The one-factor solution was supported. Two items, however, failed to load above .30 and were dropped from further analysis. Approximately 63% of the variance was explained by the one-factor model.

The same method was also used to investigate the two-factor structure of the regard subscales. A two-factor target matrix was used to maximize differences between the Public and Private Regard subscales. The solution supported the distinctness of the subscales, but two Public Regard items failed to load on either factor, and one loaded negatively on the Private Regard subscale. Only two adequate Public Regard items remained, so Public Regard was not used in further analyses. Approximately 62% of the variance was explained by the two-factor model.

As the result of the factor analyses, a 51-item revised version of the MIBI was produced. (See Appendix for the items in the revised MIBI.) This revised version of the MIBI consists of a 36-item Ideology Scale. The revised Ideology Scale is composed of four 9-item subscales (Nationalist, Humanist, Assimilationist, and Oppressed Minority). The revised Centrality Scale consists of 8 items. Finally, the Regard Scale was reduced to the 7-item Private Regard subscale. The Public Regard subscale was omitted from the revised MIBI.

Table 2 contains means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alphas for the revised MIBI for the entire sample as well as for each school separately. The means and standard deviations for the scales and subscales suggest some variance in responses as well as the absence of ceiling effects. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to test for mean differences in the six MIBI scales and subscales by school. The multivariate test was significant, $F(6, 467) = 21.93$, $p < .01$. Each of the univariate F tests, except Centrality, was significant at the .01 significance level. The revised MIBI scales and subscales demonstrated adequate internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The Cronbach's alphas for the subscales ranged from a low of .60 (Private Regard) to .79 (Nationalism). Alphas were similar for each school.

Table 3 presents the interscale correlations for the entire sample as well as for each school separately. Because of the large number of correlations performed, a Bonferroni correction was used for each group of analyses (i.e., for the full sample and for each school). Thus, correlations will be considered significant at alpha levels less than $.01/6 = .002$. The pattern of the correlations across schools was almost identical, so only correlations for the overall sample are discussed. The correlation matrix supports the predicted pattern of relationship. As hypothesized, individuals for whom race was central were also likely to have positive private regard for African Americans ($r = .37$) and endorse nationalist attitudes ($r = .57$). High central individuals were also less likely to endorse assimilationist ($r = -.19$) or humanistic attitudes ($r = -.29$). Expected patterns of association were also evident among the other ideology subscales. Humanist and assimilationist attitudes were positively correlated ($r = .55$). The oppressed minority ideology was positively correlated with endorsement of assimilationist ($r = .28$) and humanist ($r = .27$) ideologies.

To assess the predictive validity of the MIBI, the relationships between MIBI subscales and several race-related behaviors were investigated. We initially conducted a 2 × 2 MANOVA to test for interactions between school and having an African American best friend. The multivariate F statistic for the interaction between school and having an African American best friend was nonsignificant, so we conducted the MANOVA again without the inclusion of the school variable. Thus, we used a one-way MANOVA to test mean differences between individuals who had an African American best friend and those who did not with the 6 MIBI subscales as dependent variables (see Table 4). Results were as predicted. The multivariate F statistic was significant, $F(1, 472) = 9.74$, $p < .01$. Participants with an African American best friend had higher scores on the Centrality Scale, $F(1, 472) = 12.35$, $p < .01$, and the Nationalist subscale, $F(1, 472) = 37.45$, $p < .01$, but lower scores on the Assimilationist, $F(1, 472) = 19.26$, $p < .01$, Humanist, $F(1, 472) = 12.45$, $p < .01$, and Oppressed Minority subscales, $F(1, 472) = 19.68$, $p < .01$, than did those participants without an African American best friend. There was no effect found for Private Regard.

