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Problem

Not much attention has been devoted to the academic experiences of Black African college students, the latter being typically categorized with those of African Americans (Kim, 2014). While research has effectively documented the social challenges that African American college students experience at (Predominantly White Institutions (PWI). much less research has been conducted on the social experiences of subcategories within the Black population, specifically, Black Africans. Though researchers have speculated on the potential differences between the social integration experiences of
Black Africans and African American college students as these relate to religious orientation and racial identity attitude, no empirical studies exist on the proposed connection.

Method

The sample for this study consisted of 174 African American and 170 Black African college students attending PWIs within the U.S. Participants completed the BRIAS, I/E-R and IIS to provide input on one’s racial identity attitude, religious orientation, and peer-group interactions. Structural equation modeling was used to evaluate the joint and independent impact of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on the social integration experiences of Black African and African American college students attending PWIs.

Results

The initial research design was a poor fit for the data, so it was revised on the basis of theory and modification indices. The research design for the collective sample, the Black African sample, and the African American sample respectively resulted in similar fit indices and path relationships. All three models illustrated a weak direct effect between religious orientation and social integration. Also, all three designs illustrated a moderate direct relationship between racial identity attitude and social integration.

Conclusion

It can be contended that within the college milieu the status of one’s racial identity attitude has the potential to influence interpersonal relationships with peers in the
boarder social context (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016). The results also illustrate similarities in racial scores between groups. Lastly, it should be noted that in spite of the comparable racial identity scores, in this study Black African college students have distinctive cultural contexts and identities that have been retained and resulted in much less assimilation to mainstream social norms of the US society (Portes & Fernandez-Kelly, 2008). These distinctive identities should not be discounted since they may have a significant impact on individual and social functioning within the academic setting.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Black African American identity was re-invented in the United States during the Black Power Movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Black was reconstructed as positive, and the negatively imposed stereotypes and ideas previously associated with it was renounced (Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967; Philogène, 1999). The new term, African American, was an attempt to repossess the cultural and original identity that was eroded as a result of the slave trade. From the endorsement of the U.S. Constitution to African American political and social movements, people of color have exhibited their desire for full-humanity in the construction of their self-definitions (Shelby, 2003).

The dilemma with the term African American becomes obvious when the elements that create one’s cultural identity are considered. The term African American is an attempt to signify the cultural connection between being both African and American; yet, for most African Americans whose ancestors were victims of U.S. enslavement, the elements that constituted their African identity were lost or displaced within mainstream society (De Walt, 2011). However, it can be argued in the case of those individuals born and raised on the continent of Africa, their cultural identity remain intact, to the extent that such identity is rooted in historical, linguistic, and psychological factors (Diop, 1991).
Within the United States, African American is often mistakenly used to represent all people of color who trace their origin or part thereof in Africa. According to the United States Census Bureau, Black or African American is defined as “a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa” (United States Census Bureau, 2018). The problem with this definition is that it ignores the variation of cultural identities amongst people of color and places a strong emphasis on skin pigmentation; even if, an individua perception of themselves is based on culture rather than politically imposed racial categories (Hoare, 1991; Smith, 1995). Furthermore, limiting people’s social experiences, perspectives, and orientation to a black-white notion of reality leads to an inaccurate understanding of individuals and black subcategories to which they rightly belong (Morrison, 2010).

In the United States of America, the operation of the social structure systemically pigeon-holes some Americans as the hyphenated other (such as African American). This practice is upheld in nearly every aspect of society, but, it seems, especially in Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). A binary social categorization system reduces cultural and ethnic identities (De Walt, 2011), thereby forcing an individuals ethnic identity to hinge on adaptation to a narrowly coined racial social structure. Consequently, Black Africans are forced to establish their identities from existing racial categories in the United States (Okonofua, 2013).

In the United States, racial discrimination is one of the most salient features of society, with people of color historically and currently occupying a position of disadvantage relative to other racial groups (Thomas, 2000). The current designation of categories has led to separation within subcategories of the Black population in the
United States including differences in meaning construction among the various sub-
groups. The differences in social categorization systems between Black Africans and
African Americans are attributable to three factors: (1) Black Africans are included
within the same racial group based on phenotype, despite the fact that their experiences,
language, and culture are evidently different from one another. (2) Black Africans define
their race in terms of language, sociocultural heritage, and country of origin (Nigerian
American, Ghanian American, etc.) and not as Black or African American. (3)
Construction of distinct ethnolinguistic identities by Black Africans contradict the
African American identity which has historically condensed the identities of Black
African immigrant and/or international individuals and their descendants in the United
States (Bailey, 2001; Waters, 1991).

According to the Open Doors Report published by the Institute of International
Education (IIE), during the 2009-2010 school year there was a 3 percent increase in
Black African international students with the majority of students migrating from
Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, Cameroon, and South Africa to the United States. Despite this
increase, Black African college students in the United States have been frequently
omitted in discourses of race/ethnicity due to their small population size, and are
commonly assigned to the category of Black or African American. To date, there is little
to no research that has been undertaken to study this group in order to gain some
conceptual understanding of how their unique characteristics and their construction of a
distinct immigrant and international identity is different from and may be oppositional to
the African American identity (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016). In particular, how race/ethnicity
relate to the cultural adjustment processes of Black African college students in the
United States, and how their experience of profound cultural value conflicts affect their academic and personal adjustment in the American educational system is yet to be studied (Constantine, Anderson, Berkel, Caldwell, & Utsey, 2005).

Johnson (1975) described the educational system as “the most important agent in the socialization process” (p. 3). Whereas the college student socialization is a complex, interactive process that is influenced by a wide range of factors. The educational system is also identified as ethnocentric with covert and overt themes in the social order with preference for White American culture (Freire, 1970, 1985; Giroux, 1980; McLaren & Houston, 2004) The result is an unequal educational experience milieu for African Americans and other racial minorities. Likewise, Love (2010) states that the American educational system fosters, supports, and perpetuates the racial problems that exist in society. Research has effectively documented the challenges and general sources of stress that Black college student’s experience at PWIs (Neville, Heppner, Ji, & Thye, 2004). However, less research has been conducted on the experiences of subcategories within the Black population, specifically, Black African college students.

Tinto (1993) posited that students who are not integrated into the campus community are at a higher risk of attrition than those who are well integrated, because the latter has established community membership (Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Kinzie, 2009). It has been argued that African American students at PWIs are poorly integrated into the campus community (Allen, 1985) and many studies have shown that there is an achievement gap between African American students and other ethnicities that is possibly related to their lack of involvement and integration on campus (Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001). In addition to African American college students, researchers have acknowledged
that international students often face barriers when establishing social networks in their 
host country (Pritchard & Skinner, 2002). Rajapaksa and Dundes (2002–2003) study on 
college adjustment found that the majority of international students reported feeling 
misunderstood which resulted in less social connections and dissatisfaction with one’s 
social networks. In confirmation, Trice (2004) found that international students from the 
Middle East and Africa had the least amount of social interactions with U.S. students. 
Von Robertson, Mitra, and Van Delinder (2005) postulated that the lack of integration 
stems from an unwelcoming environment and lack of representation. Schlossberg’s 
(1989) marginality and mattering theory suggests that students in a minority group often 
experience feelings of marginality which may promote questions about mattering to 
others within their environment (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton & Renn, 2010). Because 
social integration is cultivated by way of relationships and connections, a lack thereof 
may cause students in a minority group to feel excluded from the dominate culture.

Research on social integration and other college issues generally focuses on 
college students, minority students, and or African American students as a whole 
(Flowers, 2004a, 2004b; Flowers & Pascarella, 2003; Greer & Chwalisz, 2007; Guiffrida, 
2003; Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2009). With that being said, Black 
African college students may differ from African American college students in how they 
identify with their race, minority group status, and social relationships due to differences 
in immigration history, varying nationalities and ethnic group ideologies (Stebleton, 
2007). Whereas, African American students tend to struggle with the meaning of their 
racial identity (Chavous, 2000), Black African college students struggle with degree of 
preference for their culture of origin or nonnative culture. Research has noted that for
Black Africans, acculturation exists as a tridimensional process where they can and may align themselves along three cultural lines: African American, European American, and or their culture of origin (Ferguson, Bornstein, & Pottinger, 2012). As such, these generalizations have the propensity to lead a disregard differences and lead to assumptions of homogeneity. (Please call me on this)

In terms of cultural identity, De Walt (2011) postulates that people of color can be placed into one of the three following categories: First Generation U.S.-Born Africans (FGAs), Continental Africans (CAs) or Generational African Americans (GAAs). FGAs are individuals who either migrated from Africa to the U.S. at an early age or have a connection to one or more African countries by way of their parents and/or family members who currently reside there; CAs are individuals born and raised in an African country; and, GAAs are individuals who identify as African American and/or Black because of the legacy of U.S. enslavement. De Walt (ibid) notes that the effects of enslavement and loss of cultural identity place GAAs and CAs in different societal parameters. He asserts there are specific elements that conceptualize a cultural identity for each reference group, but these elements are loss in the term African American or Black because the intent of this categorization is to condense variance amongst people of color.

Parallel to race, religion also plays a prominent role in identity and peer relationships. According to Park and Bowman (2015), “in the college environment, religion appears more conducive to relational networks based on similarity than relational networks that bring together people of other backgrounds” (p.21). The impact of religion within the college setting usually goes unnoticed despite the probability of religious
worldviews contributing directly or indirectly to student’s social interactions. Their study on the relationship between general religiosity and cross-racial interaction, confirmed that general religiosity was positively linked with higher interactions between racial groups specifically for white, black, and Asian American students. For this study, the Revised Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (I/E-R) was used for this study to further explore if and how religious orientation corresponds with racial identity attitudes and social relationships.

In conclusion, religion and race form identity, provide purpose, and help to establish social relationships. Within the college milieu both factors have the potential to influence interpersonal relationships with peers in the broader social context (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016). While, social integration is a challenge for many college students; the challenge is greater for students of color due to their minority status in a majority dominated environment (Sims, 2008). Examining the differences amongst college students placed in the category of African American as it pertains to internal racial processes, religious orientation, and social integration experiences at PWIs, has the potential to shed light on unique religious and racial conceptualizations that aid in creating a culturally-inclusive learning environment and strengthen cultural competence in academia.

**Rationale for the Study**

Literature continues to focus solely on the experiences of African American college students with the term African American often being used to represent all black subcategories. A significant body of research has demonstrated that the environment at PWIs strongly impact African American students’ college experience and research has
also noted that African immigrant college students often face barriers when establishing social networks with those from the dominant culture (Pritchard & Skinner, 2002). Researchers have supported the notion that becoming involved and socially integrated into the campus community is a challenging feat for many students; but particularly for students of color (Sims, 2008). Based on the literature search, there are no studies to date that examine the impact of racial identity and sociocultural factors on the social integration experiences of both African American college students and Black African college students at PWIs. More so, there are no studies that directly explore the influence of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on the social integration experiences of African American college students (Sutton & Kimbrough, 2001; Von Robertson et al., 2005) and Black African college students (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016; Chidili, 2007).

**Statement of the Problem**

The increase in diversity at PWIs has not resulted in an increase in cross-relationships at PWIs. Whereas, the educational system has been described as “the most important agent in the socialization process” (Johnson, 1975, p. 3); research has revealed that the socialization process in higher education is a challenging feat for African American and Black African college students alike (Allen, 1985; Pritchard & Skinner, 2002). Yet, in the literature, African American is often mistakenly used to represent all people of color; although, Black Africans and African Americans differ in terms of immigration history, nationality, and ethnic group ideologies, (Stebleton, 2007). It is important that this problem be addressed because research has shown that a lack of involvement and social integration within one’s campus community can adversely affect academic success in the college or university setting (Sims, 2008).
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the interplay of racial identity attitude, and religious orientation, on the social integration experiences of Black African college students and African American college students, attending predominantly White educational institutions in the United States.

