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ABSTRACT

Kirsten Cristinziani
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDES AND THE EXPERIENCE AND EXPRESSION OF ANGER
2003/04
Dr. Katherine Pérez-Rivera
Masters of Arts in Mental Health Counseling

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the racial identity attitudes of African-Americans and experience and expression of anger. For several decades, theories of racial identity development have been postulated (e.g. Cross, 1971; Helms, 1990). Affective correlates of differing statuses of racial identity development have been hypothesized and widely studied. However, the affect of anger has not been given much systematic attention in the literature, though theoretical models of racial identity development do include assumptions of the role of anger. Specifically, in Helms’ model of racial identity development (1990), which this thesis adheres to, anger is theorized to be an affective correlate of both the encounter status and the immersion-emersion status. Inferences into the experience and expression of anger at all stages of racial identity development were tested in this thesis. In this study 22 African-American females were administered a number of surveys to measure racial identity attitudes and anger experience and expression. The results of this study did not indicate a relationship between racial identity attitudes and the experience and expression of anger. However, a number of limitations to this study were discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Racial identity as a construct has been studied for several decades. Theories primarily began to arise in the early 1970's in response to the Civil Rights Movement. Overall, racial identity theory refers to the manner in which one identifies or does not identify with the racial group he or she is generally assumed to belong to (i.e., reference group orientation) (Helms, 1990). The most accepted type of racial identity development theory for African-Americans is Nigrescence theory. Nigrescence literally means “becoming Black” (Cross, 1995). Nigrescence theory seeks to delineate the aspects of racial identity development that are in response to racial oppression, as well as those aspects of identity development that are considered a normal part of human psychological development (Helms, 1990).

One of the most accepted Nigrescence models of racial identity development is the Cross model (1971). Cross’ model is a stage model. Stage theorists conceptualize identity development as a developmental process in which a person may move from one level of identity to another. As it relates to racial identity, levels of identity are characterized as attitudes resultant of a “status” of racial awareness and affiliation (Helms, 1990). Changes in attitude, referred to as stages in Cross’ model, reflect a change in racial consciousness (cognitive and affective approaches to self and society) (Worrell, Cross and Vandiver, 2001). Helms (1990) states that each stage represents a distinct “worldview” made up of feelings, thoughts and behaviors. She also hypothesizes that different racial identity attitudes might affect information processing style. This
study investigated the relationship between racial identity attitudes and the experience and expression of anger.

Cross (1971)

The Cross model (1971) is composed of five stages: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, internalization, and internalization-commitment. Each stage is conceptualized as reflecting a change in racial consciousness (cognitive and affective approaches to self and society) (Worrell, Cross and Vandiver, 2001). Stage one, pre-encounter, is described by Cross as consisting of attitudes and feelings de-emphasizing being Black and emphasizing an assimilation to "White-Anglo-Saxon Protestant characteristics" (Cross, 1971, p.16). In this version of the model, pre-encounter attitudes are conceptualized as being indicative of Black self-hatred and therefore poor psychological functioning (Worrell, Vandiver and Cross, 2000).

Stage two, encounter, is described as the individual's confrontation with personal or societal events that challenge their pre-encounter attitudes. The encounter forces a recognition that race matters in American society (Worrell, Vandiver and Cross, 2000). Many individuals who experience the encounter stage abandon the pre-encounter identity and shift into stage three of racial identity development, which is the immersion-emersion stage.

Cross (1971) defines stage three as an immersion into Blackness, fueled by feelings against a White dominant society rather than pro-Black acceptance. The person who once saw themselves as assimilated into the White culture now demonizes the White culture and glorifies the Black culture (Worrell, Vandiver and Cross, 2000). Cross (1971) argues, that though this stage appears to reflect Black Nationalism, it is really a
reflection of “Weusi (Swahili for Black) anxiety” (Cross, 1971, p. 23). This anxiety is over the concern of being what may stereotypically be seen as the “right kind” of Black person (Cross, 1995). Cross (1995) states that an individual may enter into the internalization stage if the immersion process does not result in fixation.

Cross (1971) views a person in stage four, internalization, as secure in their Black identity. Internalization attitudes, according to this version of the model, are believed to be characteristic of Black self-acceptance and psychological well being (Worrell, Vandiver and Cross, 2000). Cross (1971) states that once a person commits to using their energy to better the community for all Blacks and takes action, then the individual has reached stage five, internalization-commitment.

Helms (1990)

Helms developed a racial identity model based on the Cross model. Helms’ model consists of five stages, called ego statuses. Each status represents a distinct “worldview” made up of feelings, thoughts and behaviors. Helms hypothesizes that different racial identity attitudes may affect information-processing style, especially as relates to racial information (Helms, 1990).

The first status, called pre-encounter, is described by Helms (1990) as the depreciation of the African-American race and idealization of the White race by an African-American individual. Helms argues that people at the pre-encounter status are highly motivated to be accepted by Whites and act in ways they think will earn such acceptance. Helms describes two modes of expression of the pre-encounter status: an active and passive mode of expression. In the active mode of expression, a person deliberately idealizes Whiteness and White culture and denigrates Blackness and Black
culture. In the passive mode of expression, a person has a worldview that mirrors that of the dominant White society.

The second status, encounter, is conceptualized by Helms (1990) as the realization that the African-American individual cannot become part of the "White world." Helms divides this stage into two phases. Phase one of the encounter stage is seen as a struggle between dropping the former identity while not yet having a Black identity. Phase two of the encounter stage is when the individual begins to think about developing a new identity. Helms contends that confusion, hopelessness, anxiety, depression, and eventually anger and euphoria are some of the affective correlates of this stage. Helms states that this stage is so fleeting it is almost impossible to measure.

Helms (1990) describes the third status, immersion-emersion, as the African-American individual devaluing the White race and idealizing and aligning with the African-American race. She conceptualizes the immersion-emersion individual as often acting Black in a very stereotypical way. She hypothesizes that generalized anger is one affect that appears in immersion. Helms names three targets of the "immersion" individual's anger: 1) anger at Whites, 2) anger at themselves for being part of the White system, and 3) anger at other Blacks that continue to be in the pre-encounter status. It is also hypothesized that during this status information is sorted in a way that is consistent with the Black separatist perspective (Pérez-Rivera, 2000). Helms (1990) theorizes that as a person begins to feel they have more control, and begin to sort out the weaknesses and strengths of Black culture they will move into the internalization status.

The fourth status is called internalization. Helms (1990) conceptualizes this status as the development of a positive Black identity. Helms states that it is in this status that it
becomes possible for the African-American individual to renegotiate their position in respect to Whites and White society and maintain a balanced and objective worldview.

The fifth status is called integrative awareness. It is conceptually quite similar to the internalization status, but is marked with the activity of collaborating with others who have been oppressed and experienced racism. Typically, this status has been excluded from empirical research due to the measurement difficulty of differentiating it from the fourth status (Helms, 1990). The measurement device that corresponds to this model, the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS), does not assess this status.

Helms (1990) holds similar assumptions as does Cross (1971) about the relationship between racial identity attitudes and various aspects of psychological functioning. One such assumption is that the less “sophisticated” statuses (pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion) are accompanied by poorer psychological functioning (Parham and Helms, 1985).

Revised Cross (1991)

In 1991, Cross revised his Nigrescence model of racial identity development. One major revision was a clarification and separation between reference group orientation (societal memberships we hold) and personal identity (broader personality traits). Cross hypothesizes that self-esteem, for example, is part of our personal identity and is not affected by reference group orientation (Worrell, Vandiver and Cross, 2000). The revised theory states that self-esteem is related to anti-Black feelings and not pro-White feelings (Vandiver, Fhagen-Smith, Cokely, Cross and Worrell, 2001). In Cross’ revised model there is also an uncoupling of Black self-acceptance and mental-health (Cross, 1995). It is stated that an acceptance of Blackness will not necessarily ensure that
a positive change in a Black person's level of psychological functioning will follow.
Cross asserts that acceptance of Blackness does not change fundamental personality characteristics (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, and Fhagen-Smith, 2002), such as an individual's self-concept (Cross, 1995). However, it may be postulated based on these assumptions that a change in fleeting temperament, such as the state of anger, may be experienced as it relates to a person's worldview, value system, or reference group orientation.

