This is a repository copy of *Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) Expansion: Measuring Racial, Religious, and National Aspects of Sense of Ethnic Identity Within the United Kingdom*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/84514/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) Expansion: Racial, Religious, and

National Aspects

of Sense of Ethnic Identity within the United Kingdom

Stanley O Gaines Jr, William Marelich, David Bunce, Toby Robertson and

Barlow Wright

Abstract

In the present studies, we examined the degree to which racial, religious, and national aspects of individuals' sense of ethnic identity stand as interrelated yet distinct constructs. Results of exploratory factor analyses in Study 1 ($n = 272$) revealed that a three-factor model specifying racial, religious, and national identities yielded optimal fit to correlational data from an expanded, 36-item version of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Roberts et al., 1999), although results left room for improvement in model fit. Subsequently, results of confirmatory factor analyses in Study 2 (n = 291) revealed that, after taking covariance among the items into account, a six-factor model specifying exploration and commitment dimensions within each of the racial, religious, and national identity constructs provided optimal fit. Implications for the utility of Goffman's (1963b) interactionist role theory and Erikson's (1968) ego psychology for understanding the full complexity of felt ethnic identity are discussed.

KEYWORDS: Ethnic identity, MEIM, national identity, racial identity, religious identity.

MEIM Expansion: Racial, Religious, and National Aspects

of Sense of Ethnic Identity within the United Kingdom

Three grossly different types of stigma may be mentioned. First there are abominations of the body – the various physical deformities. Next there are blemishes of individual character perceived as weak will, domineering or unnatural passions, treacherous and rigid beliefs, and dishonesty. . . . Finally there are the tribal stigmas of race, nation, and religion, these being stigma that can be transmitted through lineages and equally contaminate all members of a family. . . .

-Erving Goffman,

Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity (1963b, p. 14)

According to Goffman (1963b), *ego identity* (also termed *sense of identity*; see Erikson, 1968) is "the subjective sense of [one's] own situation and [one's] own continuity and character that an individual comes to obtain as a result of [one's] various social experiences" (p. 129). Many of the social experiences that contribute to an individual's sense of identity reflect the individual's *ethnicity*, which Markus (2008) defined as "…a dynamic set of historically derived and institutionalized ideas and practices that (1) allows people to identify or to be identified with groupings of people on the basic of presumed (and usually claimed) commonalities including language, history, nation or region of origin, customs, ways of being, religion, names, physical appearance, and/or genealogy or ancestry; (2) can be a source of meaning, action, and identity; and (3) confers a sense of belonging, pride, and motivation" (p. 654). Combining these definitions of ego identity and ethnicity, we define *sense of ethnic identity* as the subjective sense of one's own situation and one's own continuity and character that an individual comes to obtain as a result of those social experiences

that reflect the individual's thoughts, feelings, and behavior toward the biologically and/or culturally defined group(s) to which he or she presumably belongs (consistent with Verkuyten, 2005, p. 198).

Goffman specifically referred to "race" (e.g., Goffman, 1969, p. 97-99), "religion" (e.g., Goffman, 1959, p. 169), and "nationality" (e.g., Goffman, 1963a, p. 99) as three distinct aspects of ethnicity. Moreover, Goffman (1963b) argued that when individuals are categorized as members of racial, religious, and/or national minority groups by a given society, those individuals are more likely than not to be stigmatized by individuals who are not members of those ethnic minority groups. Despite the impressive array of coping mechanisms that racial, religious, and/or national minority group members may employ as social performers within the larger society (e.g., attributions toward audience members' stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination), ethnic minority group members may suffer negative social-psychological consequences when they fail to convince audience members to view them as they view themselves (e.g., short-term, if not long-term, damage to intergroup relations with non-stigmatized persons or "normals" who continue to hold the balance of power within a given society; Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998).

In the present studies, drawing upon Goffman's (1963b) interactionist role theory, we examine the extent to which racial, religious, and national identities exist as three separate yet intertwined aspects of individuals' sense of ethnic identity. A review of several chapters (i.e., Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith, 2012; Swann & Buhrmester, 2012; Schlenker, 2012; Tangney & Tracy, 2012; Walton, Paunesku, & Dweck, 2012) from the *Handbook of Self and Identity* (edited by Leary & Tangney, 2012) and several chapters (i.e., Bamberg, De Fina, & Schiffrin, 2011; Burkitt, 2011; Hitlin, 2011; Dittmar, 2011; Serpe & Stryker, 2011; Vignoles, Schwartz, & Luyckx,

2011) from the *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research* (edited by Schwartz, Luyckx, & Vignoles, 2011) reveals that Goffman's interactionist role theory is highly relevant to identity theorists' understanding of identity development in general. However, we do not know of any previous studies in which Goffman's interactionist role theory has been applied to identity theorists' understanding of ethnic identity development in particular.

Goffman's Interactionist Role Theory

Goffman's (1959) *interactionist role theory* has its origins in Mead's (1934) dual perspectives of role theory and symbolic interactionism (Stryker & Statham, 1985). According to *role theory*, societal influences are reflected in individuals' behavior over time; in turn, individuals' behavior is reflected in individuals' personalities over time. By the same token, according to *symbolic interactionism*, individuals maintain some degree of free will, such that individuals' personalities are reflected in individuals' behavior over time; in turn, individuals' behavior can shape entire societies over time. Goffman's interactionist role theory emphasizes individuals' efforts at expressing their personalities through their behaviour (and, thus, attempting to persuade audience members to view them as they view themselves), even as societal influences potentially constrain individuals' behavior (and, consequently, threaten to constrain individuals' personality development).

Goffman's (1963b) interactionist role theory also proposes that members of racial, religious, and national minority groups are more likely to encounter difficulties in counteracting societal constraints on their behavior and, thus, in successfully expressing their views of themselves than are individuals who are not members of racial, religious, or national minority groups (Jones, 1997). Even if members of racial, religious, and national minority groups personally reject negative societal

stereotypes that persist regarding their ingroups, ethnic minority group members may be vulnerable to *stereotype threat* (a process by which minority group members' concern about acting in a manner consistent with the stereotype impairs minority group members' performance on achievement-related tasks; Steele & Aronson, 1995). Although the concept of stereotype threat can be applied to individuals whose group constitutes a numerical majority but a psychological minority (e.g., women in various Western societies; Brown, 1986), the concept of stereotype threat may be associated most frequently with those individuals whose group constitutes a numerical *and* psychological minority, such as ethnic minority group members (e.g., Black persons in various Western societies; Jones, 1997).

Racial Identity as a Core Aspect of Sense of Ethnic Identity

Goffman (1959) distinguished between the *setting* (i.e., attributes of the physical and social environment) and the *personal front* (i.e., attributes of the actor) as aspects of an actor's *front* (i.e., "…that part of the individual's performance which regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those who observe the performance" [p. 19]). Among all of the "tribal stigmas" that Goffman (1963b) identified, racial minority status emerges as the most readily discredited attribute that individuals might possess (Jones, 1997). Consequently, actors who are members of racial minority groups may find that they have particular difficulty convincing audience members (especially, but not exclusively, audience members who are not members of racial minority groups) to view actors as the actors believe that they should be viewed (Howard, 2000). For example, a London-born Black woman might find that her initially straightforward answer to the question "Where are you from?" evolves into a lengthy defense of her "Britishness" after one of her London-born, White male conversation partners not only questions her claim to

British citizenship (e.g., "But where are your *parents* from?") but also questions her

loyalty to the reigning British monarch. Even U.S. President Barack Obama, whose

election was hailed by some observers as proof that the United States is becoming a

"post-racial" society, was forced to defend his "Americanness" in the wake of claims

from "birthers" that President Obama was really a constitution-defying (and possibly

Socialist) Kenyan citizen (R. H. King, 2011; for everyday examples concerning some

White Americans' challenges to the "Americanness" of racial minority group

members in the United States, see Devos, Huynh, & Banaji, 2012; and Licata,

Sanchez-Mazas, & Green, 2011). Although some Black athletes (e.g., Thierry Henry,

Michael Jordan, Rolando) seemingly have escaped the negative consequences of

stigmatization, and although we do not wish to overstate our point regarding the

perniciousness of stigmatization against Blacks, we argue that even among Black

athletes, racial identity development occurs in response to stigmatization (e.g.,

Michael Jordan has been perceived as consciously avoiding engagement in social

activism, in order to achieve his lucrative yet nonthreatening celebrity status;

Agyemang, 2012).

