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ABSTRACT

The present study aims to examine the interconnectedness of multiple aspects of identity in a population of women of color. The research specifically investigated the relationship between womanist and ethnic identity in a sample of 198 women who identified as either Latina or African American. All were either undergraduate or graduate students from a large, Southeastern university. Participants’ ethnic and womanist identity attitudes were measured using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS), and a demographic questionnaire. Based on previous research, it was hypothesized that identification as either Latina or African American would not significantly impact scoring on the WIAS or MEIM. In addition, it was predicted the WIAS would exhibit poor psychometric properties and that it would be determined that a new factor structure is required for the WIAS to be considered structurally valid.

Results of this study supported the hypothesis that the WIAS exhibited poor reliability. An exploratory factor analysis determined that the scale consists of heterogeneous items that did not load onto a single factor. The subscales were correlated in a manner that was contradictory to the premise of the womanist model and do not seem representative of the experiences of the
women of the sample. The current research represents an important step in statistically confirming that the WIAS has poor structural validity and that alterations need to be completed in order to improve its psychometric properties. Further implications of the research will be discussed, as well as recommendations for future research.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Identity is a multifaceted construct that incorporates aspects of the individual as well as one’s connection to a larger group. It is the intersection of these individual, social, and group identities that contribute to one’s definition of their personhood. While some may describe themselves based on their relationships and connections to others, some may have more personal, individualized ideas of how to portray themselves. Identity formation models were created to capture the ways in which people are similar and unique in respect to identity. These models assess a number of aspects of identity such as sexual orientation, race, gender, and ethnicity.

Identity is comprised of both an individual, personalized component as well as a social or collective aspect. The individualized identity is created through one’s experiences, their similarities as well as differences with others, and lastly their outlook for the future (Kleiber, 1999). These personalized identities can refer to properties of the individual, including characteristics, such as being athletic or intelligent (Swann, Gómez, Seyle, Morales, & Huici, 2009). One’s social identity can be described as the combination of a person’s identification with others and their place within different societal groups (Kleiber, 1999). These group identities, such as ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation, can help a person feel connected to a group and in turn facilitate them creating a deeper understanding of themselves.

With the changing nature of women’s roles in society, they continue to develop more roles making them more complex social beings. Multiple authors have suggested the importance
of examining the convergence and intersection of multiple identities (Milville, Darlington, Whitlock, & Mulligan, 2005; Frable, 1997). By understanding the connection between the dimensions of identity, researchers can more fully understand group membership and its impact on individuals. Some research has found that self-complexity is associated with better mental health. The varying identities can provide a greater number of resources that can lead to enhanced well-being (Brook, Garcia, & Fleming, 2008). In a sense, complexity can serve as a protective factor because if one area of the self is challenged, a woman can continue to have belief in the strength of her other aspects of self.

Minority identity models were needed to highlight the individual differences of the people within minority groups and to expose the impact of positive group identity on overall psychological well-being. Racial identity formation was one of the first aspects of identity to be assessed in minority groups through a stage wise progression model. Cross (1971) theorized that racial salience in African Americans increased from a low or neutral point to a higher place of importance. The Black Identity Development Model purposes that race itself is not a sufficient label to describe members of a particular group, but instead that people vary in their connection to a specific culture (Boisnier, 2003). Cross’s model asserts that people progress through specific stages or statuses. These stages are labeled as Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, Internalization, and Internalization-Commitment. The model surmises that a person moves from a) an unawareness of the racism that exists in society to b) an experience that forces them to confront such inequity and acknowledge the racism that does persist in society to c) an immersion into one’s racial group, while rejecting all aspects of the majority culture, to d) integration of one’s experiences surrounding oppression into self, while simultaneously creating a balance between the two, and finally e) commitment to meaningful action to reduce the racism
in society (Worrell, Cross, & Vandiver, 2001; Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002; Vandiver, Fhagen-Smith, Cokley, Cross, & Worrell, 2001; Hoffman, 2006).

Since the presentation of Cross’s original model, others have been created to assess the development of White racial identity, as well as other aspects of identity related to gender. The first model generated to assess women’s identity development was the Downing and Roush model of feminist identity (1985, as cited in McNamara & Rickard, 1989). This model provides the framework for the experiences of women in their progression of confronting the sexism that occurs within society and also discovering the individual impact that it has had on their lives. The progression is from a stage of naiveté and a general acceptance of traditional gender roles to actively advocating and fighting for the equal rights of women. The model depicts a progression through five stages including: 1) passive-acceptance, 2) revelation, 3) embeddedness-emancipation, 4) synthesis, and 5) active commitment (McNamara & Rickard, 1989). Past research has supported significant relationships between feminist identity development and self-esteem (Hoffman, 2006) as well as the utilization of the model by psychologists practicing feminist therapy (McNamara & Rickard, 1989).

Once the feminist model was established, a number of instruments were developed to assess the constructs of the model. These assessments served as empirical support for the Downing and Roush model. Rickard (1987) designed the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS) as the first inventory to measure a woman’s level of feminist identity. This measure specifically addressed the cognitive elements of one’s attitude towards self. The second major instrument, Bargad and Hyde’s Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS) is composed of the five subscales that correspond to each of the five stages within the feminist model (Bargad & Hyde, 1991).
The ultimate outcome of the feminist identity model is a woman’s personalized view of themselves as a feminist. However, the construct of feminism is not universally accepted by all women or a concept that they are willing to embrace. Downing and Roush, the authors of the feminist identity model, as well as other scholars, have conveyed their apprehension surrounding the generalizability of this model towards women of color (Moradi, Subich, & Phillips, 2002; Moradi, 2005). Specifically, this model did not seem to account for the unique experiences of ethnically diverse women. To combat the inherent problem of applicability to a wider array of women, Helms proposed the womanist identity model. The term womanist was borrowed from the works of Black feminist writers as a means to describe that the outlined developmental stages within this model are pertinent to the experiences of women across ethnicity, social class, and sexual orientation (Ossana, Helms, Leonard, 1992).

The premise of the womanist model is not to have women develop a universally accepted status or definition of what it means to be a woman, but instead that she discover her personalized view of herself. Specifically, as progression occurs within the model, a woman should transition from having a definition of self that is influenced and defined by external sources to a very personal, individual description of herself as a woman. More broadly, this model assesses how a woman gains a healthier view of self and strengthens her positive group identity.

Womanist identity is comprised of four stages or sets of varying attitudes that describe the outlined progression from external influence to the individualized acceptance of self (Moradi, 2005). These stages mirror those of Cross’s Black identity model (1971). The first stage of the model, Pre-Encounter, is a period in which a woman is unaware of societal prejudice towards women and has a general acceptance of the attitudes and behaviors of traditional gender roles.
Contact with an event or person that is discrepant to a woman’s previously held belief system is necessary for her to transition to the second stage. During the Encounter phase, Pre-Encounter values are challenged and the woman gains an initial awareness of the sexism that occurs within society. As she moves into the third stage of Immersion-Emersion, she tends to develop an idealized view of other women while at the same time rejecting the patriarchal characteristics of womanhood. She will also begin to seek increased affiliation with other women that she sees as positive influences. During the final and most pivotal stage of Internalization, the woman will integrate all of her experiences and interactions into a personalized definition of womanhood (Ossana et al., 1992; Carter & Parks, 1996; Boisnier, 2003; Moradi, 2005).

In order to operationalize the model, Helms created the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS) as a means to operationalize the stages of identity. The original version of the WIAS consisted of 43 items, and the updated version contains 55 items. The model, as well as the WIAS, have been investigated by a number of scholars. Empirical support has been found for the model itself. For example, higher levels of womanist identity are associated with increased self-esteem in college women (Ossana et al., 1992). A relationship has also been determined between higher womanist identity and higher levels of racial identity. Specifically, in African American women it has been found that as their identification with their womanist identity increases, their affiliation with their racial identity also becomes a more salient aspect of self (Parks & Carter, 1996; Hoffman, 2006). Letlaka-Rennert, Luswazi, Helms, and Zea (1997) found a relationship between womanist identity and locus of control.

Ethnic identity is another facet of one’s identity that is more encompassing than assessing racial identity alone. While ethnic and racial identities do share some commonalities, there are distinct differences between the two constructs. Both stress the importance of personal and
group identification, but differ in that ethnic identity can be altered through one’s interactions and experiences within daily living (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Phinney created a model based on four ethnic identity statuses that involves both the exploration and commitment components of identity development (Phinney, Jacoby, & Silva, 2007). The different statuses are based on the presence or absence of exploration and commitment. The least mature status is diffusion in which a person lacks both exploration and commitment, while an achieved identity status is the most mature of them all (Phinney et al., 2007).

To measure the overall strength of one’s ethnic identity, Phinney created the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) to assess ethnic identity across a diverse sample. Unlike the WIAS or other identity measures, the MEIM does not assess ethnicity at specific stages, but rather looks as ethnic identity along a continuum (Avery, Tonidandel, Thomas, Johnson, & Mack, 2007). The measure includes 12 items, five that assess exploration, seven to gauge commitment and three items for more qualitative information. The MEIM has been utilized in countless studies, with samples of participants that vary in age from adolescence to adulthood and from diverse ethnic backgrounds. The scale consistently demonstrates good reliability, with alphas of above .80 across the varying samples (obtained from Phinney, September 20, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

While there have been a number of studies that have examined the relationships that exist between womanist and ethnic identities, none have been published that analyze these two constructs across ethnically diverse samples. In previous research, authors have investigated the utility of the womanist model, in conjunction with ethnic identity, with samples that consistently compared the experiences of African American and Caucasian women. However, as of present, there have been no published studies that have also included other women of color such as Asian
Americans, Latinas, Native Americans, and multi-racial and multi-ethnic women. It is important to include the encounters that other, ethnically diverse women have had in order to determine the applicability of the womanist model to all women (or even all women of color).

In the numerous studies that have assessed the applicability of the womanist model to women’s experiences, generally the results support the model; however there are questions about the adequacy of the WIAS measure as the means to operationalize the developmental progression outlined by the model. Similarly to other identity scales, the WIAS has demonstrated low internal validity across subscales. Ossana and colleagues (1992) reported reliabilities ranging from 0.43 to 0.82. In a study completed in South Africa, internal reliabilities were found to range from 0.36 to 0.63 (Letlaka-Rennert et al., 1997). Miville et al. (2005) found coefficient alphas to range from 0.55 to 0.73, which are similar to results published by Miville and Helms (1996), Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997), Carter and Parks (1996), Watt (2006), and Parks, Carter, and Gushue (1996).

Based on the lack of ethically varied samples, as well as the lower coefficient alphas for the measure, a pilot study (N=54) was conducted to investigate the utility of this model with Latina women at a large, Southeastern university. This study implemented both the WIAS as well as the MEIM in an effort to determine the relationship that exists between both womanist and ethnic identities. The results from the pilot studied confirmed earlier findings of the low internal reliabilities that exist on the WIAS with Chronbach’s alphas for the subtests ranging from 0.23 to 0.69; however, the overall internal reliability for the instrument was 0.723. One of the most problematic issues for this pilot study involved the multiple negative item-total correlations that occurred within each of the subscales. While each subscale is supposed to be a grouping of similar items, negative correlations existed with this sample of Latinas. This is
suggestive that the WIAS subscales are not composed of homogeneous items, but rather those that measure a diverse number of constructs for this sample (Schwartz & Delgado-Romero, 2009).

Scores on the subscales on the WIAS can range from 1 to 5, with scores closer to 5 being a greater indicator of agreement with the subscale. For the sample, the mean scores on Pre-Encounter were 2.12 (SD=.382), Encounter M=2.969 (SD=.419), Immersion-Emersion M=2.23 (SD=.391), and Internalization M=4.31 (SD=.285).