Another change to Cross' initial model was in the number of stages and number of racial identity attitudes at each stage. Internalization and internalization-commitment are now merged into a single stage called internalization. As well, Cross identifies multiple attitudes at each stage of development except for the encounter stage. The pre-encounter stage includes two types of attitudes, assimilation and anti-Black attitudes. The anti-Black attitudes are further divided into self-hatred and miseducation. The immersion-emersion stage is also identified as having two attitudes, anti-White and pro-Black attitudes. Lastly, the internalization stage is divided into three attitudes: 1) Black nationalist, 2) biculturalist and 3) multiculturalist attitudes (Worrell, Vandiver and Cross, 2000) (See Appendix A).

Black self-hatred, as previously conceptualized by Cross, was divided into indirect and direct self-hatred. Indirect self-hatred was idealizing Whites, and the statement "I hate being Black" summarized direct self-hatred. In the revised model, self-hatred is subsumed under anti-Black attitudes, one of the two possible attitude sets of the pre-encounter stage. Cross further hypothesizes in his revised model that idealizing Whites is not necessarily an indicator of Black self-hatred, but may be attributed to
assimilation or miseducation (Vandiver, Fhagen-Smith, Cokely, Cross and Worrell, 2001). In this way, in the revised model, there is an uncoupling of the automatic assumption that pre-encounter attitudes lead to poor self-esteem or poor psychological functioning (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell and Fhagen-Smith, 2002). For example, African-Americans in the pre-encounter stage may derive mental health benefits from high affiliations with identities that are not based on race (e.g. assimilation and miseducation) (Vandiver, Fhagen-Smith, Cokely, Cross and Worrell, 2001).

As stated, in the early versions of Cross’ theory the development of racial identity is spurred on by an encounter. The encounter stage is conceptualized by Cross as occurring in two steps: first, the experiencing of the encounter, and second, personalizing the encounter. The encounter does not have to be negative, but the encounter brings with it a great deal of emotions, such as anger and anxiety due to unfamiliarity with the new identity they are to develop (Cross, 1995).

The intense Black involvement attitudes of the immersion stage consist of feelings that everything Black is good, accompanied by an excessive embracing of everything Black. Cross contends that rage, anxiety and guilt contribute to these explorations of Blackness. These attitudes contribute to the experience of rage at a “White America”, as well as anger towards other African-Americans who are thought to be in the pre-encounter stage or are multiculturalist. Cross claims that persons endorsing these attitudes view pre-encounter or multiculturalist African-Americans as being “pro-White,” which further translates into the perception that these people are anti-Black. The second attitude set of the immersion stage is anti-White attitudes. These attitudes are described as extreme in nature and consist of such experiences as the felt desire to hurt
White people. Due to the extremity of these anti-white attitudes they can be separated as a unique identity (Vandiver, Fhagen-Smith, Cokley, Cross and Worrell, 2001). The emersion phase of this stage is defined as a leveling off of the emotionality associated with immersion. Cross explains this leveling off as a natural expectation based on a person's inability to keep up such emotional intensity, such as that associated with the "happening" of emersion. During this phase, a sense of control over one's emotions and intellect returns (Cross, 1995).

In the revised model, the internalization stage is divided into three attitude sets: 1) Black nationalist, which focuses on Black empowerment, economic equality, and African culture with little consideration for anything else; 2) biculturalist, which is characterized by an acceptance of being Black and American; 3) and multiculturalist, which is characterized by an acceptance of being Black and at least two other things (e.g., male and disabled) (Vandiver, Fhagen-Smith, Cokley, Cross and Worrell, 2001). Cross states that the internalization stage involves an awareness that racism is part of the American experience and that regardless of status, if you are African-American, you can well be the target of racism. A person in the internalization stage will be inclined to find fault in the circumstance of racism and not in the self. Cross hypothesizes three functions internalization attitudes serve in everyday life: 1) to defend a person from the anxiety of having to live in a race-based society, 2) to provide a sense of belonging, and 3) to provide a reference point for dealing with people, cultures, and interpersonal interactions beyond their orientation of race. The identity, at this stage, is hypothesized to be stable though one's reference group functions may take on a multidimensional character (Cross, 1995).
Expansion of the Racial Identity Theories

Parham (1989) expanded the theories of racial identity development by considering the process over different lifespan stages. Parham conceptualizes racial identity development as a lifelong process beginning with late adolescence. Parham hypothesizes that people can start at one stage of awareness, continue through the process of the stages, and then recycle or go through them again. He states that identity development is influenced by both internal (such as the individual) and external (such as environmental) factors. Parham outlines three possibilities on how an African-American can deal with racial identity: 1) stagnation, 2) stage-wise linear progression, or 3) recycling. He divides internalization into either ethnocentric mind or humanistic mind, and postulates that the humanistic mind is more vulnerable to recycling. However, he also points out the importance of within group variance.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the racial identity attitudes of African-Americans and the experience and expression of anger. Affective correlates of differing statuses of racial identity development have been hypothesized and widely studied. However, the affect of anger has not been given much systematic attention in the literature, though theoretical models of racial identity development do include assumptions of the role of anger. For the purposes of this study, to investigate the relationship between racial identity attitudes and the experience and expression of anger, Helms' (1990) model of racial identity was utilized for a number of reasons. First, Helms' model is integrative and comprehensive. She pays considerable attention to worldview, the way one feels, thinks and behaves in response to environmental information, especially racial information. She also hypothesizes that
different racial identity attitudes might affect information processing style, especially as it relates to racial information. This distinction is important when investigating anger, which is an affect that has been hypothesized to be effected by appraisals and therefore the processing of information. Secondly, the Helms model and its corresponding scale (the Racial Identity Attitude Scale – RIAS) has been the most widely researched and utilized. In addition, the RIAS measures the pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion and internalizations statuses of racial identity. This is important because an encounter subscale is not included on other measures and is one of the statuses that are theoretically accompanied by the affect of anger. It has only been in the past couple of years that a measure has been developed for the Cross model, and it does not include measurement of the encounter stage. In addition a literature review shows that besides the authors of the Cross scale, the Cross measure has not been widely utilized in empirical research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Racial Identity Research

This study sought to gain further understanding of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and anger. In the theorizing of Nigrescence models, it is asserted that anger plays a role in being an affect that is present at all levels of racial identity development (e.g. Cross, 1995 and Helms, 1990) with differing underlying causes (Neville, Heppner and Wang, 1997), and as a catalyst for the continuation of racial identity development (Brooks, 1997). Though inferences based on this theory can be expanded into the experience and expression of anger at differing stages of racial identity, investigation into this relationship cannot be readily found in relevant publications nor is it readily mentioned in other published studies of racial identity and other affect. It was hypothesized in this study that anger would be experienced and expressed differently at different stages of racial identity development. Though this has not been directly studied in much of the literature, inferences may be drawn out of other studies of affect.

Parham and Helms (1985) conducted an early study into the relationship between racial identity and affect. They investigated the relationship between racial identity attitudes and self-actualization and affective states of Black students. Their study gave consideration to how being Black in a White dominant society influenced the Black person's personality development and psychological adjustment. Parham and Helms (1985) conceptualized Cross' model as a description of the African-American process of
self-actualization under conditions of oppression. It was theorized that as an individual moved through the stages of racial identity they moved from less healthy identity (less self-actualizing and accepting) to a more healthy identity (more self-actualizing and accepting). Results of this study suggested pre-encounter and immersion attitudes were associated with greater personal distress. Distress was defined as having a negative relationship to healthy self-actualizing tendencies and positive relationship to feelings of inferiority, anxiety and hostility. It was found in the study that the immersion attitude scale was a significant predictor of anger. It was also found that possessiveness, self acceptance, and affective states were predicted by racial identity attitudes.