Markus (2008) defined *race* as "a dynamic set of historically derived and

institutionalized ideas and practices that (1) sorts people into ethnic groups according

to perceived physical and behavioral human characteristics; (2) associates differential

value, power, and privilege with these characteristics and establishes a social status

ranking among the different groups; and (3) emerges (a) when groups are perceived to

pose a threat (political, economic, or cultural) to each other's world view or way of

life; and/or (b) to justify the denigration and exploitation (past, current, or future) of,

and prejudice toward, other groups" (p. 654). Markus's definition of race makes it

clear that race is part and parcel of individuals' ethnicity (consistent with Landrine &

Klonoff, 1996, p. 9). Drawing upon Markus's definition of race and our own definition of ethnic identity, we define *racial identity* as the subjective sense of one's own situation and one's own continuity and character that an individual comes to obtain as a result of those social experiences that reflect the individual's thoughts, feelings, and behavior toward those ethnic groups that are defined primarily on the basis of perceived physical characteristics, and to which he or she presumably belongs. Thus, we view racial identity as a core aspect of an individual's sense of ethnic identity. However, the question of whether the construct of racial identity can be *subsumed* within the broader construct of sense of ethnic identity (thus implying that the conceptualization and measurement of sense of ethnic identity among members of various ethnic groups should take priority over the conceptualization and measurement of racial identity among members of a particular racial group) is a matter of ongoing debate (e.g., Cokley, 2007; Helms, 2007; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Like Phinney and Onwughalu (1996), we contend that the same scale can be used to measure racial identity among individuals who members of racial minority groups *and* among individuals who are not members of racial minority groups; yet unlike Phinney and Onwughalu, we also contend that individuals' sense of ethnic identity is not defined *solely* by individuals' racial identity (and, in fact, additional aspects of individuals' sense of ethnic identity should be conceptualized and measured as separate constructs).

Religious Identity as Distinct from (yet Related to) Racial Identity

Goffman (1963b) distinguished between *discredited* actors (i.e., actors whose stigma are not easily concealed) and *discreditable* actors (i.e., actors whose stigma are easily concealed but could become discredited if their stigma were made known to audience members; Major & O'Brien, 2005). Members of racial minority groups are

more likely than not to be discredited by virtue of their devalued *biological* attributes. Conversely, members of religious minority groups are discreditable, but are not as likely to be discredited upon their entrance upon an interpersonal stage, by virtue of their devalued *cultural* attributes (see Cohen, 2009). Of course, members of religious minority groups may be discredited (e.g., to the extent that Skih men within the United Kingdom choose to wear turbans in public settings, they can be regarded as discredited actors) as well as discreditable (e.g., to the extent that Sikh men within the United Kingdom choose to immerse themselves in Sikh scripture in private settings, they can be regarded as discreditable actors; see Mandair, 2007). Furthermore, religious minority group members' decisions to express their religious group membership via external appearance as well as internal conviction -- despite the threat of stigmatization within the society at large -- may be considered as processes that contribute individuals' *achieved* identity (i.e., the aspect or aspects of identity that individuals actively choose for themselves), which is distinct from individuals' *ascribed* identity (i.e., the aspect or aspects of identity that are chosen for individuals and may be adopted passively by individuals; see Baumeister, 1997).

Ellor and McGregor (2011) defined *religion* as "[an] institution of... believers" (p. 277). Combining Ellor and McGregor's definition of religion with our own definition of ethnic identity, we define *religious identity* as the subjective sense of one's own situation and one's own continuity and character that an individual comes to obtain as a result of those social experiences that reflect the individual's thoughts, feelings, and behavior toward those ethnic groups that are defined primarily on the basis of the faith-based institution to which he or she presumably belongs. Religious identity has not been received nearly as much attention from scholars within the field of ethnic psychology as has racial identity (see Frable, 1997), although the related

concept of *spiritual identity* (i.e., the subjective sense of one's own situation and one's own continuity and character that an individual comes to obtain as a result of those social experiences that reflect the individual's search for meaning in life and is not necessarily associated with religion *per se*; Sinnott, 2001) increasingly has been the subject of theorizing and research outside the field of ethnic psychology (for reviews, see MacDonald, 2011; Roehhlkepartain, Benson, & Scales, 2011). Part of the problem regarding ethnic psychologists' lack of attention toward religious identity may be that racial identity (but not religious identity) often is treated as synonymous with sense of ethnic identity (e.g., Phinney, 1996). However, just as individuals' racial and religious group memberships may covary (e.g., in the United Kingdom, most White/European-descent persons who claim a religious group membership are Christians; whereas most Asian-descent persons who claim a religious group membership are *not* Christians; U.K. Office for National Statistics, 2006), so too may individuals' racial and religious identities covary, as dual aspects of individuals' ethnicity (Cadge & Ecklund, 2007).

National Identity as Distinct from (yet Related to) Racial and Religious Identities

Goffman (1963b) did not elaborate on distinctions among discreditable actors as a function of type of social group. Nevertheless, one may distinguish between those discreditable actors whose point of reference is a stigmatized faith-based institution (i.e., members of *religious* minority groups); and those discreditable actors whose point of reference is a stigmatized state-based institution (i.e., members of *national* minority groups, or those individuals whose immigrant status prevents them from receiving the full set of rights and privileges that are afforded to native-born citizens within a given society; Joly, 2012). Of course, as is the case for members of religious minority groups who seek to affirm their religious identities (e.g., Sikh men

in the United Kingdom who choose to wear turbans in public settings), members of national minority groups may consciously adopt discrediting characteristics in order to affirm their national identities (e.g., Jamaican women in the United Kingdom who choose to wear clothing displaying the Jamaican flag in public settings; Nazroo & Karlsen, 2003). In practice, the distinction between religious and national identities often is blurred: Within the ostensibly multicultural United Kingdom, many native-born British persons view members of national minority groups as "not really British" because of national minority group members' perceived lack of Christian beliefs, not because of national minority group members' immigrant status *per se* (Storm, 2011).

Phinney and Ong (2007) noted that national identity is distinct from other types of ethnic identity. Indeed, Schwartz and colleagues (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2012) have adapted Phinney's MEIM (R. Roberts et al., 1999) to measure individuals' national (and specifically American) identity. However, just as individuals' racial, religious, and national group memberships may covary (e.g., in the United Kingdom, most Jews are White and either have emigrated themselves or have families who have emigrated from other European nations; whereas most Muslims are *not* White and have either emigrated themselves or have families who have emigrated from various Asian or African nations; U.K. Office for National Statistics, 2006), so too may individuals' racial, religious, and national identities covary (Howard, 2000).

The United Kingdom as a Societal Context for Examining the Multidimensional Nature of Sense of Ethnic Identity

Goffman (1963b) did not comment specifically on racial, religious, or national identities (let alone developmental themes of exploration or commitment) among individuals within the United Kingdom. Several years earlier, when he *did* comment on individuals' identities within the United Kingdom (e.g., Goffman, 1959), Goffman

alluded to *class* identities (Menand, 2009), not ethnic identities. However, in later years, Goffman (1982) not only acknowledged race and class as separate (albeit related) sources of identity development but also focused squarely on ethnicity (including nationality alongside race) as a source of identity development by providing an example of persons of "West Indian" descent (a term that covers individuals from several English-speaking Caribbean nations) using the annual Notting Hill carnival in London as the venue for galvanizing collective, "multi-ethnic" (p. 10) political activism (thus expressing their sense of ethnic identity in overt behavior with the goal of changing intergroup relations within British society). Although socioeconomic class might be considered relevant to culture (Cohen, 2009), we view socioeconomic class as a covariate (rather than a component) of individuals' sense of ethnic identity.