The Cronbach’s alpha of internal reliability for the MEIM was .852. Scores on this instrument can range from 1 to 4, with a higher score indicating a stronger ethnic identity. The mean score for this sample was 3.51 (SD=.378) and scores ranged from 2.42 to 4.00. This score was an indication that on average, these participants had a strong commitment to their ethnicity, which was not surprising given the manner in which the participants were recruited.

The Womanist model was created to describe the developmental process of all women, but it seemed as though it did not capture the stagewise progression for the Latina women of this sample. The WIAS subscales provided unstable correlations to other variables of interest, in this case being ethnic identity. While the women had scored highly on both of the measures of their ethnic and womanist identity, these two variables remained uncorrelated.

Overall, the results from the pilot study raised questions about the applicability of this model to the particular sample of Latina women. Specifically, the developmental progression of this model may not be relevant to their experiences or their personalized views of themselves. The sample size of the pilot study was a limitation and restricted the type of conclusions that could be made based upon the data. Therefore, the next logical step would be to increase the sample size in an effort to be able to draw more definite conclusions.
Purpose of the Study

This study explored whether or not the current structure of the WIAS is still supported or if a new factor structure would be more fitting, as well as examined the intersection of both womanist and ethnic identities. The literature has suggested a need to expand the use of the WIAS instrument to other ethnic populations in order to determine its applicability as well as overall generalizability to all women (Hoffman, 2006). The WIAS, similarly to other identity scales, has demonstrated poor internal reliability. These low numbers cast doubt to the internal validity of the instrument and its ability to adequately assess the stages of the womanist model. It is vital to determine whether or not the current factor structure of the model applies to women of color.

Although the number participants within the pilot study were sufficient to begin to analyze the relationships between womanist and ethnic identity, the sample size (n = 54), was too small to be able to evaluate the factor structure. In addition, the small number of participants limited the power to examine both psychometric properties and relationships between the WIAS and MEIM. Furthermore the participants were recruited from a flagship university in the Southeast with a total population of only 2.3% students who identify as being Latina/o. The majority of the sample was composed of undergraduate students who participated in groups with a Latino/a focus. These participants may have already possessed a higher ethnic identity due to their participation in these groups, which could also influence their gender awareness and increased their womanist scores.

This study expanded upon the findings of the pilot study and explored the relationship between womanist and ethnic identities in women of color. Specifically, investigating how a stronger or weaker ethnic identity impacts a woman’s view of her gender. The study explored
the cross cultural validity of the WIAS with a larger, more diverse group of women. The study investigated the structure of the WIAS as well as whether or not it should continue to serve as the best means of describing the stage-wise progression of the womanist model.

The results of this study could prove beneficial for professionals in a variety of settings, including in the therapeutic realm or in university settings, as well as for a woman’s personal knowledge of self. By gaining greater self awareness, a woman can be more in tune with her personal needs. Understanding one’s needs in both the inter and intrapersonal sense can improve upon a woman’s self-esteem and more broadly, her self concept. This can serve as a protective factor in the academic realm, within relationships, or in a number of other settings and situations. The results of this study could also be beneficial for future research in identity development. If the WIAS and more specifically, the stages of the womanist model no longer seem appropriate, it will be important to continue to investigate alternative models. An extensive review of the literature did not find any other studies that involved more ethnically diverse samples or those that analyzed the factor structure of the WIAS with a diverse sample of women.

*Definition of Terms*

- **Womanist Identity**: The progression towards a personalized, internal definition of womanhood as operationally defined by the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS)
- **WIAS**: 55 item revised version of the instrument
- **Race**: Category to which others assign individuals based on physical characteristics and includes a personal and group identification
Ethnicity
It is similar to race, however it is an aspect of social identity that is dynamic and changes over time based on context and experiences.

Ethnic Identity
Encompasses one’s knowledge about his or her group membership and will be operationally defined by the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM).

MEIM
15 item version, with scales for exploration and commitment.

Research Questions and Hypotheses
The proposed study aims to address the following questions and hypotheses:

Question 1: Will Latinas and African Americans have statistically different scores on womanism and ethnic identity?

Null Hypothesis 1.1: There will be no statistically significant differences between those of different ethnicities on the WIAS full scale scores.

Null Hypothesis 1.2: There will be no statistically significant differences between those of different ethnicities on the MEIM full scale scores.

Question 2(A): Will the proposed factor structure of the WIAS be replicated in a diverse sample of women of color? If not, what are alternate factor structures for the instrument?

Null Hypothesis 2.1: The factor structure of the WIAS will not be replicated.

Question 2 (B): Will the WIAS evidence strong psychometric properties (e.g., internal consistency) in this diverse sample of women?

Null Hypothesis 2.2: The WIAS will not evidence acceptable internal reliability.

Question 3: Is there a relationship between one’s ethnic and womanist identities?
Null Hypothesis 3.1: There will be no statistical correlation between scores on the MEIM and scores on the WIAS.

Question 4: Will the interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category produce a significant difference on WIAS score?

Null Hypotheses 4.1: There will not be a statistically significant interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category.
CHAPTER II  
LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the past 40 years, the research focused on identity development has steadily increased. The early attempts to define and examine the process of identity formation came through the works of Black social scientists and educators, such as Cross and Jackson (Sue & Sue, 2003). The original and most widely researched topics included racial identity. However, as time has progressed, new models have been established that study other aspects of people including gender and sexual orientation.

_Racial/Cultural Identity Development Model_

One model that was developed to generally look at the experiences of identity development across minority populations was the Racial/Cultural Identity Development Model (Sue & Sue, 2003). This model was an elaboration to the five-stage Minority Identity Model (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1989) and was to encompass a broader population. The R/CID model defines five stages that a person of color progresses through as they begin to understand themselves in terms of their own culture and of the dominant culture. The five stages include Conformity, Dissonance, Resistance and Immersion, Introspection, and Integrative Awareness (Sue & Sue, 2003). Within each level of identity, there are four corresponding beliefs and attitudes toward the self, others of the same minority, others of another minority, and toward the majority individuals. In the Conformity stage, the individual has an expressed preference for the values of the majority culture over their own. In the Dissonance stage, the individual has an experience or receives information that challenges their previously held belief system. In the
Resistance and Immersion stage, the individual completely endorses the cultural values of their own group while simultaneously rejecting the dominant culture. In the Introspection stage, the individual finds the previous stage to be too demanding and draining and begins to develop a sense of individuality. Finally, in the Integrative Awareness stage, the person can appreciate aspects of their own culture, the culture of other minorities, and the dominant culture.

The Cross Model

While there have been numerous models created to assess racial identity development of specific groups, one of the most popular and widely researched is the Cross model of psychological Nigrescence (Cross, 1971, 1991). This model was originally created during the Civil Rights movement to assess an African American’s process of becoming Black. A stage wise progression is outlined as the person transitions from a White frame of reference to a positive Black frame of reference. There are five delineated stages that the person progresses through as they develop a more positive Black identity. The stages include: Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, Internalization, and Internalization Commitment (Cross 1971, Sue & Sue, 2003).

In the first stage, Preencounter, the person has a dominant culture world view and either consciously or unconsciously devalues his or her own Blackness. During this stage the person lacks an awareness of any racial inequities within society because of their strong desire to assimilate to White culture. Persons in this stage seem to be the least healthy overall because of the negative stereotypes they have towards their own groups. These views have the potential to increase self-alienation and self-hate (Pryant & Yanico, 1991). The second stage, Encounter, is characterized by two distinct processes. First, the person encounters an event that challenges his or her previously held belief system. This causes a shift in overall thinking and how the person
then interprets the world around them. Within this stage, a person may begin to experience intense guilt or anger towards the dominate culture and how it had conditioned their attitudes and behaviors (Sue & Sue, 2003). During the third stage of Immersion-Emersion, a person immerses themselves within Black experiences and culture while simultaneously denigrating anything associated with White culture. Anything associated with Blackness is idealized, but the internalization of attitudes towards one’s own Blackness is negligible. Within the emersion portion of the stage, feelings of pride begin to increase, while the guilt and anger of previous stages diminishes. By reaching the fourth stage of Internalization, the person has developed a secure sense of their Blackness and has become more flexible and tolerant. Resolution of the previous conflicts between their old and new identities has occurred, indicating less dissonance surrounding their feelings of self. White culture is no longer seen as completely negative and Black culture is not idealized. Finally, the fifth stage of Internalization-Commitment is similar to the fourth stage, but it also incorporates a commitment towards social justice and societal change.

Cross’s original models have been used as the foundation for a number of other identity models as well as empirical studies within the psychological field. In 1991, Cross revised both the nigrescence theory as well as the model. Within the original theory (Cross, 1971) five stages of racial identity were described. In contrast, the revised model only consisted of four stages (Cross, 1991). The names assigned to the stages were no longer representative of identities, but instead described the themes of the stage. The four stages of the revised model are Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. The Pre-Encounter stage is characterized by two identities: Assimilation and Anti-Black (Cross, 1991). The Encounter stage maintains its original name and represents the event or series of events that has motivated the
person to begin to reexamine their reference group orientation (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002). The two aspects of the Immersion-Emersion stage are the identities of Intense Black Involvement and Anti-White. Finally, the Internalization stage combines the Internalization and Internalization-Commitment stages of the original model.

When developing the Cross Racial Identity Scale as a means to measure the Nigrescence model, revisions were made to the revised model (Vadiver, Fhagen-Smith, Cokley, Cross, and Worrell, 2001). The expanded Nigrescence theory (NT-E) differs from the original model in a number of ways. While the original theory was a developmental-stage theory, the expanded version focuses on attitudes or social identities (Worrell, Vandiver, Schaefer, Cross, & Fhagen-Smith, 2006). Also, a clear distinction is made between both the personal and reference group identities. The racial identity attitudes are broken down into three thematic categories: Preencounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. The Pre-Encounter stage contains the identities of Assimilation, Miseducation, and Self-Hatred. The Immersion-Emersion cluster consists of Anti-White and Intense Black Involvement. Finally, the Internalization cluster has four identities of Black Nationalist, Biculturalist, Multicultural Racial, and Multiculturalist Inclusive (Worrell, Cross, and Vandiver, 2001).

Black Racial Identity

At the core of Helms’s (1991, 1995) theory of Black racial identity is Cross’s (1971) model of Nigrescence. Her racial identity model asserts that members of socioracial groups will have experiences related to the sociopolitical construction of race. These experiences can lead to psychological consequences, including internalized racism (Nghe & Mahalik, 2001). Helms’s model includes four ego statuses that correspond to Cross’s (1971) model. The ego statuses included within this model are Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion, and Dissonance.
The Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS-B) was created in order to operationalize the ego statuses, rather than just to measure concrete stages (Gilbert, So, Russell, & Wessel, 2006). Previous research has found relationships that exist between racial identity and a number of variables including depression, general psychological functioning and well-being, self-actualization, and self-esteem (Nghe & Mahlik, 2001).

*The Chicano/Latino Model*

While there has been a tremendous amount of research completed on Black and White racial identity models, less has been done to evaluate the development of a Latino/a identity. Developmental models of Latino/a identity have been established (Bernal & Knight, 1993, Casas & Pytluk, 1995), with the one most similar to Black racial identity being designed by Ruiz (1990). The Chicano/Latino model of ethnic identity was proposed to address the limitations of the general racial and ethnic identity models. This model is based on four assumptions: marginality correlates highly with maladjustment; negative experiences of forced assimilation are destructive to the individual; having pride in one’s ethnic identity is positively correlated to mental health; a pride is one’s ethnic identity results in freedom to choose, especially in the acculturation process” (Delgado-Romero, 2001). The model includes five stages (Causal, Cognitive, Consequence, Working Through, and Successful Resolution) and their relationship to ethnic identity conflicts, interventions, and resolutions.