Neville and Lily (2000) conducted a more recent study into racial identity attitudes and affect. They investigated the relationship between racial identity category profiles and psychological distress among African-American college students. In their study, 182 African-American college students completed the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS), designed to measure racial identity attitudes corresponding to statuses of racial identity. As well, the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) a scale designed to measure psychological symptom patterns on nine symptom dimensions as well as three global indices of distress was completed. A multivariate categorization scheme revealed five types of empirically derived racial identity attitude profiles; 1) dissonance internalization (comfort with Black identity, but conflict over what it means to be Black in a White dominated society), 2) committed internalization (internalization of positive Black identity), 3) engaged internalization (confronting racial identity and racial situations), 4) undifferentiated racial identity (moderate levels of attitudes on all four RIAS, pre-encounter, encounter, immersion/emersion and internalization, subscales), and 5)
dormant racial identity (low to moderate levels of attitudes on all four RIAS subscales).
The three internalization identity profiles reflected greater endorsement of a positive
Black racial identity. The other two profiles (undifferentiated racial identity and dormant
racial identity) reflected a less defined or evolved racial identity profile. The profiles
significantly differed on four of the BSI subscales (interpersonal sensitivity, depression,
paranoid ideation and psychoticism) and on the Global Severity Index of the BSI.
Specifically, the engaged internalization profile endorsed lower interpersonal sensitivity,
psychoticism and less depression as compared to the undifferentiated racial identity
profile. In addition, the engaged internalization profile reported lower psychological
distress than the undifferentiated racial identity profile. Therefore, one of the
internalization identify profiles that reflected greater endorsement of a positive Black
racial identity was related to less psychological distress when using the BSI in
comparison to another profile that reflected a less defined or evolved racial identity.

It is important to note that the racial identity literature has also addressed the
effect of racial identity attitudes on the perception of stress. Inferences from the literature
on the effect racial identity attitudes have on other stressors can be made and are
important. A connection between stress and anger can be made based on the writings of
Novaco (1985), which relates anger to other types of stress based on the physiological
correlation between anger and other types of stress.

In 1997, Neville, Heppner and Wang, studied the relationship among racial
identity attitudes, perceived stressors, and coping styles in African-Americans. In their
study, the RIAS was used to measure racial identity attitudes, the Black Student Stress
Inventory (BSSI) was used to measure both stressors that are simply college related and
stressors that are racially related, and the Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) and the Problem Solving Style of Coping (PSSOC) were used to measure coping style. The study suggested support for the general findings that encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes were associated with greater levels of distress. Differences between perceptions of general stress and culture specific stress, as it related to racial identity attitudes, were analyzed. It was found that immersion-emersion attitudes were associated with greater perceived general and culture specific stress. It was also found that encounter attitudes were associated with greater perceptions of general stress.

The Neville, Heppner and Wang (1997) study also had another goal of looking at coping processes. The results of the study showed that persons higher in immersion-emersion scores had lower problem-solving appraisal and problem-focused coping. In addition, higher internalization attitudes were associated with lower stress and higher problem-solving appraisal and problem focused coping. Therefore, the study provided partial support for the theoretical link among racial identity theory and stress and coping styles. It also provided partial support for a relationship between racial identity attitudes and a differing of perception of different types of stress (e.g., culture specific versus general stress).

In addition to showing a connection between racial identity attitudes and level of distress, Neville, Heppner and Wang (1997) underlined the relationship between racial identity attitudes and style of coping with stressors. It will be noted at this point that Novaco (1985) states that anger is a type of stress as noted by the physiological reactions of anger which mirror other physiological reactions to stress. This study specifically looks at experience and expression of anger. Thus, it is important to note the link
between racial identity attitudes and style of coping with stressors. It can be theorized that expression of anger and coping with anger are synonymous (Pérez-Rivera, 2000). Essentially it can be hypothesized that racial identity attitudes may be related to coping with the stress of anger, conceptualized as expression of anger.

Nghe and Mahalik (2001), using the terminology of "management" and "painful affect," further studied the link between racial identity attitudes and coping with stress. They examined racial identity status as predictors of psychological defenses in African-American college students. Eighty African-American college students completed the RIAS, a defense mechanism inventory, and a defense style questionnaire. Pre-encounter and encounter ego statuses were positively related to neurotic psychological defenses, as well as defenses of principalization and reversal. Immersion ego status was positively related to immature psychological defenses (e.g., external or internal aggression), as well as turning against objects (the expression of indirect or direct aggression) and projection. Emersion ego status was positively related to mature psychological defenses, as well as turning against object and projection. Nghe and Mahalik posited that this provided support for Nigrescence racial identity models because racial identity ego statuses predicted how African-Americans manage painful affect. The authors paraphrased Helms (1995):

When an African-American person experiences an event in his or her internal or external environment relative to race, and this event creates painful affect, his or her dominant racial identity status would assist the person in managing those feelings and does protect the personal sense of well-being and self-esteem. (p. 11)
An example given by the authors was that of an African-American who was identified as being in the immersion status and whom experienced racism from a White person. They identified this person as being more prone to challenge the White person due to their status of racial identity development. It was therefore suggested in this study that racial identity status might be useful for understanding the ways in which African-Americans cope with or express their stress.

In summary, racial identity theory states that the status of racial identity development affects such things as cognitions, affects, information processing style, and styles of coping. Racial identity and affect has been studied, as mentioned above. However, racial identity and its relationship to the affect of anger has not been as widely studied. This study sought to gain a further understanding of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and the experience and expression of anger. Forthcoming is a discussion of the anger research.

Anger Research

The research regarding anger is immense. The term anger has many meanings, such as an experience or feeling, physiological reactions, attitudes, a component of aggression, or aggression (Berkowitz, 1999). For the purposes of this study, a very specific conceptualization of anger is used. This study will focus on the definitions of anger as outlined by Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell and Crane (1983). The definition of anger as outlined by Spielberger, et al. (1983) is stated as, "an emotional state that consists of feelings that vary in intensity, from mild irritation or annoyance to fury and rage" (p. 162). They make a further distinction between state-anger and trait-anger.
State-anger is defined as "an emotional state or condition that consists of subjective feelings of tension, annoyance, irritation, fury and rage with concomitant activation or arousal of the autonomic nervous system" (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell and Crane, 1983, p.168). State-anger is conceptualized as being more fleeting than trait-anger with variations in intensity. Variations in state-anger can be attributed to perceived injustices. Trait-anger, on the other hand, is defined as "individual differences in the frequency that state-anger is experienced overtime" (Spielberger, et al., 1983, p. 169). These individual differences are conceptualized as personality traits in such that, "persons high in trait-anger are more likely to perceive a wide range of situations as anger provoking and to respond to such situations with evaluations in state-anger” (Spielberger, et al., 1983, p. 169).

This study is also interested in the expression of anger. In terms of anger expression, individuals are characterized as “anger-in” if they suppress angry feelings when experienced, “anger-out” if they express anger towards other people or the environment when motivated by anger, or “anger control” if they are able and willing to control their anger in response to angry feelings (Spielberger, Johnson, Russell, Crane, Jacobs, and Worden, 1985). Anger has both adaptive and maladaptive functions. There are five situations in which anger can be effective: 1) when anger is directed at its target, 2) when the expression results in a sense of justice, 3) when the behavior of the target is changed, 4) when the target understands the victim’s anger, and 5) when the target does not retaliate (Brooks, 1997). If anger becomes chronic, that could be indicative of its maladaptive function (Novaco, 1985).
Mikulincer (1998) did a series of studies that investigated the relationship between adult attachment styles and differences in functional versus dysfunctional experiences of anger. A first study looked at attachment style differences in self-reports of anger proneness, anger expression, anger goals and responses to anger. A second study assessed attachment style, physiological signs of anger, and attribution of hostile intent. And a third study used a lexical decision task for studying attachment style differences and expected anger outcomes. It was shown in the series of studies that:

Secure persons [in terms of attachment style] scored lower in anger-proneness, endorsed more constructive anger goals, reported more adaptive responses and more positive affect in anger episodes, attributed less hostile intent to others, and expected more positive outcomes than insecure persons. (p. 513)

In summary, secure persons experienced anger in a more functional way whereas insecure persons experienced more dysfunctional anger. Secure persons also scored lower on anger-proneness (Mikulincer, 1998). Security in these studies was defined as an attachment style. The relationship between attachment style and concepts of racial identity remains unclear in the literature. However, it can be questioned from such findings whether aspects of racial identity may contribute to development of adult attachment style.