Conceptual Framework

The purpose of a conceptual framework is to explain the presumed relationship among variables. The conceptual framework used for this study addresses the interplay of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on Black African college students and African American college students at PWIs. Intersectionality is a widely applicable approach rooted in feminist and critical race theories that allows researchers to address the unique union of experiences based on multiple social categories (Crenshaw, 1989; Harper, Wardell, & McGuire, 2011), and it adapted as the logic frame of this study

The term intersectionality was created by Kimberle Crenshaw (1989, 1994). Crenshaw used the metaphor of intersecting roads to elucidate the way in which racial and gender discrimination overlap; more so, the way in which various oppressions when combined produce a distinct form of discrimination. Analysis through an intersectional lens identifies the lived experiences of oppression and discrimination due to societal responses to one’s varied identities (Crenshaw, 1989). This study utilized the lens of intersectionality as a conceptual framework in an effort to understand and embrace the multifaceted experiences of both Black African college students and African American college students.
Hancock (2007) specifies that intersectionality is based on the idea that more than one category should be analyzed, that categories matters equally, and within the relationship between categories exists a dynamic interaction between individual and institutional factors. Intersectionality is a concept that recognizes that perceived group membership can make individuals susceptible to bias, yet the complexity of an individual’s identity can shape the way in which each person experiences a specific bias (Gilborn, 2015). In this study, intersectionality is used to better understand the social integration experiences of Black African college students and African American college students and the process that creates and sustains them. In addition to how race and religious orientation intersect with other axes of oppression such as ethnicity in a university setting.

In higher education an intersectionality framework provides an understanding of students’ experiences within that specific system of power and privilege (Jones & Abes, 2013); hence utilizing such a framework for studying the experiences and multiple identities of African American and Black African college students is advantageous. While the study of college student identities in relation to persistence and retention has been studied, additional research focused on the overlapping identities of college students with a focus on challenges and strengths is warranted to broaden the existing body of literature (Jones & Abes, 2013; Jones & Wijeyesinghe, 2011; Mitchell, Simmons, & Greyerbiehl, 2014; Stewart, 2008, 2009).

To assess the interplay of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on social integration experiences of African American and Black African college students at PWIs, I employed an intersectionality approach. Intersectionality is a concept that
simultaneously considers the influence of multiple social identities. It explores the unique experiences of various social identities that could not be completely understood if these social identities were examined in isolation. Sanchez-Hucles and Davis (2010) note that intersectionality sheds light on the experiences of marginalization in addition to how multiple identities combine to construct a social reality. Common assumptions of intersectionality are (1) individuals are characterized by multiple social categories and these social categories are interconnected such that the experience of one social category is linked to another. (2) Within each of these constructed categories is an aspect of inequality or power and (3) categories are attributes of the individual as well as characteristics of the individuals social context (e.g. institutions, interpersonal interactions) with both types of categories and their significance varying depending on the individual (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016). The use of the intersectionality framework allows the researcher to consider a couple of intersecting aspects of identity which was included in the design of the study, the construction of the research questions, and the data analysis process which allowed for inquiry into intersecting identities of African American and Black African college students.

Because there are many levels of intersections, the combination of ethnicity, gender, racial identity, and religious orientation provide a way of seeing the diversity and commonalities within groups as well as the power and oppression that an individual feels as a part of a group (McCall, 2005). Dhamoon (2011) reports, “no concept is perfectly able to capture all the complexities of irreducible forms of difference” (p. 232). Accordingly, he also proposed that the term interaction can be used as an alternative to
intersection in order to define and assess the way in which specific categories function through one another and enable each other.

An intersectional type framework is used to illustrate how identities, categories, and processes exist, perform, and function through one another in an institutional context. The approach for this study is to draw inspiration from Crenshaw’s work in order to examine a group which had not been previously analyzed.

**Research Hypotheses**

This study addressed the undertaking of multi-group comparisons with the aim of comparing structural relationships between groups. The present research design shown in Figure 1 assessed the influence of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on social integration. The exogenous variables in the theoretical model are religious orientation and racial identity attitude. The observed variables for religious orientation are intrinsic (ROI), extrinsic social (ROs) and extrinsic personal (ROp). The observed variables for racial identity attitude are conformity/pre-encounter, dissonance/encounter, immersion-emersion and internalization. The endogenous variable in the theoretical model is social integration and its indicator is peer-group interaction. The hypotheses of this study are as followed: (1) the theoretical covariance matrix and the empirical covariance matrix are equal and (2) the values of model parameters are the same across the different groups.

**Significance of the Study**

This area of research is important to the field of counseling psychology because its aim is to consider variables that facilitate or hinder social integration experiences for
Black African college students, an understudied population. This study also seeks to examine the relationship between religious orientation, racial identity attitude and social integration which has yet to be studied. Lastly, the perspectives and orientations of African American college students and Black African college students remain complex and rich with multiple components on both the individual and group level; thus warranting continued research in order to identify variables that intersect with sociocultural factors impacting these students at PWIs.

**Definition of Terms**

*Black African College Students* – term used to label students of color born and raised in an African country who travelled to the United States to embark on higher education.
African American College Students – term used to label students of color who are considered and/or identify as African American/Black based on their lived scripts (De Walt, 2011).

Predominately White Educational Institutions – defined as a college/university institution that has over 50% of white enrollment.

Social Integration - the act of a student to unify or be incorporated into a community of students (Tinto, 1993).

Religious Orientation - religious motives that guide religious behavior. Intrinsic religious orientation is defined as “religion is an end unto itself, a goal pursued in the absence of external reinforcement” (Gorsuch, 1994, p.317). Extrinsic religious orientation is comprised of two groups, social extrinsic and personal extrinsic orientation. A social extrinsic orientation places emphasis on social motives as a guide for religious behavior; whereas, a personal extrinsic orientation places emphasis on the psychological motives that guide religious behavior (Lavric & Flere, 2011).

Racial Identity Attitude - describes the thoughts and perceptions individuals hold about themselves, Blacks, and Whites along four statuses: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998).

Limitations of Study
The Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale is commonly tested on African American college students. Therefore, Black African college students may interpret the items on the racial identity in a different way than the normalization samples.

There is a dearth of studies that use the I/E-R to explore religious orientation among Black African college students. Thus, it is possible that Black African college students in the current sample may interpret the items on the religious orientation measure in a different way than the normalization sample.

Due to convenience sampling, the results of the study may be generalizable to the larger population.

Different institutional types may afford different types of student experiences. For example, student experiences at a small, private institution may vary greatly from experiences at a large, public institution. As a result, the researcher cannot control for specific variances within institutions that may impact the study.

**Delimitations of Study**

Data collection is delimited to undergraduate college/university students studying at predominantly white institutions across the United States. Graduate students were not included in the sample, since the researcher would like to focus on the undergraduate student experience.

For this study, participants are asked to provide a response to more than 89 items. Survey fatigue happens when respondents become overwhelmed with questions or the number of surveys they are asked to take which can result in lower response rates or incomplete information (National Research Center, Inc., 2016).
Organization of Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides the background of the study and contains the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, conceptual framework, research questions, definitions of terms, limitations and delimitations of the study, and the organization of the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of the related literature on social integration, religious orientation, racial identity and their relationship to African American college students and Black African college students enrolled at predominantly white institutions. The sections included in this chapter are history and foundational theories of social integration; pros and cons of social integration experiences on college/university campuses; social integration experiences on African American students attending PWIs; social integration experiences on Black African college students attending PWIs; historical context for religious orientation; the links/relationships between religious orientation and social integration, with particular emphases on how those two variables impact African American students in PWIs; the links/relationships between religious orientation and social integration, with particular emphases on how those two variables impact Black African college students in PWIs; a historical context for racial identity; the links/relationships between racial identity and social integration, with particular emphases on how those two variables impact African American students attending PWIs; links/relationships between racial identity and social integration, with particular emphases on how those two variables impact Black African college students attending PWIs; the interrelationships among all three variables, and lastly, a summary of the sections. Chapter 3 presents the sampling process and population included in the study,
the methodology used which includes the research questions, research design, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and administration of data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 presents the results and the data analysis of the study, the statistical analysis and the tables that show the relationships between the variables. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study and seeks to integrate the results based on current theory and research. This chapter also highlights a brief discussion about the most important findings of the study. Furthermore, this chapter delineates conclusions, recommendations for practice, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this literature review is to describe and evaluate the current literature on the social integration process as it relates to religious orientation, and racial/ethnic identity attitude of African American and Black African college students attending PWIs. The first section of this literature review covers social integration. The second section includes an overview of religious orientation and its relationship with social integration. The third section is an overview of racial identity and its connection to social integration. Sections one through three also examine the research on Black African college students and African American college students as it pertains social integration, religious orientation, and racial identity attitude. The last section of the literature review is a summary of the sections.

Research studies have highlighted the potential differences between Black African college students and African American college students social integration experience as it relates to religious orientation and racial identity attitude. However, the relationship between all three variables has not been studied. Studies have shown that race and religion play a pivotal role of influence on interpersonal relationships with peers in the broader social context. Yet, there is no current research exploring the influence of religious orientation and racial identity on social integration. Thus, to propose a study on
the link between religious orientation, racial identity attitude, and the social integration of African American and Black African college students at PWIs assumes that there may be a relationship between these variables and that the relationship is measurable.

For this review, the search involved the use of online databases such as Sage Publications, EBSCOhost, PsycINFO. In order to find studies pertinent to the topic, key words were used. For example, African students were interchanged with African immigrant students and international students. Racial identity attitude was replaced with racial identity, black racial identity attitude scale, and nigrescence theory in order to access articles pertaining to the subject matter. The literature review covered both quantitative and qualitative research, spanning from the 1967 to 2017.

Historical Overview of Social Integration

Integration was first studied by Park and Burgess in 1921 through the concept of assimilation and the race relation cycle. The Chicago School profoundly influenced the sociological study of immigrant integration and was home to Robert E. Park, a Chicago School sociologist, Ernest W. Burgess and many others. According to Parks’ race relation cycle, there are four stages of group interaction. In the first stage immigrants try to orient themselves in their new environment taking a friendly yet curious approach. In the second stage, the dominant population allow the immigrant population to take undesirable positions in the social structure which leads to discrimination, racial conflicts, and ethnic stratification. In the third stage, the ethnic differentiation and stratification becomes normalcy. With time, there is a dissemination of the dominant population and the immigrant group; this diffusion leads to the fading of the ethnic stratification and the fourth stage, assimilation (Schunck, 2014). In addition to Park and
Burgess, other sociologists proposed a race relation cycle; for example, Emery Bogardus (1930) suggested a race relation cycle that describes the integration of immigrants in seven stages. Although both Park and Bogardus cycles have stages with friendly contacts in the beginning, and more or less animosities in the middle of the process, Bogardus focuses on society’s reaction to the immigrant population and Park places emphasis on the competition between groups. Conversely, Parks race relation cycle has been criticized for failing to acknowledge immigrant group’s influence on their host society and identifying the process of influence and adaptation as unidirectional (Schunck, 2014).

Early theorists in the field of social integration included Lockwood, Durkheim, and Blau. The term social integration was first coined by David Lockwood (“Social Integration,” 2016), a British sociologist in 1964 who emphasized the distinction between social integration and system integration in order to account for variable outcomes in social change (Archer, 1996). However, the term social integration first came into use in the work of Emile Durkheim, a French sociologist in the late 19th century. His book, Suicide lay the framework for understanding the role of social integration in health and shed light on the impact of social integration and cohesion on mortality. In Suicide, Durkheim argues that individuals are bonded to society by relationships among members as well as societal beliefs, values, and norms. He also theorized that the underlying explanation for suicide relates to the level of social integration one experiences in the group (Berkman & Kawachi, 2000, p.138). Further, research on the impact of social relationships on both morbidity and mortality is widely recognized (Berkman, Glass, Brissette, & Seeman, 2000). Studies have shown that weak social relationship factors account for 50% of the likelihood of mortality generally (Holt-Lunstad, Smith, & Layton,
2010). Relationship factors also account for the risk of early death with persons who were never married showing a 24% higher mortality rate than married individuals (Roelfs, Shor, Kalish, & Yogev, 2011).

In the 1960s, Peter Blau’s, an American sociologist and theorist, theory of social structure described the ways in which people within a given population choose to engage or disengage with one another. Accordingly, Blau (date?) notes that within a social structure, individuals are classified on the basis of innumerable attributes which categorize and distinguish individuals from one another. These attributes divide the population into subgroups (e.g. sex, religion, race, and place of residence) and have implications for social integration. His theory notes that socially relevant distinctions or commonalities between individuals determine who interacts with whom. In addition, Blau contends that group barriers in relatively homogenous communities obstruct social associations more than those in heterogeneous communities (Blau, 1960).