A similar strategy was used to investigate the relationship between MIBI subscales and enrollment in Black studies courses. The initial 2 × 2 MANOVA once again did not find a significant interaction between school and enrollment in a Black studies course. Thus, a one-way MANOVA was used to test for mean differences on the MIBI subscales between individuals who had taken Black studies courses and those who had not. Results were generally as expected. The multivariate F statistic was significant, $F(6, 467) = 3.44$, $p < .01$. Further, students

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) by School and for the Full Sample

Scale	Full sample			Predominantly White university			African American university		
	Cronbach's α	M	SD	Cronbach's α	M	SD	Cronbach's α	M	SD
Centrality	.77	5.23	1.08	.78	5.20	1.14	.75	5.28	0.98
Regard-Priv	.60	6.25[a]	0.70	.55	6.38	0.59	.61	6.05	0.81
Regard-Pub	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Assimilation	.73	4.92[a]	0.91	.66	5.16	0.80	.74	4.55	0.94
Humanist	.70	5.15[a]	0.84	.68	5.33	0.80	.69	4.87	0.81
Minority	.76	4.78[a]	0.82	.75	4.82	0.80	.77	4.70	0.86
Nationalist	.79	4.27[a]	0.99	.78	4.02	0.96	.74	4.67	0.90

Note. Priv = Private; Pub = Public.
[a] Denotes means that are significantly different between the two samples at $\alpha = .01$.

who had taken at least one Black studies course had higher levels of Centrality, $F(1, 472) = 7.98, p < .01$, and Nationalism, $F(1, 472) = 18.32, p < .01$. No other significant relationships were found.

We used Pearson's correlations to explore the relationships between interracial contact and the six MIBI subscales. Relationships were, for the most part, as expected. Contact with other African Americans was positively correlated with the Centrality ($r = .39, p < .01$), Nationalism ($r = .39, p < .01$), and Private Regard ($r = .27, p < .01$) subscales. Contact with African Americans was unrelated to Assimilationist, Humanist, and Oppressed Minority ideologies. Contact with Whites, on the other hand, was negatively related to Centrality ($r = -.46, p < .01$) and Nationalist ($r = -.41, p < .01$) subscale scores. Contact with Whites was unrelated to Assimilationist, Humanist, Oppressed Minority, and Private Regard subscale scores.

Table 3
MIBI Scale and Subscale Intercorrelations

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Overall sample					
1. Centrality	—					
2. Regard-Priv	.37[a]	—				
3. Assimilation	−.19[a]	.05	—			
4. Humanist	−.29[a]	.05	.55[a]	—		
5. Minority	.13	.12	.28[a]	.27[a]	—	
6. Nationalist	.57[a]	.13	−.40[a]	−.50[a]	.08	—
	By school					
1. Centrality	—	.37[a]	−.18	−.33[a]	.16	.60[a]
2. Regard-Priv	.42[a]	—	−.10	−.08	.13	.26[a]
3. Assimilation	−.20[a]	.04	—	.57[a]	.26[a]	−.34[a]
4. Humanist	−.27[a]	.04	.46[a]	—	.24[a]	−.42[a]
5. Minority	.13	.09	.28[a]	.28[a]	—	.13
6. Nationalist	.58[a]	.21[a]	−.32[a]	−.48[a]	.10	—

Note. For intercorrelations by school, predominantly Black universities appear above the diagonal, predominantly White universities, below. Priv = Private.
[a] Significant at $\alpha = .01/6 = .002$.

Discussion

The results provide evidence that the MIBI is a reliable and construct valid measure of the MMRI. The results suggest that the MIBI measures three interrelated empirical constructs as opposed to a single empirical construct with three different dimensions. These empirical constructs are consistent with the MMRI's conceptualization of the centrality, ideology, and regard dimensions. From an empirical standpoint, the data suggest that racial identity consists of three separate constructs. However, we believe that it is still very useful to conceptualize racial identity as a single metaconstruct comprised of different interrelated dimensions. Our factor analytic work also produced a revised, shorter MIBI. This revised MIBI yielded a Centrality Scale, a Private Regard Scale, and four ideology subscales that demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The pattern of responses suggests that the revised MIBI is able to detect the diversity of experiences within the African American community. For most of the scales, the sample used the entire response format in responding to the revised MIBI. The interscale correlations suggest that the scales and subscales are associated with each other in ways that are consistent with the MMRI. In particular, these results support the premise of the MMRI that racial identity in African Americans is a multidimensional construct in which the various dimensions are both independent and interrelated (Sellers et al., in press).