Another way of understanding anger is the appraisal-based view of anger. This view of anger contends that angry feelings only exist when environmental happenings are perceived in a certain way. The social constructivist perspective views anger as having biological, psychological and social components. Appraisals are considered to be social components. These components are flexible and are culturally determined (Berkowitz,
The appraisal theorists believe that appraisals occur in a sequence: the primary appraisal looks at the potential threat of harm or loss in the situation, and the second appraisal evaluates the coping resources at the disposal of the individual (Novaco, 1985, Utsey, 1998). It is then hypothesized that the appraisal will give rise to either a positive or negative affective reaction. As more factors are considered, such as the expectations one holds about the self and others (Novaco, 1985), the affective state becomes more pronounced. This analysis in terms of anger was outlined by Berkowitz, (1999):

In the case of anger, the afflicted person presumably has to think the agent (cause) of the undesirable event behaved in a blameworthy manner. Anger is elicited, then, if both the blameworthiness of the agent's action and the incident’s undesirableness are considered together. Focusing on one or the other of these constituents rather than on both presumably would activate affective states other than anger. (p. 416)

Research into racial identity and anger

There are two studies in the literature that specifically address the relationship between anger and Black racial identity development. A dissertation by Brooks (1997) investigated this relationship for the purpose of the construction and validation of a theoretical model and corresponding scale. In Brooks’ study, anger was conceptualized as the emotional response to injustice, which was considered as particularly relevant to the African-American experience in consideration of their everyday experience with racism. Brooks (1997) theorized that anger was dependent on the perception that injustice had taken place, and as relates to racial identity development, dependent on the perception of racial injustice. Essentially, it was hypothesized that racial identity
attitudes would alter perceptions of and reactions to racial injustice, and that anger
to perceived racial injustice would alter depending upon stage of identity
development. Specifically, it was hypothesized that "the way Black people perceive the
world influences how they perceive experiences of injustice, which results in anger as a
response" (p.25).

From Brooks' (1997) study, the Black Anger Scale (BAS) was developed, which
measured anger in the specific context of perceived racial injustice as a function of Black
identity development. More specifically, the BAS was constructed of items that
presumed both level of racial identity development and style of anger experience and
expression anchored in the context of racial injustice. For example, "I talk about the
angry feelings I experience with regards to racism with my friends, family or in groups
that I belong to," was an item belonging to the internalization stage scale, "I think it is
important to confront every situation of racism that I encounter," was an item belonging
to the immersion stage scale, and "My friends think I am being over sensitive when I say
something is racial discrimination," was an item belonging to the pre-encounter stage
scale. The BAS was found to correlate with the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS),
the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) (contrary to hypotheses), and the
Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). In Brooks’ study, the Black Anger Scale was used to
assess racial identity attitudes, as well as anger experience and expression.

The findings of Brooks’ (1997) study provide support for the theory that anger
experience and expression have different qualities at different stages of racial identity
development that can be measured. Specifically, pre-encounter attitudes were associated
with alienation from reference group orientation and indirect expressions of anger, or
anger-in. Immersion attitudes were associated with anger expression and experience, which is perceived as being accepted by the reference group, or anger-out.

A problem with the Brooks (1997) study is with the use of one measure for both anger experience and expression and racial identity attitudes all anchored in the specific context of perceived racial injustice. This combination of constructs in one scale does not allow for a separation of anger experience and expression, racial identity attitudes and perceived racial injustice. This is also a problem due to the paucity of research supporting the relationship between racial identity attitudes and experience and expression of anger. To make the assumptive leap, and to combine the constructs in one scale, may be premature. As well, by anchoring the whole scale in the context of perceived racial injustice, a thorough look at the relationship between racial identity attitudes, or anger experience and expression, with perceived racial injustice may become convoluted. If the constructs are not separated out and measured as separate constructs then their relationship to each other may be distorted. In other words, though perception of racial injustice may differ depending on stage of racial identity, and the experience of anger may also be dependent on stage of racial identity, the experience of anger may not necessarily be dependent on the perception of racial injustice. It is neither hypothesized in this study that perception of racial injustice is a necessary component to experience anger, nor that expression of anger is dependent on perception of racial injustice. The role of anger in racial identity development, as conceptualized in this study, is seen as an affect that is present at all levels of racial identity development, but with differing underlying causes (e.g., Neville, Heppner and Wang, 1997).
In 2000, Pérez-Rivera conducted her dissertation on the relationship of racial identity attitudes to the experience and expression of anger in African-Americans and Caucasians. In her study, racial identity attitudes were divided into least healthy (i.e., pre-encounter, encounter, and immersion-emersion) and healthy (i.e., internalization) statuses of racial identity. It was hypothesized that anger would be experienced in the least healthy stages of racial identity. The Helms’ (1990) Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) was used to measure racial identity attitudes, the State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS) was used to measure experience of anger, and the Anger Expression Inventory (AX) was used to measure expression of anger. Underscored in her study was the theoretical notion, already present in the racial identity models, that dependent upon the status of racial identity, the individual has cognitive templates that they employ to organize information. The importance of this notion was illustrated in the existing relationship between the experience and expression of anger and its theorized effect on an individual’s cognitive style.

Therefore, the study investigated whether racial identity attitudes of African-Americans predicted the experience and expression of anger. Specifically, it was hypothesized by Pérez-Rivera, 2000, that pre-encounter, encounter, and immersion-emersion attitudes would be predictive of a higher experience of trait-anger, while internalization attitudes would be predictive of lower trait-anger. This hypothesis was based on the notion that individuals in the statuses would process information consistent with their world view:

If the worldview of the individual consists of devaluing the African-American race, the individual will have the proclivity to process information that is
consistent with that worldview. The potentially angering event consequently activates the tendency to confirm the negative bias. (p. 43)

It was found in the study that the encounter subscale was positively related to trait anger specifically. It was also found that the negative statuses (a collapsing of the pre-encounter, encounter and immersion-emersion statuses) were positively correlated to trait-anger, thus suggesting that higher levels of negative attitudes were associated with higher trait-anger.

Another hypothesis pertained to the relationship between racial identity attitudes and the expression of anger. Specifically, pre-encounter, encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes were hypothesized to be predictive of higher anger-in and anger-out coping styles, whereas internalization attitudes were hypothesized to be predictive of lower anger-in and anger-out coping styles. It was found that the pre-encounter subscale was negatively correlated with anger-out, while the immersion-emersion subscale was positively correlated with anger-out. Further, it was found that the positive subscale (i.e., internalization) was positively correlated with anger-out. Overall, some support for the theoretical link between anger and racial identity attitudes was found in this study (Pérez-Rivera, 2000).

This study also found that social desirability responding accounted for a significant amount of the variance of the regression models, which underscores the importance of looking at this aspect when studying racial identity attitudes (Pérez-Rivera, 2000).

Additional support for the link between racial identity attitudes and anger was provided in a study of the validity of the RIAS. Fisher, Tokar and Serna (1998)
investigated the convergent validity of the RIAS and theoretically relevant criteria. They found in their study that pre-encounter attitudes were positively correlated with suppression of anger and immersion-emersion attitudes were positively correlated with outward expression of anger. Further discussion into concerns Fisher, Tokar and Serna (1998) expressed in their study about the validity of the RIAS will be provided in the upcoming section.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Hypotheses

This study sought to combine the findings and theories of racial identity research and anger research. Specifically, this study investigated the relationship between racial identity attitudes, as conceptualized by Helms (1990), and the experience and expression of anger. The following were the hypotheses of this study:

Hypothesis 1: It was predicted that there would be a significant relationship between racial identity attitudes, as conceptualized by Helms (1990) and as measured by the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) (Helms and Parham, 1996), and the experience of anger (i.e., trait-anger), as measured by the State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS) (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell and Crane, 1983). Specifically, it was predicted that encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes would be predictive of higher trait-anger, while pre-encounter and internalization attitudes would be predictive of lower trait-anger.