The intersectionality theoretical perspective lends credence to Blau’s position. The theory was coined by Kimberle Crenshaw in 1989 and has been identified as a widely applicable approach rooted in feminist and critical race theories. The theory allows researchers to address the unique union of experiences based on multiple social categories (Crenshaw, 1989; Harper et al., 2011). Analysis through an intersectional lens identifies the lived experiences of oppression and discrimination due to societal responses to one’s varied identities (Crenshaw, 1989). Intersectionality is based on the idea that more than one category should be analyzed, that categories matters equally, and within the relationship between categories exists a dynamic interaction between individual and institutional factors (Gilborn, 2015).
Anderson (1991) argued that African Americans in general have adopted “American” culture and this assimilation has occurred to various degrees and with various levels of success at the individual level. Landrine and Klonoff (1996) focused on the process of acculturation, describing it as the “extent to which ethnic–cultural minorities participate in the cultural traditions, values, beliefs, and practices of their own culture versus those of the dominant ‘White’ society” (p. 1). They also noted the challenges arising as part of this adaptation process constitute the construct of acculturative stress (Anderson, 1991; Neff & Hoppe, 1993). Acculturative stress is defined as stress related to a move from one’s culture of origin toward another culture (Berry, 1998) and is rooted in the psychological impact of social and individual functioning for ethnic minority group members within the dominant culture. Literature has shown that the impact of race and racial identity for African-Americans is multifaceted and complex; thus, it is beneficial to take an intersectional approach for this study to better understand the nature of social integration experiences of minority students and the process that creates and sustains them in a university setting.

Blau’s theory on social integration analyzed the effect of structural contexts through the lens of U.S. born individuals. Research has noted the differences between African Americans and Black Africans. This framework and others should not only focus on the impact of individual cultural changes but focus on how the understanding of factors such as immigration policies, environmental characteristics, and racialization processes intersect and affect social interaction. Although intersectionality is an approach rooted in feminist and critical race theories for women of color in the U.S., intersectionality can be applied to Black African college students as well.
Intersectionality allows for the simultaneous examination of gender, race, and class as well as other factors influencing and impacting Black African college students’ adjustment to the U.S. culture and their academic culture.

Overview of Social Integration Within the College/University Setting

The examination of the relationship between social integration and student retention originated with Vincent Tinto, a theorist in the field of higher education. Tinto’s interactionalist theory of college student departure views the occurrence of student departure as a result of a students lack of interaction and “fit” within their campus environment (Tinto 1993). Tinto describes two types of “fit,” identifying them as academic integration and social integration. Academic integration is the degree to which the student is meeting the institutions academic standards as well as the degree to which the student agrees with the institutions academic system. Social integration is the connection between the students and the social element of an institution as it pertains to collective affiliations and social support. According to Tinto (1975), as a student interacts within the various systems within an institution, he or she develops a “fit” with the institution. This “fit” can be defined as the congruence between the student and institution that they attend in terms of norms and values. Tinto (1993) posited that students who are not integrated into the campus community are at a higher risk of attrition than those who are well integrated because the latter has established community membership (Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Kinzie, 2009). Tinto (1993) also observed that Black students integrate differently than other groups and this difference tends to incite feelings of perceived social isolation and marginalization. Similarly, Berger and Braxton (1998) study on the impact of organizational attributes on social integration and the
college student withdrawal process concluded that organization attributes had an important role in social integration.

Becoming involved and socially integrated into the campus community is a challenging feat for many students; and for some students it could adversely affect their success in the college or university setting (Sims, 2008). Researchers have supported the notion that social integration is one of the top challenges that college students must conquer when they enter the higher education system; for this reason, during the first months of college, students are more focused on the establishment of interpersonal relations, then later shift their focus to academics (Diniz & Almeida, 2006; Ferreira, Almeida & Soares, 2001). Costa & Leal (2004) state that peer, family and faculty support are important for the students’ personal and interpersonal adjustment in higher education; on the other hand, Pinheiro & Ferreira (2005) note, more importantly than the quality and dimension of the social network, is the way in which the student perceives their social support.

In a study by Zheng, Sang & Wang (2004), the authors concluded that college students who left their country of origin for higher education showed higher values of subjective well-being when they felt socially integrated within the college/university setting. Another study conducted by Lundberg, Schreiner, Hovaguimian, and Miller (2007) examined the impact of race/ethnicity and first-generation student status impact on student involvement and learning. The authors concluded that first-generation college students were less involved with students who were different from them; yet reported higher academic achievement. According to Imaginario, Vieira, Neves de Jesus (2013) social integration in college has close ties with one’s well-being at college. The findings
from their study suggest that all the dimensions from social integration in higher education (interpersonal relationship, personal well-being and emotional balance) play an important role on the evaluation that the students make of their happiness.

Beresneviciute (2003), conceptualizes social integration as a position that an individual assign to her/himself and how he/she identifies her/himself within the social context. Further defining it “as an individual’s visibility in the social topography” (p.99). Research has shown that social experiences impact students’ overall college experience and success. Aspects such as social support networks, experiences of isolation and alienation, and faculty-student relations have been identified as important to successful integration within an institution (Allen, 1992; Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Severiens & Wolff, 2008). Yet, while, social integration is a challenge for many college students; the challenge has shown to be greater for students of color due to their minority status in a majority dominated environment (Sims, 2008).

Although diversity is increasing at PWIs, the increase in ethnic diversity has not resulted in an increase in cross-race relationship or lessened the racial tension between groups. Issues related to race are intertwined into the academic and social sectors resultant in an institutional climate where race is at the forefront of informal and formal structures and societal norms around race and intergroup interactions shape each individual experience and behavior within the academic setting (Chavous, 2005). It appears that both intersectionality and social integration are based on the idea that there exists a dynamic interaction between individual and institution; yet, intersectionality goes deeper to show that the end product of the interaction between individual and institution
results from the relationship within multiple categories possessed by a specific individual (Gilborn, 2015).

Overview of the Social Integration of African American College Students Attending Predominantly White Institutions

Many researchers have sought to understand the key to college retention (Tinto, 1987, 1993; Cohen, 1998; Youn, 1992; Levin & Levin, 1991; Roach, 2000; Braunstein & McGrath, 1997). According to Tierney (1992), “social integrationists have hypothesized that success in college is contingent upon an individual’s ability to become academically and socially integrated into the life of the institution” (p. 614). From the 1970’s through 1990’s, numerous studies were conducted as researchers sought to examine the African American student experience in college (Allen, 1985; Allen, 1992; Babbit, Burbach, & Thompson, 1975; Beasley & Sease, 1974; Fleming, 1984; Sedlacek, 1999; Schwitzer, Griffin, Ancis, & Thomas, 1999; Taylor & Olswang, 1997). Over time, there has been an increase in Black student enrollment at PWIs and decrease in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) as a result of more access to institutional offerings (Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010). Despite the diversity in numbers, Pope et al. (2009) stressed that institutions have struggled with “how to best respond to diversity issues and how to foster belonging and equity on campus” (p. 642). African American females, in particular, have been said to hold a dual burden of both race and gender in dominant environments such as PWIs (Von Robertson et al., 2005; Sims, 2008).

Despite the portrayal of African Americans as homogeneous, the Black student body on college campuses, as in other contexts, is often geographically diverse. Some Black students are accustomed to predominantly black environments whereas others are
accustomed to predominantly white environments. For the former group, the geography and racial composition of a students’ hometown can present an additional barrier to the effective social integration at a PWI (Woldoff, Wiggins, & Washington, 2011). A significant body of research has demonstrated that the environment at PWIs strongly impact African American students’ college experience. Research shows that students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds describe their PWIs as unfriendly and biased (Henry & Nixon, 1994). These experiences are associated with many adverse outcomes such as low academic performance, higher levels of stress, mental health challenges, and college withdrawal (Harwood et. al, 2012).

Harwood et al. (2012), study on racial microaggressions revealed that many students of color at a specific PWI reported derogatory jokes and comments, and overall unequal treatment. Other studies have investigated feelings of alienation among minority college students and found that African American students at PWIs experience more feelings of alienation than other student groups. These same studies have found that African American students perceive their general campus climate more negatively than other students (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). Negga, Applewhite, and Livingston (2007) quantitative analysis revealed that African American students attending a PWI reported lower levels of social support in comparison to white and black students attending a historically black college/university.

Although African American enrollment at PWIs is steadily increasing, researchers (Lewis, 2008; Washington, 2005) have posited that most African American students’ norms and values are incongruent with those of a PWI. Equally, Tinto (1993) observed that Black students integrate differently than other groups and this difference tends to incite feelings of perceived social isolation and marginalization resultant in the
development of social networks to create a sense of belonging. Guiffrida (2005) sought to examine the cultural perspective of Tinto’s (1993) theory which argued two limitations of Tinto’s position. Guiffrida believed that Tinto’s theory: 1) does not “recognize cultural variables [which] makes it particularly problematic when applied to minority students” and it 2) suggests that students must “break away” from past associations and traditions to become integrated into the college’s social and academic realms” (p. 451). Other researchers indicated that Tinto’s theory requires minority students to assimilate into the campus community while adopting the norms of the dominant culture rather than to maintain their own culture. Yet, Tinto argued, “Conformity is not necessary for integration” and suggested that minority groups often seek membership in campus subgroups to feel more integrated into the community (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2009, p.423).

Although research has shown that African American students experience a number of significant challenges during their college experience at PWIs, Strayhorn and Terrell (2007) argued that a lack of support is troublesome for African American students. Von Robertson et al. (2005) defined support as “the extent to which a person’s basic social needs for assistance are gratified through interaction with others” (p.36). Kuh (2001) further explained that larger institutions of higher education often establish subcultures within the community making it difficult to develop a coherent culture of campus norms and values. This further complicates the African American students’ ability to socially integrate at PWIs, as their social norms and values have been said to be inconsistent with those of the dominant group (Guiffrida, 2003). Consequently, many minority groups have been known to establish their own subgroups in order to persist at PWIs. Guiffrida (2003) also explained that traditional African American student
organizations are often a means of social integration at PWIs for this group. Student satisfaction and connectedness constitute a significant function of student success and should not be overlooked, unfortunately it continues to be a problem for both African Americans and non-white-foreign-born immigrant and/or international students attending PWIs.

While some researchers (Lewis, 2008; Washington, 2005; Tinto, 1993) have posited that most African American students’ norms and values are incongruent with those of a PWI. The intersectionality framework emphasizes that social identities and categories should not be viewed as independent variables that capture individual characteristics; instead, they should be viewed as markers of institutional processes (Cole 2010). Furthermore, institutional policies and practices structure social inequalities and stigma in ways that shape the social integration of students of color at PWIs.

A Theoretical Overview of the Social Integration of Black African College Students Attending Predominantly White Institutions

The Immigration and Nationality Act defines an immigrant as any individual who is not a U.S. citizen or national of the United States (Department of Homeland Security, 2015). International students are individuals’ who study at an institution of higher education in the United States on a temporary visa that allows for academic coursework (Institute of International Education, 2015). Immigrant and international students bring with them unique heritages that increase cultural awareness and appreciation (Smith & Khawaja, 2011; Bevis, 2002). The increase enrollment of foreign-born students “reflects the competitive edge that universities and colleges in the United States have in the global environment with respect to dynamism, diversity, and excellence” (Evivie, 2009, p.2).
The inflow of foreign students studying in the United States of America has remained high given globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007). According to the Open Doors Report published by the IIE, in the 2009-2010 school year there was a 3 percent increase in African international students with the majority students migrating from Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, Cameroon, and South Africa to the United States. The more recent wave of voluntary migration from Africa can be traced back to the Refugee Act of 1980 and the Diversity Visa program of 1990, which encouraged immigration from nations dominated by conflict nations under-represented groups (Anderson, 2015). While in the past few decades the majority of African immigrants stemmed from countries such as Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, and Liberia, diversity and refugee programs have expanded the list of countries (Capps, 2012) to Somalia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sudan, Eritrea and Ethiopia (Anderson, 2015). The United States receives the largest number of international students, followed by the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Australia (Open Doors, 2008). Among these migrants, there have been a growing number of African born migrants residing in the U.S., which the U.S. Census Bureau reports has nearly doubled each decade since 1970 (Gabino, Trevelyan, & Fitzwater, 2014). The foreign-born African population has nearly doubled from 2000-2010, with 1.1 million African immigrants residing in the U.S. (Capps, 2012). Although there is no specific data to identify the number of African immigrants attending U.S. institutions, the number of international students from Sub Saharan Africa has increased by 21% (Open Doors, 2014).

Theoretically, Black African students represent the intersection between race and immigration in the United States (Bennett & Lutz, 2009). More specifically, they
“embody countervailing sociological forces” (p. 72), as on one hand they are a migrant group in a country shaped by the immigrant achievement narrative, and on the other hand they are members of a racial group located in a place of disadvantage on the racial hierarchy (Bennett & Lutz, 2009).