During the Causal stage, messages that the person receives from the environment or from other significant interpersonal relationships either affirm, ignore, negate, or denigrate one’s Latino/a heritage. There is a failure to identify with one’s Latino heritage because of one’s previous traumatic or humiliating experiences associated with ethnicity. Within the Cognitive stage, three flawed belief systems are incorporated because of previous negative messages:
Ethnic group membership is associated with poverty and prejudice; assimilation into the majority (White) culture is the only means of escape; assimilation is the only means to success. During the Consequence stage, estrangement and rejection towards one’s Latino/a heritage intensifies as their fragmented identity becomes more evident. The Working Through stage is composed of two distinct events. First, the person can no longer cope with their identity conflict. Second, the person can no longer embrace the identity of another group, but instead reclaim their previously disowned Latino/a identity. Finally, in the Successful Resolution Stage, the person accepts both themselves and their culture.

*Feminist Identity Development*

Other variables, besides race, are also integral to a person’s social identity. Currently, there are two primary models created to assess women’s identity development: the Downing and Roush model of feminist identity (1985, as cited in McNamara & Rickard, 1989) and the womanist identity development model (Ossana, Helms, & Leonard, 1992). Although these models are both based on a stage-wise progression of identity development, the ultimate outcome between the two differs.

The framework of the feminist model was based upon Cross’s (1971) model of Black identity development. The feminist model’s main premise is to understand the developmental process that a woman progresses through on her journey of identification as a feminist and an increased awareness of the existence of sexism in society (McNamara & Rickard, 1989). The model purports a movement through five stages including: (1) Passive Acceptance, (2) Revelation, (3) Embeddedness-Emancipation, (4) Synthesis, and (5) Active Commitment. These stages correlate to Cross’s stages of Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, Internalization, and Internalization-Commitment (Hoffman, 2006).
During Stage 1 of the feminist model, a woman is accepting of the traditional gender roles placed upon her by society and the notion that men are the superior gender. In moving to Stage 2, a type of contradictory exposure occurs that the woman can not deny and feelings of guilt begin to emerge over the oppressive nature of society. In Stage 3, a woman will begin to form close ties to other supportive women that can provide her with a safe space to express her anger surrounding her discovery of the oppression she endured throughout her lifetime. The main facet of Stage 4 is the development of a positive feminist identity. Finally in Stage 5, the feminist identity is translated into consequential and effectual action (Boisnier, 2003).

To measure the theoretical construct of feminist identity, scales were created to examine the progression through the stages. The Feminist Identity Scale (FIS) was an inventory developed to evaluate a woman’s level of feminist identity (Rickard, 1987 as cited in McNamara & Rickard, 1989). A second instrument, the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS), was composed of five subscales corresponding to those stages in the original feminist model. Research by Boisnier (2003) suggested that Black or African American women were less likely to identify with the term feminist and therefore the FIDS was not suited to measure the identity development of Black women.

*Womanist Identity Development Model*

The feminist movement had been viewed by some to be a construct that only applied to White, middle class women and excluded women of color (Moradi, 2005). In response, a more inclusive model was needed to represent the gender identity development of African American women (Ossana et al, 1992). This model was termed the womanist model of identity development. Helms defined womanism to be “a worldview and identity that centralizes (a) women’s strengths and experiences and (b) interconnection of race/ethnicity, gender, class,
sexual orientation, and other dimensions of diversity” (Moradi, 2005). However, the prevalent aim of this model is not focused on African American feminism or philosophy, but rather to explain the commitment that women have to their multiple identities.

Helms (in Ossana et al., 1992) applied the term womanist, from African American feminist writers, to explain that regardless of race, social class, or political orientation the progression towards self-definition is applicable to all women. The premise of the womanist identity model is the movement from womanhood being defined by external, societal forces to a more personalized, internal definition. In order to adopt this individualized idea of what constitutes being a woman, a progression through a number of stages must first occur, similar to Cross’s Black identity model (1971). In the Pre-Encounter stage, there is a level of acceptance of traditional gender roles and a denial of gender bias in society. The Encounter stage is characterized by a shift to a general questioning and a perplexity surrounding conforming to society’s gender roles. The transition from the first stage to the second is prompted by an external event that disputes a woman’s previously held belief system. The second stage is an opportunity for a woman to begin to search for alternative explanations and reasoning behind her gender role conflict. In the third stage of Immersion-Emersion, the dissonance of the second stage is settled through external explanations. During this period of a woman’s identity development, she will reject previously held traditional gender roles, even going to the extreme of a denunciation of the male gender. At this time she will surround herself with positive female role models and embrace an idealized view of those women. In the final stage of Internalization, the woman has attained a more integrated identity in which the definition of her womanhood is internal and much more personalized (Carter & Parks, 1996). Within this stage,
she is able to self identity her personal definition of womanhood without dependence on
traditional gender roles or the feminist influence.

A number of authors have utilized the womanist identity development model within their
research, with their focus being directed at populations involving White and African American
women. Boisnier (2003) concluded that, with greater frequency, White women would identify as
feminists, according to the Downing and Roush model, while African American women had
higher scores on the Immersion-Emersion stages, signifying their increased likelihood of
identifying with the process of becoming womanist, rather than feminist. Carter and Parks
(1996) found a similar connection between racial and womanist identity development. For an
African American woman, the process of comprehending her racial identity can concurrently
impact her progression towards a womanist identity. This research provides evidence that the
womanist identity model is fitting for African American women, but does not mention any other
women of color. There is a clear need to test the use of the womanist identity model with diverse
populations besides African American and White women (Hoffman, 2006).

To measure the progression through the stages of womanist identity development, the
most commonly used instrument is the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS) (Ossana et al.,
1992). The scale was created in order to evaluate the attitudes associated with each of the four
stages in the womanist identity development model. The scale has been utilized in a multitude of
studies in connection to self-esteem (Ossana et al, 1992) and also mental health disorders.
Specifically, Ossana et al (1992) found that Internalization attitudes were positively correlated to
self-esteem, while Immersion-Emersion and Encounter attitudes were negatively related to self-
esteeem. Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997) found a connection between both womanist
identity and racial identity in African American college students. Miville, Darlington, Whitlock,
and Mulligan (2005) discovered that gender identity was a strong predictor of all ego identity statuses among White college women. For Black women in South Africa, Letlaka-Rennert, Luswazi, Helms, and Zea (1997) found a negative correlation between the scores on Preencounter and Immersion-Emersion and self-efficacy, but a positive relationship with external locus of control. Although there have been numerous studies that have used the WIAS, very little research has been completed comparing these attitudes with racial or ethnic identity development.

The two models share a stage wise progression and a similar sequence, but they are quite dissimilar in the final outcome and eventual goal of the model. Healthy identity in the feminist model is defined as realizing a sense of feminism or adopting some feminist beliefs, whereas in the womanist model attaining a sense of value for one’s womanhood in any chosen role is the ultimate objective (Boisnier, 2003).

**Ethnic Identity**

Ethnic identity is multidimensional in nature. It stems from a connection to other people in a particular group, but it is also related to culture and specific settings. Ethnic identity encompasses one’s knowledge about his or her group membership, which is continuously altered due to experiences in daily life. Ethnic identity is similar to racial identity in the personal and group identification, but differs in the respect that ethnic identity is a process that is based upon a person’s actions and choices (Phinney & Ong, 2007).

Phinney and Ong (2007) stated that “ethnic identity is dynamic; it changes over time and context and must therefore be considered with reference to its formation and variation” (p. 271). This particular model of identity formation was based upon Erikson’s stages of development, but also incorporated aspects of Marcia’s ego identity development (1980, as cited in Hoffman,
Marcia created one of the most well known identity models at the personal level. The ego statuses of the model focused on the two basic processes of Exploration/Crisis and Commitment (Marcia, 1980). The four ego statuses used to describe the presence or absence of crisis and commitment across personal domains were: Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, and Diffusion.

Based on these statuses, Phinney focused her model on the exploration and commitment stages. In exploration, learning about one’s ethnicity is central in assisting in increasing understanding about how it will impact one’s life. Commitment is action oriented and involves the decision surrounding the general meaning of one’s ethnicity (Phinney, Jacoby, & Silva, 2007). The different stages of identity development are then based on the presence or absence of exploration and commitment. The most immature of the statuses is diffusion, where there is neither exploration nor commitment. On the opposite extreme is the mature, achieved identity of a person that has fully examined their ethnic group identification. In summary, there are three stages that involve progression from unexamined identity, to exploration of identity, and finally a fully achieved identity (Hoffman, 2006).

Phinney (1992) created the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) to assess ethnic identity. Unlike the WIAS discussed previously, the scores on the MEIM do not correspond to the specific period of development. Instead, a composite mean is calculated to determine the overall strength of one’s ethnic identity (Hoffman, 2006). The MEIM has been utilized with a number of populations from adolescents to adults. Ong, Phinney, and Dennis (2006) reported that Latino college students with higher levels of ethnic identity experienced greater academic achievement. The MEIM has also been implemented as a tool with international populations. With a group of adolescents from Zimbabwe, Worrell, Conyers, Mpofu, and Vandiver (2006)
found that ethnic identity was best represented by a single factor, rather than the two factor structure of the MEIM. With Australian adolescents, the reliability of the ethnic identity scale was high and adequately assessed the group (Dandy, Durkin, McEvoy, Barber, & Houghton, 2008).

Identity Salience

Silverstein (2006) asserted that adhering to a “complexity paradigm” would create understanding of a person’s multiple identities and help unify multicultural and feminist perspectives (Reynolds & Constantine, 2004). For example, racial salience refers to the extent that a woman’s race is relevant to her self-concept at a particular moment in time. It is highly sensitive to environmental influences and is a mediating process of more stable characteristics of identity (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998). The Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) is an instrument designed to measure the construct of racial salience and to determine the amount of importance that a person places on race when defining themselves. Women have a number of identities that can vary in salience based on situational cues and personal factors. These intersecting identities contribute to a woman’s internalized view of self and construe the way that she behaves in specific situations.

Issues Pertaining to Latinas

Expanding research to Latinas is extremely important due to the continuous increase of this population in the United States. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2006), persons of Hispanic or Latino origin constitute 14.8% of the total United States population. Although the population is continuously expanding, the opportunities awarded to them are quite limited. There are a great number of barriers that face Latinos including the difference in language, health disparities, poverty, and low educational attainment (Santiago-Rivera et al., 2002). The
combination of all of these stressors increases the risk of psychological issues. For example, Latina women are at greater risk for developing depressive disorders or exhibiting depressive symptomatology compared to Latino men (Comas-Díaz & Greene, 1994). By completing more research on the Latina population, greater knowledge can be attained surrounding this expanding population and their conflict regarding what it means to be a modern woman in a society that still condones traditionality (Arredondo, 2002).

Level of acculturation is a factor that influences the lives of Latinos in the United States. Marín (in Santiago-Rivera, Arrendondo, & Gallardo-Cooper, 2002) stated that the “process of acculturation depends on a) the degree to which the individual identifies with the culture of origin, b) the importance given to having contact with individuals from other cultures, and c) the ‘numerical balance’ between the people who are part of the majority culture and those who are part of the Latino’s culture of origin” (p. 38). Ethnic identity and acculturation are related in the respect that the level of ethnic identity can impact one’s process of acculturating to the majority culture. Ethnic identity tends to be more stable across time, while acculturation is a behavioral process that can vary (Cachelin, Phinney, & Schug, 2006). In addition, the process of acculturating can impact the changing nature of a woman’s ethnic identity. Other important processes that influence ethnic identity include enculturation and assimilation. Assimilation is known as the end result of a complete acculturation (Pizarro & Vera, 2001).

