

©2014

Kiara Chanel Caryl Wesley

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE STEREOTYPE SCALE SCORES

By

KIARA CHANEL CARYL WESLEY

A thesis submitted to the

Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Science

Graduate Program in Psychology

written under the direction of

Dr. Shalonda Kelly

and approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

October 2014

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Stereotype Scale Scores

By KIARA CHANEL CARYL WESLEY

Thesis Director:
Dr. Shalonda Kelly

This study examines the psychometric properties of the Stereotype Scale, a 52-item measure designed to capture the endorsement of stereotypical in-group beliefs of African Americans, using appropriate exploratory factor analysis methods in two distinct samples of African American men and women from Lansing, Michigan ($N = 329$) and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania ($N = 142$). Scale items reflect adjectives describing positive or negative stereotypes of Blacks in general, Black men, and Black women. Viable seven- and one-factors solutions were cross-validated, with significant overlap in factors across samples. Overlapping factors for the seven-factor solution were labeled *Coon*, *Individual Ability*, *Welfare Mother*, *Jezebel Buck*, and *Community Oriented*, with the seven-factor model accounting for 48% of the variance in the Lansing sample and 45% of the variance in the Philadelphia sample. The one-factor model, comprised primarily of item content promoting negative beliefs, accounted for 30% of the variance in both samples. Evidence for convergent validity was found for factors within the Lansing sample, such that factor scores were related to racial identity, psychological distress, Afrocentricity, and relationship satisfaction scores in expected directions, although not for all factors. Implications for the use of the Stereotype Scale and recommendations for future research are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Abstract of the Thesis | ii |
| List of Tables | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| A Sample of Current Measures of Internalized Racism | 3 |
| Stereotype Scale | 7 |
| Method | 9 |
| Participants and Procedures | 9 |
| Measures | 11 |
| Results | 13 |
| Construct Validity Results | 18 |
| Discussion | 21 |
| Factor Solutions and Historical Portrayals of African Americans | 21 |
| Construct Validity Findings | 24 |
| Limitations and Future Directions | 25 |
| References | 28 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1 | |
| <i>Seven-Factor Solution Pattern Coefficients and Communalities for the Lansing and Philadelphia Samples</i> | 35 |
| Table 2 | |
| <i>One-Factor Solution Item Content, Pattern Coefficients, and Communalities for Lansing and Philadelphia Samples</i> | 38 |
| Table 3 | |
| <i>Pearson's r correlations of Stereotype Scale Seven-factor and One-factor Model Scores with Racial Identity and Psychological Distress Scores in Lansing Subsample</i> | 41 |
| Table 4 | |
| <i>Pearson's r correlations of the Stereotype Scale Seven-factor and One-factor Model Scores with ASCSC Two-factor Model in Lansing Sample</i> | 42 |

Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Stereotype Scale Scores

Oppression, defined as one group holding more access to power and privilege, and using those advantages to maintain the status quo (David & Derthick, 2014), has led to detrimental effects on the well-being of African Americans in the United States. Oppression can occur at many levels, including within social, institutional, and political contexts (David & Derthick, 2014). For example, a majority of all Americans report experiencing some form of discrimination, however African Americans attribute almost 90% of these experiences to their race, whereas their White counterparts only attribute 21% of perceived discriminatory experiences to their race or ethnicity (Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999). Furthermore, it is well-documented that perceived discrimination is associated with adverse mental and physical health for African Americans (e.g. Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003). Such experiences of discrimination, coupled with larger systemic forms of oppression, project negative messages about the oppressed group, and these messages are theorized to be internalized by those who are members of that oppressed group (David & Derthick, 2014). The endorsement of negative stereotypes and beliefs about one's own racial group, known as internalized racism (Cokley, 2002), is one aspect of internalized oppression that can occur for African Americans.

Internalized racism has been associated with detrimental health outcomes for African Americans. For example, Chae, Lincoln, Adler, and Syme (2010) found that agreement with negative beliefs about Blacks was positively associated with cardiovascular disease history for African American men. Furthermore, this endorsement of negative beliefs moderated the effect of racial discrimination on risk for cardiovascular

disease, such that African American men who endorsed negative stereotypes but did not report discrimination had the highest risk of cardiovascular disease (Chae et al., 2010). In addition, internalized racism is also associated with mental health outcomes, particularly psychological distress. For example, Kelly (2004) conducted a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to identify the underlying components of scores derived from the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale, the African Self-Consciousness Scale, and the Stereotype Scale, each of which was designed to measure African Americans' views of their own racial group. Findings revealed that scores on each of these scales shared components that embody both anti-Black and pro-Black perspectives, and that these components were associated differently with psychological distress. Specifically, individual scale scores that represented an anti-Black perspective accounted for a significant amount of variance in psychological distress scores, whereas scale scores that represented a pro-Black perspective were not associated with psychological distress (Kelly, 2004).

Efforts to critically examine internalized racism are complicated due to the limited number of adequate measures to capture this construct, however one clear way to assess internalized racism is through the examination of in-group stereotypes, which often reflect negative beliefs that were originally promoted by the dominant culture to maintain the status quo. Research shows that negative stereotypes about African Americans are unique and pervasive. Stephens and Phillips (2003) identified common stereotypes of African American women, such as the "freak," a sexually aggressive woman who wants sex without an emotional attachment, the "matriarch," a controlling, emasculating woman who only needs a man for providing children, and the "gold digger," who exchanges sex for financial gain. Common stereotypes identified by Bogle

(2002) for African American men include the “Buck,” a big, savage, and oversexed man, and the lazy and unreliable “Coon.” These negative stereotypes fall along gender lines and are theorized to foster confrontational relationships between African American men and women (Hines & Boyd-Franklin, 2005; Stephens & Phillips 2003). These and other stereotypes of African Americans also tend to be more negative than the stereotypes applied to other ethnic groups. For example, a study found that White male college undergraduates perceived Black female rape victims as more promiscuous than their White counterparts (Donovan, 2007). In addition, 58% of the male participants and 63% of the female participants incorrectly rated Black males as most likely to rape a White woman (Donovan, 2007). As a result of the pervasive nature of these beliefs, some African Americans are prone to endorse such stereotypes as representative of their own group (e.g. Kelly, 2004).

A Sample of Current Measures of Internalized Racism

Due to the prevalence of stereotypes and the growing body of literature showing their associations with physical and mental health, the development of reliable and valid measures to assess this construct are critical. A number of recent empirical studies on internalized racism (e.g. Cokley, 2005; Cort et al., 2009) used the Nadanolitization Scale (NAD; Taylor & Gundy, 1996), which measures the degree to which Black individuals identify with and internalize “racist” stereotypes of African Americans. The scale is comprised of the Racist subscale (24 items) and the Social subscale (25 items) for a total of 49 items. The racist subscale includes items reflecting beliefs that Blacks are biologically or genetically inferior, whereas the social subscale reflects beliefs in more positive attributes of an environmental or social origin. Items address stereotypes of

African Americans in general rated on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Sample items include “The large number of African Americans addicted to hard drugs suggests a form of biological weakness” (racist subscale) and “Black people are born with greater rhythm than White people” (social subscale). Initial reports found an internal consistency of .81 for this scale (Taylor & Grundy, 1996).

Cokley (2002) performed an EFA on the racist subscale, revealing a three-factor structure: mental/genetic deficiencies, sexual prowess, and natural ability, each with an internal consistency of .82, .67, and .77, respectively. In addition, scores on the racist subscale factors of mental and genetic deficiencies were positively correlated with negative pre-encounter miseducation and self-hatred racial identity attitudes, providing support for the convergent validity of those two factors derived from this subscale.