Hypothesis 2: It was predicted that there would be a significant relationship between racial identity attitudes, as conceptualized by Helms (1990) and as measured by the RIAS (Helms and Parham, 1996), and expression of anger, as measured by the Anger Expression Scale (AX) (Spielberger, Johnson, Russell, Crane, Jacobs and Worden, 1985). Specifically, it was predicted that pre-encounter attitudes would be predictive of higher anger-in, while encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes would be predictive of higher anger-out. Internalization attitudes were predicted not to have a relationship with mode of anger expression.
Participants

Participants were 22 African-American female students attending Rowan University, a predominately White University located in Glassboro, New Jersey. Ages ranged from 18 to 30 with a mean age of 21.18 (SD = 2.89). The participants were primarily recruited through flyers and classroom recruitment offering $10 for participation in a study measuring social and political attitudes and through an Introduction to Psychology participant pool. All Introduction to Psychology students that participated were given research credit, which was a requirement for course completion. The target sample size for this study was 85 participants. Despite outreach to several classrooms and on-campus organizations such as the Black Culture League and the NAACP, the participation rate remained low which resulted in the attained sample size of 22 participants.

Measures

A demographic questionnaire, as well as four self-report measures assessing racial identity attitudes, experience of anger, expression of anger, and social desirability responding, were employed in this study. Racial identity attitudes were the independent variables in this study and anger experience and expression were the dependent variables in this study.

Demographic Questionnaire: Participants were asked to answer the following demographic information: sex, age, marital status, race, ethnicity, state of origin, whether they grew up in a rural/country or urban/city area, total annual household income, the percentage of people in school or work environment of the same ethnicity, and religious
affiliation. The demographic information was used to compare homogeneity of group on the various demographic variables.

**Racial Identity Attitude Scale-Long form (RIAS-L):** The 50-item RIAS-L (Helms and Parham, 1996) was used to measure participants' racial identity attitudes. The scale is delineated into four statuses of racial identity development: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion and internalization. Internalization/commitment is not included in this scale due to the difficulty of operationalizing differences between this stage and the internalization stage, which presents a measurement difficulty. The pre-encounter (i.e., items 4, 8, 9, 12, 21, 25, 29, 31, 32, 40, 41, 44, 46, 47), encounter (i.e., items 23, 24, 28, 33), immersion-emersion (i.e., items 3, 11, 18, 19, 26, 27, 34, 36, 39), and internalization (i.e., items 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 22, 30, 37, 42, 45, 49, 50) subscales were analyzed.

Participants responded using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) "Strongly Disagree" to (5) "Strongly Agree". The RIAS-L is scored by averaging ratings for the items on each subscale. The scores can range from 1 to 5 on each subscale. Higher scores represent stronger endorsements of the attitudes for the corresponding subscale.

Fischer, Tokar and Serna (1998) raised concerns over the validity of the RIAS-L. They reported that the RIAS-L was skewed in that there often was more endorsement of internalization attitudes. It was hypothesized that the skewness of the data may be accounted for by social desirability responding. In fact, they found that there was a "method effect" for social desirability. In other words, socially desirable responding was in part responsible for the appearance of constructs. However, this was only a significant effect for the pre-encounter subscale, which Fisher, Tokar and Serna suggested may show
respondents' tendency to present themselves in a socially desirable way, which they hypothesized, might actually be what is underlying the pre-encounter subscale.

However, there is considerable support for the construct validity of the RIAS-L with a number of studies demonstrating the relation between scores on the RIAS-L and theoretically based constructs. For instance, the RIAS-L was used to demonstrate the relationship between pre-encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes and negative self-actualizing tendencies (Parham and Helms, 1985). Pre-encounter attitudes, as measured by the RIAS-L, were shown to predict preferences for Caucasian counselors, while immersion-emersion attitudes were shown to predict preferences for African-American counselors (Parham and Helms, 1981). Fisher, Tokar and Serna (1998) showed that pre-encounter attitudes, as measured by the RIAS-L, were positively correlated with the suppression of anger, while immersion-emersion attitudes were related to the outward expression of anger.

Evidence for the structural validity of the RIAS-L also exists. Pina, Bland, Shervington, Rice and Foulks (2000) conducted a principal components analysis on the RIAS-L using a sample of males in treatment for cocaine dependence. A four-factor solution was found to provide a "best fit" for their data. They concluded that factors clearly corresponded to the constructs of pre-encounter and immersion-emersion with no overlap. The two remaining factors corresponded with internalization, as conceptualized by Helms (1990), and internalization-commitment. No factor specific to the encounter phase emerged in their analyses.

This is similar to the earlier findings of Ponterotto and Wise (1987). They conducted an oblique factor analytic method and found strong support for Cross’
constructs of pre-encounter, immersion-emersion and internalization, but little statistical support for the encounter stage as represented in the RIAS-L. They reported alpha coefficients for the RIAS-L subscales of pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion and internalization as .63, .37, .72, and .37 respectively.

Helms and Parham (1996) reported adequate internal consistency reliabilities for the pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization subscales of the RIAS-L as .76, .51, .69, and .80 respectively. Despite the mixed support of the RIAS-L, the reliability and validity data is adequate to support its use in the current study. Moreover, it appears to be the scale of choice in the research on racial identity development.

**State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS):** The 30-item STAS (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell and Crane, 1983) was used to measure the participants’ experience of anger. The STAS measures two components of anger: state-anger and trait-anger. State-anger is conceptualized as the current emotional state of anger, while trait-anger is conceptualized as a general personality trait for anger. The STAS is composed of these subscales: the State-Anger subscale (i.e., items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15) and the Trait-Anger subscale (i.e., items 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30).

Participants respond using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from (1) “Not at All” to (4) “Very Much So” for the State-Anger subscale and (1) “Almost Never” to (4) “Almost Always” for the Trait-Anger subscale. The STAS is scored by adding the total ratings for each subscale. Scores can range from 15 to 60 for each subscale. Higher scores represent endorsements of higher levels of the experience of State-Anger and or Trait-Anger.
In the construction and validation of the STAS, Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell and Crane (1983) reported alpha coefficients for the State-Anger subscale ranging from .88 to .95, which suggested a high degree of internal consistency. Alpha coefficients for the Trait-Anger subscale ranged from .81 to .92, which also suggested a high degree of internal consistency. Retclaff (1992) reported that the State-Anger subscale has an internal consistency of .93, while the Trait-Anger subscale has an internal consistency of .87. Biskin (1992) pointed to the excellent theoretical framework that the scale was constructed upon as support for the validity of the scale. Reliability and validity data is adequate to support the usage of this measure in the current study.

**Anger Expression Scale (AX):** The 20-item AX (Spielberger, Johnson, Russell, Crane, Jacobs and Worden, 1985) was used to measure the participants’ expression of anger. The AX measures two dimensions of the expression of anger: anger-in and anger-out. Anger-in is conceptualized as the suppression of anger, while anger-out is conceptualized as expressing anger in an outward manner towards others or the environment through loud verbalizations or attacks. The AX is composed of these subscales: the Anger-In subscale (i.e., items 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18) and the Anger-Out subscale (i.e., items 2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20).

Participants respond using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from (1) “Almost Never” to (4) “Almost Always”. The AX is scored by adding the total ratings for each subscale. Scores can range from 8 to 32 for each subscale. Higher scores represent endorsements for the corresponding style of anger expression.

In the construction and validation of the AX, Spielberger, Johnson, Russell, Crane, Jacobs and Worden (1985) found that for the validation group (1,114 high school
students) alpha coefficients ranged from .73 to .84. They also concluded that convergent, divergent, concurrent, and construct validity existed for the scale. Spielberger, Krasner and Solomon (1988) reported no correlation between the AX subscales. Further a factor analysis showed two independent underlying dimensions. Reliability and validity data is adequate to support the usage of this measure in the current study.

**Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD):** The 33-item MCSD (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) was used to measure participants' socially desirable responding. Participants respond by indicating "True" or "False" to each item. Eighteen items are keyed in the true direction (i.e., items 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33) and 15 items are keyed in the false direction (i.e., items 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 22, 23, 28, 30, 32). Any true response to an item keyed in the true direction will receive 1 point and any false response to an item keyed in the false direction will receive 1 point. Scores can range from 0-33 with higher scores indicating that the person was responding in a socially desirable direction.

Internal consistency measures have been found to be adequate and have been reported to range from .73 to .88. In addition, adequate test-retest reliability has been reported at .88 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Reliability and validity data is adequate to support the usage of this measure in the current study.

**Hypothesis-Guessing Questionnaire:** A hypothesis guessing questionnaire was added at the end of each packet to gain information about the respondents’ impressions of the measurements and also to gauge whether they were able to ascertain any of the hypotheses of the study. The questionnaire consisted of six questions and was used qualitatively.
Procedures

Participants were recruited through various means. Undergraduate students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology were given the opportunity to sign up for the study on a posted sheet in the Psychology Department and were asked to leave their name and phone number or e-mail address so they could be contacted. All Introduction to Psychology students that participated were given research credit, which was a requirement for course completion, for participating in the study.

Students were also recruited from flyers posted throughout the campus stating that they could earn ten dollars for participating in a study run by the Department of Psychology. The ten-dollar stipend was part of an internal grant awarded to the faculty advisor. On the flyers, students were provided with a contact number and e-mail address. The students were to call the contact number and were asked demographic data. The project facilitator, faculty advisor, and/or this writer also entered classrooms with the agreement of the instructors and offered students the opportunity to participate in a study that would pay ten dollars for a 35-minute survey. They were handed sheets that asked for demographic and contact information. All eligible students were then contacted.

Students recruited via these means were asked the following demographic data upon contact by the project facilitator, faculty advisor or this writer either via phone, e-mail, or on the sheets that were handed out in classrooms: sex, age, marital status, race and academic class level. If the student self-identified as a member of the African-American race (e.g. Black, Afro-American), they were informed that they qualified for the study and were asked to choose a session date to attend. They were made aware at that time, that the ten dollar stipend would be mailed to them at a later date by Rowan
University’s Accounts Payable Department and would not be paid to them at the completion of the testing session. Eligibility requirements were not made explicit unless the student inquired. Upon inquiry, students were informed that the study consisted of a number of surveys designed to investigate social and political attitudes and the ways that men and women respond to certain daily annoyances. Students were also informed that their responses would be kept confidential.

Testing sessions were held in well-lit rooms throughout the college campus. Upon participants’ arrival to the testing session they were informed that this was the study on the social and political attitudes of men and women and the way they respond to certain daily annoyances. Each participant was then handed and asked to review and sign an informed consent sheet (See Appendix B). Participants then turned in the informed consent sheet to the project facilitator. Any questions at that point were entertained.

Each participant then received a questionnaire packet that included a demographic data sheet, the RIAS-L, the STAS, the AX, the IRRS, the MCSD and a hypothesis-guessing questionnaire. The packets were counterbalanced. Packet A was in the following order: STAS, RIAS-L, AX and MCSD. Packet B was in the following order: RIAS-L, STAS, MCSD and AX. Participants were asked to anonymously complete the questionnaire and submit the questionnaire to the project facilitator, faculty advisor, or this writer once completed and before leaving the room. Upon submission to the project facilitator, faculty advisor, or this writer a debriefing form (See Appendix C) was provided to each participant. The participant was instructed to read the debriefing form prior to exiting the room. Any questions or comments that the participant had were
entertained. The debriefing form was then retrieved, unless the participant requested to keep a copy.

The Introduction to Psychology students that took this survey to fulfill a research requirement received a receipt indicating they completed the study and were to receive credit. All other students were asked to indicate their name, social security number, and mailing address on a separate sheet of paper. They were informed that Rowan University’s Accounts Payable Department would mail the ten dollar stipend to their mailing address. They were also given a receipt indicating they completed the study and were to receive ten dollars. The receipt also indicated that they could call the principal investigator if they did not receive their stipend in 4 weeks. The participant was then thanked for their participation.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

To test the hypotheses that encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes would be predictive of higher trait-anger and pre-encounter and internalization attitudes would be predictive of lower trait-anger; and pre-encounter attitudes would be predictive of higher anger-in and encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes would be predictive of higher anger-out, a regression analysis was performed. The regression analysis yielded no significant results, indicating that racial identity attitudes were not predictive of anger experience or expression.

Due to the small sample size a non-parametric test, Gamma test of association, was performed to see if there was an association between subscale scoring. The Gamma test of association did not yield significant results, indicating there was no association between subscale scoring.

To investigate whether participants were endorsing particular racial identity attitude subscales over other racial identity attitude subscales, the Wilcoxon non-parametric test was utilized to analyze this question of whether or not participants were endorsing particular racial identity attitudes over others. There was a significant finding at the .0001 level (Z = -4.108, p < .0001) that indicated there was a significant difference between participants’ endorsement of internalization attitudes (M = 4.34, SD = .4091) and immersion-emersion attitudes (M = 2.01, SD = .4315), which indicates a greater endorsement of internalization attitudes over immersion-emersion attitudes. A significant finding at the .0001 level (Z = -4.076, p < .0001) indicated that there was a significant
difference between participants’ endorsement of internalization attitudes and encounter attitudes \((M = 2.67, SD = .773)\), which indicates a greater endorsement of internalization attitudes over, encounter attitudes. In addition a significant finding at the .0001 level \((Z = -4.108, p < .0001)\) indicated that there was a significant difference between participants' endorsement of internalization attitudes and pre-encounter attitudes \((M = 1.55, SD = .2946)\), which indicates a greater endorsement of internalization attitudes over pre-encounter attitudes.

Correlations were computed to detect any relationships between the independent variables (RIAS subscale scores), the dependent variables (anger subscale scores: trait-anger subscale, anger-in expression subscale, and anger-out expression subscale) and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale (MCSD). A significant inverse correlation was found between the MCSD and the immersion-emersion subscale score \((r = -.435, p < .05)\) and the MCSD and the trait-anger subscale score \((r = -5.42, p < .01)\). It was found that as the scores on the MCSD increased, scores on the trait-anger subscale went down. As well, as scores on the MCSD increased, scores on the immersion-emersion subscale went down. A significant correlation between the trait-anger subscale and anger-out subscale was found \((r = .598, p < .01)\). A significant correlation was also found between the immersion-emersion subscale and the encounter subscale \((r = .437, p < .05)\) and the immersion-emersion subscale and the internalization subscale \((r = .562, p < .01)\).
The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the racial identity attitudes of African-Americans and experience and expression of anger. Affective correlates of differing statuses of racial identity development have been widely studied and often supported. Such an example, is the support in the literature of a relationship between racial identity attitudes and stress. It was noted, in this study, that anger has been indicated as a type of stress (Novaco, 1985) due to the similarity of physiological reactions of stress and anger. Despite the empirical support of a relationship between racial identity attitudes and stress, and the accompanying connection between stress and anger, the hypothesized relationships between racial identity attitudes and anger experience and expression were not supported. It was hypothesized that encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes would be predictive of higher trait-anger and pre-encounter and internalization attitudes would be predictive of lower trait-anger; and pre-encounter attitudes would be predictive of higher anger-in and encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes would be predictive of higher anger-out. Regression analyses indicated that there was no predictive relationship between these variables.

There were a number of limitations to this study, which preclude any strong inferences into the meaningfulness of the found results. The most blatant limitation was the small sample size. The sample size that would have been required for the desired effect size of .80 was not obtained in this study. Due to time constraints and low levels of
participation, the sample size remained rather low. This calls into question what characteristics of the participants that were obtained made them more likely to participate. The explanation that there may be something unique about the participants that were obtained may be substantiated by the significantly higher endorsement of internalization attitudes over the other racial identity attitudes.