The United States currently is undergoing a rapid transformation toward a society in which no single racial group constitutes a majority (although White persons still constitute a plurality and generally maintain the balance of political power; see Slocum & Y.-T. Lee, 2010). Thus, at least with regard to race, one could argue that the traditional minority-majority distinction that Goffman (1963b) promoted is no longer relevant in the United States. However, Goffman's minority-majority distinction remains relevant to understanding intergroup relations within the United Kingdom – a nation in which two-thirds of individuals are native-born White Christians (U.K. Office for National Statistics, 2006).

Goals of Study 1

In Study 1, we tested the following hypotheses concerning an expanded, 36-item version of the MEIM (R. Roberts et al., 1999): (a) A three-factor solution with separate dimensions of racial, religious, and national aspects of individuals' sense of

ethnic identity will yield optimal fit to correlations among item scores. (b) Scores on the three dimensions will be significantly and positively intercorrelated. We tested these hypotheses via exploratory factor analyses with maximum likelihood solutions (S. du Toit, M. du Toit, Mels, & Cheng, 2006), using PRELIS 2.72 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2005b).

Study 1

Method

  Participants. Participants in Study 1 represent a convenience sample, all of whom were at least 18 years of age and were recruited as volunteers by members of the research team outside as well as within Brunel University, but generally across a wide variety of settings within the West London area (following Gaines, Bunce, Robertson, & Wright, 2010). A total of 272 individuals (122 men, 149 women, and 1 individual who did not report his or her gender) comprised the sample for Study 1. The mean age of participants in Study 1 was 29.16 years (*SD* = 12.94 years).

  The racial, religious, and national group classifications that we employed in Study 1 were the same classifications that are used by the U.K. Office for National Statistics (2006; see also Gaines, Bunce, Robertson, & Wright, 2010). With regard to racial group membership (which was labelled as "ethnicity," consistent with the wording used by the U.K. Office for National Statistics, 2006) among participants in Study 1, 48.9% classified themselves as members of racial minority groups in the U. K. (32.7% Asian descent, 16.2% Black/African descent); 46.0% classified themselves as members of the racial majority (i.e., White/European descent); 0.7% classified themselves as having mixed descent; 3.3% classified themselves as "Other"; and 1.1% did not indicate their racial group membership. With regard to religious group membership in Study 1, 25.2% classified themselves as members of religious minority

groups (5.1% Jewish, 15.4% Muslim, 4.0% Hindu, and 0.7% Buddhist); 36.0%

classified themselves as members of the religious majority (i.e., Christian); 7.0%

classified themselves as "Other"; and 31.6% did not indicate their religious group

membership (note that due to a clerical error, the Sikh religious minority group was

not included as an option for Study 1 participants). Finally, with regard to national

group membership (i.e., citizenship status) among participants in Sample 1, 12.9%

classified themselves as members of national minority groups (i.e., non-citizens of the

U.K.); 86.4% classified themselves as members of the national majority (i.e., citizens

of the U.K.); and 0.8% did not indicate their national group membership.

Materials. Study 1 participants completed an adapted version of the

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; see R. Roberts et al., 1999). The

original version of the MEIM contained 12 items, each of which referred to

individuals' thoughts, feelings, and/or behavior regarding the ethnic or cultural groups

to which they belong. We expanded the MEIM to 36 items by creating three versions

of each original item, substituting the terms "racial group," "religious group," and

"national group," respectively (following Goffman, 1963b), for "ethnic or cultural

group." Each item was scored according to a 5-point, Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly

disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*), with higher scores reflecting higher levels of the aspect

of ethnic identity in question. A complete list of items is presented in the Appendix.

Procedure. Study 1 was conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines

of the British Psychological Society (BPS, 2005). First, as part of a "Personality and

Politics Survey," participants read and signed an informed consent sheet that

described the purpose of the study in general terms. Second, participants completed a

survey that included the aforementioned, expanded version of the MEIM (as well as

demographic items and additional scales that will not be mentioned further). Finally,

participants read a debriefing form that explained the purpose of the study in greater detail. Participants did not receive any incentives, financial or otherwise, as compensation for taking part in Study 1.

Results and Discussion

The raw data for scores on all 36 ethnic identity items in Study 1 (12 apiece measuring racial, religious, and national aspects) were screened for non-normality of distributions via PRELIS 2.72 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2005b). Results of Mardia's test indicated that, at the multivariate level, the distributions of item scores did not depart significantly from normality (relative multivariate kurtosis = 1.19, *NS*). Therefore, we calculated an item matrix of zero-order correlations (available from the first author upon request) for further processing via PRELIS 2.72.

Exploratory factor analyses of the Expanded MEIM. Following Conway and Huffcutt (2003), we performed exploratory factor analyses (a) using the maximum likelihood estimation method (given our goal of understanding the latent structure of the expanded MEIM); (b) using chi-square, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the decision tree in PRELIS 2.72 (see S. du Toit, M. du Toit, Mels, & Cheng, 2006) as criteria for deciding on the optimal number of factors (given our goal of using multiple fit criteria); and (c) using the PROMAX oblique rotated solution (given our goal of extracting a set of factors that most likely would reflect the "true" latent structure of the expanded MEIM). Results of an initial exploratory factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation via PRELIS 2.72 suggested that, according to the decision tree (for which the table can be obtained from the first author upon request), as many as 18 factors could be extracted from the correlation matrix; and according to the chi-square criterion, as many as 14 factors could be extracted. However, the initial exploratory factor analysis produced by

PRELIS yielded factor matrices for only 10 factors (details are available from the first author upon request). Moreover, results of the 10-factor Promax-rotated solution could not be interpreted, due to error messages involving Heywood cases (i.e., one or more communality coefficients greater than 100%, possibly due to near-perfect correlations among item scores; Thompson, 2004). Further inspection of RMSEA values (following Gaines, Bunce, Robertson, & Wright, 2010) revealed that, consistent with hypotheses, as few as three factors could be retained, although the chi-square value remained significant.

Given that a three-factor solution was sufficient to explain substantial variance in item scores, we conducted a subsequent exploratory factor analysis in which we specifically requested a three-factor solution. Results of the subsequent, three-factor version of the exploratory factor analysis (shown in Table 1) indicated that all 12 racial identity items loaded together; 12 religious identity items loaded together; and 11 of the 12 national identity items loaded together, using the criterion of factor loadings exceeding .31 only on the hypothesized factor in question (for Item 2, the loading was just below .31; see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In fact, with the exception of Items 1 and 2 for the national identity scale, all items achieved loadings greater than .40 on their hypothesized factors.

Intercorrelations among racial, religious, and national identity scores.
Prior to calculating total scores for the racial, religious, and national identity scales in Study 1, we conducted a series of reliability analyses. Correlations among item scores within each of the three scales are available from the first author upon request. Results of reliability analyses indicated that the 12-item racial identity scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .91, average interitem correlation = .47); dropping any of the items would result either in no change (4 items) or a slight decline

in reliability (8 items). Similarly, results of reliability analyses indicated that the 12-

item religious identity scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .96,

average interitem correlation = .64); dropping any of the items would result either in

no change (10 items) or a slight decline in reliability (2 items). Finally, results of

reliability analyses indicated that the 12-item national identity scale was internally

consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .90, average interitem correlation = .44); dropping any

of the items would result either in a slight increase (1 item), no increase (3 items), or a

slight decline in reliability (8 items).