Acculturation is a multidimensional and dynamic process. However, most research studies typically assess this phenomenon by English language fluency or demographic proxies, such as the amount of time one has lived in the United States (Torres, 2010). An alternative to the classic definition would be a bidirectional model. Within this model, the orientations towards the majority culture and the heritage culture occur on two separate scales. Torres (2010)
states that this postulation emphasizes the difference between cultural contact—the inclination to participate in the mainstream culture and cultural continuity—maintenance of one’s own cultural heritage. There is an assumption made within the bidirectional model that a person may adhere to more than one culture simultaneously (Furman, Negi, Iwamoto, Rowan, Shukraft, & Gragg, 2009). For those that adopt and integrate values from their culture of heritage and from the majority group are considered “biculural”.

Previous research has discovered a relationship exists between level of acculturation and physical and mental health. This connection remains a complex issue because of the many variables that can impact level of acculturations such as country of origin and socioeconomic status. Mixed results have been reported on the influence of acculturation. Some studies have indicated that high acculturation can produce positive outcomes, such as higher socioeconomic status and better education. Alternatively, some studies have revealed that higher acculturation is associated to worse health outcomes, such as alcohol usage, obesity, and smoking (Sánchez, Rice, Stein, Milburn, & Rotheram-Borus, 2010). Torres (2010) suggested that the incorporation of both cultural dimensions is associated with healthier psychological outcomes, whereas in individuals who only focus on one culture tend to experience increased distress. Higher levels of stress can come from the alienation and discrimination that a person can experience as they distance themselves from their support and previous cultural identity (Furman et al., 2010).

Acculturative stress has been defined as a response to life events that are rooted in cultural contact and interaction between multiple cultures (Torres, 2010). This distress emerges from the imbalance of cultural demands and access to necessary resources. Some examples of stressors include adhering to both American and Latino ways of living as well as development of
language fluency. It has been found that acculturative stress is a risk factor for poor mental health, particularly depression (Hovey & Magana, 2002).

The Hispanic Health Paradox is a hypothesized phenomenon that asserts that despite the social, economic, cultural, and linguistic disadvantages faced by newly immigrated Latinos, Latinos have fewer negative health outcomes (Sánchez et al., 2010). However, as these immigrants acculturate to the United States culture, they develop worse physical and mental health outcomes. This paradox can be attributable to two main factors: 1) Immigrating to a new country is an extremely difficult undertaking, therefore the healthier people make the migration, 2) The Latino culture has a close family structure which insulates the individual and that as the person distances themselves from the heritage culture to the US culture results in worse health outcomes (Franzini, Ribble, & Keddie, 2001). Hispanic Americans have significantly higher rates of tuberculosis, AIDS, and obesity. Access to accurate health information is often limited or inaccurate which could exacerbate health disparities within the population (Sue & Sue, 2003).

Acculturation can impact many aspects of a person, including his or her gender identity. In the Latin culture, traditional gender roles are culturally prescribed and continue to persist today (Wood & Price, 1997). The norms that tend to govern these roles in Latina women are labeled under the construct of marianismo. In this view, women are deemed spiritually superior and expected to resemble the Virgin Mary in her attitude and demeanor (Kulis, Marsiglia, & Hurdle, 2003). Through a woman’s suffering and sacrificing for the family, she increases her ability to identify as Mary (Wood & Price, 1997). Gil and Vazquez (1996) stated that the 10 commandments of marianismo include:

1) Do not forget a woman’s place,

2) Do not forsake tradition,
3) Do not be single, self-supporting, or independent minded,

4) Do not put your needs first,

5) Do not forget that sex is for making babies, not for pleasure,

6) Do not wish for more in life than being a housewife,

7) Do not be unhappy with your man, no matter what he does to you,

8) Do not ask for help,

9) Do not discuss personal problems outside the home, and

10) Do not change.

From this viewpoint, men have the free rein to engage in any activity of their choice, while the “good” women are expected to be idle and accept such behaviors (Wood & Price, 1997). Women are perceived to be defenseless and vulnerable. However, these characteristics are not an attitude of learned helplessness, but instead one of learned disconnection. This stoicism also advocates the dominant male discourse and the need for emotional distancing techniques, which serves to support the traditional social structure of Latino societies (Bracero, 1998). When in countries such as the United States, women can feel the negative consequences associated with marianismo. Their “double minority status” results in their struggle with adapting to unequal relationships supported by both racism and sexism. This hierarchical structure can support other negative consequences such as discrimination, sexual harassment, and economic exploitation of women (Cianelli, Ferrer, and Mcelmurry, 2008).

**Issues Pertaining to African Americans**

It is also important to continue to study the issues pertaining to African American women. African Americans are not a homogeneous group and continue to face issues with health disparities, poverty, institutional racism, discrimination, and the stigma associated with
mental illness (Obasi & Leong, 2009). The combination of all of these daily stressors can increase the distress experienced by these women, which in turn will impact their psychological health.

Race-related stress was defined as “the race-related transactions between individuals or groups and their environment that emerge from the dynamics of racism, and that are perceived to tax or exceed existing individual and collective resources or threaten well-being” (Harrell, 2000, p. 44). Race related stress can stem from the feeling of being overlooked, mistreated, or from microaggressions. Racism can operate at multiple levels including the individual, institutional, and cultural (Scott, 2003). These negative experiences can be the sequelae for mental health issues. Both the day to day discrimination as well as the effects of lifelong discrimination have been shown to be a predictor of both major depression as well as nonspecific psychological distress (Jones, Cross, & DeFour, 2007). Not only is race-related stress linked to mental health issues, but other associations have been found that link experiences of discrimination to health compromising behaviors (i.e. cigarette smoking) as well as to hypertension (Danoff-Burg, Prelow, & Swenson, 2004).

Acculturation is a concept that has not only been applied to Latinas, but also to the experience of people of African descent. It has been used to investigate the relationships with constructs such as suicide, substance abuse, management of cultural diversity, as well as racial identity (Obasi & Leong, 2009). However, acculturation is often overlooked with the African American population because they are not a recent immigrant group. African Americans possess a strong cultural orientation that includes fundamental themes. Some of the most prominent orientations within Black culture include affect, communalism, and spirituality (Scott, 2003). Communalism from an African-centered perspective encompasses an awareness of the
interdependence between people, social orientation, and responsibility towards one’s group. Affect is similar in that it encompasses the incorporation of thoughts and feelings, value of affection information, and sensitivity to the emotional reactions of others (Boykin, 1986).

Spiritualism is another construct of particular importance to African American women. While religion and spirituality are often used interchangeably, they do not necessarily share the same meaning. Religion is often seen as a narrow, inclusive concept. Spirituality on the other hand is defined as a “broad concept, with no boundaries, and is not dependent upon a collective or institutional context, although it sometimes encompasses participation in religion. It is an individual searching for meaning…” (Heath, 2006, p. 158). Much of an African American’s spirituality may focus on the interpersonal relationships, which serves as a means to strengthen the sense of community, as well as a protective factor to combat psychological distress.

Another pressure faced by African American women is the stereotype of the matriarch of the family. While this can serve as a positive influence for some women, the effect of holding such a pivotal family role can be detrimental to others (Heath, 2006). This traditional role implies that the woman is strong enough to hold the entire family together. Without an outlet, many Black women can find this role to be draining and lonely. With loneliness can come isolation, which increases a woman’s chances of experiencing issues with their own mental health and can negatively impact overall well being.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter outlines the procedures used to investigate the present study. The chapter will focuses on the research methodology employed in the research. Specifically, the following components will be addressed: research design, information on the sample, the method of data collection and procedures, explanation of the survey instruments, and the data analysis used in the study.

Participants

The principal criterion for participation within this study was that the women had to identify into the large categorical labels of either African American or Latina. In addition, women were also included that identified as being either bi-racial or identification with multiple ethnicities. However, at least one of the ethnicities needed to be either African American or Latina. In addition, the women were afforded the opportunity to describe themselves by a qualitative term of their choice. This label provided more specific information about the number of subpopulations and racial variability within the sample. By looking beyond the general ethnic label of African American or Latina, a more heterogeneous sample that was more reflective of the diversity of the United States was achieved (Sue, 1999). Allowing the women the opportunity to describe their ethnicity empowered them to select which part of their ethnicity is most salient. For example, they could have pride in their racial group (i.e. Black) or in their country of origin (i.e. Mexican American). The women needed to be enrolled as either an undergraduate or graduate student. A more detailed description of the data collected from the
demographic questionnaire will be discussed later in the description of the survey
instrumentation.

**Demographic Information**

A total of 198 women attending a large Southeastern university were recruited to
participate in this study. Age of respondents ranged from 18 to 52 (M=21.94, SD=4.34). There
were 42 (21.2%) first year students, 37 (18.7%) sophomores, 32 (16.2%) juniors, 24 (12.1%)
seniors, 56 (28.3%) graduate students, and 5 (2.5%) who were labeled under the term “other”.
These five participants were all undergraduate students who were in either their fifth or sixth
year of studies. In regards to their declared majors, each participant reported their major and
then these responses were grouped into categories including psychology/sociology/women’s
studies, international affairs, and then the rest were generally placed in the category termed
“other”. Of all of the participants, 49 (24.7%) reported being psychology/sociology/women’s
studies majors, 13 (6.6%) were international affairs, and 134 (67.7) were categorized as other.
The respondents self reported their hometown as being located in the United States (85.9%) or
international (12.6%). Additionally, 29.8% of the women reported being first generation college
students and 25.3% identified as the first generation of their family to be born in the United
States. On the MEIM, participants were able to self identify their ethnicity with the qualitative
label of their choice. From this question it was found that 13.6% identified as Hispanic, 10.1% as
Latina/o, 12.6% by their country of origin, 1.0% as White, 27.3% as Black, 26.8% as African
American, 3.5% as Biracial, and 1.5% as African. Table 3.1 provides information on the
demographic information obtained about the participants.
Table 3.1

*Description of the Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Standing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Sociology/Women’s Studies</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Design

The study utilized a correlational research design as well as structural equation modeling. The study sought to provide evidence for the structural validity of the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS). The study also explored whether a relationship existed between one’s ethnic identity and one’s womanist identity. Furthermore, the study surveyed the naturally occurring variance between one’s ethnic group identification, ethnic identity, and womanist identity. The women involved in the study were not randomly assigned to groups. Within the study, no intervention was provided and no variables were manipulated.

Instrumentation

Participants were contacted through electronic mail over listserves associated with student organizations or approached individually by the researcher. Participants were provided with information surrounding the researcher and also IRB approval information. Each person completed the following measures: The Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale, The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, and a demographic questionnaire. The sequence of the above measures was varied to control for order effects.

Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS)

The WIAS was developed as a measurement of Helms’s womanist identity development model. The scale consists of 55 items that correspond to the subscales of Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. The 55 item version was used in this study and consisted of 20 Pre-Encounter items, 9 Encounter items, 15 Immersion-Emersion items, and 11 internalization items (Ossana et al., 1992).
Participants indicated their responses to each item based on 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree). Scores for each of the four subscales were calculated by determining the mean for similarly keyed items. Higher scores were indicative of a stronger level of agreement with the status represented by the particular subscale. Ossana et. al (1992) reported coefficient alphas of .55 (Pre-Encounter), .43 (Encounter), .82 (Immersion-Emersion), and .77 (Internalization). When evaluating the psychometric properties of the WIAS, Moradi, Yoder, and Berendsen (2004) found coefficient alphas of .44 (Pre-Encounter), .31 (Encounter), .76 (Immersion-Emersion), and .54 (Internalization). Sample statements from each of the subscales include: “Sometimes I am embarrassed to be the sex I am” (Pre-Encounter), “Maybe I can learn something from women” (Encounter), “I limit myself to activities involving women” (Immersion-Emersion), and “I believe that being a woman has caused me to have many strengths” (Internalization). A more detailed description of the WIAS score profile can be found in the results section.

**Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)**

The MEIM is an instrument developed to assess ethnic identity across all ethnic groups. The current version of the MEIM consists of 15 items. The first 12 items can be divided into two factors (obtained from Phinney on September 20, 2008): Ethnic Identity Search (developmental and cognitive component) and affirmation, belonging, and commitment (affective component). The final three items are used as a means of categorization for ethnicity.