Along with the evidence of the construct validity of the revised MIBI, the results also suggest that it possesses predictive validity. The individual scales were related to race-relevant activities in ways consistent with the MMRI. In general, individuals for whom race played a significant role in their identity and who emphasized the uniqueness of being Black in their definitions of being Black were more likely to take Black studies courses and interact with other African Americans. In contrast, individuals whose definitions of being Black emphasized the similarities between Blacks and other groups including mainstream society, were more likely to interact socially with Whites. It is still an open question as to the causal direction of these relationships. It is most likely that these causal relationships are bidirectional. For instance, individuals who have strong nationalist ideologies

Table 4

Mean Differences in MIBI Subscales by Race of Best Friend and Black Studies Courses Taken and Correlations of MIBI Subscales With Interracial Contact

Subscale	Black best friend	No Black best friend	$F(1, 472)$	Black studies courses	No Black studies courses	$F(6, 467)$	Contact with Whites	Contact with Blacks
Centrality	5.36	5.01	12.34[a]	5.41	5.13	7.98[a]	−.46[a]	.39[a]
Regard-Priv	6.21	6.32	3.12	6.24	6.26	0.14	−.18	.27[a]
Assimilation	4.70	5.01	19.26[a]	4.76	4.84	1.45	.10	.02
Humanist	5.07	5.25	12.45[a]	5.12	5.15	0.31	.17	−.11
Minority	4.67	4.92	17.68[a]	4.76	4.76	0.01	.07	.01
Nationalist	4.41	3.93	37.45[a]	4.44	4.10	18.32[a]	−.41[a]	.40[a]

Note. Bonferroni corrections were used for the correlations between the MIBI and Interracial Contact Subscales $\alpha = (.01/12) = .0008$. MIBI = Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity; Priv = Private.
[a] Significant at $\alpha = .01$.

are likely to seek out other African Americans to behaviorally express those beliefs, but being in social contact primarily with African Americans is also likely to result in a greater emphasis on the uniqueness of being African American.

An examination of the results by school suggests level differences but not relational differences. There were school differences in the meaning of being Black but not in the significance that the students placed on race in defining themselves. In general, African American college students at both predominantly African American and White universities believed that race is an important part of their self-concept. However, students from the predominantly African American university reported higher levels of racial private regard and were more likely to emphasize the uniqueness of the African American experiences compared with the students at the predominantly White university, who emphasized the similarities between Blacks and other groups in their definition of being Black. Thus the differences in racial identity across predominantly African American and White universities that were reported by Baldwin, Duncan, and Bell (1987) are probably more a function of racial ideology and not racial centrality. Despite the mean level differences, the pattern of relationships among the various components of the MMRI did not differ across schools. This provides further evidence of the robustness of the underlying structure of the revised MIBI.

Although the analysis produced strong evidence supporting the validity of the Centrality and Ideology scales, the results for the Regard Scale were not as convincing. Specifically, the factor analyses did not yield a strong solution for the Public Regard subscale. The poor performance of the Public Regard subscale may be partly the result of a relatively small number of items (four items). Another potential reason for the poor performance centers around the relevance of the construct for African Americans. Although the symbolic interactionist approach and the theory of reflective appraisal emphasize the attitudes of the broader society about the self in shaping the individual's view of the self (Mead, 1934; Stryker & Serpe, 1982), a number of researchers have noted little relationship between the way others view African Americans and African American's attitudes and beliefs about themselves (Cross, 1991; Rosenberg, 1979; Rosenberg & Simmons, 1972). As stated above, our measure of public regard is based heavily on Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) oper-