Zero-order correlations among total scores for the racial, religious, and

national minority scales for Study 1 indicated that consistent with hypotheses, all

correlations were significant and positive (*r*'s = .48 between racial and religious

identities, .45 between racial and national identities, and .15 between religious and

national identities; all *p*'s < .05 or below). Although the correlations were significant,

none of the magnitudes of the correlations was sufficiently high to justify concern

regarding the distinctiveness of any of the scales. Overall, our hypotheses regarding

factor structure and interfactor correlations among three (rather than nine or six)

aspects of ethnic identity were supported in Study 1.

Exploration and commitment: Distinct dimensions within racial,

religious, and national identities? Drawing upon Erikson's (1950) ego psychology,

Marcia (1966, 1967) distinguished between *exploration* (i.e., "the sorting though of

multiple alternatives"; Schwartz, 2001, p. 11) and *commitment* (i.e., "the act of

choosing one or more alternatives and following through with them"; Schwartz, 2001,

p. 11) in developing a model of identity statuses. Phinney (1990) contended that

Marcia's distinction between exploration and commitment not only is relevant to

understanding identity development in general but is especially relevant to

understanding ethnic identity development in particular. Although Phinney (1992) initially argued that the 14-item version of the MEIM measured ethnic identity as a unitary construct, Phinney and colleagues subsequently contended that 12-item (R. Roberts et al., 1999) and 6-item (Phinney & Ong, 2007) versions of the MEIM measured exploration and commitment as separate yet related aspects of ethnic identity (e.g., Ong, Fuller-Rowell, & Phinney, 2010). Notwithstanding evidence that the 14- and 12-item versions of the MEIM may be understood more accurately as measures of cognitive, affective, and behavioural aspects of ethnic identity (e.g., Gaines et al., 2010; R. M. Lee & Yoo, 2004; Juang & Nguyen, 2010), the consensus view is that exploration and commitment underlie individuals' sense of ethnic identity (Umana-Taylor, 2011).

Can exploration and commitment be identified as distinct dimensions within the larger constructs of racial, religious, and national identities? Goffman's (1963b) interactionist role theory did not distinguish between exploration and commitment as separate processes within the development of individuals' ethnic identity development in general, or within the development of individuals' racial, religious, or national identities in particular. Moreover, results of Study 1 led us to conclude that a three-factor solution (without a further distinction between exploration and commitment among racial, religious, or national identities) provided optimal fit in exploratory factor analyses. However, given Phinney's (e.g., Roberts et al., 1999) contention that the 12-item MEIM measures exploration and commitment as twin themes in ethnic identity development in general, and given Schwartz et al.'s (2012) similar results concerning the American Identity Measure (AIM), we cannot rule out the possibility that these developmental themes remain embedded within racial, religious, and

national aspects of sense of ethnic identity as measured by an expanded MEIM (see

MacDonald, 2011; Roehlkepartain et al., 2011; and Umaña-Taylor, 2011).

Goals of Study 2

In Study 2, we tested the goodness-of-fit of the same three-factor solution that

we tested the same hypotheses that we tested in Study 1. In addition, in Study 2, we

compared the goodness-of-fit of the three-factor solution (i.e., racial, religious, and

national identities) with the goodness-of-fit of a second, six-factor solution (i.e.,

exploration and commitment as separate dimensions within the racial, religious, and

national identity factors) via confirmatory factor analyses (Mels, 2006). We used

PRELIS 2.72 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2005b) strictly as a data pre-processor and entered

the resulting zero-order correlation matrix among the 36 expanded-MEIM items into

confirmatory factor analyses via LISREL 8.72 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2005a).

Study 2

As Thompson (2004) observed, results of exploratory factor analyses

regarding new scales in one study ideally should be replicated via confirmatory factor

analyses regarding those scales in a follow-up study. In order to maintain as much

comparability as possible between the two studies, Study 2 involved the use of data

collection procedures that were similar to the procedures that we used in Study 1.

Method

Participants. Participants in Study 2 represent a convenience sample, all of

whom were at least 18 years of age and were recruited as volunteers by members of

the research team outside as well as within Brunel University, but generally across a

wide variety of settings within the West London area (following Gaines, Bunce,

Robertson, & Wright, 2010). A total of 291 individuals (128 men, 162 women, and 1

individual who did not report his or her gender) comprised Study 2. The mean age of participants in Study 2 was 26.96 years ($SD = 9.34$ years).

The racial, religious, and national group classifications that we employed in Study 2 were the same classifications that are used by the U.K. Office for National Statistics (2006). With regard to racial group membership (which was labelled as "ethnicity," consistent with the wording used by the U.K. Office for National Statistics, 2006) among participants in Study 2, 71.7% classified themselves as members of racial minority groups in the U. K. (64.9% Asian descent, 6.8% Black/African descent); 23.7% classified themselves as members of the racial majority (i.e., White/European descent); 1.4% classified themselves as having mixed descent; 2.4% were classified as "Other"; and 0.7% did not indicate their racial group membership. With regard to religious group membership in Study 2, 64.9% classified themselves as members of religious minority groups (1.0% Jewish, 25.8% Muslim, 16.8% Hindu, 1.7% Buddhist, and 19.6% Sikh); 23.0% classified themselves as members of the religious majority (i.e., Christian); 8.9% were classified as "Other"; and 0.7% did not indicate their religious group membership. Finally, with regard to national group membership (i.e., citizenship status) among participants in Study 2, 15.8% classified themselves as members of national minority groups (i.e., non-citizens of the U.K.); 82.1% classified themselves as members of the national majority (i.e., citizens of the U.K.); and 2.1% did not indicate their national group membership.

Materials and procedure. Study 2 participants completed the aforementioned 36-item version of the MEIM. Moreover, except for a retitling of the survey as simply "Personality Survey" rather than "Personality and Politics Survey," the procedure in Study 2 was identical to the procedure in Study 1.

Results and Discussion

The raw data for scores on all 36 ethnic identity items in Study 2 were screened for non-normality of distributions via PRELIS 2.72. Results of Mardia's test indicated that, at the multivariate level, the distributions of item scores did not depart significantly from normality (relative multivariate kurtosis = 1.30, *NS*). Therefore, we calculated a matrix of zero-order correlations among item scores (available from the first author upon request) for further processing via PRELIS 2.72.

Confirmatory factor analyses of the Expanded MEIM. Given that results of initial exploratory factor analyses in Study 1 were plagued by Heywood cases, we applied the ridge option and ridge constant (unique to LISREL; Mels, 2006) as safeguards against Heywood cases (see Wothke, 1993) in initial and subsequent confirmatory factor analyses in Study 2. In an initial confirmatory factor analysis with three hypothesized factors, we entered the following combination of fixed and freed parameters into a maximum likelihood solution via LISREL 8.72: (a) Unique error variance was held equal across all items within a given scale (i.e., all uncorrelated measurement error terms were freed but constrained to be equal within each of the scales, whereas all correlated measurement error terms were fixed at .00). (b) All items were allowed to load only on their hypothesized factor (i.e., loadings for items on their hypothesised factor were freed, whereas all other loadings for items on the other factors were fixed at .00). (c) No residual correlations were allowed (i.e., all six correlations among the latent variables were freed, whereas all residual terms were fixed at 1.00).

Results of the initial confirmatory factor analysis indicated that, consistent with hypotheses, the three-factor model (with intercorrelations among the factors) yielded a satisfactory fit to the data (chi-square = 312.31, degrees of freedom = 624, *NS*; RMSEA = .00; comparative fit index, or CFI, = 1.00). Moreover, inspection of

factor loadings (shown in Table 2) revealed that with the exception of loading for the

second racial identity item on the racial identity factor (which was just below .40), all

loadings for items on their hypothesized factors exceeded .40 and were significant

(p's < .01). In and of itself, the three-factor model (i.e., racial, religious, and national

identities) could not be rejected.