African immigrant college students often face barriers when establishing social networks with those from the dominant culture (Pritchard & Skinner, 2002). Trice (2004) found that international students from the Middle East and Africa had the least amount of social interactions with U.S. students. In his study, 48% of international Middle Eastern students and 46% of African students had zero to one interaction with U.S. students per semester. Rajapaksa and Dundes (2002–2003) study on the adjustment to college which compared international students to U.S. students, found that a large portion of African college students reported feeling misunderstood and had difficulty forming friendships; accordingly, international students were more likely than U.S. students to be dissatisfied with their social networks. The results of the study concluded that the international student’s perception of their social network correlated with their adjustment.

In comparison to domestic students, international students have to make more of an effort when it comes to social integration because their familial and social network from their home country is not within easy reach (Bochner et al. 1977; Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008). Furthermore, they must adapt and become cognizant of the explicit and implicit beliefs, values and norms of their host institute/country (Bochner et al. 1977; Rienties et al. 2012; Russell et al. 2010; Zhou et al. 2008). Social barriers are considered common during international students’ college experiences in the United States; however, researchers have documented that positive social interactions in a
host country are important for international students’ development (Glass, 2012). Glass and Westmont (2014) found that a sense of belongingness exerted a direct positive effect on cross-cultural interactions for international and U.S. undergraduate students.

African migrant students are typically guided by African-centered perspective to life, which include group survival, communalism, harmony, collective responsibility, commonality, cooperation, expressive individualism, oral tradition, and social time perspective (Constantine et al., 2005; Myrick, 2002; Nebedum-Ezeh, 1997). These principles may cause difficulty adjusting to an American higher education institution that values individualism, independence, and self-reliance (Constantine et al., 2005). In their examination of the cultural adjustment experiences of African international students, Constantine et al. (2005) demonstrated that students from Kenya, Nigeria, and Ghana felt that the “educational system in the United States was too Eurocentric or oriented toward White cultural values” (p.60). Dissonance in cultural values can then lead to increased feelings of alienation and isolation (Boafo-Arthur, 2014). Therefore, an incongruent system of values and attitudes between African migrants and their host country may inhibit both cultural and social adaptation.

Theoretically, African immigrant and international students represent the intersection between race/ethnicity and immigration in the United States (Bennett & Lutz, 2009); yet there remains a lack of research on their experiences in the US educational system and their capacities to negotiate a range of cultural expectations. For this reason, the utilization of the intersectionality framework is applicable for the analysis of Black African college students experience as it serves as a useful tool to shed light on
intersectional identities that have the potential to either facilitate or hinder social integration experiences.

A Historical and Theoretical Overview of Religious Orientation

The religious orientation paradigm, originally pioneered by the work of Allport (1959), suggests that individuals are motivated to be religious in different ways irrespective of religious affiliation. In his work, Matthew (1996) defines religion as “an organized system of beliefs, practices and symbols, designed to enable closeness to God.” Allport and Ross (1967) developed the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) on the basis that behind religious behavior are religious motives. Allport (1959) identified these religious orientations as extrinsic and intrinsic. Extrinsic religion is defined as a self-serving tool; whereas intrinsic religion is religion that is sought after for a deeper, more meaningful relationship with God (Hills, Francis, Argyle, & Jackson, 2004; Hunter & Merrill, 2013). In their critique and elaboration of Allport’s work, Batson and Ventis (1982) created a three-dimensional model which added ‘religion as quest’ as a third specific form of religious motivation. Quest is defined by questioning and ambiguity. That is, whereas intrinsic motivation represents adherence to a religion, quest entails a continual seeking of answers. (Nielsen, Hatton, & Donahue, 2013).

Though there are a large number of tools available for the assessment of religious beliefs, practices, motivation and commitment (Sanea, Darko, Bjanka, Miro, & Gordana, 2008) one of the scales commonly used is the I/E-R by Gorsuch and MacPherson (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989). The I/E-R is a revision of the Age-Universal I/E scale and the latter is a revision of the ROS. With the creation of the I/E-R, Gorsuch (1994) redefined intrinsic religious commitment as “the motivation for experiencing and living
one’s religious faith for the sake of the faith itself. The person’s religion is an end unto
itself, a goal pursued in the absence of external reinforcement” (p.317). Gorsuch and
McPherson also separated extrinsic religious orientation into extrinsic social and extrinsic
personal. An extrinsic social orientation places emphasis on social motives as a guide for
religious behavior; whereas, an extrinsic personal orientation places emphasis on the
psychological motives that guide religious behavior (Lavric & Flere, 2011).

Social theorists have been examining the unclear relationship between religion,
individual and collective attitudes and action. Karl Marx ([1844]1978) searched the
extent by which religion stifles social change; whereas, Émile Durkheim ([1912]2001)
explored the degree to which it is a source of cohesion that fuels collective action (Read
and Eagle, 2010). Chaves (2010) on the other hand, coined the phrase, religious
congruence fallacy, which assumes that religious beliefs are correlated with specific
behaviors across contexts and situations, when in fact they do not.

Religious involvement can serve to shape and form attitudes, outlooks, behaviors,
Yet, religion is just one of the many identity categories that explain social behavior;
individuals possess multiple, competing group identities that shape their social
experiences and attitudes (Read and Eagle, 2010). Social theorists have presented
incongruent findings on the relationship between religion and social life. Furthermore,
Chaves (2010) highlights how multiple identity categories interact with religion across
contexts and situations to produce highly variable, seemingly mixed outcomes. With that
being said, research has made it difficult to make definite conclusions about the
intersection of religious orientation and race on social life.
Faith development theories (Fowler, 1981; Parks, 2000) propose that young adulthood is a critical time for individuals to re-evaluate the faith of their childhood in light of new discoveries, establish an identity separate from that of their caregivers, and affiliate with communities that help them in their quest for meaning. Religious participation and commitment contribute to general feelings of satisfaction, enhanced quality of life, happiness, and the perception that life is meaningful (Emmons, Cheung, & Tehrani, 1998). Religious socialization is associated with positive educational outcomes (Elder & Conger, 2000; Sanders, 1998). It also fosters attitudes and outlooks which shapes individual action (Glanville, Sikkink, & Hernandez, 2008)

Faith communities are influential in the formation of friendships and intimacy with other people, and these supportive networks, in turn, provide a wide range of psychological and spiritual benefits (Hill & Pargament, 2003). African Americans tend to have a strong religious orientation (Cone, 1990). That is, African Americans typically embrace the value of religion and the practical application of spiritual principles in life (McAdoo, 1993). Brown and Gary (1991) note that within the African American community, the church provides psychological affirmation, identity formation, economic opportunities, and is an agent of socialization. As it pertains to race, past scholars described the Black church as an “invisible institution” (Frazier, 1963) where Black Americans rely on one another for support in the face of inequalities and racial issues that confront African American students within higher education today (Barrett, 2010). According to Carroll (1998) the stress some African-American students experience at
majority institutions is produced, fostered, and embedded within the fabric of the campus environment. As a result of these environmental conditions, some students may turn to spirituality as a coping mechanism. African American students at PWIs report higher levels of spirituality and religiosity than white students at predominantly white campuses (Walker & Dixon, 2002).

A qualitative study by Herndon (2003) investigated spirituality among African American males enrolled at a PWI. The participants reported that spirituality allowed them to excel in the face of social adversities. Within his study, one participant reported “it [spirituality] helps me to cope with white people. Sometimes I find it difficult to interact with them.” The findings in Herndon (2003) also revealed that African American students’ reflection upon their religion may help them assign meaning to broad social and ethical issues they may encounter as they matriculate through higher education. Read and Eagle (2010) study on intersecting identities and religious incongruence revealed that black women are more likely than all others to say that they have a personal relationship with God (55.5%), followed by black men (40.1%) and white women (37.0%) with white men least likely to respond in this way (27.0%).

Barrett (2010) study identified religious socialization as a socializing agent based on the concept of habitus, developed by Pierre Bourdieu. His study concluded that religious socialization allows for the exposure to various cultures, perspectives and life trajectories that are conducive to successful educational outcomes. In his findings, he also notes that there are efforts of school and other mainstream institutions to block students from nonmainstream backgrounds (Bourdieu, 2000) restricting them from obtaining these perceptions and possibilities resulting from religious socialization.
Intersectionality has the potential to help explain why different dimensions of religion operate differently across racial-gender groups. Research on African Americans concludes that African American students are more likely than other students to believe in God and attend religious services (Bartlett, 2005; Sanchez & Carter, 2005; Taylor & Chatters, 2010). Literature has also shown there are significant differences in religious identity across race and gender identity categories. Revealing African Americans as having higher levels of religiosity than whites, and black women, in particular, are more likely to say they have a personal relationship with God.

**The Relationship Between Religious Orientation and Social Integration Among Black African College Students Attending PWIs**

Guy (1999) contends that culture is critical in defining people in terms of “how they view themselves and the world around them” (p.6). This implies that culture is an important component in intrapersonal factors and interpersonal relationships. Black African international students bring along with them a different cultural experience to the U.S. The greater the cultural gap between a students’ country of origin and the U.S., the greater the adjustment needed on the part of international student (Tomich, McWhirter & King, 2000). Therefore, it is to be expected that European international students adjust better than Black African and South American international students (Sodowsky & Plake, 1992); for European international students have a greater commonality of the traits, beliefs, and values found within U.S. society. In order to improve adjustment of Black African college student educators need to understand the “cultural worlds within which individuals have grown and developed; how individuals interpret who they are in relation to others” (Alfred, 2002, p.5).
In support of Guy’s (1999) work is Johnson-Bailey (2002) who accentuates the concept of cultural diversity. Johnson-Bailey acknowledges that U.S. society is comprised of different cultures with each group having their own values and experiences. She challenges educators to acknowledge, affirm, and value diversity. She also notes that it is critical to an international students’ success that social factors such as religion and values be taken into consideration as they pertain to adjusting to the U.S. culture and the academic culture.

A study conducted by Patel, Ramgoon, and Paruk (2009) found that Black and Indian South African college students reported higher religiosity levels than their white counterparts. Literature has also proposed that that Black African students are unique in their religious and spiritual conceptualizations. Religious and spiritual practices of Black Africans are linked to their particular country’s beliefs and practices, with some overlapping similarities from other countries. Thus, Black African students may hold particular religious/spiritual values based on the importance of religion/spirituality in their respective country or religious culture (Booker, 2010).

Similar to other international college students who travel to the United States from other countries, Kenyan, Nigerian, and Ghanaian international college students in particular may experience profound cultural value conflicts that affect their personal adjustment in American college settings. Cultural value conflicts and cognitive dissonance result from grappling with the values and behavioral expectations from an individual’s culture of origin and the values and behavioral expectations present in the host culture (Inman, Ladany, Constantine, & Morano, 2001). A salient type of cultural value conflict for some Kenyan, Nigerian, and Ghanaian international college students
relates to differences in worldviews and values as compared to white college students born in the United States (Constantine et al., 2005) and black students born within the U.S.

Current research shows key shortcomings on the religious and spiritual practices of Black Africans. According to Booker (2010), Black African students may hold particular religious and spiritual values based on the importance of religion and spirituality in their respective country. These shortcomings lead to ongoing queries regarding Black African students’ religious experiences and orientation in their host country. Thus, an intersectional approach serves as a guiding framework in shifting the focus away from solely focusing on individual-level conceptualizations of culture, to structural examinations that take into account one’s native culture.

A Historical Overview of Racial Identity

Although race is a socially constructed concept, it has had real consequences for the life experiences and life opportunities of African Americans in the United States. American society’s categorization of individuals into an assigned racial group, specifically Black/African American has resulted in the psychological unification of Africans and African Americans who vary a great deal in their experiences and cultural expressions. However, the meaning that African Americans place on race in defining themselves is that which we refer to as racial identity (Sellers, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998).

In an increasingly diverse society, racial and ethnic identity development becomes increasingly critical to the overall college student development and quality of collegiate experiences. The racial identity development of non-whites (i.e., blacks, Asian
Americans, and Latino Americans) and whites has drawn increasing attention in the literature (Evans et al., 2010). The first theories on Black racial identity (Jackson & Kirschner, 1973; Vontress, 1971) were developed to address racial issues that impacted the psychotherapy process and the idea that assimilation was necessary for healthy psychological adjustment (Helms, 1990). Whereas other theories (Cross, 1971, 1978; Jackson, 1975; Thomas, 1971) defined healthy Black identity development and asserted that overidentification with White culture is psychologically unhealthy (Helms, 1990). Black racial identity theories that focus on emotional, cognitive, and behavioral processes associated with being Black America have been labeled Black racial identity. These theories reflect the notion that African Americans process through a series of stages beginning with negative thoughts and feelings about themselves and ending with internalized positive feelings about themselves, other African Americans, and other ethnic groups.