Scores on the racist subscale in its entirety were not correlated with multicultural inclusive attitudes, indicating divergent validity of two of the factors, but not the scale as a whole (Cokley, 2002). Overall, the specific psychometric properties of the social subscale have not yet been assessed, as no known studies have utilized this subscale.

Another scale, the Internalized Racial Oppression Scale (IROS; Bailey, Chung, Williams, Singh, & Terrell, 2011), is designed to assess 5 dimensions of internalized racism in Blacks: a) internalization of negative stereotypes (INS), b) self-destructive behaviors (SDB), c) devaluation of the African worldview and motifs (DAW), d) belief in the biased representation of history (BRH), and e) alteration of physical appearance (APA). The scale uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), with higher scores indicating a higher degree of internalized racism (Bailey et al., 2011). Sample items include “Money management is something that Black

people cannot do” (INS), and “There were no institutions of higher learning in Africa” (BRH; Bailey et al., 2011). EFA and CFA supported the retention of four (BRH, DAW, APA, and INS) dimensions of the IROS, and the separation of the APA dimension into two separate factors, one focused on a general desire to alter physical appearance and another focused specifically on changing hair (HC). The DAW dimension was deleted due to poor reliability following CFA (Bailey et al., 2011). The four retained factors (BRH, INS, APA related to appearance, and HC) had alpha coefficients of .77, .81, .72, and .69 respectively, with an overall alpha of .87 for the entire scale. The factors of the IROS each were positively correlated with the Pre-Encounter subscale of the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS-B; Helms & Parham, 1996), designed to measure anti-Black attitudes (Bailey et al., 2011).

While the NAD Scale and IROS measure negative stereotypes of African Americans as a whole, another self-report measure, the Stereotypic Roles for Black Women Scale (SRBWS; Thomas, Witherspoon, & Speight, 2004), assesses stereotypes held by African American women in regards to their own group. To test the fit of the theorized model of the Mammy, Jezebel, Sapphire, and Superwoman as the four dominant stereotypical images of Black women, initial analyses of all 61 items using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were conducted, resulting in a 34-item scale that provided the best fit of theorized four factor model (Thomas et al., 2004). These four subscales are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Sample statements include, “I feel guilty when I put my own needs before others” (Mammy), “Black women will use sex to get what they want” (Jezebel), “Black women have to be strong to survive” (Superwoman), and “People respond to me more if I

am loud and angry” (Sapphire). Each subscale had low to moderate internal consistency: Mammy .52, Sapphire .70, Jezebel .72, and Superwomen .67 (Thomas, Witherspoon, & Speight, 2004). The four subscales were negatively correlated with self-esteem as measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965).

The foregoing measures make sound contributions in identifying content areas for which African Americans may experience internalized racism, yet also there is a need to examine the multidimensional nature of prevalent stereotypes about African American men and women. In particular, while the SRBWS measures gender specific stereotypes for women, it does not measure the stereotypes that may apply specifically to African American men, and the NAD and the IROS measure only general stereotypes. Given that gender appears to play a large role in distinguishing some of the most prominent stereotypes of African Americans (e.g. “matriarch” stereotype of African American women, “absentee father” stereotype of African American men), adequate measures to assess gender as a potential aspect of the multidimensionality of this construct are needed. The measurement of both general and gender-specific stereotypical beliefs can allow researchers to assess the relative impact of general and gendered stereotypes on the mental health of African Americans.

In addition, the measurement of positive as well as negative beliefs is necessary for a comprehensive analysis of stereotypes as a multifaceted construct. Of the foregoing scales, the NAD and IROS only have four items each that assess positively valenced beliefs about African Americans. It is logical to expect positive in-group beliefs to be positively associated with mental health, but there is evidence that positive stereotypes can be detrimental. For example, Asian Americans’ endorsement of positive Asian

stereotypes such as being the smart “model minority” were associated with their endorsement of somatic complaints and higher levels of psychological distress (Gupta, Szymanski, & Leong, 2011). Thus, an assessment of the dimension of the positive or negative valence of in-group beliefs will allow for the exploration of how such beliefs are associated with the mental and physical health of African Americans. The present study incorporates these considerations through the psychometric examination of a multidimensional measure of African Americans’ stereotypical beliefs about their own group.

The Stereotype Scale

The Stereotype Scale is a promising alternative measure for assessing multiple areas of stereotypical beliefs about Black men and women, because it measures general, gendered, and positive and negative stereotypes of African Americans. Kelly and Floyd (2001) adapted the Stereotype Scale from Allen and Hatchett’s 10-item Black Group Perception Scale (BGPS; 1986) that measures anti-Black myths for African Americans as a whole. Kelly and Floyd (2001) added four additional general stereotypes, and then asked about these same 14 stereotypes separately for Black men and women. Moreover, they added five additional stereotypes common to Black men, and five additional stereotypes common to Black women to those respective subscales. In sum, 14 items address Blacks in general, 19 items address Black men, and 19 items address Black women for a total of 52 items (Kelly & Floyd, 2001). Furthermore, the additional items reflected positive stereotypes in addition to the solely negative ones used in the BGPS. Example items are, “Most Black people are community oriented,” “Most Black people are lazy,” “Black men neglect their families,” and “Black women are intelligent,” with

negative adjectives reverse scored. Each item is scored on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 *strongly agree* to 5 *strongly disagree* (Kelly, 2004). Cronbach's alphas for the scale were as follows for men's and women's reports respectively: .83 and .84 for Blacks in general, .87 and .87 for ratings of Black men, and .79 and .84 for ratings of Black women, indicating good internal consistency. While designed to address the degree to which one endorses negative stereotypes about Blacks, the scale's inclusion of positive stereotypical statements and gender distinctions provides an opportunity for a more nuanced understanding of the types of stereotypes that African Americans may internalize. As a result, an understanding of the psychometric properties of the Stereotype Scale can allow researchers to maximize the use of the scale to test more complex associations between internalized racism and health outcomes.

The proposed study aims to address the aforementioned needs through an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the Stereotype Scale. Based on theory regarding negative stereotypes a unidimensional model of the Stereotype Scale scores will be tested. In addition, a 3-factor model will also be tested, Kelly and Floyd's (2001) original conceptualization of stereotypes differing according to whether or not they apply to African Americans as a whole, or African American men or women.

Following factor analysis, convergent validity will be assessed. It is hypothesized that scores from the Stereotype Scale will be positively associated with scores endorsing the devaluation of African Americans and preference for Whites and White culture, and positively associated with individual psychological distress. In contrast Stereotype Scale scores are hypothesized to be negatively associated with the internalization of a positive and realistic view of Black identity, and the degree to which African Americans endorse

African-centered social and cultural values and beliefs. It is also hypothesized that scores from the Stereotype Scale will be negatively associated with relationship satisfaction, consistent with theory (Hines & Boyd-Franklin, 2005) and prior research highlighting the negative impacts of such beliefs on relationship satisfaction (Kelly & Floyd, 2001).

Method

Participants and Procedures

To examine the underlying factor structure of the Stereotype Scale, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed on two separate, previously collected data sets. The EFA was performed on each sample separately using identical statistical methods, allowing for a comparison of factors found within the Stereotype Scale across samples. The first is a sample of 348 African American adults from the greater Lansing area in Michigan. This sample will be referred to as the *Lansing Sample*. The second is a sample of 142 African American participants from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and the surrounding community. This sample will be referred to as the *Philadelphia Sample*. Participants in both samples completed the Stereotype Scale.