Drawing upon Roberts et al. (1999), we conducted a subsequent confirmatory

factor analysis in which each of the major aspects of ethnic identity (i.e., racial,

religious, and national identities) was subdivided into exploration and commitment

dimensions. Results of the second confirmatory factor analysis indicated that this six-

factor model (with intercorrelations among the factors) not only yielded a satisfactory

fit to the data (chi-square = 181.71, degrees of freedom = 609, *NS*; RMSEA = .00;

CFI = 1.00) but, contrary to hypotheses, also yielded a significantly *lower* chi-square

value than did the three-factor model (difference in chi-square = 130.60, difference in

degrees of freedom = 15, p < .01). Furthermore, inspection of factor loadings (shown

in Table 3) revealed that loadings for items on their hypothesized factors exceeded .50

and were significant (p's < .01).

Intercorrelations among scores for exploration and commitment aspects

of racial, religious, and national identities. Prior to calculating total scores for the

exploration and commitment subscales within the racial, religious, and national

identity scales in Study 2, we conducted a series of reliability analyses. Correlations

among item scores within each of the six scales are available from the author upon

request. Results of reliability analyses indicated that the 5-item racial identity

exploration scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .75, average interitem

correlation = .38); dropping any of the items would result in a slight decline in

reliability. Similarly, results of reliability analyses indicated that the 7-item racial

identity commitment scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .89; average interitem correlation = .53); dropping any of the items would result in a slight decline in reliability. Also, results of reliability analyses indicated that the 5-item religious identity exploration scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .87, average interitem correlation = .57); dropping any of the items would result either in no change (1 item) or a slight decline in reliability (4 items). In addition, results of reliability analyses indicated that the 7-item religious identity commitment scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .96; average interitem correlation = .77); dropping any of the items would result either in no change (1 item) or a slight decline in reliability (6 items). Furthermore, results of reliability analyses indicated that the 5-item national identity exploration scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = 74; average interitem correlation = .37); dropping any of the items would result in a slight decline in reliability. Finally, results of reliability analyses indicated that the 7-item national identity commitment scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .92, average interitem correlation = .63); dropping any of the items would result either in no change (1 item), or a slight decline in reliability (6 items).

Zero-order correlations among total scores for the racial, religious, and national identity exploration and commitment scales for Study 2 (shown in Table 4) indicated that all of the correlations were positive; with the exception of the correlations (a) between racial identity exploration and national identity commitment and (b) between religious identity exploration and national identity commitment (both *NS*), all of the correlations were significant (*p*'s < .05 or below). Although most of the correlations were significant, only one of the magnitudes of the correlations (i.e., between religious identity exploration and religious identity commitment) was sufficiently high to justify concern regarding the distinctiveness of any of the scales.

Overall, despite the initially encouraging results for our hypothesized three-factor model, the results for a competing six-factor model and associated interfactor correlations those dimensions suggested that a six-factor model yielded even better fit to the data for Study 2 than did the three-factor model.

General Discussion

Results of both studies indicate that, consistent with Goffman's (1963b) interactionist role theory, individuals' racial, religious, and national identities are distinct yet interrelated aspects of individuals' sense of ethnic identity. In addition, results of Study 2 in particular indicate that within each of these aspects of ethnic identity, the developmental themes of exploration and commitment that Marcia (1966, 1967) derived from Erikson's (1959) ego psychology are distinct yet interrelated dimensions. All in all, results of the present studies suggest that Goffman's interactionist role theory is necessary – but not sufficient – to explain the factor structure of the expanded, 36-item version of the MEIM.

Although he did not cite a specific article, book, or chapter by Erikson, Goffman (1963b, p. 129) *did* mention Erikson by name when defining ego identity. When we originally developed the expanded MEIM, we were guided by Goffman's distinction among the "tribal stigmas" of race, religion, and nationality, not Erikson's (1950) concept of ego identity. However, in retrospect, we believe that ego identity serves as an important conceptual bridge between Goffman's "tribal stigmas" and Marcia's (1966, 1967) distinction between exploration and commitment. According to Goffman, "…[Erikson's] concept of ego identity allows us to consider what the individual may feel about stigma and its management, and leads us to give special attention to the advice [that the individual] is given regarding these matters" (1963b, p. 130). Given that the individual learns about his or her membership in various

ethnic groups long before he or she comes to identify with those groups (Allport,

1954/1979), the processes of exploration and commitment may involve an

individual's coming to terms with several facets of his or her ethnicity en route to

deciding that racial, religious, and national identities are three critical aspects of his or

her larger sense of ethnic identity (due in no small part to the individual's

socialization experiences concerning those aspects of ethnicity that possess the

greatest potential to hinder his or her attempts at impression management; see Gaines,

2002).

Why was the amount of error associated with the three-factor model of racial,

religious, and national identities so high in Study 1? Unlike confirmatory factor

analyses via LISREL 8.72 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2005a), exploratory factor analyses

via PRELIS 2.72 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2005b) do not enable researchers to correct

for extremely high correlations that can produce Heywood cases (see S. du Toit, M.

du Toit, Mels, & Cheng, 2006; Mels, 2006). Although exploratory factor analyses are

entirely appropriate as initial attempts toward scale validation, results of the present

studies are consistent with the emerging view that exploratory factor analyses should

not be used as the only attempts toward construct validation (Thompson, 2004).

Conversely, why were scores on the exploration and commitment components

of religious identity (but not scores on the exploration and commitment components

of racial identity or national identity) so strongly correlated with each other in Study

2? P. E. King (2003) contended that in Erikson's (1968) ego psychology,

"…[R]eligion is the oldest and most enduring institution that promotes the emergence

of fidelity, the commitment and loyalty to an ideology that emerges upon the

successful resolution of the psychosocial crisis of identity formation…" (p. 198). In

turn, drawing in part upon P. E. King, Roehlkepartain and colleagues

(Roehhlkepartain, Benson, & Scales, 2012) argued that religious commitment
(Worthington et al., 2003) promotes individuals' moral development. Perhaps the
pathway from exploration to commitment is especially direct (rather than mediated by
other factors) with regard to the development of religious identity, compared to the
development of racial or national identities.

Strengths and Limitations of the Present Studies

The present studies are characterized by certain strengths. For example, in
both studies, our samples were highly diverse in terms of individuals' racial, religious,
and national group memberships (as is the West London population from which we
drew our samples; see U. K. Office for National Statistics, 2006). In addition, with
Goffman's (1963b) interactionist role theory as our primary conceptual guide, we
found that all three "tribal stigmas" of race, religion, and nationality are reflected in
individuals' sense of ethnic identity. Finally, our combination of exploratory factor
analyses (Study 1) and confirmatory factor analyses (Study 2) yielded complementary
results that are consistent with Goffman's interactionist role theory, yet underscore the
importance of Erikson's (1950) ego psychology (which, as we noted above,
influenced Goffman's theory).

Nevertheless, the present studies also are characterized by certain
shortcomings. For instance, not only was Sample 1 less diverse than Sample 2 in
terms of age as well as ethnicity (thus potentially limiting the generalizability of the
three-factor solution from Study 1 to Study 2); but we generally did not have a
sufficiently large number of individuals from ethnic minority versus ethnic majority
groups in either sample to make meaningful comparisons regarding equality of
correlation matrices or mean scores (and we inadvertently omitted one important
religious minority group classification, namely Sikh, in Study 1). Also, even if we

had been able to make large numbers of comparisons regarding ethnic minority-majority correlation matrices and mean scores, the one-to-one correspondence that we have implied concerning specific types of ethnic group membership and specific types of ethnic identity might not have been supported (e.g., in the United States, members of racial minority groups tend to score higher on *religious* identity than do individuals who are not members of racial minority groups). Lastly, to the extent that results of exploratory factor analyses (Study 1) failed to uncover exploration and commitment components of individuals' racial, religious, or national identities, those results might be viewed as contradicting the results of subsequent confirmatory factor analyses (Study 2).