Each participant is asked to indicate their level of agreement with each of the statements through their response on a 4-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree). The suggested scoring method is to calculate the total mean score which can range from 1-4. A higher participant’s score is an indication of a stronger ethnic identity. Phinney (1992) reported
internal consistencies of .81 for the high school sample and .90 for the college sample.

According to Phinney, since its introduction in 1992, the MEIM has been used in a number of studies and has consistently demonstrated good reliability and validity, with coefficient alphas typically exceeding .80 (obtained from Phinney, September 20, 2008). For example, one study completed on a population of 1,713 undergraduate students, found that the Cronbach’s alpha for the exploration subscale was .83 and .89 for the commitment scale (Phinney et al., 2007).

**Demographic Questionnaire**

The demographic questionnaire (Appendix) included questions for the participant to answer regarding descriptive variables such as age, major, and class standing. In addition, it was asked whether or not they were a first generation college student, and whether or not they were the first generation of their family to be born in the United States. Lastly, they were asked to identify their family’s socioeconomic status.

**Data Collection**

Students were recruited via a number of different means. All the data was collected through face to face interactions. Data collection began during the fall semester of 2010 and concluded in May 2011. Purposive sampling was used to target students who identified themselves as either African American or Latina. Following IRB approval, the principal investigator electronically contacted organizations on campus that had an African American or Latina/o affiliation. The email sent to the presidents of these organizations explained the purpose and aims of the research. In addition, an inquiry was made about whether or not they would be willing to allow the investigator to attend one or more of the meetings of their organizations. As an incentive for the organizations to participate, the author offered to complete psychological workshops or programming on topics such as time management or coping with
stress. Of all of the organizations contacted, only two were willing to have the primary investigator attend their membership meetings. Neither of the organizations expressed any interest in programming.

To achieve a more diverse sample beyond students who participate in groups with an ethnic affiliation, individual students were approached during lunch hours in the university’s student center. The principal investigator attended the student center on six occasions between the hours of 11 AM and 2 PM. The investigator would approach individuals or groups and inquire about participation. They were informed about the nature of the research and that their participation was completely voluntary.

For the students that were willing to participate, a further explanation surrounding the nature of the research was provided. After obtaining consent, participants were given a packet containing the demographic questionnaire, a WIAS, and a MEIM. Each packet was ordered differently to control for order effects on responses to each of the instruments. Completion time of all of the instruments took 15-20 minutes.

*Data Analysis*

The IBM SPSS Statistics 18 (Formerly: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) (SPSS) was utilized to analyze the data for this study. Descriptive statistics (i.e. means, standard deviations) were utilized to evaluate the demographic information provided by the participants. The following independent variables will be used: ethnic identification and score on the MEIM. The following dependent variable will be used: full scale and subscale scores on the WIAS. Question 1: Will Latinas and African Americans have statistically different scores on womanism and ethnic identity?

*Null Hypothesis 1.1:* There will be no statistically significant differences between those
of different ethnicities on the WIAS full scale scores.

*Null Hypothesis 1.2:* There will be no statistically significant differences between those of different ethnicities on the MEIM full scale scores.

*Statistical Analysis:* One-way ANOVA’s were completed to compare Latina and African American womanist and ethnicity scores. The independent variable was ethnic label (Latina or African American). The dependent variables were the mean scores on the WIAS and MEIM. Alpha levels were set at 0.05.

Question 2(A): Will the proposed factor structure of the WIAS be replicated in a diverse sample of women of color? If not, what are alternate factor structures for the instrument?

Question 2 (B): Will the WIAS evidence strong psychometric properties (e.g., internal consistency) in this diverse sample of women?

*Null Hypothesis 2.1:* The factor structure of the WIAS will not be replicated

*Null Hypothesis 2.2:* The WIAS will not evidence acceptable internal reliability.

*Statistical Analysis:* An exploratory factor analysis was completed in order to assess the structural validity of the WIAS. To assess internal reliabilities, Cronbach’s alpha will be used.

Question 3: Is there a relationship between one’s ethnic and womanist identities?

*Null Hypothesis 3.1:* There will be no statistical correlation between scores on the MEIM and scores on the WIAS.

*Statistical Analysis:* A correlational analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between womanist and ethnic identities. Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated to determine if a relationship existed between WIAS full scale scores and MEIM full scale scores. Alpha levels were set at .05.
Question 4: Will the interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category produce a significant difference on WIAS score?

Null Hypotheses 4.1: There will not be a statistically significant interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category.

Statistical Analysis: A 2 x 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted in order to determine the interaction between a woman’s ethnic label, her strength of ethnicity, and her level of association to womanism. Specifically, the three factors included: 1) Latina versus African American, 2) Scores on the MEIM, 3) Scores on the WIAS.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study examined (a) the factor structure of the WIAS and (b) the relationship between womanist and ethnic identity. This chapter will provide the results found within the study. The analysis of the demographic data will be presented first in order to provide a description of the sample. Next, the results of the research questions and hypotheses will be addressed.

Sample Size

The number of participants needed to complete this survey was determined based on the necessary sample size to complete a factor analysis. The factor analysis literature provides recommendations regarding the minimum number of participants to obtain adequately stable factor solutions. These recommendations remain inconsistent and there is not one agreed upon method for determining a sufficient sample size. Several authors have suggested minimum sample sizes from 100-250 people (Hogarty, Hines, Kromrey, Ferron, & Mumford, 2005). Comrey and Lee (1973) suggested a rough guide for adequate sample sizes as “100=poor, 200=fair, 300=good, 500=very good, and 1000 or more=excellent”. Another method to for determining participants is to consider the subject-to-variables ratio of at least 5 to 1 (Bryant & Yarnold, 2000). However, there have been other suggested minimums that the number of participants should range from 3 to 20 times the number of variables (Mundrom, Shaw, & Ke, 2005). Another rule suggests that there should never be less than 100 participants, regardless of the subjects to variable ratio (Bryant & Yarnold, 2000).
There is not empirical evidence to support any of these recommendations because the minimum number of participants varies based upon the strength of the phenomenon being assessed. However, the one rule that is generally accepted is that the larger the sample the better, especially if the communalities are expected to be low (Gorsuch, 1983). Based on this literature, the researcher sought to achieve a sample size of at least 200 women, which according to Comrey and Lee (1973) was a “fair” sample size. Achieving a sample of 200 would also place the subject-to-variable ratio within the recommended range of 3 to 6 (Cattell, 1978).

Study participants were excluded if they indicated having an ethnic background that was different than African American or Latina. Participants who did not respond completely to the WIAS or the MEIM (n=3) were also excluded. After the exclusion of the non-qualified participants, the sample included 198 participants. This sample size was a ratio of 3.6 participants to each variable of the WIAS.

Preliminary Statistical Analysis

The table below (4.1) provides information on the means, standard deviations, and the Cronbach alpha levels of each of the subscales of the WIAS and the MEIM used in the present research. The subscales of Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization subscales are reported for the WIAS. The closer the score is to the maximum of 5, the more a woman identifies with the attitudes of that subscale of the instrument. The average across all items is presented for the MEIM, rather than the individual subscales because only the overall total was utilized in the statistical analysis of this study. On the MEIM, a higher score closer to 4 is indicative of a stronger ethnic identity identification.
Table 4.1
*Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach Alphas levels of the instrument scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Possible Score range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter (WIAS)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter (WIAS)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion (WIAS)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization (WIAS)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the WIAS, the average score across the sample on Preencounter was 2.24, the average score on Encounter was 2.90, the average score on Immersion-Emersion was 2.22, and the average score on the Internalization subscale was 4.25. When only looking at participants who identified as African American, their scores were as follows: 2.27 on Preencounter, 2.86 on Encounter, 2.20 on Immersion-Emersion, and 4.20 on Internalization. For those participants who described themselves as Latina, their average score on Preencounter was 2.16, the average score on Encounter was 2.97, the average score on Immersion-Emersion was 2.25, and the average score on Internalization was 4.30.

Intercorrelations were completed to assess for relationships amongst the subscales of the WIAS. The Preencounter subscale was found to be significantly correlated to the Encounter scale (r= .287, p< .01) and with Immersion-Emersion (r= .339, p< .01). The Encounter scale was significantly correlated with the Preencounter scale, the Immersion-Emersion subscale (r= .460, p< .01), and with Internalization (r= .255, p< .01). Correlations were also completed at the item level. The inter-item correlations ranged from -0.181 to 0.376 on the Preencounter subscale. On
the Encounter subscale, the inter-item correlations ranged from -0.154 to 0.636. The correlations ranged from -0.104 to 0.43 on the Immersion-Emersion scale. The inter-item correlations on the Internalization subscale ranged from -0.143 to 0.385.

On the MEIM, the average score for all participants was 3.44. For the participants who identified as African American, they scored an average of 3.45. Those participants who identified their ethnic identity as Latina had an average score of 3.53 on the MEIM. In terms of internal consistency, the subscales of Exploration and Affirmation, Belonging, and Commitment were found to have Cronbach Alphas of .71 and .86. The internal consistency for the complete instrument was found to be satisfactory with a Cronbach Alpha of .87.

Analysis of Research Questions and Hypotheses

Findings of the data related to the research questions and hypotheses are as follows:

Question 1:

Will Latinas and African Americans have statistically different scores on womanism and ethnic identity?

Null Hypothesis 1.1: There will be no statistically significant differences between those of different ethnicities on the WIAS full scale scores.

In order to explore the differences between ethnic groups on the WIAS, four one-way ANOVAs were computed. The scores of African American and Latina women were compared across the Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization subscales of the WIAS. The women who identified themselves as Multiracial were not included in this analysis because the N size was too small to be compared to the sample size of African Americans and Latinas. It could have potentially identified significant differences that were not truly present within the data and therefore only the African Americans and Latinas were utilized in the
analysis. Table 4.5 presents the results of the one-way ANOVAs as well as the means and standard deviation for each group on the two measures.

The data supported the null hypothesis for three out of the four ANOVAs that were completed. The analysis for the Preencounter scale did not yield significant results $F(1, 172) = 3.50, p = .063$. In this sample, it appears as though there are no significant differences in the responses towards the early stages of identity development between African American and Latinas.

The one-way ANOVA comparing scores across the Encounter subscale did not produce significant results $F(1, 174) = 2.307, p = .131$. This finding denotes that there were not significant mean differences on the Encounter subscale scores between African American and Latina women in this sample. The data did not yield a significant mean different on attitudes of Immersion-Emersion $F(1,172) = .555, p = .457$.

The one-way ANOVA yielded a significant mean difference on Internalization scores between African Americans and Latina women in the sample. The result of this analysis was $F(1, 174)= 4.173, p = .043$. This finding indicates that there was a significant difference in scoring between the two ethnic groups on the final subscale of the WIAS. Latina women scored significantly higher than African American women. This higher scoring signifies that the Latina women endorsed more of the items that correspond to the attitudes of the Internalization stage of the womanist model.

Null Hypothesis 1.2: There will be no statistically significant differences between those of different ethnicities on the MEIM full scale scores.

The author conducted a one-way ANOVA to determine if a significant mean difference existed on ethnic identification as evidenced by scores on the MEIM between African American
and Latina females in the sample. The data did not yield significant results $F(1, 173) = 1.902, p = .170$. In the studied sample, it appears as though there is not a significant difference in the level of ethnic identification between African Americans and Latinas. The null hypothesis was confirmed based on the results of the data.

Table 4.2

One-Way ANOVAs Comparing Across Ethnic Groups for the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS) and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.27 (0.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>2.16 (0.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>2.307</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.86 (0.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>2.97 (0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.20 (0.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>2.25 (0.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>4.173</td>
<td>.043*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.20 (0.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>4.30 (0.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3.45 (0.40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>3.53 (0.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$

Question 2(A):

Will the proposed factor structure of the WIAS be replicated in a diverse sample of women of color? If not, what are alternate factor structures for the instrument?