With the participants endorsing internalization attitudes over the other racial identity attitudes, the ability to detect relationships among the other attitudes was made more difficult. In addition, as was noted in the hypotheses, it was not expected that internalization attitudes would be predictive of anger expression. Racial identity theory states that persons within the internalization status of racial identity development are more able to find fault in such anger provoking situations as racism, with the situation, and less inclined to find fault with the self (Cross, 1995), which may protect against the experience of anger. Cross further hypothesizes that internalization attitudes protect a person from the anxiety of living in an inherently racist society; perhaps, it could be postulated that this “protection” may extend to the experience of anger. Helms (1990) further states that persons in the internalization status are better able to maintain a balanced and objective worldview. Perhaps, it could be inferred that a person whom experiences the world objectively may also be protected from the experience of anger. Therefore, it may not be inconsistent with racial identity theory to not see a relationship between internalization attitudes and anger experience and expression.

The above outlines two important theoretical points: 1) Cross (1995) hypothesizes that persons that identify with internalization attitudes are more likely to find fault in the circumstance of racism and not in the self; and 2) Helms (1990)
hypothesizes that an individual endorsing internalization attitudes is more able to maintain an objective worldview. Based on the combination of these two points it could be hypothesized that the person endorsing internalization attitudes may also be less likely to appraise a situation of racism as anger provoking. This is a similar hypothesis as was asserted by Brooks, 1997. As mentioned previously, appraisal theory underscores the importance of perceptions in the activation of anger. It may be hypothesized in future research that the results of this study may have been affected by the effect of changing perceptions on racial stress, which in turn may affect anger experience.

Utsey, Ponterotto, Reynolds and Cancelli (2000) state that racial discrimination remains a major quality-of-life issue for African-Americans. Racism can be defined as the belief or advocacy that a given group is superior to others based on race. Racism can be conceptualized as being composed of three “types” of racism: individual, institutional and cultural racism.

Feagin (1991), in his qualitative study, showed how context affected African-American responses to racism. The Feagin study focused on where discrimination took place, the type of discriminatory acts, and coping responses of African-Americans when confronted with discrimination. In his study of middle-class African-Americans, he found that many evaluate/appraise the situation before acting. After the evaluation/appraisal, Feagin found that, the coping responses that were most often considered included leaving the site of the discrimination, ignoring the situation, resigned acceptance, verbal reprimands, sarcasm, physical counterattacks, and sometimes even lawsuits. It may therefore be inferred that once the appraisal was completed the middle-class African-Americans reverted to their primary anger expression style. Although this
study did not break down whether individual people reverted to the same style in every situation, it can be seen in the description of the coping responses that there are anger-in and anger-out expressions of anger in response to racial discrimination.

Feagin (1991) concluded from his study that the “depth and complexity” of African-American responses to White discrimination shows the "changing character of the White-Black interaction" (p. 115). Perhaps it could also be conceptualized that the complexity of the African-American response to White discrimination shows the heterogeneity of African-Americans as a group. The literature has repeatedly shown the inappropriateness of looking at African-Americans as a homogenous group (e.g., Pérez-Rivera, 2000). Perhaps it can be further hypothesized that the complexity of the African-American response to racial discrimination is partially a function of racial identity attitudes.

In fact, Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, and Bylsma (2003) considered such issues. In their study, they investigated African-American college students' experiences with everyday racism and the characteristics of, and responses to, these incidents. In their study, African-American college students reported their experiences with everyday racism using a daily diary format. The diaries were kept for two weeks where race related incidents were recorded and characterized, and emotional and behavioral responses were assessed. Examples of the incidents they reported included bad service or awkward and nervous behavior. The study found that such experiences of racism created a decrease in the comfort of the students and an increase in feelings of threat. The most frequently reported emotional reaction was anger; in fact, 70% reported feeling extremely angry and 30% reported taking some action.
Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, and Bylsma (2003) investigated the role that individual differences, such as racial identity, played on the number and types of incidents reported. As well, they looked at the relationship between these types of individual differences and the types of emotional and behavioral responses reported. However, style of anger expression as a construct was not investigated.

To measure racial identity, Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, and Bylsma (2003) used the identity subscale of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale. The subscale assesses the importance of group membership to one's self-concept. The participants were instructed to think of their social group as African-American. This type of measurement is actually in conflict with racial identity theory, which states that the status of racial identity would predicate reference group orientation. Swim et al. wanted to test whether strong racial identity attitudes would relate to more reported incidents of racial discrimination, as well as more assertive responses to the incidents. Overall, racial identity, as measured by the Collective Self-Esteem Scale, was unrelated to the number of incidents reported and unrelated to the emotional or behavioral responses to incidents reported.

Landrine and Klonoff (1996) developed a measure called the Schedule of Racist Events, and used it to measure the negative physical and mental consequences of racial discrimination for African-Americans. The Schedule of Racist Events is an 18 item self-report inventory that assesses the frequency of racial discrimination over the past year and over an entire lifetime, as well as the extent to which the discrimination is evaluated (i.e., appraised) as stressful. These authors based their hypotheses on the work of appraisal theorists, and just as appraisal theorists believe that primary and secondary appraisals are made for generic life events, these authors hypothesized that African-
Americans likely go through such appraisals when confronted with a racist event. Therefore, it was hypothesized by Landrine and Klonoff that African-Americans would differ in their appraisal of racist events. Novaco (1985) supports the notion of incorporating anger (though he does not specifically state anger in response to racial discrimination) into the stress theory framework.

Though Landrine and Klonoff (1996) did not investigate the role racial identity played in their hypotheses, they did theorize that Afrocentric social and political attitudes might be a personality factor that moderates the negative impact of racist events. It should be noted that Afrocentric social and political attitudes are characteristics theorized to be part of the internalization racial identity status. Landrine and Klonoff state:

By providing a cognitive framework for understanding and responding to racist events, the Afrocentric consciousness should decrease the perception of racist events as one’s own fault, increase active coping, increase social support seeking, and thereby decrease the negative health and psychological impacts of these events. (p. 147)

Unfortunately that specific hypothesis was not addressed in their study.

As mentioned above, appraisal theory underscores the importance of perceptions in the activation of anger. As well, based on the above literature, it may be hypothesized in future research that the results of this study may have been affected by the effect of changing perceptions of racial stress, which in turn may affect anger experience.

Another factor that may help account for the inability to find support for the hypothesized relationships between racial identity attitudes and the experience of anger is the relationship that was found between the MCSD and trait-anger. The MCSD was used
in this study to measure participants' penchant for responding in socially desirable ways. It was found that as a participant's score on the social desirability scale increased their endorsement of trait-anger decreased. Being that trait-anger is the type of anger that was hypothesized to be predicted by the racial identity attitudes, it is significant to note that social desirability responding may have been inhibiting participants' willingness to endorse this type of anger. Therefore, any relationship that may have been observed between the racial identity attitudes and the experience of anger may be obscured, in this study, by participants' seeming unwillingness to endorse anger when responding in a socially desirable way.

One additional footnote is the found negative relationship between the MCSD and immersion-emersion subscale scores. It may additionally be inferred that a participants' willingness to endorse immersion-emersion attitudes decrease as their desire to respond in a socially desirable way increases. Since, immersion-emersion attitudes are the attitudes that are the most theoretically and empirically linked with anger experience and expression, if this sample was less willing to endorse these attitudes when responding in a socially desirable way, then again, the hypothesized relationship between immersion-emersion attitudes and trait-anger may become obscured. This may be especially true when the relationship between socially desirable responding and trait-anger is added to the equation.