The *Lansing* sample comprises 329 African American heterosexual adults, recruited as part of two separate studies examining associations between racial perspectives and couple relationships in the Lansing area of Michigan (Kelly & Floyd, 2001, $N = 73$ couples or 146 partners; Kelly, 2004, $N = 112$ couples or 224 partners). As the latter study replicated and extended the first, it was considered appropriate to the combine the samples, resulting in a total of 174 couples ($N = 348$). Data from 11 couples who happened to participate in both studies were removed from the smaller data set prior to the combination of the samples, as this smaller sample was less recent and included

few scales than the larger sample. Inclusion criteria included couples in a serious relationship that were married or living together for at least six months. Participants also had to be 18 years of age or older. Couples were recruited via flyers, snowball sampling, and networking with African American organizations. Research assistants then administered questionnaires to participants. As an incentive for their participation, their names were entered into a \$100 lottery drawing. Of the 174 couples ($N = 348$ participants), married couples represented 79% of the sample. The average educational level was 16 years of completed education, or a bachelor's degree ($M = 15.90$, $SD = 2.46$ for men and $M = 15.73$, $SD = 2.52$ for women). The average age of the participants was 41 years old ($SD = 12.09$). Median annual income was \$40,000 for men and \$35,940 for women. Participants that did not complete the Stereotype Scale in its entirety were removed from analyses, resulting in the final sample size of 329 participants.

The *Philadelphia* sample comprises 142 participants (41 men and 101 women) who completed the Stereotype Scale in its entirety, were at least 18 years of age, and self identified as at least a second generation African American (Chestnut, 2009). Participants who indicated they were “currently in a committed relationship” were included, although their partners were not required to complete the study as part of the inclusion criteria. Of the 142 participants, 68% were married and living together, 22% were not married and not living together, 9% were not married but living together, and 1% were married but not living together. 60% of participants completed college. The average age of participants was 40 years old ($SD = 11.44$), 78% of the sample was employed, and 74% of participants had children.

Measures

Demographics. For all participants in both the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* sample, basic demographic information was collected such as age, marital status, education level, and yearly income.

Stereotypes. The Stereotype Scale developed by Kelly and Floyd (2001) assessed the degree to which one endorses negative, anti-Black myths. The 52-item scale is comprised of three checklists of adjectives representing positive or negative stereotypes of Blacks in general (14 items), Black men (19 items), and Black women (19 items). Each item is scored on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 *strongly agree* to 5 *strongly disagree* (Kelly, 2004). Negative items are reverse scored, so that higher total scores reflect a greater endorsement of stereotypes overall.

Relationship Satisfaction. The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier 1976) was used to assess relationship satisfaction for partners. The DAS consists of 32 items assessing global domains of relationship functioning. A total score of 100 generally indicates a cutoff between “happy or non-distressed” and “unhappy or distressed” couples. The DAS has well-established validity and reliability in distinguishing distressed from nondistressed couples, both married and unmarried (e.g. Bellack & Hersen, 1998). The DAS was used in both the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* samples.

Afrocentricity. The African Self-Consciousness Scale (ASCS) assessed afrocentricity, or the degree to which African American endorse African-centered social and cultural values and beliefs (Baldwin & Bell, 1985). The 42-item scale was measured on an 8-point scale from 1 *strongly disagree* to 8 *strongly agree*, with negatively worded items reversed scored such that higher scores reflect greater Afrocentricity. Cronbach’s alphas for the ASCS ranged from .70 to .81 across three studies (Baldwin & Bell, 1985;

Bhagwat, Kelly, & Lambert 2012; Stokes, Murray, Peacock, & Kaiser, 1994). The ASCS was administered in the *Lansing* sample only.

Black Racial Identity. The Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS-B; Parham & Helms, 1985) is a 50-item questionnaire to assess Black racial identity. Based on Cross's (1971) stage model of racial identity, the RIAS-B measures Pre-encounter, or the devaluation of Black identity and culture and preference for White culture, Immersion, or an idealized identity that rejects Whites, and Internalization, a positive and realistic view that does not reject Whites nor idealize Blacks (Parham & Helms, 1985).

Psychological Distress. Psychological distress was assessed using the Global Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis, 1983), a 53-item self-report measure of symptoms experienced by participants over the past week. The Global Severity Index is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 *not at all* to 4 *extremely*. This commonly used scale is the best single indicator of psychological distress (Derogatis & Fitzpatrick, 2004). Published reliability coefficients for Brief Symptoms Inventory subscales and indices range from .71 to .85 (Derogatis & Fitzpatrick, 2004). Psychological distress was only assessed in subset of the *Lansing* sample, comprised of 112 couples.

Results

The Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1950) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO; Kaiser, 1970) were examined to assess the appropriateness of factor analysis for each data set. KMO values higher than .70 indicate an appropriate sample while values lower than .70 indicate a potential for difficulties interpreting the data via factor analysis. Both data sets were confirmed to be appropriate

for exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Identical EFA methods for both the *Philadelphia* and *Lansing* sample were used, allowing for cross-validation that yields a true comparison of factors across the two data sets (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). Both samples included only those participants who completed identical versions of the Stereotype Scale in its entirety, resulting in no missing data. As a result, a total of 19 participants in the *Lansing* sample and 19 in the *Philadelphia* sample were excluded from analyses.

Given the lack of structural validity studies and factor analytic studies on the Stereotype Scale, EFA was deemed the most appropriate methodological approach. EFA was conducted using a maximum likelihood extraction method for each data set, and then a polychoric correlation matrix was calculated and examined. Polychoric correlation matrices account for unique conventions of the Likert-type rating scale typical of self-report measures like the Stereotype Scale, specifically the limited response options ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*, which can result in statistical artifacts that skew analyses (Bonett & Price, 2005; Panter, Swygert, Dahlstrom, & Tanaka, 1997). An oblique rotation method (promax) was applied, as this approach allowed for the potential of orthogonality among factors (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999), and for factors to be intercorrelated, which is likely in measures of cultural and ethnic attitudes that may be interrelated (Marks, Settles, Cooke, Morgan, & Sellers, 2004).

Following rotation, multiple methods were used to determine the number of factors to retain, based on best practice recommendations regarding factor retention (e.g. Costello & Osborne, 2005; Fabrigar et al., 1999; Hayton et al., 2004). This included the Kaiser criterion (Hayton et al., 2004), the scree test (Fabrigar et al., 1999), and parallel

analysis. Parallel analysis involves comparing a real data set with generated random data sets of the same sample size and number of variables. Thus real data with a valid underlying factor structure should have eigenvalues larger than those parallel components found in random data (Hayton et al., 2004). A three-factor solution consistent with Kelly and Floyd's (2001) theory that some important differences exist in stereotypes regarding Blacks in general, Black men, and Black women. In addition, a one-factor solution was extracted to evaluate the possibility of unidimensional Stereotype Scale scores, consistent with prior empirical findings involving the use of all items from the scale.

As recommended (e.g. Costello & Osborne, 2005; Fabrigar et al., 1999; Hayton et al., 2004) the determination of which factors to retain were also based on factors having more than three items with pattern coefficient cutoffs of .40 or higher (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Cross-loaded items only were retained on the factor in which that particular item had the pattern coefficient that was at least .2 higher than the loading on any other factor. We did not retain items with closer loadings. In addition, only factors that have good internal consistency, as evidenced by Cronbach alpha coefficients of .70 or greater (Cronbach, 1951) were retained. These criteria helped to yield interpretable factors. Using the aforementioned criteria, both samples yielded only seven- and one- factor solutions that were viable. The seven-factor model will be discussed first, as it was empirically derived from the combined usage of parallel analysis and the scree test, while the one-factor solution was evaluated based upon the possibility of unidimensional Stereotype Scale scores.