All things considered, we believe that the strengths outweigh the shortcomings in the present studies. Regarding our inability to examine meaningful ethnic minority-majority comparisons on correlation matrices or mean scores, we erred on the side of caution (e.g., generally significant Box's M statistics regarding minority-majority differences in correlation matrices – not reported in the present paper, but available from the first author upon request – led us to forgo mean comparisons, even though such statistics may be overly conservative; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Moreover, the prospect of complex links between specific types of ethnic group membership and specific types of ethnic identity could lead to intriguing profiles of ethnic identity for each ethnic group (e.g., Black/African-descent persons might tend to score higher than all other racial groups, minority as well as majority, on racial identity; whereas Asian-descent persons might tend to score higher than all other racial groups, minority as well as majority, on religious identity; Cook & Kono, 1977). Finally, regarding the potentially contradictory results of exploratory versus confirmatory factor analyses concerning exploration and commitment components of

racial, religious, or national identities, we note that it is not unusual for exploratory

factor analyses to yield more parsimonious results than do confirmatory factor

analyses; Phinney's (1992) original, exploratory factor analyses of the MEIM yielded

more parsimonious results (i.e., one ethnic identity factor) than did Roberts et al.'s

(1999) subsequent, confirmatory factor analyses (i.e., separate yet correlated

exploration and commitment factors).

Directions for Future Research

At the time that we conducted the present studies, we opted not to include

Roberts et al.'s (1999) 12-item MEIM alongside our expanded MEIM, due to

concerns that participants would conflate the terms *race/racial* and *ethnicity/ethnic* (a

matter of considerable debate among researchers within ethnic psychology; e.g.,

Cokley, 2007; Helms, 2007; Phinney & Ong, 2007) when answering items that varied

only in the use of those terms across scales. However, future researchers might wish

to include alternative measures of generic ethnic identity with substantially different

items, such as Phinney and Ong's (2007) 6-item Revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity

Measure (MEIM-R), in order to determine the extent to which racial, religious, and

national identities contribute to individuals' overall ethnic identity (keeping in mind

that the MEIM-R, like our expanded MEIM, measures exploration and commitment

as dual developmental themes). Umana-Taylor, Yazedjian, and Bamaca-Gomez's

(2004) Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS) also could be used as an alternative measure of

generic ethnic identity for the same purpose (keeping in mind that the EIS is unique in

adding *resolution* to the developmental themes of exploration and achievement, the

latter of which Umana-Taylor et al. termed *affiliation*).

In addition, at the time that we conducted the present studies, Schwartz et al.'s

(2012) AIM had not been published. However, within the United States, future

researchers might wish to substitute the AIM for the national identity scale within our expanded MEIM in order to determine whether American identity in particular is related to racial and religious identities (keeping in mind that the AIM, like our expanded MEIM, measures exploration and commitment as dual developmental themes). Outside the United States, future researchers might wish to adapt our national identity scale to particular national contexts in a manner similar to Schwartz et al.

Finally, although we were aware of the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale-Black (RIAS-B; Parham & Helms, 1981) and other pre-existing racial identity measures that were guided directly or indirectly by Cross's (1971) nigrescence theory (rather than the interactionist role theory of Goffman, 1963b) and that were developed specifically with Black participants in mind, we did not have access to sufficiently large numbers of Black participants to make it practical to include such race-specific measures. However, future researchers who *do* have access to sufficiently large Black samples might find it useful to administer our measure of racial identity alongside more race-specific measures. In the wake of theoretical and empirical refinements that have occurred since the RIAS-B was published (Cokley, 2007), we recommend the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI; Sellers et al., 1997) and/or the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS; Vandiver et al., 2000), both of which were guided by the view that Black Americans' experiences with stigmatization, stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination make their racial identity development unique within the United States (see Sellers et al., 1998; Worrell et al., 2001). Given that the CRIS already has been used in tandem with the 14-item MEIM (Phinney, 1992) within the United States (Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006) and in tandem with the MIBI within the United States (Vandiver et al., 2002), we believe that the next logical step for

researchers would be to administer the CRIS and/or MIBI together with our measure of racial identity outside as well as within the United States.

Conclusion

At the beginning of the article, we noted that Goffman's (1963b) interactionist role theory focused on race, religion, and nationality as three major aspects of ethnicity that are likely to be implicated in social stigma and identity development. A large body of evidence links race, religion, and nationality to social stigma (Ruggs, Martinez, & Hebl, 2011). However, the literature on these "tribal stigmas" as reflected separately and together in identity development is virtually nonexistent. We hope that this article will encourage identity theorists and researchers to attend increasingly to the contributions of racial, religious, and national identities to individuals' overall sense of ethnic identity.

References

Agyemang, K.J.A. (2012). Black male athlete activism and the link to Michael

   Jordan: A transformational leadership and social cognitive theory analysis.

   International Review for the Sociology of Sport, *47*, 433-445.

Allport, G. W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

   (Original work published 1954)

Bamberg, M., De Fina, A., & Schiffrin, D. (2011).   Discourse and identity

   construction. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook*

   of identity theory and research (pp. 177-199). New York: Springer Verlag.

Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Identity, self-concept, and self-esteem: The self lost and

   found. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality*

   psychology (pp. 681-710). San Diego: Academic Press.

British Psychological Society (2005). *Code of conduct, ethical principles and guidelines*

   of the British Psychological Society. Leicester, United Kingdom: BPS.

Brown, R. (1986). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Burkitt, I. (2011). Identity construction in sociohistorical context. In S. J. Schwartz, K.

   Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp.

   267-284). New York: Springer Verlag.

Cadge W., & Ecklund, E. H. (2007). Immigration and religion. *Annual Review of*

   Sociology, *33*, 359–379.

Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American Psychologist*, *64*, 194-204.

Cokley, K. (2007). Critical issues in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity: A

   referendum on the state of the field. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*, 224-

   234.

Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (2003). A review and evaluation of exploratory factor
analysis practices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*,
6, 147-168..

Cook, N. & Kono, S. (1977). Black psychology: The third great generation. *Journal
of Black Psychology*, *3*, 18–28.

Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T.
Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 504-
553). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). The Negro-to-African American conversion experience.
African American World, 20, 13- 27.

Devos, T., Huynh, Q.-L., & Banaji, M.R. (2012). Implicit self and identity. In M. R.
Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 155-
179). New York: Guilford.

Dittmar, H. E. (2011). Material and consumer identities. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx,
& V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 745-
770). New York: Springer Verlag.

du Toit, S., du Toit, M., Mels, G., & Cheng. Y. (2006). *LISREL for Windows: PRELIS
user's guide*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.

Ellor, J. W., & McGregor, J. A. (2011). Reflections on the words "religion," "spiritual
well-being," and "spirituality." *Journal of Religion, Spirituality and Aging*, *23*,
275-278.

Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.

Frable, D. E. S. (1997). Gender, racial, sexual, and class identities. *Annual Review of
Psychology*, *48*, 139-163.

Gaines, S. O., Jr. (2002). Discredited and discreditable identities: One Black

American's experiences in the United States, Jamaica, and England. *Western

Journal of Black Studies*, *26*, 159-164.

Gaines, S. O., Jr., Bunce, D., Robertson, T., & Wright, B. (with Goossens, Y., Heer,

D., Lidder, A., Mann, A., & Minhas, S.) (2010). Evaluating the psychometric

properties of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) within the

United Kingdom. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*,

10, 1-19.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY:

Doubleday.

Goffman, E. (1969). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the organization of

gatherings*. New York: Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*.

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1969). *Where the action is: Three essays*. London: Penguin Press.

Goffman, E. (1982). The interaction order: American Sociological Association, 1982

Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 1-17.

Helms, J. E. (2007). Some better practices for measuring racial and ethnic identity

constructs. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*, 235-246.

Hitlin, S. (2011). Values, personal identity, and the moral self. In S. J. Schwartz, K.

Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp.