ationalization of public collective self-esteem. In a study comparing the collective self-esteem of African American, Asian American, and White college students, Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, and Broadnax (1994) found evidence that, unlike the other two groups, African Americans' perceptions of how others viewed them was unrelated to their personal self-esteem. Although Crocker et al. (1994) reported an acceptable level of internal consistency for the Public Collective Self-Esteem subscale, they did not report such information specifically for the African Americans in the sample. Nonetheless, we are in the process of developing more items for the Public Regard subscale and plan to investigate this issue further in the future.

Along with the work on the Public Regard subscale, additional research is needed for the revised MIBI to achieve its full potential. Specifically, further research is needed using the MIBI with more diverse samples of African Americans. Although the results of the present study suggest that the MIBI is appropriate for college samples, there is still some question with respect to its applicability to older or younger age groups. The meaning of race in the lives of individuals also may vary as a result of both developmental and cohort influences (Parham & Williams, 1993). The MIBI may also be more appropriate for individuals who have higher levels of education. In constructing the MIBI, we attempted to use language and sentence structures that were accessible to as many people as possible. Nevertheless, it is still unclear whether the MIBI is an appropriate instrument for less educated or less literate African Americans. Also, it is important to investigate whether the MIBI is a valid measure for African Americans from various socioeconomic backgrounds. Stokes, Murray, Peacock, and Kaiser (1994) noted that African Americans of higher income more strongly identified with African Americans than did individuals with lower incomes. On average, the present sample came from significantly more affluent backgrounds than the general African American population. Further research is needed with a more representative sample before we will know whether the MIBI works equally well for African Americans of different ages, educational levels, and income levels.

The present findings suggest that the revised MIBI has great promise as a measure of three of the dimensions of African American racial identity that are proposed by the MMRI. As a

result, the MIBI allows researchers the opportunity to explore the association between relevant dimensions of African Americans' racial identities in conceptually sensible ways. The MIBI is an important tool for investigating the role that racial identity plays in the psychosocial functioning and life experiences of African Americans. The results from the present study provide a strong foundation on which to build.

References

Azibo, D. (1992). *Liberation psychology.* Trenton, NJ: African World Press.

Baldwin, J. A. (1980). The psychology of oppression. In M. K. Asante & A. Vandi (Eds.), *Contemporary Black thought.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Baldwin, J. A., & Bell, Y. (1985). The African Self-Consciousness Scale: An Africentric personality questionnaire. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 9*(2), 61–68.

Baldwin, J. A., Brown, R., & Rackley, R. (1990). Some socio-behavioral correlates of African self-consciousness in African American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology, 17*(1), 1–17.

Baldwin, J. A., Duncan, J. A., & Bell, Y. R. (1987). Assessment of African self-consciousness among Black students from two college environments. *Journal of Black Psychology, 13,* 27–41.

Bowman, P., & Howard, C. (1985). Race-related socialization, motivation, and academic achievement: A study of Black youths in three generational families. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24,* 134–141.

Broman, C. L., Jackson, J. S., & Neighbors, H. W. (1989). Sociocultural context and racial group identification among Black adults. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie sociale, 2,* 367–378.

Chavous, T. M. (1996). *Racial ideology as a predictor of academic achievement for African American college students.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Cooper, J., & Fazio, R. H. (1984). A new look at dissonance theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 229–266). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 60–67.

Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 503–513.

Cross, W. E. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience. *Black World, 20,* 13–27.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Demo, D., & Hughes, M. (1990). Socialization and racial identity among Black Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 53,* 364–374.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting White' ". *Urban Review, 18,* 176–206.

Gurin, P., Hurtado, A., & Peng, T. (1994). Group contact and ethnicity in the social identities of Mexicanos and Chicanos. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 521–532.

Helms, J. E., & Piper, R. (1994). Implications of racial identity for vocational psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44,* 124–138.