Null Hypothesis 2.1: The factor structure of the WIAS will not be replicated.
An exploratory factor analysis using the Principal Axis Factoring extraction method was utilized to analyze the data of the study. This method of factoring was selected because of its ability to detect the underlying theoretical constructs in a set of variables. In addition, this method does not make distributional assumptions about the data set. Tinsley and Tinsley (1987) suggested that the principal axis factoring should be implemented when in the initial stages of instrument development. While the WIAS has been published in numerous studies, its use has not yet been validated in a sample of diverse women to date. It is vital to determine if there are items on the scale that may be problematic to the overall validity of the instrument and specifically with the population of African American and Latina women.

The items developed for this scale were intended to measure the developmental stages associated with gender identity development of the womanist model. The factors were rotated using the Direct Oblimin procedure, which is an oblique rotation. This rotation is consistent with previous research and was selected because it allows the factors to correlate with one another and reduces cross loadings (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The number of factors to extract was determined through the examination of eigenvalues and a scree plot. It was hypothesized that the factor structure should be composed of four factors based on the corresponding womanist model. Results of the scree plot and eigenvalues provided some initial support for this hypothesized model. Figure 1 represents the scree plot of the eigenvalues and Table 4.3 provides the information on the initial eigenvalues found.
Table 4.3

Eigenvalues of the Exploratory Factor Analysis of the WIAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.871</td>
<td>5.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>4.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>3.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4.3, the hypothesized four factor solution only accounts for 23.057% of the total variance for the scale. A pattern matrix assesses the strength of the loadings of each of the factors. The pattern matrix, as determined by SPSS 18.0, could not be completed for the scale. The rotation failed to converge after 25 iterations. SPSS 18.0 determined the overall convergence of the WIAS scale to be equal to .000, which indicates that no true factors could be
extracted for the scale. This finding suggests that the individual items do not group together in such a way to measure a specific construct and therefore cannot form any factors. Overall, the WIAS demonstrates poor structural validity and it is confirmed that no factor structure exists for the instrument with this population.

Question 2 (B):

**Will the WIAS evidence strong psychometric properties (e.g., internal consistency) in this diverse sample of women?**

*Null Hypothesis 2.2:* The WIAS will not evidence acceptable internal reliability.

The null hypothesis was supported. The data indicated that the WIAS did not evidence acceptable internal reliability. The Cronbach Alpha for the WIAS instrument as a whole was found to be 0.771. The instrument in its entirety evidenced a higher reliability than any of the individual subscales. The Cronbach Alphas for the subscales ranged from 0.51 to 0.72. This data set found internal reliabilities to be .69 (Preencounter), .52 (Exploration), .72 (Immersion-Emersion), and .51 (Internalization).

Question 3:

**Is there a relationship between one’s ethnic and womanist identities?**

*Null Hypothesis 3.1:* There will be no statistical correlation between scores on the MEIM and scores on the WIAS.

The results found allow for the rejection of null hypothesis 3.1. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were completed between the each of the four scales of the WIAS and the total score of the MEIM to address question 3. Table 4.4 presents the correlations between all pairs of measures collected for this study. The data indicated that there was not a significant correlation between the Encounter subscale and the MEIM, $r = .074$, $p > .05$ or with the Immersion-Emersion
subscale and the MEIM, $r=.020, p>.05$. However, two significant correlations were found. The correlation between the Preencounter scale and the MEIM was $r=-.160, p<.05$, which is a significant negative correlation. Overall, the relationship between the Preencounter scale and the MEIM score can be summarized as weak and in the hypothesized direction of the models on which these instruments were based. The current study’s finding is that a high acceptance of traditional gender roles is negatively associated with a strong ethnic identity.

The correlation between the Internalization subscale and the MEIM was $r=.239, p<.01$, which is a weak significant positive correlation; thus, providing more support for the rejection of null hypothesis 3.1. Overall, the relation between the Internalization subscale of the WIAS and the MEIM may be summarized as weak and in the hypothesized direction to support the premises of the models. The current data indicates that a strong, individualized sense of one’s self as a woman is positively associated with a strong sense of one’s ethnic identification.

Table 4.4

Pearson Correlations of Subscales of the WIAS and MEIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preencounter</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
<th>Immersion-Emergence</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
<th>MEIM Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emergence</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.239**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Question 4:

Will the interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category produce a significant difference on WIAS score?
**Null Hypotheses 4.1**: There will not be a statistically significant interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category.

In order to assess this question, the author conducted univariate ANOVAs to assess the impact of ethnic identification and ethnic label on WIAS scores. The independent variables used were a participant’s score on the MEIM and then whether or not she identified herself as African American or Latina. Four ANOVAs were examined in order to analyze the effect of the independent variables on each of the subscales of the WIAS.

The data for Preencounter did not yield significant results. Neither main effect was found to be significant $F(19, 137) = 1.264, p = .217$ for MEIM total score and $F(1, 137) = 1.31, p = .289$ for ethnic label. The interaction between ethnic identification and ethnic label did not produce a significant result $F(14, 137) = 1.719, p = .058$. This indicates that the strength of a woman’s ethnic identification and her ethnicity do not impact her belief in the attitudes of the Preencounter stage of the womanist model. Results from this analysis can be seen in Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>361.572</td>
<td>2924.33</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Label</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM * Ethnic Label</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>1.719</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .285 (Adjusted R Squared = .108)

The data for the influence of ethnic identity and identification on the Encounter subscale of the WIAS did not produce significant results. The main effects of ethnic identity and ethnic
label, as well as the interaction of the two were all found to be insignificant. The MEIM total main effect was $F(19, 139) = .750, p = .761$ and for ethnic label it was $F(1, 139) = 1.691, p = .196$. The interaction of level of ethnic identity and ethnicity did not yield a significant result $F(14, 139) = 1.196, p = .285$. In this sample, it appears that strength of ethnic identification and ethnicity does not impact a woman’s score on the Encounter subscale of the WIAS. A summary of the results can be found below in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6

Univariate Analysis of Variance for the Encounter Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>611.196</td>
<td>2597.257</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Label</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM * Ethnic Label</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .205 (Adjusted R Squared = .011)

The univariate ANOVA conducted on strength of ethnicity and ethnic label on the Immersion-Emersion subscale did not produce significant results. The main effect of strength of ethnicity as evidenced by the score on the MEIM was not significant $F(19, 137) = .552, p = .933$. The main effect of ethnic label on the Immersion-Emersion score was not significant $F(1, 137) = .661, p = .418$. Lastly, the interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic label did not yield a significant result $F(14, 137) = .727, p = .744$. In this sample, strength of ethnicity and whether a woman identifies as African American or Latina does not influence her adherence to the attitudes of the Immersion-Emersion scale of the WIAS. A summary of the results is presented below in table 4.7.
Table 4.7

Univariate Analysis of Variance for the Immersion-Emersion Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>356.389</td>
<td>1800.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Label</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM * Ethnic Label</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .157 (Adjusted R Squared = -.052)

The univariate ANOVA completed to assess the impact of strength of ethnicity and ethnic label on Internalization scores on the WIAS did not yield any significant results. The main effect of MEIM total was not significant at $F(19, 139) = 1.281, p = .205$. The main effect for ethnic label was not significant on the Internalization score $F(1, 139) = 2.003, p = .159$. The interaction between a woman’s strength of ethnicity and also her ethnic identification did not produce a significant interaction $F(14, 139) = .829, p = .637$. For this sample, a woman’s strength of ethnicity as well as whether she identifies as African American or Latina does not influence her belief in the attitudes of the Internalization subscale of the WIAS. Results from this ANOVA are presented below in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

Univariate Analysis of Variance for the Internalization subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1303.511</td>
<td>11562.732</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Label</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM * Ethnic Label</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .217 (Adjusted R Squared = .026)
Summary of the Study

As society evolves towards becoming more diverse, the multicultural aspects of identity are increasingly salient. There have been a number of models created in order to assess the components of identity; including ones for gender and ethnicity. The womanist model was developed in order to describe the stage wise progression of women, regardless of ethnicity, from an undeveloped, external definition of gender towards an integrated, personalized characterization of self. The WIAS was developed as a way to operationalize the stage-wise progression of the model. Previous researchers have frequently questioned the psychometric properties of the WIAS. Specifically, the instrument has consistently demonstrated poor internal reliability and problematic validity. Therefore, it was important to examine not only the psychometric properties of this instrument with a diverse sample of women, but also assess the factor structure of the WIAS. The factor structure can help determine the utility of the instrument as a measurement of the womanist model and whether it adequately assesses the experiences of a sample of women of color. Understanding the cultural validity of the instrument can provide evidence for either the continuation or discontinuation of the instrument as a measurement of gender identity.

For this study, participants were approached in person to complete a number of survey instruments to assess demographic variables, as well as the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS) and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). The WIAS assessed for a
participant’s adherence to the attitudes associated with the developmental stages of Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. The MEIM evaluated ethnic identity along a continuum, rather than at a specific stage or status. Based on the review of the literature, it was hypothesized that: (a) There will be no statistically significant differences between those of different ethnicities on the WIAS full scale scores, (b) There will be no statistically significant differences between those of different ethnicities on the MEIM full scale scores, (c) The factor structure of the WIAS will not be replicated, (d) The WIAS will not evidence acceptable internal reliability, (e) There will be no statistical correlation between scores on the MEIM and scores on the WIAS, and (f) There will not be a statistically significant interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category.

One hundred and ninety-eight students from a flagship university in the Southeast region of the United States agreed to participate in this study. In terms of ethnicity, 13.6 percent of the women identified as Hispanic, 10.1 percent identified as Latina, 12.6 percent identified by their country of origin, 1 percent identified as White, 27.3 percent identified as Black, 26.8 percent identified as African American, 3.5 percent identified as Multi-ethnic, and 1.5 percent identified as African. The age range of the participants was from 18 to 52. Academically, the women represented all years ranging from first years through graduate students.

Discussion

In the discussion of each of the proposed research questions of the current study, it is important to address the findings that were both significant as well as those that were not. Each result provided valuable information surrounding the future use of the WIAS as a measurement for womanist identity and its relationship towards other sociocultural variables, such as ethnicity.
Will Latinas and African Americans have statistically different scores on womanism and ethnic identity?

The null hypothesis was confirmed for three out of the four subscales of the WIAS. No significant differences were found between African Americans and Latinas on Preencounter, Encounter, or Immersion-Emersion. The only significant difference that was discovered between the two groups was on the final stage of Internalization. African Americans as a group scored higher on Preencounter. Latinas had a higher mean score on Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization.

The significant difference found on the final stage of the developmental womanist model could be attributed to participant recruitment. The majority of the Latina sample participated in the study while in attendance at an organizational meeting with a Latina/o focus. They may have had a stronger identification and understanding of self because of their level of support with other female students from a similar ethnic background. In addition, the Latina students represent a small percentage of students on campus and may have engaged in greater self exploration compared to other students.

The null hypothesis was confirmed that no significant differences existed between African American and Latina students in terms of ethnic identity. The Latina students overall had a higher score on the MEIM than African American students.

Will the proposed factor structure of the WIAS be replicated in a diverse sample of women of color? If not, what are alternate factor structures for the instrument?

It had been hypothesized that the WIAS would produce a four factor structure that was congruent to the four stages of the womanist model: Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. However, results indicated that the items did not produce
significant loading onto a single factor. This finding differs from the results of a study by Moradi and colleagues (2004), where an exploratory factor analysis produced a three factor solution that accounted for only 27% of the variance. Within that particular study, the sample solely consisted of African American and Caucasian women.