One final consideration that may, at least partially, account for the inability to detect relationships between racial identity attitudes and the experience and expression of anger was the use of the Racial identity attitude scale (RIAS) (Helms and Parham, 1996). Both Cross (1995) and Helms (1990) acknowledge the multidimensionality of the
expression of the racial identity statuses. For example, Helms (1990) specifies two possible modes of expression of pre-encounter; the active and passive modes of expression. And Cross (1995) specifies several racial identity attitudes for each stage of development. However, in the RIAS each status is measured as a single construct. Therefore, it is impossible to test the experience of an affect, such as anger, within the status. For example, in the passive mode of expression of the pre-encounter status, Helms states that a person is assimilated into the dominant culture and mirrors the beliefs of the dominant culture, therefore it may be inferred that the experience of anger may be lessened due to the unacceptability of minority anger by the dominant culture. However, in the active mode of expression of the pre-encounter status, a person deliberately belittles the Black culture, which may actually enhance the experience of anger. Further evidence of the multidimensionality of racial identity statuses can be found in the previously cited study conducted by Neville and Lilly (2000). In their study, five empirically derived racial identity profiles were found, three of which were related to the internalization status. They investigated the underlying pattern of responses and found significant differentiation, which they concluded may detect differences in people largely endorsing internalization attitudes. Neville and Lilly stated that this may be a particularly important consideration with college populations, which seem to largely endorse internalization attitudes.

In addition to limiting the relationships that can be looked at, the absence of subscales in the RIAS to account for the differing expressions within the racial identity status may also make it less likely certain attitudes will be endorsed. The significant positive correlation found in this study between the immersion-emersion subscale and the
encounter subscale; and the immersion-emersion subscale and the internalization subscale may provide further support to the notion that the RIAS is not very sensitive in detecting the differences between racial identity attitude expression. A measure for the 1991 Cross model exists, the Cross Racial Identity Scale, CRIS (Vandiver, Cross, Fhagen-Smith, Worrell, Cokley, Swim and Caldwell, 2000) which, has separate subscales for each stage of racial identity development. However, the CRIS, does not allow for the generalizations from subscale to broader stage, as well does not measure the encounter stage, which is theoretically linked with anger. As well, due to the lack of research using the CRIS, the RIAS was chosen for this study. It would be interesting to see in future research, if a seemingly more sensitive instrument would yield support for the theoretical relationship between anger and racial identity attitudes.

Despite not finding any significant relationships between racial identity attitudes and the experience and expression of anger, the above discussion may account for possibilities for why this relationship was not seen in this study but could possibly be seen in future studies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Encounter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre-Encounter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre-Encounter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on assimilation to White culture</td>
<td><em>Assimilation</em></td>
<td>Depreciation of Black culture and idealization of White race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encounter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Encounter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Encounter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation with experiences that force realization of the importance of race and the need for change</td>
<td>Experience and personalization of the encounter</td>
<td>Realization that Blacks cannot be part of the White race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immersion/Emersion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Immersion/Emersion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Immersion/Emersion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion into and glorification of Black culture</td>
<td><em>Anti-White</em></td>
<td>Idealization of and aligning with Black race characterized by general anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internalization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internalization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security in Black identity, viewed as Black self-acceptance</td>
<td><em>Black Nationalist</em></td>
<td>Development of positive Black identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalization-Commitment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internalization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Integrative-Awareness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commits energy to taking action to better community</td>
<td><em>Biculturalist</em></td>
<td>Collaboration with others that have experienced oppression and racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Multiculturalist</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cross (1971) Emphasis on assimilation to White culture
- Cross (Revised) Pre-Encounter *Assimilation* Low affiliation for Black high affiliation to American *Anti-Black* Black self-hatred
- Helms (1990) Pre-Encounter Depreciation of Black culture and idealization of White race
- Cross (Revised) Encounter Experience and personalization of the encounter
- Helms (1990) Encounter Realization that Blacks cannot be part of the White race
- Cross (Revised) Immersion/Emersion *Anti-White* Extreme tendency to disparage White culture *Intense Black Involvement* Rabid embracing of everything Black
- Helms (1990) Immersion/Emersion Idealization of and aligning with Black race characterized by general anger
- Cross (Revised) Internalization *Black Nationalist* Focus on Black empowerment
- Helms (1990) Internalization Development of positive Black identity
- Cross (Revised) Internalization-Commitment *Biculturalist* Acceptance of being Black and American
- Helms (1990) Integrative-Awareness Collaboration with others that have experienced oppression and racism
- Cross (Revised) Internalization-Commitment *Multiculturalist* Acceptance of being Black and at least two other things (e.g. catholic and male)
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE INFORMED CONSENT
Informed consent

The measures that you are being asked to fill out are part of a research study being conducted by Dr. Pérez-Rivera and Kirsten Cristinziani of the Department of Psychology at Rowan University. Completing these measures should take approximately 35 minutes. We are interested in examining people’s social and political attitudes, the ways that men and women respond to certain daily annoyances, and how they cope with them. We are interested in the patterns that will arise from these measures, and not in anyone’s individual answers. We would like everyone to answer the questions to the best of their ability. In return for participating in this study, you will receive a $10.00 stipend.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. We do not believe that there are any risks associated with this study. However, there remains the possibility of feeling some negative emotional reactions. If this becomes the case, you may choose to withdraw from the study at any time. You may also choose to withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason, even after signing the consent form, without any penalty. You may also choose not to answer any question or questions that we present to you. All information from this study will be stored in a secure facility at Rowan University. The information will remain confidential. All questionnaires will be coded by participant number only and be stored without participant’s names. Only Dr. Pérez-Rivera, Kirsten Cristinziani, and any other project facilitator, which may include an undergraduate or graduate student working under the direct supervision of Dr. Pérez-Rivera or Kirsten Cristinziani, will have access to the questionnaires. Any information accessed by the principal investigators and any other project facilitator will remain confidential. In our article reports, no individuals will be described in such a way that they may be identified.

This study has been approved by the Rowan University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Participants. If you have any questions concerns or questions about this study, please do not hesitate to call the principal investigators, Dr. Katherine Pérez-Rivera or Kirsten Cristinziani, who may be contacted at (856) 256-4500 ext. 3776. Individuals with specific ethical concerns should contact the Rowan University Grants and Sponsored projects at (856) 256-4057.

I understand the purpose and procedures of this study, and all of my questions and concerns have been answered. I understand that my answers on the measures that I am being asked to fill out will remain confidential, and that I will not be identified by name in any subsequent article reports. The principal investigators, Dr. Katherine Pérez-Rivera and Kirsten Cristinziani, or a project facilitator has informed me that I am not running any risks by participating in this study. Furthermore, I agree to volunteer in this study and I am hereby consenting to participate in this study. I understand that my participation in this study does not imply employment with the state of New Jersey, Rowan University, the principal investigator, or any other project facilitator.

Signing this form indicates that you fully understand the information on this form and that you consent to participate in this study.

Name of participant:
Signature of participant:
Signature of Witness:
Date:
APPENDIX C

DEBRIEFING SHEET
Debriefing

This study that you just participated in was particularly designed to examine the relationship between people's racial identity attitudes and their experience of anger. The study was also designed to examine the relationship between people's racial identity attitudes and their anger management style, as well as the relationship between people's racial identity attitudes and perceived racial stress. Specifically, racial identity refers to a person's attitudes about his or her own race. We are trying to identify whether a person's attitudes about his or her own race has a relation to how much anger (s) he experiences. We are also trying to identify whether these attitudes have a relation to how (s) he copes with that anger, as well as whether a person's attitudes about his or her own race affects the perception of racial incidents. As was mentioned in the informed consent form, all information from this study will remain confidential.

Information obtained from the responses you provided will be used in formulating hypotheses for future racial identity and anger research. PLEASE do not discuss the purpose or methods of this research study with friends or fellow students. Other students will be recruited for this study from various courses on campus and/or from other colleges/universities. If these students know anything about this study, the results may not be valid. Thank you for participating. As was mentioned in the informed consent form, this study was approved by the Rowan University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Participants. If you have any further questions about this study, please contact the principal investigators, Dr. Katherine Pérez-Rivera or Kirsten Cristinziani, at (856) 256-4500, ext. 3776. Individuals with specific ethical concerns should contact the Rowan University Office of Government Grants and Sponsored Projects at (856) 256-4057.