Examining the seven-factor model, Table 1 includes item content, pattern coefficients, and communalities for the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* samples.

Communalities for the *Lansing* sample ranged from .28 to .82. Communalities greater than .5 are generally considered adequate, while communalities at .7 or higher are preferred (MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999). Thus some communalities in the *Lansing* sample did not meet optimal criteria. However, larger sample sizes and a higher determination of factors, specifically more item loadings on a particular factor, can accommodate for this limitation (MacCallum et al., 1999). Thus, the sample sizes of 329 for the *Lansing* sample and 142 for the *Philadelphia* sample can be sufficient for an accurate EFA despite lower communalities (MacCallum et al., 1999).

Factors derived from pattern coefficients meeting the foregoing criteria were labeled according to well-documented stereotypes to facilitate ease of interpretation. The first factor in the *Lansing* sample, comprised of 11 items and accounting for 13% of the variance, was labeled *Coon* as it included negative stereotypes of Blacks in general, Black men, and Black women such as “lazy” and “ashamed of themselves.” The second factor, comprised of ten items and accounting for 10% of the variance, was labeled *Individual Ability* as it included positive content items of all three groups such as “intelligent” and “competent.” The third factor, labeled *Welfare Mother*, was comprised of seven items highlighting negative stereotypes of Black women such as “neglecting their families” and “selfish,” and accounted for 9% of the variance. The fourth factor was comprised of four items, accounting for 5% of the variance, and labeled *Pride*, as it included the “proud of themselves” item for all three groups, and the “respectful towards men” item for Black women. The fifth factor, comprised of three items accounting for 5%, was labeled *Jezebel Buck* as it included content for all three groups related to Blacks as “hypersexual.” The sixth factor, comprised of five items, was omitted due to a lack of

interpretability, as item content included a mix of positively and negatively valenced items for Blacks in general and Black men, as well as two items that were closely crossloaded, resulting in less than three items with the same valence and no crossloadings. Finally, the seventh factor included four items accounting for 5% of the variance and was labeled *Community Oriented*, as content referred to all three groups as “community-oriented” and Black men as “faithful to their partners.” Taken together, the resulting six factors accounted for 48% of the variance in Stereotype Scale scores. Internal consistency estimates, measured using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, were high, ranging from .71 to .91.

Communalities ranged from .33 to .87 for the *Philadelphia* sample. The first factor, comprised of ten items accounting for 13% of the variance, was labeled *Coon* as it included negative stereotypes of Blacks in general and Black men such as “lazy” and “ashamed of themselves.” The second factor, comprised of nine items accounting for 10% of the variance, was labeled *Community Oriented* as it included positive content items of all three groups such as “community oriented” and “hard working.” The third factor, comprised of four items accounting for 8% of the variance, was omitted due to inadequate internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient = .49). The fourth factor was comprised of seven items accounting for 9% of the variance, and labeled *Welfare Mother*, as it included items highlighting negative stereotypes of Black women such as “neglecting their families” and “selfish.” The fifth factor, comprised of four items accounting for 8% of the variance, was labeled *Individual Ability* as it included content for all three groups related to Blacks as “intelligent” and “competent.” The sixth factor, comprised of four items accounting for 6% of the variance, was labeled *Jezebel Buck* as

item content included “hypersexual” for all three groups and “selfish” for Blacks in general. Finally, the seventh factor was omitted due to a lack of at least three items meeting the pattern coefficient cutoff of .40 or higher. Taken together, the resulting five factors in the *Philadelphia* sample accounted for 45% of the variance in Stereotype Scale scores. Internal consistency estimates were high, ranging from .78 to .88.

In total, across samples there were five similar factors out of six total factors for the *Lansing* sample and five total for the *Philadelphia* sample. Within the *Coon* factor, eight items overlapped out of a potential ten for the *Philadelphia* sample and 11 for the *Lansing* sample. For the *Individual Ability* factor, all four items in the *Philadelphia* sample loaded in the *Lansing* sample, however the *Lansing* sample had an additional six items. The *Welfare Mother* factor had six items in common out of a potential seven items across samples. All three items for the *Jezebel Buck* factor in the *Lansing* sample matched the *Philadelphia* sample, with the *Philadelphia* sample only having only one additional item load. Finally, for the *Community Oriented* factor, three out of four items in the *Lansing* sample loaded in the *Philadelphia* sample, however the *Philadelphia* sample had six additional items load on that factor.

Table 2 includes item content, pattern coefficients, and communalities for both the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* sample’s one-factor models. Communalities ranged from .19 to .74 and .17 to .63 in the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* samples respectively. The factor in the *Lansing* sample contained 35 items accounting for 30% of the variance in the Stereotype Scale scales, whereas the factor in the *Philadelphia* sample contained 40 items accounting for 30% of the variance in scores. Item content for the one-factor model across samples reflected negative views of Blacks in general, Black men, and Black

women. Cronbach's alphas were .94 and .72 for the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* samples respectively. In total, samples had 32 item loadings in common out of a potential 35 items for the *Lansing* sample and 40 items for the *Philadelphia* sample.

Convergent Validity Results

Participants in the *Lansing* sample completed additional measures, allowing for the assessment of convergent validity. All participants in the *Lansing* sample completed the African Self-Consciousness Scale (Baldwin & Bell, 1985). Only a subset (112 couples) of the *Lansing* sample also completed the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS-B; Parham & Helms, 1985) and the Global Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis, 1983). As negative items are reversed scored, and the Likert scale ranges from 1 *strongly agree* to 5 *strongly disagree*, higher scores on the Stereotype Scale indicated more negative stereotypes, and lower endorsement of positive items. Thus, it was hypothesized that the identified factors from the Stereotype Scale would be positively associated with the pre-encounter and immersion subscales of the RIAS-B and positively associated with psychological distress as measured by the Global Severity Index (GSI). In contrast, factors were hypothesized to be negatively associated with the internalization subscale of the RIAS-B and the African Self-Consciousness Scale. Participants in both the *Lansing* and the *Philadelphia* samples completed the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier 1976), a measure of relationship satisfaction. It was hypothesized that identified factors from the Stereotype Scale would be negatively associated with scores on the DAS.

Table 3 highlights Pearson's r correlations between Stereotype Scale factors, racial identity as measured by the RIAS-B, and psychological distress as measured by the

GSI. Findings supported partially supported hypotheses as *Coon*, *Welfare Mother*, *Jezebel Buck* as well as the one-factor solution were all positively correlated with pre-encounter and immersion scales. *Individual Ability* and *Pride* factors were only positively correlated with the pre-encounter scale. Also in line with the stated hypothesis, *Individual Ability*, *Pride*, and *Community Oriented* factors, as well as the one-factor solution were negatively correlated with the internalization scale. In examining associations with the GSI, results partially supported predictions. The *Coon*, *Welfare Mother*, and *Jezebel Buck* factors were all positively correlated with GSI scores, whereas the *Individual Ability*, *Pride*, and *Community Oriented* factors were not significantly correlated with GSI scores. The one-factor model was also positively correlated with GSI Scores.