There are several explanations that could account for this outcome in the present study. Similar to other identity scales, the items may have a more subjective rather than objective basis. The items may be more indicative of a person’s preferences rather than of the attitudes associated with a certain stage of the womanist model. The individual scales also prove problematic in that they contain heterogeneous items that do not significantly correlate to one another. In fact, many of the items share little to no relationship to one another as evidenced by correlations that are almost 0.00. In addition, many of the items are negatively correlated to one another on the same subscale. This seems contradictory in that the items on a subscale should be addressing the same construct, but instead it seems as if they are measuring separate ideas. The lack of homogeneity at the item level has also been found in other identity subscales created by Helms, such as the White Racial Identity Scale (WRIAS) (Rowe, 2006). The WRIAS has been criticized by multiple authors for having significant design and psychometric problems. Specifically, the low internal reliabilities and inter scale correlations have proven to be most disturbing to some researchers.

The results indicated that contradictory subscales of the WIAS were correlated to one another. The Preencounter attitudes were found to be positively related to both the Encounter and Immersion-Emersion attitudes. In the Preencounter phase, a woman is accepting of traditional views of gender. However, during the Encounter phase a person should begin to view themselves differently and their previous belief system has been challenged. Therefore, the
relationship between Preencounter and Encounter should be nonexistent or negative rather than positive. Also, the beliefs of Preencounter are opposing to those held by women in the Immersion-Emersion phase. By the third phase of the developmental model, the woman is developing her own positive sense of womanhood and is rejecting of traditionally held principles. Therefore, a positive relationship should not exist between these subscales. These findings are consistent to previously published research (Ossana et al. 1992; Poindexter & Robinson, 1997). Consistent to the proposed developmental model, Encounter and Immersion-Emersion scores were found to be positively related to one another. This is a similar finding to previous research involving samples of African American and Caucasian women (Ossana et al. 1992; Poindexter & Robinson, 1997; Boisnier, 2003; Moradi et al. 2004). In the current study, a positive, significant relationship was found between the attitudes of the Encounter and Internalization stages. There have been mixed findings in previous research regarding this relationship in which some studies have found a negative relationship between the stages while others have been positive. Many of the correlations found during this study are contrary to the proposed theoretical foundation of the womanist model. This provides further statistical evidence that the WIAS does not measure the theoretical construct it purports to evaluate.

The results of the study support the null hypothesis that the factor structure of the WIAS does not correspond to the four developmental stages of the womanist model. The WIAS was found to exhibit poor structural validity with this sample of African American and Latina women. There is statistical support that the instrument is not adequately measuring the developmental attitudes of the model and possesses significant psychometric limitations.
Will the WIAS evidence strong psychometric properties (e.g., internal consistency) in this diverse sample of women?

The null hypothesis was supported that the WIAS did not exhibit strong internal consistency in this sample of African American and Latina women. This finding is supported by previous research utilizing the WIAS instrument. The acceptable cutoff for Cronbach alpha scores has been established at 0.70. In this current study, the only subscale to surpass this cutoff was the Immersion-Emersion subscale at 0.72. The next most reliable subscale was Preencounter at .69, followed by Exploration at .52 and Internalization at .51. Other studies have reported similar results with Immersion-Emersion being the most reliable of the four subscales. However, in previous studies, Encounter has typically been the least reliable of the subscales. In the current study, Internalization was found to possess the lowest internal reliability. It may be that utilizing such a diverse sample of women impacted the reliabilities of each of the subscales because previous research has only contained samples of African American or Caucasian women.

Is there a relationship between one’s ethnic and womanist identities?

Regarding the correlations between ethnicity and womanist identities, the expected null hypothesis was not supported. A significant negative correlation was found between scores on the MEIM and Preencounter. This indicates that the stronger a woman’s ethnic identity, the more she is rejecting of the attitudes associated with traditional gender roles and beliefs. A significant positive correlation was discovered between scores on the MEIM and Internalization. It was found that the more a woman identified with her ethnicity, the stronger her beliefs about her gender. The results were not surprising to the investigator given the premise of each of the models. These significant correlations suggest that there is a parallel process of identity
development in terms of both ethnicity and gender. Specifically, these results indicate that the more achieved one’s overall gender identity, the more achieved her ethnic identity as well. In terms of the womanist model, a gender identity in the early stages of development would be incongruent with the ideals of a developed ethnic identity and therefore their negative relationship to one another seems fitting.

Some caution should be taken when interpreting this result. The sample size of the current study was quite large in terms of what is required for correlational analysis. With this size sample, it is possible that significant correlations could be found based solely on the number of participants and not the strength of the relationship between variables. Both significant correlations would be classified as weak and therefore may not truly capture the association between both identities.

Will the interaction between strength of ethnicity and ethnic category produce a significant difference on WIAS score?

Results indicated that strength of ethnicity, as evidenced by score on the MEIM, and the ethnic classification of either African American or Latina did not produce a significant difference in score on the subscales of the WIAS. Meaning that the influence of strength of ethnicity and ethnic label did not impact how the women scored on the four subscales of the WIAS. The lack of significant results was not surprising to the researcher because of previous results found in the current study. One possible explanation for the finding is related to the instrumentation utilized. The WIAS instrument has demonstrated poor psychometric properties and may not adequately measure the developmental progression of womanist identity.
Implications

The results of this study have provided valuable statistical information regarding the WIAS instrument and womanist model. The original premise of the womanist model was to be applicable to the experiences of all women, regardless of sociocultural variables. Subsequently, the WIAS instrument was designed to capture the stage wise progression of the model towards a personalized definition of womanhood. The women who participated in this study identified themselves as either African American or Latina. In theory the WIAS should have captured their personal definitions of what it means to be women, but in reality the WIAS did not seem to adequately assess the experiences of the women in the sample.

Previous research has questioned the psychometric properties of the WIAS and its use with diverse samples. This study provides empirical evidence of the poor reliability and validity of the instrument. Specifically, the WIAS has exhibited poor structural and cultural validity. The internal validity of an instrument is important when making causal inferences between two variables. Since the WIAS seems to lack internal validity, conclusions regarding its relationship to other constructs need to be made with caution. The lack of a factor structure is indicative of poor construct and structural validity. Cultural validity is based upon the operationalization of a construct and statistical analysis should provide support for the interpretation of the construct. Unfortunately, the findings of this study demonstrated that the items on the WIAS have a poor relationship with one another. This result provides further support that the instrument is not measuring the theoretical construct on which it was originally based. It seems apparent that the attitudes and core tenants of each stage of the womanist model are complex and not being captured by the WIAS.
The WIAS score profile for the women in this sample was not evenly distributed across the four stages, but significantly higher scores were seen on the Internalization subscale compared to the other three. This pattern was similar across both the African American and Latina women. However, Internalization was also found to have the lowest alpha and therefore the lowest reliability of all of the subscales. It is noteworthy that there was a strong ethnic identification amongst the women in this sample as well. Different dimensions of identity may influence a woman’s definition of self and more specifically how she views her gender; thus impacting scores on the WIAS. The university from which these women were recruited from is a predominately White institution from a rural town in the Southeast. Therefore, it is possible that their development during this transitional period to adulthood may have impacted the results. For many of the participants, emerging adulthood is a time for identity exploration and personal discovery. Being that these participants are underrepresented in the population at their university, they may have engaged in more in-depth self exploration and had encounters with other students that could have made specific aspects of identity more salient than others. By increasing self awareness they could have simultaneously strengthened their multiple dimensions of identity.

This results of the study supported that the WIAS is not an adequate instrument to describe the developmental progression of womanism in this sample. It highlights the need for a new instrument to be created in order to describe the statuses that a woman undergoes as she ascertains a more individualized view of self. While the WIAS may no longer be the most appropriate method for assessing gender identity in women, the theoretical basis on which it was created it still valuable.
The study confirms the importance understanding a woman’s multiple identities and how these aspects of self can be addressed across a variety of settings. The assertion of the womanist model of developing a personal definition of womanhood can still be used in therapy as a theoretical framework for discussing a woman’s sense of her gender as it applies to self as well as society. It can provide both the client and the therapist with beneficial information about how a woman views her intra and interpersonal self. For the therapist, understanding that identity is not a linear progression, but more of a process can impart insight into women with both traditional and nontraditional views of gender roles our society. Rather than just focusing on differences between men and women, the model can help distinguish within group dissimilarities as well. It can assist the therapist in developing an appreciation for the client’s perspective and how their experiences have shaped how they view themselves as an individual and how they exist in the world. Specific interventions can then be selected that are targeted for the needs of the individual.

For clients in therapy, this model can help them to learn to characterize themselves in a personalized manner, rather than drawing from feminist, womanist, or any other external influences. They can develop an internal sense of self in terms of both their gender as well as their other identities. Rather than just defining themselves by single aspects of their identity, they can learn to understand the complexity of multiple identities and how they interact with one another. While at times a certain facet of self may be more salient, it is important that the woman become increasingly conscious of how these different identities constantly evolve based on experience. The recognition of this intricacy and multidimensionality of identities can serve as a protective factor and also as a point of individual strength.
Based on the literature and also findings in this study, a discussion of multiple identities would be useful in university settings, including both in the curriculum as well as student affairs programming. Educating both undergraduate and graduate students about the intersection of identities could be helpful for their own personal development. Specifically, educating women about the womanist model could assist them in gaining empowerment about their own gender without feeling the additional pressure of identifying themselves as a feminist. Often the labeling oneself as a feminist can feel incongruent with one’s beliefs or values. Instead, the womanist model provides a framework for understanding one’s self, but with a personalized definition of womanhood as the outcome. Discussing the intersection of identities is not just a topic of interest for women’s studies classes, but would be applicable across a number of disciplines that have a multicultural focus to the educational material.

Educating women about their various identities is not just a topic that should be addressed within the classroom, but could also be the focus of student affairs programming. A goal of university systems is the retention of students, especially those that are underrepresented in the community. Programs could be developed that highlight the multiple identities of students as a way of promoting self or group exploration. These programs could be presented as an aspect of orientation or later as a means to educate students on where they can find groups that have a sociocultural focus. These experiences can increase involvement in university activities as well as enhancing support within the community. By finding a network, the transition to college can become an easier experience. Instead of feeling isolated, these groups or programs could help students form a connection to one another and also to the university itself.

As campuses continue to grow more diverse, it is necessary that women are provided with an opportunity to address issues relating to the developmental challenges that they could
potentially face while attending college. These discussions need to occur in a safe space where they can converse surrounding their feelings related to both their ethnicity as well as their gender. Additionally, these meetings could focus on developing goals for themselves both personally and educationally. This could help foster a sense of self-esteem as well as well as further support through their educational journey; thus increasing their likelihood of graduation.

**Future Research**

Future research can focus on a number of different topic areas. If the WIAS is going to continue to be utilized as an instrument to measure gender identity development, more research on its psychometric properties is of necessity. Specifically, there needs to be greater attention paid to the subscales with the lowest reliabilities. The research needs to be focused on questions of validity, reliability, and refining the current structure. When analyzing each of the subscales at the item level, those with negative inter-item correlations or those with a correlation closest to zero should be discarded. The remaining items should then be investigated with a factor analysis with a large, diverse group of women. These women should be from a variety of ethnic backgrounds and be of non college-age. Ethnic groups beyond African American and Caucasian women have been underrepresented in research and therefore need to be included if a new factor structure is going to be assessed. Also, including an international group of women would broaden the understanding of womanist attitudes beyond those experiences of those in the United States.

Another research consideration would be to contemplate creating a new instrument and model for gender identity development in women. The womanist model and WIAS have been in existence for over 20 years. While the premise of the model continues to be applicable today, the items themselves may be outdated and no longer applicable to the experiences of the women
of this decade. Instead, they may require rewriting in order to be updated to the language and experiences of today’s women. The instrument needs to reflect the changing attitudes relating to gender roles in our society.