515-530). New York: Springer Verlag.

Howard, J. A. (2000). Social psychology of identities. *Annual Review of Sociology*,

26, 367-393.

Joly, D. (2012). Race, ethnicity and religion: Emerging policies in Britain. *Patterns of Prejudice*, *46*, 467-485.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2005). *LISREL 8.72*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.

Jöreskog , K., & Sörbom, D. (2005). *PRELIS 2.72*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.

Juang, L. P., & Nguyen, H. H. (2010). Ethnic identity among Chinese-American youth: The role of family obligation and community factors on ethnic engagement, clarity, and pride. *Identity*, *10*, 20-39.

King, P. E. (2003). Religion and identity: The role of ideological, social, and spiritual contexts. *Applied Developmental Science*, *7*, 197-204.

King, R. H. (2011). Becoming Black, becoming President. *Patterns of Prejudice*, *45*, 62-85.

Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). *African American acculturation: Deconstructing race and reviving culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.

Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J. P. (2012). The self as an organizing concept in the social and behavioral sciences. In M. R.Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 1-20). New York: Guilford.

Lee, R. M., & Yoo, H. C. (2004). Structure and measurement of ethnic identity for Asian American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *51*, 263-269.

Licata L., Sanchez-Mazas M., & Green, E. G. T. (2011). Identity, immigration, and prejudice in Europe: A recognition approach. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 895-916). New York: Springer-Verlag.

MacDonald, D. A. (2011). Spiritual identity: Individual approaches. In S. J.

    Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory*

    and research (pp. 531-544). New York: Springer Verlag.

Major, B. N., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review*

    of Psychology, *56*, 393-421.

Mandair, N. (2007). Re-enchanting Englishness: Multiculturalism and the matter of

    Britain. *Social Identities*, *13*, 283-306.

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, *3*, 551-558.

Marcia, J. E. (1967). Ego identity status: Relationship to change in self-esteem, 'general

    maladjustment,' and authoritarianism. *Journal of Personality*, *35*, 119-133.

Markus, H. R. (2008). Pride, prejudice, and ambivalence: Toward a unified theory

    of race and ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 651-670.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society from the standpoint of a social*

    behaviorist. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mels, G. (2006). *LISREL for Windows: Getting started guide*. Lincolnwood, IL:

    Scientific Software International.

Menand, L. (2009). Some frames for Goffman. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *72*, 296-

    299.

Nazroo, J., & Karlsen, S. (2003). Patterns of identity among ethnic minority people:

    Diversity and commonality. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *26*, 902-930.

Ong, A. D., Fuller-Rowell, T. E., & Phinney, J. S. (2010). Measurement of ethnic

    identity: Recurrent and emergent issues. *Identity: An International Journal of*

    Theory and Research, *10*, 39-49.

Oyserman, D., Elmore, K., & Smith, G. (2012). Self, self-concept, and identity. In M. R.Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 69-104). New York: Guilford.

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

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: A review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 499-514.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with adolescents and you adults from diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7, 156-176.*

Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist*, *51*, 918-927.

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*, 271-281.

Phinney, J.S., & Onwughalu, M. (1996). Racial identity and perception of American ideals among African American and African students in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20,* 127-140.

Roberts, R., Phinney, J., Masse, L., Chen, Y., Roberts, C., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity in young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19,* 301-322.

Roehlkepartain, E. C., Benson, P. L., & Scales, P. C. (2011). Spiritual identity:

Contextual perspectives. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *The handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 545- 562). New York: Springer Verlag.

Ruggs, E. N., Martinez, L. R., & Hebl, M. (2011). How individuals and organizations can reduce interpersonal discrimination. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5,* 29-42.

Schlenker, B. R. (2012). Self-presentation. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity (*2nd ed., pp. 542-570). New York: Guilford.

Schwartz, S. J. (2001). The evolution of Eriksonian and neo-Eriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *1*, 7-58.

Schwartz, S. J., Park, I. J. K., Huynh, Q., Zamboanga, B. L., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Lee, R., et al. (2012). The American Identity Measure: Development and validation across ethnic subgroup and immigrant generation. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 12*, 93-128.

S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (eds.) (2011). *The handbook of identity theory and research.* New York: Springer Verlag.

Sellers, R. M., Rowley, S. A. J., Chavous, T. M., Shelton , J. N., & Smith, M. (1997). Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity: Preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 805-815.

Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S.A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality & Social Psychology Review, 2*, 18-39.

Serpe, R. T., & Stryker, S. (2011). The symbolic interactionist perspective and

identity theory. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook

of identity theory and research* (pp. 225-248). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Sinnott, J. D. (2001). Introduction: Special issue on spirituality and adult

development, Part I. *Journal of Adult Development*, *8,*199–200.

Slocum, F., & Lee, Y.-H. (2010). Racism, racial stereotypes, and American politics.

In J. L. Chin (Ed.), *The psychology of prejudice and discrimination: A revised

and condensed edition* (pp. 1-13). Santa Barbara, CA: Prager/ABC-CLIO.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test

performance of African-Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology*, *69*, 797-811.

Storm, I. (2011). Ethnic nominalism and civic religiosity: Christianity and national

identity in Britain. *Sociological Review*, *59*, 828-846.

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

Park, CA: Benjamin Cummings.

Stryker, S., & Statham, A. (1985). Symbolic interaction and role theory. In G.

Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 1,

pp. 311-378). New York: Random House.

Swann, W. B., Jr., & Buhrmester, M. D. (2012). Self-verification: The search for

coherence. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and

identity (*2nd ed., pp. 405-424). New York: Guilford Press.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.).

Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tangney, J. P., & Tracy, J. L. (2012). Self-conscious emotions. In M. R. Leary & J.

    P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 446-478). New

    York: Guilford Press.

Thompson, B. (2004). *Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis*. Washington, DC:

    American Psychological Association.

U. K. Office for National Statistics (2006). *Focus on ethnicity and religion*. Houndmills,

    UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Umana-Taylor, A.J. (2011). Ethnic identity. In S. J.Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V.

    L.Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 755–774). New

    York: Springer-Verlag.

Umana-Taylor, A. J., Yazedijan, A., & Bamaca-Gomez, M. (2004). Developing the

    Ethnic Identity Scale: Using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives.

    Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, *4*, 9-38.

Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E., Jr., Fhagen-Smith, P. E., Worrell, F. C., Swim, J. K., &

    Caldwell, L. D. (2000). *The Cross Racial Identity Scale*. State College, PA:

    Authors.

Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E., Jr., Worrell, F. C., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2002).

    Validating the Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*,

    49, 71-85.

Verkuyten, M. (2005). *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. Hove: Psychology

    Press.

Vignoles, V. L., Schwartz, S. J., & Luyckx, K. (2011). Introduction: Toward an

    integrative view of identity. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles

    (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp.1–27). New York:

    Springer-Verlag.

Walton, G. M., Paunesku, D., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Expandable selves. In M. R.

Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 141-

154). New York: Guilford Press.

Worrell, F. C., & Gardner-Kitt, D. L. (2006). The relationship between racial and ethnic

identity in Black adolescents: The Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS) and the

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). *Identity: An International Journal

of Theory and Research*, *6*, 293-315.

Worrell, F. C., Cross, W. E., Jr., & Vandiver, B. J. (2001). Nigrescence theory:

Current status and challenges for the future. *Journal of Multicultural

Counseling and Development*, *29*, 201-221.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., McCullough, M. E.,

Berry, J. W., Schmitt, M. M., Berry, J. T., Bursley, K. H., & O'Conner, L.

(2003). The religious commitment inventory-10: Development, refinement,

and validation of a brief scale for research and counseling. *Journal of

Counseling Psychology*, *50*, 84-96.

Wothke, W. (1993). Nonpositive definite matrices in structural modeling. In K. A.

Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 256-93).

Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Table 1

Factor Loadings for Expanded MEIM Items, Three-Factor Solution, Study 1 (n =

259)

Racial identity items

	Factor		
	Racial	*Religious*	*National*
Item	*Identity*	*Identity*	*Identity*
raceid1	**0.567**	-0.013	-0.071
raceid2	**0.419**	0.026	-0.005
raceid3	**0.768**	-0.041	-0.007
raceid4	**0.590**	0.009	-0.103
raceid5	**0.750**	-0.111	0.041
raceid6	**0.795**	-0.031	0.086
raceid7	**0.795**	-0.143	0.013
raceid8	**0.638**	-0.003	-0.171
raceid9	**0.716**	0.020	0.144
raceid10	**0.682**	0.096	-0.067
raceid11	**0.723**	0.098	0.098
raceid12	**0.738**	0.037	0.129

Religious identity items

Factor

Item	Racial Identity	Religious Identity	National Identity
relid1	0.173	**0.622**	-0.067
relid2	0.150	**0.541**	-0.044
relid3	-0.022	**0.852**	-0.021
relid4	0.119	**0.695**	-0.104
relid5	0.005	**0.893**	0.021
relid6	-0.030	**0.903**	0.068
relid7	0.006	**0.809**	0.017
relid8	0.200	**0.543**	-0.115
relid9	-0.090	**0.939**	0.066
relid10	0.073	**0.732**	-0.052
relid11	-0.074	**0.930**	0.057
relid12	-0.083	**0.924**	0.093

National identity items

	Factor		
	Racial	*Religious*	*National*
Item	*Identity*	*Identity*	*Identity*
natid1	0.122	0.026	**0.394**
natid2	0.015	0.025	0.302
natid3	0.045	0.043	**0.651**
natid4	0.155	-0.015	**0.402**
natid5	0.049	0.000	**0.757**
natid6	0.002	0.030	**0.842**
natid7	0.184	-0.011	**0.620**
natid8	0.096	-0.070	**0.481**
natid9	-0.099	0.088	**0.872**
natid10	0.040	0.014	**0.578**
natid11	-0.043	0.006	**0.845**
natid12	0.015	0.006	**0.817**

Table 2

Factor Loadings for Expanded MEIM Items, Three-Factor Solution, Study 2 (n =

281)[1]

Racial identity items

	Factor		
	Racial	*Religious*	*National*
Item	*Identity*	*Identity*	*Identity*
raceid1	**0.480**	0.000	0.000
raceid2	**0.420**	0.000	0.000
raceid3	**0.630**	0.000	0.000
raceid4	**0.540**	0.000	0.000
raceid5	**0.590**	0.000	0.000
raceid6	**0.670**	0.000	0.000
raceid7	**0.730**	0.000	0.000
raceid8	**0.620**	0.000	0.000
raceid9	**0.720**	0.000	0.000
raceid10	**0.700**	0.000	0.000
raceid11	**0.750**	0.000	0.000
raceid12	**0.710**	0.000	0.000

---

[1]NOTE: Factor loadings in the confirmatory factor analyses were reported up to two decimal places in LISREL 8.72 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2005a). For comparison purposes with Study 1, we added a third decimal place of 0 to the factor loadings in Study 2.

Religious identity items

	Factor		
	Racial	*Religious*	*National*
Item	*Identity*	*Identity*	*Identity*
relid1	0.000	**0.750**	0.000
relid2	0.000	**0.570**	0.000
relid3	0.000	**0.830**	0.000
relid4	0.000	**0.730**	0.000
relid5	0.000	**0.840**	0.000
relid6	0.000	**0.850**	0.000
relid7	0.000	**0.830**	0.000
relid8	0.000	**0.780**	0.000
relid9	0.000	**0.870**	0.000
relid10	0.000	**0.790**	0.000
relid11	0.000	**0.880**	0.000
relid12	0.000	**0.870**	0.000

National identity items

Factor

Item	Racial Identity	Religious Identity	National Identity
natid1	0.000	0.000	**0.550**
natid2	0.000	0.000	**0.390**
natid3	0.000	0.000	**0.680**
natid4	0.000	0.000	**0.550**
natid5	0.000	0.000	**0.740**
natid6	0.000	0.000	**0.810**
natid7	0.000	0.000	**0.760**
natid8	0.000	0.000	**0.600**
natid9	0.000	0.000	**0.770**
natid10	0.000	0.000	**0.550**
natid11	0.000	0.000	**0.750**
natid12	0.000	0.000	**0.780**

Table 3

Factor Loadings for Expanded MEIM Items, 6-Factor Solution, Study 2 (n = 281)[2]

Racial identity items

	Factor					
	Racial		*Religious*		*National*	
Item	*EXP*	*COM*	*EXP*	*COM*	*EXP*	*COM*
racid1	**0.560**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid2	**0.510**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid4	**0.590**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid8	**0.710**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid10	**0.710**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid3	0.000	**0.680**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid5	0.000	**0.660**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid6	0.000	**0.700**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid7	0.000	**0.770**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid9	0.000	**0.770**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid11	0.000	**0.740**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
racid12	0.000	**0.760**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

---

[2]NOTE: Factor loadings in the confirmatory factor analyses were reported up to two decimal places in LISREL 8.72 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2005a). For comparison purposes with Study 1, we added a third decimal place of 0 to the factor loadings in Study 2.

Religious identity items

Factor

	Racial		*Religious*		*National*	
Item	*EXP*	*COM*	*EXP*	*COM*	*EXP*	*COM*
relid1	0.000	0.000	**0.780**	0.000	0.000	0.000
relid2	0.000	0.000	**0.640**	0.000	0.000	0.000
relid4	0.000	0.000	**0.740**	0.000	0.000	0.000
relid8	0.000	0.000	**0.800**	0.000	0.000	0.000
relid10	0.000	0.000	**0.810**	0.000	0.000	0.000
relid3	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.850**	0.000	0.000
relid5	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.870**	0.000	0.000
relid6	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.880**	0.000	0.000
relid7	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.860**	0.000	0.000
relid9	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.890**	0.000	0.000
relid11	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.890**	0.000	0.000
relid12	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.890**	0.000	0.000

National identity items

	Factor					
	Racial		*Religious*		*National*	
Item	*EXP*	*COM*	*EXP*	*COM*	*EXP*	*COM*
natid1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.640**	0.000
natid2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.520**	0.000
natid4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.610**	0.000
natid8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.670**	0.000
natid10	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.580**	0.000
natid3	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.700**
natid5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.780**
natid6	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.840**
natid7	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.800**
natid9	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.800**
natid11	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.780**
natid12	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.840**

Table 4

Matrix of Zero-Order Correlations among Scores on Racial, Religious, and National Exploration and Commitment Scales,

Study 2 (n = 281)[3]

	Correlations					
Scale	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*
	Racial exploration	*Racial commitment*	*Religious exploration*	*Religious commitment*	*National exploration*	*National commitment*
1	--					
2	.59***	--				
3	.56***	.32***	--			
4	.38***	.41***	.80***	--		
5	.37***	.19**	.30***	.20**	--	
6	.04	.27***	.05	.17**	.59***	--

---

[3]NOTE: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Author Notes

Appendix:

List of Expanded MEIM Items

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my (race) (religion) (nationality), such as its history, traditions, and customs.

2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own (race) (religion) (nationality).

3. I have a clear sense of my (race) (religion) (nationality) and what it means for me.

4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my (race) (religion) (nationality).

5. I am happy that I am a member of the (race) (religion) (nationality) I belong to.

6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own (race) (religion) (nationality).

7. I understand pretty well what my (race) (religion) (nationality) means to me.

8. In order to learn more about my race, I have often talked to other people about my (race) (religion) (nationality).

9. I have a lot of pride in my (race) (religion) (nationality).

10. I participate in cultural practices of my own (race) (religion) (nationality), such as special food, music, or customs.

11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own (race) (religion) (nationality).

12. I feel good about my (race) (religion) (nationality).