Higgins, E. T. (1989). Knowledge accessibility and activation: Subjectivity and suffering from unconscious sources. In J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp. 75–123). New York: Guilford Press.

Horowitz, R. (1939). Racial aspects of self-identification in nursery school children. *Journal of Experimental Education, 7,* 133–140.

Hughes, M., & Demo, D. H. (1989). Self-perceptions of Black Americans: Self-esteem and personal efficacy. *American Journal of Sociology, 95,* 132–159.

Hyde, J. S., Essex, M. J., & Horton, F. (1993). Fathers and parental leave: Attitudes and experiences. *Journal of Family Issues, 14,* 616–638.

Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewin, K. (1941). Jewish self-hatred. *Contemporary Jewish Record, 4,* 219–232.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 302–318.

Marsiglio, W. (1993). Contemporary scholarship on fatherhood: Culture, identity, and conduct. *Journal of Family Issues, 14,* 484–509.

McDonald, R. P. (1985). *Factor analysis and related methods.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Milliones, J. (1980). Construction of a Black consciousness measure: Psychotherapeutic implications. *Psychotherapy: Theory and Practice, 17,* 175–182.

Morten, G., & Atkinson, D. R. (1983). Minority identity development and preference for counselor race. *Journal of Negro Education, 52,* 156–161.

Norusis, M. J. (1985). *SPSS-X advanced statistics guide.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parham, T. A., & Austin, N. (1994). Career development counseling for African Americans: A contextual reappraisal using the Nigrescence construct. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44,* 139–158.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1981). The influence of Black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences for counselor race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28,* 250–257.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem in Black students: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26,* 143–147.

Parham, T. A., & Williams, P. T. (1993). Relationship of demographic and background factors to racial identity attitudes. *Journal of Black Psychology, 19,* 7–24.

Penn, M. L., Gaines, S. O., & Phillips, L. (1993). On the desirability of own-group preference. *Journal of Black Psychology, 19,* 303–321.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7,* 156–172.

Ponterotto, J. G. (1989). Expanding directions for racial identity research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17,* 264–272.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). Group rejection and self-rejection. In R. G. Simmons (Ed.), *Research in community and mental health* (pp. 3–20). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rosenberg, M., & Simmons, R. G. (1972). *Black and White self-esteem: The urban school child.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association Rose Monograph Series.

Rowley, S. A. J., Sellers, R. M., Chavous, T. M., & Smith, M. A. (1996). *The relationship between racial identity and self-esteem in African American college and high school students.* Manuscript submitted for publication, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Sanders-Thompson, V. (1994). Socialization to race and its relationship to racial identification among African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology, 20,* 175–188.

Sellers, R. M. (1993). A call to arms for researchers studying racial identity. *Journal of Black Psychology, 19*, 327–332.

Sellers, R. M., Shelton, J. N., Cooke, D. Y., Chavous, T. M., Rowley, S. A. J., & Smith, M. A. (in press). A multidimensional model of racial identity: Assumptions, findings, and future directions. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *African American identity development: Theory, research, and intervention.* Hampton, VA: Cobb & Henry.

Shelton, J. N., & Sellers, R. M. (1996). *The stable and situational properties of African American racial identity.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Simon, R. (1992). Parental role strains, salience of parental identity and gender differences in psychological distress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 33*, 25–35.

Smith, E. J. (1989). Black racial identity development: Issues and concerns. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17*, 277–288.

Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 181–188.

Steele, C. M., & Spencer, S. J. (1992). The primacy of self-integrity. *Psychological Inquiry, 3*, 345–346.

Stokes, J. E., Murray, C. B., Peacock, M. J., & Kaiser, R. T. (1994).

Assessing the reliability, factor structure, and validity of the African Self-Consciousness Scale in a general population of African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology, 20*, 62–74.

Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version.* Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin Cummings.

Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience and role behavior. In W. Ickes & E. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles, and social behavior* (pp. 199–218). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57*, 16–36.

Taylor, R. D., Casten, R., Flickinger, S. M., Roberts, D., & Fulmore, C. D. (1994). Explaining the school performance of African-American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 4*, 21–44.

Terrell, F., & Terrell, S. L. (1981). An inventory to measure cultural mistrust among Blacks. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 5*, 180–184.

Wegner, D. M., & Shelton, J. N. (1995). *Interracial Contact Scale.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

White, C. L., & Burke, P. J. (1987). Ethnic role identity among Black and White college students: An interactionist approach. *Sociological Perspectives, 30*, 310–331.

Appendix

Revised Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity

Centrality Scale

1. Overall, being Black has very little to do with how I feel about myself. (reverse scored)
4. In general, being Black is an important part of my self-image.
5. My destiny is tied to the destiny of other Black people.
6. Being Black is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am. (reverse scored)
7. I have a strong sense of belonging to Black people.
8. I have a strong attachment to other Black people.
9. Being Black is an important reflection of who I am.
10. Being Black is not a major factor in my social relationships. (reverse scored)

Regard Scale: Private Regard Subscale

1. I feel good about Black people.
2. I am happy that I am Black.
3. I feel that Blacks have made major accomplishments and advancements.
4. I believe that because I am Black, I have many strengths.
5. I often regret that I am Black.
6. Blacks contribute less to society than others.
7. Overall, I often feel that Blacks are not worthwhile.

Ideology Scale

Assimilation Subscale

1. Blacks who espouse separatism are as racist as White people who also espouse separatism.
2. A sign of progress is that Blacks are in the mainstream of America more than ever before.
6. Because America is predominantly White, it is important that Blacks go to White schools so that they can gain experience interacting with Whites.
7. Blacks should strive to be full members of the American political system.
8. Blacks should try to work within the system to achieve their political and economic goals.
9. Blacks should strive to integrate all institutions which are segregated.
10. Blacks should feel free to interact socially with White people.
11. Blacks should view themselves as being Americans first and foremost.
12. The plight of Blacks in America will improve only when Blacks are in important positions within the system.

Humanist Subscale

3. Black values should not be inconsistent with human values. (omit from analyses)
4. Blacks should have the choice to marry interracially.

5. Blacks and Whites have more commonalties than differences.
6. Black people should not consider race when buying art or selecting a book to read.
7. Blacks would be better off if they were more concerned with the problems facing all people than just focusing on Black issues.
8. Being an individual is more important than identifying oneself as Black.
9. We are all children of a higher being, therefore, we should love people of all races.
10. Blacks should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race.
11. People regardless of their race have strengths and limitations.

Oppressed Minority Subscale

1. The same forces which have led to the oppression of Blacks have also led to the oppression of other groups.
3. The struggle for Black liberation in America should be closely related to the struggle of other oppressed groups.
5. Blacks should learn about the oppression of other groups.
6. Black people should treat other oppressed people as allies.
7. The racism Blacks have experienced is similar to that of other minority groups. (omit from analyses)
9. There are other people who experience racial injustice and indignities similar to Black Americans.
10. Blacks will be more successful in achieving their goals if they form coalitions with other oppressed groups.
11. Blacks should try to become friends with people from other oppressed groups.
12. The dominant society devalues anything not White male oriented. (omit from analyses)

Nationalist Subscale

1. It is important for Black people to surround their children with Black art, music and literature.
2. Black people should not marry interracially. (omit from analyses)
4. Blacks would be better off if they adopted Afrocentric values.
5. Black students are better off going to schools that are controlled and organized by Blacks.
6. Black people must organize themselves into a separate Black political force.
7. Whenever possible, Blacks should buy from other Black businesses.
9. A thorough knowledge of Black history is very important for Blacks today.
10. Blacks and Whites can never live in true harmony because of racial differences.
12. White people can never be trusted where Blacks are concerned.