Associations between one- and seven-factor models and total ASCS scores were also tested via Pearson correlations in the entire *Lansing* sample. It was hypothesized that the identified factors would be negatively associated with ASCS scores. Results supported hypotheses, as negative associations were found between both the *Coon* and *Welfare Mother* factors and total ASCS scores, $r(327) = -.13, p = .02$ and $r(327) = -.12, p = .04$ respectively. In addition, the *Individual Ability* factor was also negatively associated with total ASCS scores and $r(327) = -.26, p = .001$. No other factors were significantly correlated with ASCS scores. Results indicated a significant negative correlation between the one-factor model and total ASCS scores $r(327) = -.144, p = .01$.

The seven-factor and one-factor models in the *Lansing* sample were also tested for convergent validity using the two-factor model of the ASCS. The first factor of the ASCS was labeled *Embracing African Heritage* and the second factor was labeled *Refusal to Deny African Heritage* (Bhagwat et al., 2012). Table 4 highlights Pearson's r

correlations of the Stereotype Scale seven-factor and one-factor models with the ASCS two-factor model. Support for negative associations between Stereotype Scale scores by factor and the ASCS was only found for the second factor, *Refusal to Deny African Heritage*. This was true across 4 factors and the one-factor model. Only the *Individual Ability* factor scores were associated with the first factor, *Embracing African Heritage*, of the ASCS.

In examining the associations between the Stereotype Scale scores and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) scores, results supported hypotheses but only for the *Lansing* sample. For the *Coon* factor in the *Lansing* sample, results indicated a significant negative association to DAS scores $r(327) = -.236, p = .001$. Scores on the *Welfare Mother* factor were also negatively correlated with DAS scores $r(327) = -.208, p = .001$. Results for the *Pride* and *Jezebel Buck* factors also indicated significant negative associations to DAS scores, $r(327) = -.145, p = .001$ and $r(327) = -.134, p = .02$ respectively. The *Community Oriented* factor was also negatively correlated to DAS scores $r(327) = -.148, p = .001$. Thus all factors, except for *Individual Ability*, were negatively correlated with DAS scores. Finally, significant negative correlations were found between scores on the DAS and the one-factor model, $r(327) = -.253, p = .001$. For the *Philadelphia* sample no factors were significantly related to total DAS scores.

Discussion

The current study examined the factor analytic structure of the Stereotype Scale scores using best practice recommendations and two separate data sets, as well as tested the convergent validity of the scale. Seven- and one- factor solutions were supported across the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* samples and exhibited good internal consistency.

The seven-factor solution exhibited remarkable consistency in factor retention across samples. In total five factors significantly overlapped in their content, namely the *Coon*, *Individual Ability*, *Welfare Mother*, *Jezebel Buck*, and *Community Oriented* factors. Notably, the *Welfare Mother* factor was the only one contain items specific to one gender, in this case women, across samples. One-factor solutions were also very consistent across samples. Convergent validity findings comparing the factors scores to racial identity, psychological distress, Afrocentricity, and relationship satisfaction scores provided support overall for the expected associations between the variables, although not for all factors.

Factor Solutions and Historical Portrayals of African Americans

Notably, across samples, the seven-factor model appears to be conceptually consistent with prominent negative stereotypes of African Americans that have a historic precedence. Negative stereotypes of African Americans arose out of slavery, dehumanizing African slaves and perpetuating views of African slaves as lazy, inferior, and amoral (Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008). Factors within the seven-factor model containing negatively valenced items reflect well-known stereotypes of African Americans from this era. The *Coon* factor is consistent with the historical coon stereotype of the African American as a buffoon who is lazy and weak (Bogle, 2002). Such beliefs served to mark enslaved Africans as inferior, and thus justify the need for control over them from slave masters (Goff et al., 2008). Characterized by overt sexual promiscuity (Stephen & Phillips, 2003), the *Jezebel Buck* factor highlights negative views around Black sexuality that came out of prevalent beliefs held about enslaved Africans that

justified their being raped by their White slave masters and bred with Black slave men to have children that became the property of the slave masters.

Only the *Welfare Mother* factor had item content specific to views about women only. This factor contained items endorsing views of African American women as lazy liars who are neglectful of their families. These items are consistent with the welfare mother stereotype, a relatively newer stereotype comprised of negative beliefs of African American women as lazy mothers who collect government assistance and have many children (Stephens & Phillips, 2003), which developed out of outrage over African American women receiving government assistance originally intended for White women widowed by war (Sklar, 1995). Thus, this stereotype served to justify limiting access to such programs. Given the prevalence of multiple forms of oppression in the United States (e.g. David & Derthick, 2014), perhaps the gender specific nature of the *Welfare Mother* factor also highlights the impact and intersection of double oppression, in this case racism and sexism, as there was no factor in either sample representing items solely about Black men.

In contrast, the items that loaded onto the *Community Oriented* and *Pride* factors reflected positive cultural values such as being connected to the community, having pride for oneself, and working hard for Blacks in general, Black men, and Black women. For the *Individual Ability* factor, item content represented positive views of capabilities. Research indicates that African Americans are documented as being both highly individualistic and highly collectivist in comparison to other cultures (Coon & Kemmelmeier, 2001), and thus item content within the *Community Oriented* and *Individual Ability* factors are in line with such findings. Furthermore, African Americans

often tend to turn to family members or informal community resources to cope with racism discrimination (e.g. Sanders Thompson, 2006). Thus, these factors seem to capture known cultural values of African Americans that relate to community and personal achievement.

Interestingly, the *Pride* factor was only supported in the *Lansing* sample. Items loading on this factor are consistent with research highlighting racial socialization and the resultant ethnic pride are cultural practices that often serve as protective factors in African American families, particularly in the face of racial discrimination (e.g. Wills et al., 2007). As a higher proportion of men than women across racial backgrounds are likely to cite race/ethnicity as the reason for discrimination (Kessler et al., 1999), this difference in the loading of pride-related items between samples may be related to the lower number of male participants in the *Philadelphia* sample. In particular, the *Philadelphia* sample was comprised of 101 women and 41 men, thus this sample may not accurately reflect the responses of men related to views of ethnic pride.

The one-factor model was also extremely consistent across the *Lansing* and *Philadelphia* samples, indicating that a one-factor solution is also an appropriate model for the Stereotype Scale scores. Item content highlighted negative views of all Blacks, and Black men and women. This suggests that the Stereotype Scale seems to capture a theorized unidimensional model of in-group stereotypical beliefs, consistent with current measures of internalized racism such as the NAD, in which support was found for the subscale capturing negative in-group beliefs for Blacks in general (Taylor & Gundy, 1996). Like the seven-factor models, the items represented are consistent with the same types of negative attributes that developed in slavery to justify the poor treatment of

slaves (Goff et al., 2008). Taken together, factors found across the two samples highlight that not only are stereotypical views from slavery are still prominent influences today, but that African Americans may internalize these views.

While the one-factor model is viable due to adequate internal consistency and sufficient pattern coefficients and item loadings, the seven-factor model seems a more appropriate fit overall. In particular, the seven-factor model was empirically derived from the combined usage of factor retention techniques. In addition, the seven-factor model also accounts for a greater proportion of the variance, accounting for 48% in the *Lansing* sample and 45% in the *Philadelphia* sample whereas the one-factor model only accounts for 30% of the variance in both samples.