One of the most popular conceptualizations of Black racial identity was Cross (1971, 1991) Nigrescence model. The notion of Nigrescence refers to a re-socializing experience process by which an individual's identity is transformed from centralizing on non-African American, to African American, and then to multiculturalism (Cross, Parham, & Helms 1991). Cross’s original model consisted of four-stages (pre-encounter, encounter immersion-emersion, and internalization). Parham and Helms (1981) developed the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS) to operationalize the Nigrescence model. Helms (1984, 1986, 1990, 1994a, 1994b, 1995) further modified Cross’s (197, 1991) Nigrescence model by identifying the stages as “ego-statuses” in order to reflect a more fluid process. Alexander (2004) stated that racial identification is a shared
American experience and that living in the United States makes one recognize their race and its implication. Helms (1990) concluded that African Americans have had to struggle to affirm their racial identity, in contrast Black African international students’ racial identity is less prominent since Black African international persons have lived in racially homogeneous settings; consequently, they have not had experiences related to race. A later study by Phinney and Onwughalu (1996) noted that racial identity scores did not differ between Black African international and African American student groups; especially those Black African international students who have been in the U.S. for some time which means that Black African students’ racial identity significantly increased with longer residence in the United States.

This is not saying much and can be deleted.

Racial Identity and African American College Students Attending PWIs

Initial theories on Black racial identity focused on African American’s stigmatized status in American society (Clark & Clark, 1939; Horowitz, 1939) Allport (1954) argued that racism negatively impacted the African American psyche. As a result, he proposed that African Americans were forced to either accept being devalued or disconnect themselves from the broader society, in order to function. Subsequently, much of the early research on African American racial identity presumed that self-hatred was a significant aspect of the African American self-concept (Cross, 1991).

In contrast to Allport, Dubois (1903) did not view the African American self-concept as necessarily marred. He acknowledged that racial oppression impacted the development of one’s self-concept. He also acknowledged that culture had a direct
relationship with African American ego development. DuBois recognized that African Americans could achieve a healthy self-concept even with the stigma of being devalued by the larger society through reconciliation of selves. DuBois (1903) saw African Americans being conflicted by a double consciousness resulting from the inherent struggle of being both a “Negro” (the othered self) and American. Dubois proposed that the essential task of healthy ego-development in African Americans could be achieved through a resolution between the two selves.

Many theorists have developed models to describe the Black identity development process. One of the most popular models in the psychological literature is the Nigrescence theory and model by Cross (1971). Cross defined Nigrescence as “…the process of becoming Black”, and formulated a five stage model wherein African Americans navigate a series of developmental changes in their racial identity, resulting in a healthy self-image (Cross, 1994). The first stage, Pre-encounter, is characterized by the tendency to endorse Eurocentric sentiments. The next stage, Encounter, is understood to be brought about by an experience that challenges the individual’s racial view causing them to refute the Eurocentric perspective about being Black. The third stage, Immersion-Emersion, refers to embracing the Black-American experience and history. The fourth stage, Internalization, depicts an individual with a positive and personally relevant Black racial identity. The last stage, Internalization/Commitment is characterized by social activism for Black-Americans and other oppressed groups (Cross, 1971). Racial identity theorists after Cross, opted to combine the fourth and fifth stages, creating a four-stage model (i.e. Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization Helms, 1990). Despite revisions to Cross (1991) nigrescence model. The original theory
continues to be used empirically owing to its association with the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) which aided in the theory’s practical application (Vandiver & Cross, 2002).

Cross and Helms’ racial identity scale proves useful for understanding the racial development of African Americans. Cross (1994) wrote that African Americans go through a pre-encounter, encounter, immersion/emersion, internalization and internalization-commitment stages in their racial identification. There are different outcomes based on the types of racial socialization messages received by African Americans. Intersectionality uncovers how variance among day-to-day experiences and situations contribute to differences in the perception and effects of racial discrimination, racial identity attitude, and the psychological tools an individual develops to cope with structural racism.

Racial Identity and Black African College Students Attending PWIs

Based on the literature, race may also play a role in the cultural adjustment of African international students in the United States due to the fact that Black African international students have lived in a racially homogeneous setting and therefore are “less likely to have had negative experiences related to discrimination or racism prior to coming to the United States” (Constantine et al., 2005, p.58). Previous studies on international students indicate that differences in skin complexion have a direct relationship with the perceived prejudice experienced by international students (Tomich, McWhirter, & Darcy, 2003). Often those with a darker skin complexion endure more prejudice from White people than do others with any other skin color (Smith-McLallen, Johnson, Dovidio, & Pearson, 2006).
International students of color also face obstacles related to intersections of nationality and race. While in U.S. colleges and universities, they find themselves in a different cultural context with racial issues at the forefront (Constantine et al., 2005; Fries-Britt et al., 2014; George Mwangi et al., 2016; Massey, Mooney, & Torres, 2007; Nadal et al., 2014). In a study of 24 Black undergraduate and graduate students in physics, George Mwangi et al. (2016) report that black students born outside of the U.S and black students born within the U.S. described different educational experiences with differences ensuing from the intersection of race and nationality. Likewise, Griffin et al.’s (2016) study of 43 Black immigrant and native Black undergraduate students found that Black immigrant and U.S. born Black students recognized that racialized experiences occurred on their campus, but their views on the experiences varied by nationality.

Immigrants from Africa and the Caribbean are a growing component of the U.S. population and have assisted in the racial and ethnic transformation of the United States resulting in the changes in the demographics of Black people and the interpretation of blackness. Through the process of cultural adaptation, African and Caribbean immigrants go through a series of identity changes that shape their self-concept which include the meaning of race and the implication of their skin color in the United States. Black immigrants are forced to confront the structure of a racialized social system in America, which provides a “structure for judging attributes of blacks” (Shaw-Taylor & Tuch, 2007, p.18). According to Portes and Zhou (1993), the effect of the color line is obviously problematic for Black immigrants because of prejudice and stigma that may be attached to blackness. Thus, for Black immigrants and or international students, identifying as Black becomes problematic because of the stigmatized view of blackness.
According to Pierre (2004), differences in the understanding of Black consciousness and identity formation among African immigrants and African Americans as well as Caribbean Blacks stem from a historical legacy of slavery in America and the Caribbean. African immigrants, especially those from sub-Saharan Africa, migrate from a non-racialized society to a racialized society which may create cognitive dissonance. Instead of racial categories, countries within the sub-Saharan African region have a different social stratification system. “Clanism is a system of social differentiation where membership is determined through shared mythical ancestors” (Kusow, 2004, p.2). Race and clanism create different social and cultural implications in both regions. On account of the differences in social stratification systems between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, African immigrants who migrate to the United States interpret and experience race differently which presents a unique insight into the race relations in the United States. According to Gilroy (1999),

The changing racial and ethnic profile of the North American population, particularly the increase in the number of non-white foreign-born immigrants, introduces a new sociological movement in which non-white immigrants not only bring the racial and cultural identities of their homeland, but also redefine the meaning of racial categories from the historically and contemporary normative black and white dichotomy to a situation of multiple and hybrid identity categories (as cited in Abdi, 2006, p.3).

African immigrants are not only changing the demographics of North America but are also redefining the meaning of “blackness.” This presents new challenges and insights on the interpretation of race. Abdi (2006), (the name is Abdi Kusow) research on racial formation among Somali immigrants in North America, revealed that Somalis had
a different concept of racial categories informed by their tribal and ethnic background. The results of his study postulated that African immigrants who move to the United States undergo a racialization process that includes acceptance, resistance or negotiation.

At the conceptual level, the literature suggests the need to attend to how racialization processes unfold among immigrants and their U.S.-born co-ethnics. Some studies such as Shaw-Taylor & Tuch (2007) highlight how Black immigrants are forced to confront the structure of racialized social system in America; whereas Griffin et al.’s (2016) study found that Black immigrant and U.S. born Black students recognized that racialized experiences occurred on their campus, but their views on the experiences varied by nationality. Immigration-related variables such as generational status, length of time in the United States, citizenship status, and age at migration are often interpreted as proxies for acculturation. Applying intersectionality theory to the study of racial identity as it pertains to Black Africans identifies how meaning of these immigration-related variables under specific contexts are influenced by race, class, gender and other social hierarchies.
Acculturative stress is defined as stress related to a move from one’s culture of origin toward another culture (Berry, 1998), and is rooted in the psychological impact of social and individual functioning for ethnic minority group members within the dominant culture. Aponte and Wohl (2000) distinguished enculturation from acculturation in terms of mode of transmission. During the enculturation process, cultural knowledge is communicated through interactions with peers or one’s cultural group institutions. In contrast, the acculturative process is the result of the interaction between two cultural groups with the minority group either willingly or unwilling abandoning cultural values and practices for the cultural values and practices of the majority group. Other researchers have stated that that acculturation is a bi-directional process by which both majority and minority cultures are affected through continual interaction (Aponte & Barnes, 1995; Casas & Pytulk, 1995) instead of unidirectional as stated by Aponte and Wohl (2000).

Research proposes that white students and minority students at the same college or university institution view race relations and racial justice on a given college or university differently. White students account for a more positive perception of intergroup relations and acceptance of diversity in comparison to African Americans (Chavous, 2005). Minority students are more likely than white students to look at both the individual and systemic factors when evaluating the ways race functions on their college campus; whereas, white students are more likely to see intergroup relations as any other interaction among individuals (Blauner, 1989).
Mendoza-Denton et al. (2002) examined African American students’ expectations of being accepted or rejected on the basis of their minority status. Students high in race rejection sensitivity (RS-race) showed greater discomfort in their social relationships and less psychological well-being. Smedley et al. (1993) examined the relationship between minority status stress and the psychological adjustment of minority freshman. In their study, minority status negatively affected the student’s confidence and sense of belonging at their university, with the impact being even greater for African American students (Lawson & Soto, 2015).

It is presumed that an individual with high levels of acculturation and racial identity are well-integrated within both the White majority group and their respective cultural group (Kitano & Maki, 1997; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Geton, 1993). At the same time, Carter (1991) notes that irrespective of one’s security with their racial identity, there is an awareness of the social implications of race. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) suggested that students from racially underrepresented groups who attend predominantly white campuses often band together for support due to the perceived negative connotations they sense from nonminority students and faculty. Thus, negative interpersonal experiences in predominantly white university settings can limit the ability of some African American students to engage in campus life opportunities.

Intersectionality’s embrace of multiple intersecting identities allows for the variability within African Americans as it pertains to individual and collective racial identity attitudes within the academic setting. Research in this area shows that racial identity and acculturative stress have some impact on social integration experiences of African-Americans. As previously stated, minority students are more likely than white
students to look at both the individual and systemic factors when evaluating the ways race functions on their college campus (Blauner, 1989). Thus, there are different outcomes based on the types of racial socialization messages received by African Americans that may have a psychological impact on their individual and social functioning within the dominant culture (Berry, 1998).

The Relationship Between Racial Identity and Social Integration Among Black African College Students Attending PWIs

Race may also play a role in relation to the cultural adjustment of African international students in the United States. Black African international students have grown in a racially homogeneous environment and therefore are “less likely to have had negative experiences related to discrimination or racism prior to coming to the United States” (Constantine et al., 2005, p.58). However, race may become a more prevalent issue for many of these African international students particularly for those in predominantly White institutions (Adeleke, 1998; Molestsane, 1995), and this racial discrimination may lead to their adjustment difficulties. Previous studies on international students indicate that differences in skin color have a direct relationship with the perceived prejudice experienced by international students (Tomich, McWhirter, & Darcy, 2003). Often those with Black skin color suffer more prejudice from White people than do others with any other skin color (Smith-McLallen, Johnson, Dovidio & Pearson, 2006).

According to Nebedum-Ezeh’s (1997) study, African students encounter discrimination on campus, feel isolated and are not socially connected to native students. In their study Sodowsky and Plake (1992) found that African international students
perceive more prejudice than Asian and South American students. This prejudice indicates a sense of alienation from the dominant group thus causing acculturative stress. Ward and Searle (1991) support the hypothesis that higher degrees of cultural distance between international students’ countries of origins and their host countries are associated with higher degrees of social difficulty in cross-cultural interactions. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that international students experiencing high degrees of cultural distance also experience higher degrees of acculturative stress.