There were no opportunities for participants to provide any comments or feedback within this study surrounding their attitudes or belief systems about their gender. Future research in the area of womanist and gender identity development should include more qualitative or mixed methods research. Preferably, face to face interviews would be conducted with women in order to provide them with a space to share their stories. It could be an empowering experience for them to use their voices surrounding their experiences of what it has meant to be a woman. These individual stories could then be integrated into the further development of the theory as well as play a pivotal role in the refinement of any measures. This approach would place value on the individual which seems congruent to the ideals established by the womanist model.

In the future, research related to the relationships between multiple identities should be examined. While many previous studies, including this one, evaluated the relationship between womanist attitudes and ethnicity, future studies should include other important aspects of identity. Specifically, future studies could be more longitudinal in nature assessing the changes in attitudes relating to gender throughout the lifespan. As women age and experience different life events, their belief systems could become more traditional or nontraditional in nature. Also, more information is needed about the connectedness between other variables, such as sexual orientation and religious affiliation, on feelings related towards gender. The influences of each of these varying aspects of identity create the intricacies that make each woman an individual. Research may also look at how differing areas of the country impact a woman’s view of self.

For example, do women living in more diverse, metropolitan cities have differing views of
gender roles compared to women in small, rural towns? It would seem plausible that those women that are exposed to greater diversity may hold less traditional views of self compared to women living in smaller towns where there would be less exposure.

*Limitations*

There were a number of identifiable limitations in this study. One of the limitations relates to the personal characteristics of the researcher. While the researcher in this study is a woman, I do not identify as African American or Latina. When approaching participants, there was often a significant amount of anxiety surrounding the ethnic differences. As a researcher, I wanted my participants to realize my commitment to multicultural research rather than them feeling as though they were being taken advantage of for my own benefit. I tried to adhere to Latina/o cultural expectations such as *personalismo* by making efforts to approach participants in person and allowing them to get to know me rather than simply sending out electronic requests. However, there were often cultural customs during meetings and in other interactions for which I did not have understanding and this could have potentially caused a barrier between the participants and myself.

Further limitations related to the characteristics of the participants themselves and the fact that they were all college students. While the researcher attempted to obtain an equal number of African American and Latina women, there were a greater number of women in the sample who identified themselves as African American. However, all of the students were from the same university located in a rural portion of the state. There could be certain personality characteristics that would be inherent to these students to decide to attend the flagship university of the state. Different results could have been obtained if the students had attended a school in a more urban setting, one that was smaller in size, or one that would have a larger population of
underrepresented students. Many of the participants were also members of organizations that had an ethnic affiliation. Those students who choose to join such organizations could have a higher ethnic identification which could have impacted their responses to both the ethnic and womanist identity measures in this study. They could use these groups as a source of support and as resources as they navigate through their time at the university. Lastly, a number of the participants were recruited through the department of the researcher. These participants could have felt a certain pressure to participate because of their departmental affiliation and previous relationship with the researcher.

When completing research that involves factor analysis, it is important to achieve a large sample size. While the sample size obtained in this study was sufficient to complete the statistical analysis, it was still considered on the smaller size. While it is unlikely that more participants would have influenced the results, it is still a possibility. If a future factor analysis would be completed, a larger sample size should be obtained.

Evaluating identity development is a challenging undertaking. It is difficult to assess statuses of development as there are not always clear indices that a new stage has been achieved. It is not always a linear process and people can progress at varying rates. While the WIAS has attempted to operationalize the womanist model, it appears to be a poor measurement of this identity development with this sample. No normative data was available surrounding the psychometric properties of the WIAS with the Latina population except for the pilot study completed by this researcher. Without this data, it is difficult to draw definite conclusions about the results discovered involving the Latina women. In addition, the poor psychometric properties exhibited by the WIAS limit the general results of this study. The WIAS does not
seem to measure the construct on which it was based and was found to be an inappropriate means to capture the progression of womanist development with this population.

Conclusion

This study is a representation of the researcher’s personal journey towards an individualized sense of womanhood and her commitment towards multicultural research. The study is inclusive of many of the established values of counseling psychology including being strength based, focused on the social justice movement, and the multicultural component.

To focus on a woman’s strengths is a foundation of both feminist therapy as well as counseling psychology. This study’s contribution is for each woman to find strength within her identities, may it be her gender, ethnicity, or another variable of personal importance to her. It can serve as a protective factor against the stereotypes that plague our society as well as a way to cope with microaggressions. What is important to remember is that multiple identities uniquely contribute to each woman and it is her journey to discover which are most salient to her.

The social justice movement combines both multiculturalism and a call for action and implementation. Conducting multicultural research means to expand research to populations that are typically underrepresented in the literature. It is a misrepresentation to believe that just because an instrument is reliable and valid with a certain group that it can be expanded to other, more diverse groups. The WIAS is purposed to apply to all women, but this study proves that it lacks validity with a sample of African American and Latina women. Sufficient evidence was found to not support the usage of the WIAS with a diverse sample of women as a measurement of gender identity. However, it is clear that identity development will continue to be an important area of research in both gender and multicultural psychology.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Multiple Identities: The Intersection of Womanism and Ethnicity in a Diverse Sample of Women

“Multiple Identities: The Intersection of Womanism and Ethnicity in a Diverse Sample of Women” is a paper based survey that involves the examination of a person’s womanist and ethnic identity development. The results of this survey will be used to determine the relationship between these two constructs in African American and Latina women, while simultaneously advancing the current research. It will provide a greater insight into this complex intersection of identities and the importance of understanding all aspects of a person. Before taking part in this study, please read the consent form below and sign at the bottom if you understand the statements and freely consent to participation in the study.

Consent Form
This research study involves the use of two paper and pencil measurements designed to assess the intersection of a participant’s womanist and ethnic identity. This study is being conducted by Erin Forehand, M.Ed. and Dr. Edward Delgado-Romero of the University of Georgia. It has been approved the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board (2011-10309-0). No deception is involved in this study and there are no known risks or discomforts in participation.

Completion of the instruments of this study should only take you between 15-20 minutes and all participants will remain anonymous.

All responses will be treated as anonymous and at no time will individuals be identified. Rather, all participants will be provided with a packet of instruments that is already numbered and that will be the only mode of data identification.

By participating in this study, you will be advancing the field of multicultural psychology. Participation is completely voluntary and therefore you may refuse to participate or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project. Participants may contact Erin Forehand at Schwem2@uga.edu; Professor Edward Delgado-Romero, Professor in the Counseling Psychology program, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, 402 Aderhold Hall, Athens, GA 30602, or at (706) 542-0500. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 629 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.
If you are 18 years of age or older, understand the statements of above, and freely consent to participate in this study, please sign below.

__________________________  __________________________
Participant Signature/Date    Researcher Signature/Date

Please sign both copies, keep one and return the other to the researcher
For Organizations
Dear ____________,
My name is Erin Forehand and I am a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology. In collaboration with Edward Delgado-Romero PhD, I am conducting a research project entitled *Multiple Identities: The Intersection of Womanism and Ethnicity in a Diverse Sample of Women* that looks at the intersection of both gender and ethnic identity in African Americans and Latinas. This project has been approved by the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board (Project number 2011-10309-0). I am contacting your organization to see if you would have students that would be interested in participating in this project. If so, approximately how many women would be available? In return for your participation, I am offering a workshop as programming that could be on a variety of psychological topics (ex. stress management) that could be chosen by your organization. I appreciate your time and look forward to hearing back from you.

For an Individual
Dear ____________,
My name is Erin Forehand and I am a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology. In collaboration with Edward Delgado-Romero PhD, I am conducting a research project entitled *Multiple Identities: The Intersection of Womanism and Ethnicity in a Diverse Sample of Women* that looks at the intersection of both gender and ethnic identity in African Americans Latinas. This project has been approved by the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board (Project number 2011-10309-0). I am contacting you to see if you would be interested in participating in this project. By participating in this study, you would be advancing the field of multicultural psychology and expanding current research. I appreciate your time and look forward to hearing back from you.
### APPENDIX C

#### Demographics Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a first generation college student?</td>
<td>Yes____  No_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you the first generation of your family to be born in the United States?</td>
<td>Yes____  No_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

**Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale**

This questionnaire is designed to measure people’s attitudes about what it means to be a woman. There are no right or wrong answers. Try to be as honest as possible. For each item, circle the number that best describes how you feel. 1-Strongly disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

1) In general, I believe men are superior to women
2) I try not to take part in activities that make me appear un-lady like.
3) I believe that being a woman has caused me to have many strengths.
4) Women should not blame men for their social problems.
5) I would feel incomplete if I did not marry.
6) I don’t know whether being a woman is an asset or a deficit.
7) I feel more comfortable being around men than I do being around women.
8) I feel unable to involve myself in men’s activities, and I am increasing my involvement in activities involving women.
9) I am insulted when people call me a “feminist”.
10) I am comfortable wherever I am.
11) Maybe I can learn something from women.
12) Sometimes I think men are superior and sometimes I think they’re inferior to women.
13) Women usually don’t have anything intelligent to say about politics.
14) In general, women have not contributed much to American society.
15) When I think about how men have treated women, I feel overwhelming anger.
16) People, regardless of their sex, have strengths and limitations.
17) A woman’s most important role in life is to provide emotional support for others.
18) Sometimes I am proud of belonging to the female sex and sometimes I am ashamed of it.
19) Sometimes, I am embarrassed to be the sex I am.
20) I am determined to find out more about the female sex.
21) I use the word “girl” to describe myself and/or my female friends.
22) Being a member of the female sex is a source
of pride to me.  
23) Thinking about my values and beliefs takes up a lot of my time.  
24) I do not think I should feel positively about people just because they belong to the same sexual group as I do.  
25) A woman’s appearance is her most important asset.  
26) I would have accomplished more in this life had I been born a man.  
27) Most men are insensitive.  
28) Women and men have much to learn from each other.  
29) Women who think and act like men are a disgrace.  
30) I’m not sure how I feel about myself.  
31) Sometimes I wonder how much of myself I should give up for the sake of helping minorities.  
32) Men are more attractive than women.  
33) I try to do only those things that increase my femininity.  
34) I reject all male values.  
35) Men have some customs I enjoy.  
36) Men are difficult to understand.  
37) It embarrasses me when other women act unfeminine.  
38) I wonder if I should feel a kinship with all minority group people.  
39) Women should learn to think and act like men.  
40) My most important goal in life is to fight the oppression of women.  
41) My most important goal in life is to raise healthy children.  
42) I enjoy being around people regardless of their sex.  
43) I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who share my beliefs about women.  
44) The burden of living up to society’s expectations of women is sometimes more than I can bear.  
45) I limit myself to male activities.  
46) I don’t trust women.  
47) Both sexual groups have some good people and some bad people.  
48) I feel anxious about some of the things I feel about women.  
49) I feel like I am betraying my sex when I take advantage of the opportunities available to me in the male world.  
50) I want to know more about the female culture.  
51) I think women and men differ from each other in some ways, but neither group is superior.  
52) I find that I function better when I am able to view men as individuals.
53) I limit myself to activities involving women.  
54) Most men are untrustworthy.  
55) American society would be better off if it were based on the cultural values of women.
APPENDIX E
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many
different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from.
Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African
American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian
or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your
ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be ____________________

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(4) Strongly agree    (3) Agree    (2) Disagree    (1) Strongly disagree

1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as
   its history, traditions, and customs.
2- I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members
   of my own ethnic group.
3- I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.
4- I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.
5- I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.
6- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
7- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.
8- In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked
   to other people about my ethnic group.
9- I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.
10- I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food,
    music, or customs.
11- I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.
12- I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

13- My ethnicity is
    (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
    (2) Black or African American
    (3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others
    (4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
    (5) American Indian/Native American
    (6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
    (7) Other (write in): _____________________________________
14- My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above)
15- My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above)