Convergent Validity Findings

Across all analyses, results indicated support for the convergent validity of the Stereotype Scale with racial identity, Afrocentricity, psychological distress, and relationship satisfaction scales for most factors. Specifically, some of the identified factors were positively associated with the pre-encounter and immersion subscales of the RIAS-B and positively associated with psychological distress. Some factors were also negatively associated with the internalization subscale of the RIAS-B, the African Self-Consciousness Scale, and relationship satisfaction.

However there were a few notable findings that were contrary to predictions. In particular, the *Coon*, *Welfare Mother*, and *Jezebel Buck* factors were all positively correlated with GSI scores as expected, whereas the *Individual Ability*, *Pride*, and *Community Oriented* factors were not significantly correlated with GSI scores. Given that items on the *Coon*, *Welfare Mother*, and *Jezebel Buck* factors represent stereotypes with

more of a historic precedence that arose out of slavery, these kinds of beliefs may be more related to experiences of psychological distress than others. This suggests that the nature of in-group stereotypes maybe more complex and nuanced. In examining relationship satisfaction, support was found for negative associations between identified factors and DAS scores, but only in the *Lansing* sample. One explanation may be that *Lansing* sample included both partners in a commitment relationship whereas the *Philadelphia* sample did not, and thus partner dependency effects may account for this difference across samples.

Limitations and Future Directions

The use of two distinct samples allowed for the cross-validation of the factor structure of the Stereotype Scale scores, however there were some limitations. In particular, the *Lansing* sample contained both partners in a commitment relationship, thus the role of dependence effects in this data set cannot be accounted for. Within the *Philadelphia* sample there were less men ($n = 41$) than women ($n = 101$), indicating the need to replicate the EFA within a sample of men to further validate the factor structure identified in the *Philadelphia* sample. This difference in sample composition is a strength for female participants, in that within two different samples of women there were similar findings. However, there is less confidence in the findings for men given that the *Lansing* sample has partner dependency effects, and the *Philadelphia* sample had few men. In addition, as the participants in the *Philadelphia* sample did not complete additional measures assessing in-group racial beliefs, the convergent validity of the factors identified could not be assessed within this sample. Another limitation is that both samples, while from different areas, do not represent the entire United States, and thus it

is unclear if the factor solutions indicated here would differ in samples from the western or southern parts of the United States.

Despite the aforementioned limitations, the results of the EFA indicate that the Stereotype Scale is a promising comprehensive measure of stereotypes that are prominent in our society (e.g. Bogle, 2002; Stephen & Phillips, 2003), and have been embedded in African American history since slavery. In particular, it seems to adequately capture not only the multidimensional but unidimensional aspects of in-group stereotypes for African Americans. Given the associations of internalized racism with negative health outcomes (e.g. Chae et al., 2010; Kelly, 2004), these findings have important implications for future study. In particular, parsing out aspects of in-group stereotypes will allow for a more accurate assessment of the impact of such beliefs on the mental and physical health of African Americans. This is especially important given the finding that some factors were positively associated with psychological distress scores while others were not. Continued testing of the Stereotype Scale through the replication of EFA across more geographically distinct samples and through increasing rigorous methods such as Confirmatory Factor Analysis will be critical in determining the optimal utility of the scale overall, and its ability to increase our understanding of the role of internalized racism in African American health.

References

- Allen, R. L. & Hatchett, S. (1986). The media and social reality effects: Self and system orientations of Blacks. *Communication Research*, 13, 97-123.
- Bailey, T. M., Chung, Y. B., Williams, W. S., Singh, A. A., & Terrell, H. K. (2011). Development and validation of the Internalized Racial Oppression Scale for Black individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58, 481-493. doi: 10.1037/a0023585481
- Baldwin, J. A., & Bell, Y. R. (1985). The African Self-Consciousness Scale: An Africentric personality questionnaire. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 9, 61-68.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1950). Tests of significance in factor analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, 3, 77-85.
- Bellack, A. S., & Hersen, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Behavioral assessment: A practical handbook* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bhagwat, R., Kelly, S., & Lambert, M. C. (2012). Exploratory factor analysis of the African Self-Consciousness Scale scores. *Assessment*, 19, 65-76. doi: 0.1177/10731911111398314.
- Bogle, D. (2002). Toms, coons, mulattoes, mammies, and bucks: An interpretive history of blacks in American films (4th ed.). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Bonett, D. G., & Price, R. M. (2005). Inferential methods for the tetrachoric correlation coefficient. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 30, 213-225.
- Chae, D. H., Lincoln, K. D., Adler, N. E., & Syme, S. L. (2010). Do experiences of racial discrimination predict cardiovascular disease among African American men? The moderating role of internalized negative racial attitudes. *Social Science &*

- Medicine*, 22, 1182-1188. Chapman, A. B. (2007). In search of love and commitment. In H.P. McAdoo (Ed.), *Black families* (pp. 258–296). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chestnut, C. (2009). *The Study of Internalized Stereotypes among African American couples*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Cokley, K. O. (2002). Testing Cross's revised racial identity model: An examination of the relationship between racial identity and internalized racialism. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49(4), 476-483.
- Cokley, K. O. (2005). Racial(ized) identity, ethnic identity, and Afrocentric values: Conceptual and methodological challenges in understanding African American identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 517–526. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.517
- Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2001). Cultural orientations in the United States: (Re)Examining differences among ethnic groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(3), 348-364.
- Cort, M. A., Tull, E. S., Gwebu, K., Dlamini, P., Pinkney, E., Gramby, E., Gwebu, E. T. (2009). Education and internalized racism in sociopolitical context: Zimbabwe and Swaziland. *The Social Science Journal*, 46, 644–655. doi:10.1016/j.sosci.2009.08.001
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10, 1-9.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests.

Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). The negro-to-black conversion experience. *Black World*, 20, 13-27.

David, E. J. R., & Derthick, A. O. (2014). What is internalized oppression, and so what?

In E. J. R. David (Ed.), *Internalized Oppression: The Psychology of Marginalized Groups* (pp. 1–30). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Derogatis, L. R. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: An Introductory report.

Psychological Medicine, 13, 595-605.

Derogatis, L. R., & Fitzpatrick, M. (2004). The SCL-90-R, the Brief Symptom Inventory

(BSI) and the BSI-18. In M. E. Maruish (Ed.), *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcomes assessment* (3rd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 1-41). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Donovan, R. A. (2007). To blame or not to blame: Influences of target race and observer

sex on rape blame attribution. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 722-736.

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating

the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.

Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and

refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 7, 286-299.

Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human:

Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences.

- Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 292-306. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.292
- Gupta, A., Szymanski, D. M., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). The “model minority myth.” Internalized racialism of positive stereotypes as correlates of psychological distress, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 2, 101-114. doi: 10.1037/a0024183.
- Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 7, 191-205.
- Hines, P. M., & Boyd-Franklin, N. (2005). African American families. In M. McGoldrick, N. Garcia-Preto & J. Giordano (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (3rd ed., pp. 88-101). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35, 401-416.
- Kelly, S. (2004). Underlying Components of Scores Assessing African Americans’ Racial Perspectives. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 37, 28-40.
- Kelly, S., & Floyd, F. J. (2001). The effects of negative racial stereotypes and Afrocentricity on Black couple relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, 110-123.
- Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K. D., & Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40, 208–230. doi:10.2307/2676349

- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 4(1), 84-99.
- Marks, B., Settles, I. H., Cooke, D. Y., Morgan, L., & Sellers, R. M. (2004). African American racial identity: A review of contemporary models and measures. In R.L. Jones (Ed.), *Black Psychology* (4th ed., pp. 383-404). Hampton, VA: Cobb & Henry.
- Panter, A. T., Swygert, Kimberly A., Dahlstrom, W. G., & Tanaka, J. S. (1997). Factor analytic approaches to personality item-level data, *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 68, 561-589. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6803_6
- Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 143-147.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sanders Thompson, V. L. (2006). Coping responses and the experience of discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 1198–1214. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00038.x
- Sklar, H. (1995). The upperclass and mothers in the hood. In M. L. Anderson & P. Hill Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (2nd ed., pp. 123–133). New York, NY: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 15–27.