Due to differences in immigration history, varying nationalities and ethnic group ideologies, African immigrant college students may differ from African Americans in how they identify with their race and minority group status (Stebleton, 2007). In addition, the shift from living in a racially homogenous environment in their respective counties to a PWI may result in increased exposure to and experiences with racism (Reynolds & Constantine, 2007). These occurrences have the potential to affect their racial identity, resulting in their efforts to assimilate, acculturate, and/or resist prescribed notions of their identity (De Walt, 2011). African immigrant college students typically identify themselves by their country of origin where ideologies are based on ethnicity rather than race. Therefore, while in the United States, race may pose a challenge for African immigrant college students because others may misconstrue their identity by basing it on racial group membership rather than their ethnicity (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016).

Allen (2001) suggested, the conception of a Black sense of self is interdependent and influenced by group socialization processes and experiences. Phinney and Onwughalu (1996) pointed out that the interracial experiences of people of African descent from Africa, which are also applicable to those from the West Indies or
Caribbean, differ in that they are not minorities in their nations of origin and these differences in interracial experiences may have profound implications for group socialization practices in addition to racial/ethnic identity development (Anglin & Whaley, 2006).

The primary tenet of intersectionality is the notion that social categories are not independent and unidimensional but rather multiple and mutually constitutive (Bowleg, 2012). Research on the topic on cultural distance between Ward and Searle (1991) support the hypothesis that higher degrees of cultural distance between international students’ countries of origins and their host countries are associated with higher degrees of social difficulty in cross-cultural interactions. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that international students experiencing high degrees of cultural distance also experience higher degrees of acculturative stress. Due to differences in immigration history, varying nationalities and ethnic group ideologies, African immigrant college students may differ from African Americans in how they identify with their race and minority group status (Stebleton, 2007). Therefore, while in the United States, race may pose a challenge for African immigrant college students because others may misconstrue their identity by basing it on racial group membership rather than their ethnicity (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016). There are limits to the findings of these studies, Black Africans have multiple intersecting identities and intersectionality examines identities based on one’s own context and from their vantage point rather than their deviation from the norms of White middle-class people (Weber & Parra-Medina, 2003).
Summary

De Walt (2011) postulates that people of color can be placed into one of the three following categories: First Generation U.S.-Born Africans (FGAs), Continental Africans (CAs) or Generational African Americans (GAAs). De Walt also notes that the effects of enslavement and loss of cultural identity place GAAs and CAs in different societal parameters. He asserts there are specific elements that conceptualize a cultural identity for each reference group, but these elements are loss in the term African American or Black because the intent of this categorization is to condense variance amongst people of color. Black Africans and African Americans are often grouped according to racial group and the data compiled is rarely disaggregated on the basis of other elements (Stebleton, 2007). This monolithic categorization ignores the ethnic, cultural, and racial differences that exist within these black subcategories in a university setting.

Intersectionality theory addresses the unique union of experiences based on multiple social categories (Crenshaw, 1989; Harper et al., 2011). The theory is used in this study to better understand the nature of social integration experiences of minority students and the process that creates and sustains them in a university setting. According to Tinto (1975), as a student interacts within the various systems within an institution, he or she develops a “fit” with the institution. Similarly, Beresneviciute (2003), conceptualizes social integration as a position that an individual assign to her/himself and how he/she identifies her/himself within the social context.

There has been an increase in Black student enrollment at PWIs and decrease in HBCUs as a result of more access to institutional offerings (Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010) and the inflow of foreign students studying in the United States of America has remained
high given globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007). A significant body of research has demonstrated that the environment at PWIs strongly impact African American students’ college experience. Likewise, research has shown that African immigrant college students often face barriers when establishing social networks with those from the dominant culture (Pritchard & Skinner, 2002). More so, an incongruent system of values and attitudes between African migrants and their host country may inhibit both cultural and social adaptation.

Guy (1999) contends that culture is critical in defining people in terms of “how they view themselves and the world around them” (p.6). This implies that culture is an important component in intrapersonal factors and interpersonal relationships. Religion and race form identity, provide purpose, and help to establish social relationships. Within the college milieu both factors have the potential to influence interpersonal relationships with peers in the boarder social context (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016).

Both intersectionality and social integration are based on the idea that there exists a dynamic interaction between individual and institution; yet, intersectionality goes deeper to show that the end product of the interaction between individual and institution results from the relationship within multiple categories possessed by a specific individual (Gilborn, 2015). The impact of race and racial identity for African-Americans and Black Africans is multifaceted and complex due to both groups displaying some degree of identity complexity and variability over time and in different situations. Likewise, religion is just one of the many identity categories that explain social behavior; individuals possess multiple, competing group identities that shape their social experiences and attitudes (Read and Eagle, 2010). There remains a lack of research on
Black Africans experiences in the US educational system and their capacities to negotiate a range of cultural expectations. For this reason, the utilization of the intersectionality framework is beneficial with both African American and Black African college students as it serves as a useful tool to shed light on intersectional identities that have the potential to strengthen or dissuade social integration experiences.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the interplay of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on social integration experiences of Black African college students and African American college students attending PWIs in the United States. The endogenous variable examined in this study is social integration. The exogenous variables examined in the study are racial identity and religious orientation. The demographics in this study include: place of origin, gender, age, racial composition of primary, secondary, and high school, as well as length of time in the U.S.

This chapter presents the research methodology for the study. The research methodology chapter includes the research design, population and sample, hypotheses, and definition of variables. This chapter also includes a discussion on instrumentation, data collection procedures and data analysis.

Research Design

For the purpose of this research study, the survey method was chosen because of its ability to collect data from a large number of respondents in a relatively short time, respondents are more willing to share personal information because they are not
disclosing it directly to another person and eliminate interview bias. With no manipulation of the independent variables, the study is a non-experimental, correlational, cross-sectional design.

**Population and Sample**

This study examined black undergraduate college students who were born and raised on the continent of Africa and migrated to the U.S. to attain a higher education as well as African American undergraduate college students born and raised in the U.S., between the ages of 18-22, and who attended a PWI as of 2018. For the study, a convenience sample was recruited by an online survey tool (QuestionPro) selected according to the inclusion/exclusion criteria determined by the researcher. The sample for this study consists of 174 African American college students and 170 Black African college students studying in the U.S.

**Research Hypotheses**

There were two research hypotheses for this study. The first was, the theoretical covariance matrix and the empirical covariance matrix are equal. It was assumed that the theoretical model and the observed data would achieve a good fit, therefore justifying the model’s explanation of social integration as a function of racial identity attitude and religious orientation. The second hypothesis stated that the values of the model parameters would be the same across the different groups. It was suggested that differences exist between the model for the African American college students and the model for the Black African college students. The analytic model for this study proposed a relationship between religious orientation and social integration, a relationship between
racial identity attitude and social integration, and lastly, an interrelationship between religious orientation and racial identity attitude (see Figure 1 in Chapter 1).

Definition of Variables

This study looked at two exogenous variables, racial identity attitude and religious orientation. Racial identity attitude is measured by the Black Racial identity index which consists of 5 stages.

The first stage, conformity/pre-encounter, is characterized by the tendency to endorse Eurocentric sentiments. The second stage, dissonance/encounter, is brought about by an experience that challenges the individual’s racial views, causing the individual to refute the Eurocentric prospective of what it means to be Black. The third stage, immersion-emersion, refers to the embracing of Black American experience and history. In the fourth stage, internalization, an individual has a positive and personally relevant Black racial identity. The fifth and final stage, internalization/commitment, is characterized by social activism for Black Americans and other oppressed groups (Cross, 1971).

Religious orientation is measured by intrinsic, extrinsic social, and extrinsic personal. With the creation of the I/E-R, Gorsuch (1994) redefined intrinsic religious commitment as “the motivation for experiencing and living one’s religious faith for the sake of the faith itself. The person’s religion is an end unto itself, a goal pursued in the absence of external reinforcement (p.317). Gorsuch and McPherson also separated extrinsic religious orientation into extrinsic social and extrinsic personal. An extrinsic social orientation places emphasis on social motives as a guide for religious behavior;
whereas, an extrinsic personal orientation places emphasis on the psychological motives that guide religious behavior (Lavric & Flere, 2011).

This study also looked at the endogenous variable social integration. Social integration is the connection between the students and the social element of an institution as it pertains to collective affiliations and social support (Tinto, 1993). The conceptual and measurement definition of the three variables to be included in this study is outlined below.

Racial Identity Attitude (RIA)

Racial identity attitude is conceptually defined as a person’s attitudes, thoughts, feelings, behaviors towards both oneself as member of a racial group and members of the dominant racial group (Carter, 1996, p. 195). Each level of racial identity [e.g. Pre-encounter (Conformity), Post-encounter (Dissonance), Immersion, Emersion, and Internalization] consists of its own constellations of emotions, beliefs, motives, and behaviors, which influence its expression (Carter, 1996, p.196). It is instrumentally defined as the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS), a 60-item scale that measures racial identity attitude. The BRIAS includes items such as, “I believe that certain aspects of “black experience” apply to me, and others do not.” For the operational definition, items on the BRIAS are scored using a 5-point Likert scale. The values for scoring range from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The score for the scale is obtained by summing up the responses to each item, then dividing by the number of items in the scale.
Religious Orientation (RO)

Religious orientation is conceptually defined as the motives behind religious behavior (Allport, 1950). It is instrumentally defined as the I/E-R, a 14-item scale that measures attitudes reflective of three dimensions of religious motivation. For the operational definition, items on the I/E-R are scored using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1 strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Respondents scores are summed up and result into two scores based on which the participants are divided into categories according to their external or internal spirituality.

Social Integration (SI)

Social integration is conceptually defined as the act of a student to unify or be incorporated into a larger campus group or community of students (Tinto, 1993). The instrumental definition for Social Integration is the Institutional Integration Scale (IIS), a 30-item scale that assesses student self-reported levels of social and academic integration (French & Oakes, 2004, p.89). For the purpose of this study only the peer-group interactions subscale will be used and analyzed. Operationally, items on the IIS are scored using a 5-point Likert scale. The values for scoring range from 1(strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).
Instrumentation

The researcher used four instruments in conducting this study, in order to properly account for the elements being measured. Instruments for this study consist of a demographic form and three questionnaires: BRIAS-60 items developed by Huentity Psychological Consulting (2010), I/E-R by Gorsuch and MacPherson (1989), and IIS by French and Oakes (2004). The reliability and validity of all three instruments are outlined below.

The first BRIAS, Form A, was created by Hall, Cross, and Freedle (1972) and consisted of 30 items. In a study by Ponterotto and Wise (1987), the RIAS responses of 186 African American were comparable with Cross’s (1971, 1978) Preencounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization stages; however, responses were unsubstantiated for the RIAS Encounter subscale. The RIAS-Short Form B (RIAS-B) followed shortly thereafter. It was designed to measure four of the five attitudes described in the original Nigrescence model and consisted of the same 30 items in the RIAS but included a reassignment of items to subscales and was factor analytically derived. The scales psychometric properties was evaluated by Yanico, Swanson, and Tokar (1994) and results were consistent with Ponterotto and Wise’s (1987) findings with the RIAS. Although there was some support for the factorial validity of the Preencounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization subscale, there was low internal consistencies for all four subscales and high intercorrelation for Encounter and Immersion-Emersion.

The RIAS-Long Form (RIAS-L) consisted of 50 items and was developed by Helms and Parham (1996) with the purpose to increase the internal consistency estimates of the original scale. Tokar & Fischer (1998) evaluated the scale through confirmatory
and exploratory factor analysis and of the 50 items in the scale, only 39 items were used for analysis. Results revealed low correlation of Encounter items with the other three subscales, high intercorrelation between the other three subscales, and mildly adequate internal consistency reliability estimates. Harkley, McLellan & Randall (2002) tested the stability and internal consistency of the RIAS-L in a clinical population with 53 participants. Due to the inadequate test properties of the scale, Harkley et al. used the individual item test-retest results and applied a threshold strategy between the two administrations. With the application of the threshold, scale items were reduced from 50 to 23 and the Encounter scale was eliminated. The findings from the three modified scales (i.e. Pre-encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization) were similar to Tokar & Fischer’s (1998) findings. Helms has continued to work on improving the measurement of the BRIAS as reflected in the development of the BRIAS-60 items. At present, the psychometric properties for the BRIAS-60 items have not been substantiated.

The original study for the I/E-R consisted of a sample of 771 college students at both secular and religious colleges in Southern California. For the I/E-R intrinsic dimension, the Cronbach’s α = 0.83 and for its overall extrinsic dimension the Cronbach’s α = 0.65 [extrinsic social = .58; extrinsic personal = .57] (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989).

French and Oaks (2004) evaluated the IIS psychometric properties by using two samples of 1st year undergraduate students were used in this study. The first sample of participants consisted of 773 students (men = 361, women = 412). The second sample consisted of 1,734 (men =1,144, women = 590). Ethnicity of the participants included Caucasian (87%), African American (3.7%), Asian American, (3.7%), Hispanic (0.20%),
and Native American (2.0%). For the first sample the coefficient alpha was .83. For the second sample, the coefficient alpha was .92. The coefficient alpha for the Peer-Group Interaction subscale was (.84).

Procedures

The data collection process for this study included four sections. The first section is comprised of the informed consent form which serves the purpose of explaining the research question, risk and benefits, confidentiality, and other relevant information to the participants. The second section consists of a background survey, which will be used to obtain demographic information. The third section will contain an inventory assessing the religious orientation, racial identity attitude, and social integration of the participants. However, before the researcher began the data collection process, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Andrews University will first have to approve and grant permission for any the research to take place. The IRB application will provide an outline of the intended research to be undertaken.

QuestionPro will directly add filters to their panel list as per the researchers’ inclusion criteria and prospective participants will receive a single email link for access to the survey. The first page of the survey will be an informed consent form that will describe the parameters of the study, its purpose, significance, potential risks and benefits for participants. The participants will also be informed about data management and their right to confidentiality. Prospective participants will indicate their consent to participate by clicking on an “I agree” button at the end of the informed consent form on the first page of the survey. Once this button is clicked to indicate consent, the online survey comprising demographic screening items will be accessible. Once participants have been
determined eligible by the demographic screening items, they will be presented with items from a merged document of three questionnaires (84 items) about racial identity attitude, religious orientation, and peer-group interactions (BRIAS, I/E-R, and IIS respectively).

No physical, social, psychological, legal or economic harm to participants was anticipated as a result of this study. QuestionPro’s Respondent Anonymity Assurance (RAA) will ensure that respondent anonymity is preserved. No participants contact or identifying information was made available to the principal investigator of this study. All survey responses will be kept confidential. To avoid human error, the original data were transferred to SPSS directly from QuestionPro’s data collection platform. QuestionPro reports Internet Protocol (IP) addresses to ensure that surveys are only taken once by participants. There was no follow up with participants after the completion of the survey. All IP addresses were deleted once the SPSS file had been transferred. The data was stored under a secure password protected file on a secure password protected computer. Additional password protected backup files were stored on an external USB flash drive, kept in a secured location by the principal investigator. The dissertation methodologist also had access to the raw data. After the data had been successfully downloaded, backed up and securely stored, the original files will be deleted from QuestionPro. The Andrews University IRB policy requiring storage of survey data for a minimum of three years, will be applied. Following this mandatory storage period, the data were securely deleted.
Data Analysis

In order to evaluate the relationship between the endogenous variables and the exogenous variable, the researcher employs correlation, regression analysis, and structural equation modeling, and a survey. These statistical techniques are appropriate for this study because they can indicate not only the singular impact and relationship with each other but also the joint impact. Correlation indicates not only the strength but also the direction of the relationship, while regression gauges the joint and singular impact of the independent variable on the dependent (Bewick, Cheek, & Ball, 2003). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is also appropriate for this study because of its ability to evaluate the specific relationships hypothesized among a set of variables. In this study, the researcher utilized structural equation modeling as a means to understand the patterns of covariance among a set of variables and explain their variance with the model specified. The following section explains the procedures that were followed for the analysis of the data.

Data Entry & Cleaning

After the data were collected, they were exported from QuestionPro and recorded in Excel. Then, the researcher exported the numerical data from Excel to SPSS for analysis. To ensure the values entered into the SPSS data file were within the boundaries of what would be reasonably expected, the researcher cleaned the data. Cleaning the data entailed checking for consistency to verify the reliability of the data collected. Data that were erroneous were corrected using raw scores from the responses by cross checking
original items on the questionnaires and Excel spreadsheets. Missing cases were deleted if 90% of the data is missing.

Rationale for Using Structural Equation Modeling

The researcher used SEM to analyze the research questions. The researcher compared the influence of religious orientation which included manifest variables: intrinsic, extrinsic social, extrinsic personal; racial identity attitude which includes manifest variables: pre-encounter, post-encounter, immersion, emersion, and internalization; in addition to black subgroups which included Black African college students and African American college students on social integration. The data were analyzed using AMOS to estimate the parameters, provide descriptive statistics, correlations and to determine the fit of the structural model with the observed data. The statistical significance level of .05 was used for the study.

When using the SEM technique, the following assumptions were assumed: (1) multivariate normal distribution, (2) a linear relationship between endogenous and exogenous variables, (3) the data is free of outliers, (4) the sample size is 200 to 400, and (5) error terms are uncorrelated with other variable error terms. The researcher assessed the validity of the measurement model and examined the structural model validity. Assessing the measurement model is also called the CFA. In the CFA, the researcher compares the theoretical measurement against the reality model and the result of the CFA must be associated with the constructs’ validity (Statistics Solutions, 2019). In terms of the structural model validity, a model is considered a goodness-of-fit if the value of the chi-square test provides an insignificant result at a 0.05 threshold (Barrett, 2007). The Chi-Square assumes multivariate normality, therefore severe deviations form normality
may result in model rejections (McIntosh, 2006). RMSEA tells us how well the model with chosen parameter estimates would fit the population’s covariance matrix (Byrne, 1998). A cut-off value close to .06 (Hu and Bentler, 1999) or a stringent upper limit of 0.07 (Steiger, 2007) is recommended for the RMSEA. The goodness-of-fit index (GFI) has a cut-off point of $p > 0.90$ (Miles and Shevlin, 1998). For the normed-fit index (NFI) and the comparative fit index (CFI), values of $p > 0.95$ is indicative if a good fit according to the recommendations of Hu & Bentler (1999, as cited in Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to investigate the interplay of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on the social integration experiences of Black African and African American students attending predominantly White institutions. In particular, I sought to investigate the differences between African American college students and Black African college students’ racial identity attitude and religious orientation, and how both variables independently and collectively influence the aforementioned groups’ incorporation into a predominantly white community of students. Correlation analysis, regression analysis, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) were used to gauge the independent and joint effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables. This chapter presents a description of the characteristics of the sample participants; a discussion of the zero-order correlation and a report of the findings resulting from the SEM and multiple regression analyses.

Participant Description

A total of 1624 individuals clicked on the link to my survey. However, some of those cases were excluded from the data analysis because the participant did not meet the study’s criteria, or the participant chose to discontinue the survey before completion. Of
those who consented to the informed consent, 356 individuals completed the whole survey. That means that 1, 151(71%) individuals were automatically terminated for not meeting study criteria (i.e. the college/ university I currently attend is predominately black and the college/ university I currently attend is an equal representation of black and white students). Among the 356 completed surveys, an additional 12 were removed from the data set after a manual review in data screening due to a large number of missing responses. After these cases were removed from the data set, the 344 remaining respondents were included in the data analysis.

Demographic Characteristics

A description of the demographic characteristics of the sample provides useful information not only for the choice of techniques the researcher employs in making sense of the data, but also a better contextual grasp for those who read the research report. A description of the demographic variables included in this study is given in Table 1.

As can be noted, most of the participants 174(50.6%) were born in the US. The Black African students’ place of birth breakdown reveals that the majority of these students 69(20%) originated in West Africa, followed by North Africa 27(7.8%); East Africa 26(7.6%); Central Africa 25(7.3%); and South Africa 23(6.7%). Most of the sample, 273(79.4%) identified as female. In the age category participants were between the ages of 18 to 22, with the breakdown as follows: 73 (21.2%) 18 years old; 96 (27.9%)19 years old; 69 (20%)20 years old; 64 (18.6%); 21 years old; and 42 (12.2%) 22 years old.
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 344)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Composition of Primary School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominate Black</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominate White</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Composition of Middle School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominate Black</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominate White</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Composition of High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominate Black</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominate White</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked to indicate the racial composition of the primary school they attended, 95 (27.6%) reported attending a predominantly black primary school; 172 (50%) a predominately white school; and 77 (22.4%) a mixed primary school. The responses that participants gave on the racial composition of their middle school indicate that 119 (34.6%) attended a predominantly black middle school; 139 (40.4%) a predominantly white middle school; and 86 (25%) a mixed middle school. Finally, when asked about the racial composition of the high school they had attended, 99 (28.8%) noted that they had attended a predominantly black high school with 142 (41.3%) indicating attendance of a predominately white high school; and 103 (29.9%) a mixed high school.

**Observed Variables Description**

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the following endogenous variables: Confor, Disso, Im_Em, Intern, ROI, ROs, ROp, and SI. The highest mean for the collective sample was reported in the subscale of Internalization (3.92) and the lowest mean (1.91) in the Conformity subscale.

Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations for the African American sample. As is the case of the overall sample, the highest mean for the African American subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in the United States</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was reported on the Internalization subscale (3.86) and the lowest mean on the
Conformity (2.25). Table 2

*Observed Variables Mean and Standard Deviations – Collective Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roi</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Observed Variables Mean and Standard Deviations – African American Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roi</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations for the Black African sample.

The highest mean for the group was reported on the Internalization subscale (3.91) and the lowest mean was on the Conformity subscale (2.12). these statistics as noted earlier
are consistent with the overall sample mean as well as that for the African American subgroup, indicating little variance across groups.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roi</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zero-Order Correlations

The zero order correlations (Appendix) show that the correlations ranged from weak to strong. The following variables were moderately correlated: SI and Intern ($r = .38$), ROI and ROs ($r = .49$), ROI and ROp ($r = .39$), ROI and Intern ($r = .37$), ROs and ROp ($r = .34$), and lastly ROs and Conform ($r = .37$). Disso and Conform ($r = .69$) as well as Intern and Im_Em ($r = .64$) were strongly correlated.

Hypotheses Testing

The first hypothesis of this study was that the covariance matrix and the empirical covariance matrix are equal. The initial model of social integration is available in Figure 2. The predictive relationships of social integration model for the sample is displayed in
Figure 3, while the predictive relationships of social integration model for Black African college students appears in Figure 4. Additionally, the predictive relationships of social integration model for African American college students, as shown in Figure 5 is an indication of partial support for the hypothesis as there is a moderate direct effect of RIA on SI; though there is only a weak direct effect of RO on SI. The second hypothesis of this study was

![Figure 2: Initial Model of Social Integration.](image-url)
Figure 3: Predictive Relationships of Social Integration Model – Collective.

Figure 4: Predictive Relationships of Social Integration Model - Black African College Students.
that the values of the model parameters are different across groups. The paths are comparable across groups, hence there are no significant difference between model parameters.

The initial model of social integration was a poor fit for the data. The Chi-square for the original model was 198.88 ($df = 23$) with a probability level of $< .001$. This was not surprising given the sample size of the study and the skewness of some of the data, which can both prevent the Chi-square from reaching non-significance at the .05 level. Therefore, as anticipated, the model was evaluated on the basis of fit indices. The criteria used to determine acceptable model fit was $GFI \geq .90$; $NFI \geq .95$; $CFI \geq .95$; and $RMSEA; \leq .06$. Cut-off values were determined according to the recommendations of Hooper et al., 2008. The fit indices for the hypothesized model were as follows: $GFI =$
.89; $NFI = .85$; $CFI = .87$; and $RMSEA = .15$ (.13 to .17). These fitting indexes including the poor $RMSEA$ don’t support the viability of the model.