- Stephens, D. P., & Phillips, L. D. (2003). Freaks, gold diggers, divas, and dykes: The sociohistorical development of adolescent African American women's sexual scripts. *Sexuality & Culture*, Winter, 3–49.
- Stokes, J. E., Murray, C. B., Peacock, M. J., & Kaiser, R. T. (1994). Assessing the reliability, factor structure, and validity of the African self-consciousness scale in a general population of African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 20, 62–74.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Taylor, J., & Grundy, C. (1996). Measuring Black internalization of White stereotypes about African Americans: The Naganolitization Scale. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Handbook of tests and measurements of Black populations* (Vol. 2, pp. 217–226). Hampton, VA: Cobb & Henry.
- Thomas, A. J., Witherspoon, K. M., Speight, S. L. (2004) Toward the development of the Stereotypic Roles for Black Women Scale. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 30, 426–442. doi: 10.1177/0095798404266061

Table 1

Seven-Factor Solution Pattern Coefficients and Communalities for the Lansing and Philadelphia Samples

| Item | LC | LIA | LWM | LP | LJB | LCO | L h^2 | PC | PCO | PWM | PIA | PJB | P h^2 |
|------|------------|------------|------|------------|------------|------------|---------|------------|------------|------|------------|------------|---------|
| 1 | .79 | -.08 | -.07 | .28 | .10 | -.05 | -.69 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | .72 | .10 | .08 | -.26 | .00 | .21 | .71 | .69 | -.08 | .12 | .08 | .33 | .78 |
| 3 | .57 | .07 | .29 | -.24 | -.14 | .09 | .62 | .69 | .18 | .14 | -.16 | .21 | .78 |
| 4 | .57 | .10 | .32 | -.17 | -.08 | -.13 | .79 | .63 | .08 | .03 | .04 | .13 | .77 |
| 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -.24 | .55 | .09 | .24 | .00 | .66 |
| 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -.03 | .40 | .13 | .13 | -.36 | .35 |
| 7 | .52 | -.17 | -.03 | .09 | -.04 | .23 | .52 | .73 | -.10 | .20 | .30 | .07 | .58 |
| 8 | .55 | .03 | .19 | -.04 | .01 | .03 | .54 | .62 | -.16 | .00 | -.01 | .05 | .47 |
| 9 | .08 | .12 | -.21 | .69 | .02 | .02 | .56 | .08 | .56 | -.06 | .04 | .11 | .64 |
| 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .22 | -.11 | .17 | -.07 | .52 | .58 |
| 11 | -.04 | .01 | -.03 | -.08 | .02 | .82 | .57 | .04 | .62 | -.07 | -.11 | -.04 | .33 |
| 12 | .06 | .61 | -.14 | .10 | .13 | .07 | .43 | .13 | .62 | -.09 | .37 | .08 | .63 |
| 13 | .07 | .13 | -.01 | -.06 | .82 | -.01 | .74 | .40 | .09 | .11 | -.05 | .62 | .74 |
| 14 | .06 | .75 | -.14 | .01 | .14 | -.20 | .48 | .05 | .16 | -.01 | .61 | -.18 | .61 |
| 15 | .81 | -.12 | .02 | .23 | -.02 | .06 | .73 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 16 | .75 | .11 | .09 | -.11 | .03 | .06 | .82 | .59 | .01 | .05 | -.19 | .06 | .65 |
| 18 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .48 | -.04 | .09 | .00 | .10 | .60 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----|
| 19 | .14 | .48 | -.11 | .15 | -.04 | .00 | .54 | -.31 | .51 | .11 | .31 | .04 | .79 |
| 21 | .41 | -.17 | .01 | .27 | -.13 | -.04 | .44 | .49 | -.22 | -.01 | .00 | -.17 | .47 |
| 22 | .41 | .12 | .12 | .20 | .07 | -.16 | .49 | .71 | -.24 | .13 | -.03 | -.17 | .87 |
| 23 | -.04 | .07 | -.12 | .83 | .00 | -.08 | .65 | -.15 | .56 | .16 | .01 | .33 | .52 |
| 24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .56 | -.25 | -.02 | .06 | .18 | .56 |
| 25 | .03 | -.06 | -.25 | .01 | .00 | .81 | .67 | .03 | .72 | -.07 | -.34 | -.04 | .54 |
| 26 | -.11 | .69 | .05 | -.04 | .02 | .08 | .56 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | -.03 | -.03 | -.07 | .14 | .88 | .02 | .83 | .18 | -.13 | .05 | -.02 | .51 | .69 |
| 28 | .04 | .80 | -.13 | .06 | .19 | -.14 | .59 | -.07 | .02 | .01 | .72 | -.14 | .61 |
| 30 | -.27 | .41 | .06 | .10 | -.01 | .13 | .29 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 33 | .07 | -.10 | -.25 | .17 | .03 | .42 | .32 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 34 | .46 | -.12 | .26 | .38 | .09 | .00 | .61 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 35 | .32 | .05 | .67 | -.10 | .11 | -.09 | .77 | .28 | .23 | .61 | -.16 | .02 | .73 |
| 36 | .27 | .10 | .74 | -.14 | -.07 | -.07 | .65 | .19 | .04 | .56 | -.05 | .02 | .49 |
| 37 | .24 | .03 | .66 | .10 | -.02 | -.21 | .78 | .33 | .10 | .48 | -.11 | .13 | .66 |
| 38 | .02 | .53 | .20 | .09 | .06 | .03 | .51 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 39 | -.09 | .44 | .24 | .11 | -.03 | .16 | .51 | .07 | .03 | -.50 | .31 | -.09 | .49 |
| 40 | .13 | -.10 | .63 | .08 | -.02 | -.01 | .49 | .24 | .02 | .60 | .08 | .07 | .51 |
| 41 | .15 | .08 | .64 | .01 | -.05 | -.05 | .51 | .26 | -.11 | .68 | .06 | -.01 | .65 |
| 42 | -.02 | .12 | .25 | .61 | -.04 | .03 | .60 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 43 | -.05 | -.06 | .60 | -.02 | .10 | -.03 | .41 | -.14 | .01 | .73 | .05 | .22 | .58 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|------|------------|------|------------|------------|-----|
| 44 | .11 | .26 | .08 | -.14 | -.02 | .58 | .48 | .08 | .63 | -.27 | -.01 | -.25 | .52 |
| 45 | -.08 | .71 | .13 | .08 | -.04 | .03 | .64 | .13 | .17 | -.26 | .63 | .00 | .60 |
| 46 | -.01 | .15 | .15 | -.12 | .84 | -.01 | .71 | -.06 | -.04 | .09 | -.12 | .60 | .47 |
| 47 | .22 | .77 | .02 | -.10 | -.05 | -.04 | .64 | -.09 | -.22 | -.05 | .79 | -.04 | .62 |
| 48 | .00 | -.12 | .41 | .02 | .26 | -.02 | .34 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 51 | -.22 | -.03 | .35 | .42 | -.04 | .07 | .34 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Note. LC = Lansing sample, *Coon* factor; LIA = Lansing sample, *Individual Ability* factor; LWM = Lansing sample, *Welfare Mother* factor; LP = Lansing sample, *Pride* factor; LJB = Lansing sample, *Jezebel Buck* sample; LCO = Lansing sample, *Community Oriented* factor; L h^2 = Lansing sample communalities; PC = Philadelphia sample, *Coon* factor; PCO = Philadelphia sample, *Community Oriented* factor; PWM = Philadelphia sample, *Welfare Mother* factor; PIA = Philadelphia sample, *Individual Ability* factor; PJB = Philadelphia sample, *Jezebel Buck* factor; P h^2 = Philadelphia sample communalities. Pattern coefficients $\geq .40$ are bolded.

Table 2

One-Factor Solution Item Content, Pattern Coefficients, and Communalities for Lansing and Philadelphia Samples

| Item | LF1 | L h^2 | PF1 | P h^2 |
|--|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| 1. Most Black people are ashamed of themselves | .66 | .43 | .34 | .12 |
| 2. Most Black people are lazy | .76 | .58 | .76 | .58 |
| 3. Most Black people neglect their families | .74 | .55 | .77 | .59 |
| 4. Most Black people are lying or trifling | .83 | .70 | .78 | .61 |
| 5. Most Black people are hard working | .56 | .31 | .65 | .42 |
| 6. Most Black people do for others | .53 | .28 | .43 | .18 |
| 7. Most Black people give up easily | .64 | .41 | .63 | .40 |
| 8. Most Black people are weak | .72 | .52 | .60 | .36 |
| 9. Most Black people are proud of themselves | .36 | .13 | .33 | .11 |
| 10. Most Black people are selfish | .64 | .41 | .62 | .39 |
| 11. Most Black people are community oriented | .31 | .10 | .32 | .11 |
| 12. Most Black people are intelligent | .36 | .13 | .41 | .17 |
| 13. Most Black people are hypersexual | .51 | .26 | .64 | .41 |
| 14. Most Black people are competent (capable) | .36 | .13 | .63 | .40 |
| 15. Most Black men are ashamed of themselves | .71 | .51 | .49 | .24 |
| 16. Most Black men are lazy | .86 | .74 | .78 | .61 |
| 17. Most Black men neglect their families | .78 | .61 | .69 | .47 |
| 18. Most Black men are lying or trifling | .83 | .69 | .72 | .52 |
| 19. Most Black men are hard working | .56 | .31 | .74 | .54 |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| 20. Most Black men do for others | .53 | .28 | .46 | .21 |
| 21. Most Black men give up easily | .55 | .30 | .55 | .30 |
| 22. Most Black men are weak | .68 | .46 | .80 | .63 |
| 23. Most Black men are proud of themselves | .30 | .09 | .32 | .10 |
| 24. Most Black men are selfish | .60 | .36 | .66 | .44 |
| 25. Most Black men are community oriented | .36 | .13 | .36 | .13 |
| 26. Most Black men are intelligent | .38 | .15 | .51 | .26 |
| 27. Most Black men are hypersexual | .50 | .25 | .65 | .42 |
| 28. Most Black men are competent (capable) | .43 | .19 | .59 | .35 |
| 29. Most Black men are chauvinistic | .37 | .14 | .21 | .04 |
| 30. Most Black men are charismatic | .10 | .01 | .17 | .03 |
| 31. Most Black men are dominating towards women | .45 | .20 | .29 | .08 |
| 32. Most Black men are respectful towards women | .38 | .14 | .44 | .19 |
| 33. Most Black men are faithful to their partners | .30 | .09 | .43 | .19 |
| 34. Most Black women are ashamed of themselves | .66 | .43 | .58 | .34 |
| 35. Most Black women are lazy | .77 | .60 | .69 | .48 |
| 36. Most Black women neglect their families | .65 | .43 | .59 | .35 |
| 37. Most Black women are lying or trifling | .80 | .64 | .74 | .55 |
| 38. Most Black women are hard working | .49 | .24 | .56 | .31 |
| 39. Most Black women do for others | .46 | .21 | .54 | .29 |
| 40. Most Black women give up easily | .60 | .36 | .58 | .34 |
| 41. Most Black women are weak | .62 | .38 | .60 | .35 |
| 42. Most Black women are proud of themselves | .44 | .20 | .35 | .13 |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|------------|-----|
| 43. Most Black women are selfish | .52 | .27 | .44 | .19 |
| 44. Most Black women are community oriented | .37 | .14 | .45 | .20 |
| 45. Most Black women are intelligent | .38 | .15 | .50 | .25 |
| 46. Most Black women are hypersexual | .45 | .20 | .42 | .18 |
| 47. Most Black women are competent (capable) | .47 | .22 | .48 | .23 |
| 48. Most Black women are emasculating | .46 | .21 | .43 | .19 |
| 49. Most Black women are competitive | .02 | .00 | -.09 | .01 |
| 50. Most Black women are dominating towards men | .32 | .10 | .36 | .13 |
| 51. Most Black women are respectful towards men | .30 | .09 | .41 | .17 |
| 52. Most Black women are feminine | .22 | .05 | .30 | .09 |

Note. LF1 = One factor solution for *Lansing* sample; L h^2 = *Lansing* sample

communalities; PF1 = One factor solution for *Philadelphia* sample; P h^2 = *Philadelphia*

sample communalities. Pattern coefficients $\geq .40$ are bolded.

Table 3

Pearson's r correlations of Stereotype Scale Seven-factor and One-factor Model Scores with Racial Identity and Psychological Distress Scores in Lansing Subsample (n = 221)

| Factors | Scales Assessing Convergent Validity | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------|
| | Pre-Encounter RI | Immersion RI | Internalization RI | GSI |
| Stereotype Scale Seven-factor Solution | | | | |
| Coon | .53** | .34** | -.10 | .51** |
| Individual Ability | .22** | -.04 | -.30** | -.00 |
| Welfare Mother | .46** | .41** | -.05 | .55** |
| Pride | .21** | -.05 | -.18** | .07 |
| Jezebel Buck | .28** | .40** | -.03 | .33** |
| Community Oriented | .09 | -.09 | -.25** | .04 |
| One-factor Solution | | | | |
| | .54** | .38** | -.15* | .51** |

Note. GSI = Global Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis, 1983); RI

= Racial Identity as assessed with the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Parham &

Helms, 1985). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Pearson's r correlations of the Stereotype Scale Seven-factor and One-factor Model

Scores with ASCSC Two-factor Model in Lansing Sample (n =329)

| Factor | Scale Assessing Convergent Validity | |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | ASCS Factor 1 | ASCS Factor 2 |
| | <i>Embracing African</i> | <i>Refusal to Deny African</i> |
| | <i>Heritage</i> | <i>Heritage</i> |
| | Stereotype Scale Seven-factor Solution | |
| Coon | .01 | -.34** |
| Individual Ability | -.20** | -.22** |
| Welfare Mother | -.02 | -.29** |
| Pride | .02 | -.01 |
| Jezebel Buck | .11 | -.17** |
| Community Oriented | -.07 | -.04 |
| | One-factor Solution | |
| | -.01 | -.33** |

Note. ASCS Factor 1 = African Self-Conscious Scale (Baldwin & Bell, 1985), Factor 1

Embracing African Heritage; ASCS Factor 2 = African Self-Conscious Scale, Factor 2

Refusal to Deny African Heritage (Bhagwat et al., 2012).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.