Exploratory analyses were implemented in order to develop an adjusted model. The first main change was to combine the immersion and the emersion subscales into one subscale as proposed by Helms and Parham (1996). Then, additional modification indices were examined and correlations that were theoretically consistent were added to improve model fit. Correlations were added between the error terms on ROs and Disso ($r = .31$), between the error terms on ROs and Conform ($r = .46$), and lastly between the error terms on Conform and Disso ($r = .67$). The following paths display a positive beta coefficient and a strong relationship, RO to ROs ($\beta = .56, p < .001$), RO to ROI ($\beta = .86, p < .001$), and lastly, RIA to Im_Em ($\beta = .64, p < .001$). There was a moderate direct effect of RIA on SI ($\beta = .33, p = .001$), indicating that higher RIA is significantly correlated with higher SI. Conversely, there was a weak direct effect of RO on SI ($\beta = .13, p = .036$). Overall, the collective model accounted for 16% of the variance in SI. The unstandardized coefficients for all three models are presented in Table 5. Table 6 presents the standardized coefficients for Figure 3.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Collective R² = .16</th>
<th>Black African R² = .16</th>
<th>African American R² = .18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROp ← RO</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs ← RO</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI ← RO</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern ← RIA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso ← RIA</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em ← RIA</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform ← RIA</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4 depicts the predictive relationships of social integration on Black African college students solely. The correlations between the error terms on ROs and Disso ($r = .38$) and between the error terms on ROs and Conform ($r = .48$) were slightly higher than the collective sample. Conversely, the correlation between the error terms on Conform and Disso ($r = .66$) was equivalent for the Black African college student model and the collective model. The following paths displayed positive beta coefficients and a strong relationship: RO to ROi ($\beta = .89$, $p < .001$) and RIA to Im_Em ($\beta = .63$, $p < .001$). There was a moderate direct effect of RIA on SI with $\beta = .32$ ($p = .001$), indicating that higher RIA is significantly correlated with higher SI. Conversely, there is a weak direct effect of RO on SI ($\beta = .15$, $p = .121$). Table 5 illustrates the path coefficients in Figure 4.

Overall, the model accounted for approximately 16% of the variance in SI.

Figure 5 depicts the predictive relationships of social integration of African American college students exclusively. In comparison to the collective sample, the correlation between the error terms on ROs and Disso ($r = .25$) on the African American sample was lower than that of the collective sample. However, the correlation between the error terms on ROs and Conform ($r = .47$) was higher than that of the collective sample. The correlation between the error terms on Conform and Disso ($r = .67$) was equivalent for the African American college student model and the collective model. Lastly, the African American sample displayed higher factor loadings on ROs (.67) and ROp (.55) in comparison to the African American sample. The following paths displayed a positive beta coefficient and a strong relationship: RO to ROs ($\beta = .67$, $p < .001$), RO to

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIA ↔ RO</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI ↔ RO</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI ↔ RIA</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROi ($\beta = .85, p < .001$) and RIA to Im_Em ($\beta = .64, p < .001$). There was a moderate direct effect of RIA on SI ($\beta = .35, p < .001$), indicating that higher RIA is significantly correlated with higher SI. Conversely, there was a weak direct effect of RO on SI ($\beta = .14, p = .099$). Table 5 illustrates the path coefficients in Figure 5. Overall, the model accounted for approximately 18% of the variance in SI.

Table 6 illustrates the Chi-square and fit indices for all three models. The Chi-square for the collective model was 65.786 ($df = 16$) with a probability level of <.001. The fit indices for the model were as follows: $NFI = .92; IFI = .94; CFI = .94; and SRMR = .06$. The Chi-square for the Black African model was 39.503 ($df = 16$) with a probability level of .001. The fit indices for the model were as followed: $NFI = .90; GFI = .95; CFI = .93; and SRMR = .06$. Lastly, the Chi-square for the African American model was 45.683 ($df = 16$) with a probability level of < .001. The fit indices for the model were as followed: $NFI = 90; GFI = .94; CFI = .93; and SRMR = .07$.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>African American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>65.786</td>
<td>39.503</td>
<td>45.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The model for the collective sample, the Black African sample, and African American sample resulted in similar fit indices and path relationships. All models
illustrated a moderate direct effect between RIA and SI, indicating that higher RIA is significantly correlated with higher SI. All models also illustrated a weak direct effect between RO and SI. Lastly, the percent of variance explained by the predictor variables was highest with the African American sample (18%).

The results of this study were described in this chapter. First, characteristics of the sample including data screening steps were described. Secondly, characteristics of the variables were described. Thirdly, results of SEM analyses were shown and described for the full sample, Black African sample and African American sample.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter the contents of the previous four chapters are summarized. The purpose of the study is outlined; the literature review is condensed; the methodology is described, and the results of the study are presented. Following, the findings are reflected upon in light of the existing literature. Finally, implications and recommendations for future research are identified and discussed.

Research Problem

The increase in diversity at Predominantly White Institutions (PWI) has not resulted in an increase in cross-relationship satisfaction for African American and Black African students attending these institutions. Whereas, the educational system has been described as “the most important agent in the socialization process” (Johnson, 1975, p. 3), research has revealed that the socialization process in higher education is a challenging task for African American and Black African college students alike (Allen, 1985; Pritchard & Skinner, 2002).

However, what seems missing is an acknowledgement of the fact that the two groups are culturally different, and conflating them, as is currently done in the National
census, for example, compromises efforts aimed at understanding the nature of their social integration experience at PWIs. Black Africans and African Americans differ in terms of immigration history, nationality, and ethnic group ideologies, (Stebleton, 2007). It is therefore important that this difference be acknowledged in any effort directed at determining how this difference play into their social integration experience at PWIs.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the interplay of racial identity attitude and religious orientation on the social integration experiences of Black African college students and African American college students, attending predominantly White institutions.

**Research Hypotheses**

This study addressed the undertaking of multi-group comparisons with the aim of comparing structural relationships between groups. The analytic model shown in Figure 1 proposes a relationship between racial identity attitude and religious orientation on one hand and social integration on the other. The exogenous variables in the theoretical model are religious orientation and racial identity attitude. Religious orientation is captured by the intrinsic/extrinsic social scale, while racial identity attitude consisting of the subscales of conformity/pre-encounter, dissonance/encounter, immersion-emersion and internalization, is captured by BRIS. The endogenous variable in the theoretical model is social integration and its indicator is peer-group interaction. The hypotheses of this study were: (1) the theoretical covariance matrix and the empirical covariance matrix are equal and (2) the values of model parameters are the same across the different groups.
Significance of the Study

This area of research is important to the field of counseling psychology because its aim is to consider variables that facilitate or hinder social integration experiences for Black African college students, an understudied population. This study also sought to examine the relationship between religious orientation, racial identity attitude and social integration which has not been currently studied. Lastly, the perspectives and orientations of African American college students and Black African college students remain complex and rich with multiple components on both the individual and group level; and thus, warrant continual research in order to identify sociocultural factors impacting students of color at PWIs.

Summary of Literature Review

According to Tinto (1975), as a student interacts within the various systems within an institution, he or she develops a “fit” with the institution. This “fit” can be defined as the congruence between the student and the institution that they attend in terms of norms and values. All in all, social integration is cultivated by way of relationships and connections; therefore, the lack thereof causes students to feel excluded from their campus environment.

Over time, there has been an increase in Black student enrollment at PWIs and decrease in HBCUs as a result of more access to institutional offerings (Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010). There has also been a growing number of African born migrants residing in the U.S., which the U.S. Census Bureau reports has nearly doubled each decade since 1970 (Gabino, Trevelyan, & Fitzwater, 2014). The foreign-born African population has
nearly doubled from 2000-2010, with 1.1 million African immigrants residing in the U.S. (Capps, 2012). Although there is no specific data to identify the number of African immigrants attending U.S. institutions, the number of international students from Sub Saharan Africa has increased by 21% (Open Doors, 2014). Theoretically, African immigrant and international students represent one kind of the intersections between race/ethnicity and immigration in the United States. More specifically, they “embody countervailing sociological forces” (Bennett & Lutz, 2009, p.72). (In what sense? Need to elaborate on last sentence.)

In an increasingly diverse society, racial and ethnic identity development becomes increasingly critical to the overall college student development and quality of collegiate experiences. The concept of race has historically played a major role in the lives of African Americans. Guy (1999) contends that culture is critical in defining people in terms of “how they view themselves and the world around them” (p.6). This implies that culture is an important component in intrapersonal factors and interpersonal relationships. Allen (2001) suggested, the conception of a Black sense of self is interdependent and influenced by group socialization processes and experiences. Phinney and Onwughalu (1996) pointed out that the interracial experiences of people of African descent from Africa, which are also applicable to those from the West Indies or Caribbean, differ in that they are not minorities in their nations of origin and these differences in interracial experiences may have profound implications for group socialization practices in addition to racial/ethnic identity development (Anglin & Whaley, 2006).

Religion and race form identity, provide purpose, and help to establish social relationships. Religious involvement can serve to shape and form attitudes, outlooks,
behaviors, and practices in an educational setting (Regnerus, 2000, as cited in Brown &
Gary, 1991). Religious participation on a college setting is itself a form of social
integration. Faith communities are influential in the formation of friendships and
intimacy with other people (Hill & Pargament, 2003). Religious activities and is
positively linked to social adjustment among college students (Fiesta, Strange, and
Woods, 2002).

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) suggested that students from racially
underrepresented groups who attend predominantly white campuses often band together
for support due to the perceived negative connotations they sense from nonminority
students. Thus, negative interpersonal experiences in predominantly white university
settings can limit the ability of some African American students to engage in campus life
opportunities. On the other hand, the changing racial and ethnic profile of the North
American population, particularly the increase in the number of non-white foreign-born
immigrants, introduces a new sociological movement in which non-white immigrants not
only bring their homeland racial and cultural identities, but also in real terms redefine the
meaning of racial categories from the historically and contemporary normative
black/white dichotomy to a situation of multiple and hybrid identity categories (as cited
in Kusow, 2006, p.3). Abdi is the first name).

Methodology

This study employed a non-experimental, correlational design, using self-report
surveys. The sample consisted of black undergraduate college students who were born
and raised on the continent of Africa and migrated to the U.S. to attain a higher education
as well as African American undergraduate college students born and raised in the U.S.
Sample respondents were between the ages of 18-22, and were at the time of data collection attending a PWI in the U.S. in 2018. The surveys were administered through QuestionPro, an online survey tool. All variables were quantified by participant self-report. The current study collected survey responses from 344 college students. Participants completed surveys which gathered information on racial identity attitude, religious orientation, and peer-group interactions. Racial identity was measured with the BRIAS. Religious orientation was measured with I/E-R and peer group interactions was measured with IIS. The data were analyzed using SPSS and AMOS to formulate a structural equation model in order to the examine the relationship among the variables and determine the model fit.

Findings and Discussions

The findings of this study are based on the outcomes generated by the employ of three statistical techniques: zero-order correlation, multiple regression analysis and structural equation modeling. This study addressed the undertaking of multi-group comparisons with the aim of comparing findings of the collective group, Black Africans and African Americans. The hypothesis of this study was that the theoretical covariance matrix corresponded with the empirical data produced in the predictive relationships of social integration of the collective model; the predictive relationships of social integration model for Black African college students, and the predictive relationships of social integration model for African American college students. Through the structural equation modeling hypothesis testing produced a poor fit in the initial model; a satisfactory fit was yielded in the adjusted model. Findings for the research question are discussed below.
Respondents Demographics

A total of 356 individuals completed the whole survey and an additional 12 were removed from the data set due to a large number of missing responses, the 344 surveys that remained were used for data analysis. The sample included Black African college students ($N = 170$) and African American college students ($N = 174$). The regional breakdown of the participants in the study includes 69 (20%) born in West Africa; 26 (7.6%) in East Africa; 25 (7.3%) in Central Africa; 27 (7.8%) in North Africa; 23 (6.7%) in South Africa; and 174 (50.6%) in America. Regarding the number of years lived in the U.S., five (1.5%) reported less than one year, 11 (3.2%) reported one to two years, 12 (3.5%) reported three years, and 316 (91.9%) reported four or more years. In terms of gender, 273 (79.4%) were female and 71 (20.6%) were male. Participants were between the ages of 18 to 22.

Research Hypotheses

The researcher hypothesized that the covariance matrix and the empirical covariance matrix are equal. The predictive relationships of social integration model for the collective group, predictive relationships of social integration model - Black African college students and predictive relationships of social integration model for African American college students indicate partial support. There was a moderate direct effect of RIA on SI; but a weak direct effect of RO on SI. The initial model was revised and several paths were added to improve fit, based on standardized residuals and modification indexes. The adjusted model included both adding and eliminating paths between observed variables, and resulted in a satisfactory fit for the data ($NFI = .92$; $IFI = .94$; $CFI = .94$; and $SRMR = .06$). The second hypothesis of this study was that the value of
the model parameters are different across groups. The results of study illustrated that the paths within the models are comparable across groups and there are no significant difference between model parameters.
Adjusted Model

Structural equation modeling was used to evaluate whether the hypothesized relationships among variables in the initial model were supported by this sample. Structural equation modeling revealed the initial model of social integration was a poor fit for the data, so revisions were made on the basis of the modification indices and theory. Exploratory analyses were implemented in order to develop an adjusted model. The first main change was to combine the immersion and the emersion subscales into one subscale as proposed by Helms and Parham (1996). Then, additional modification indices were examined and correlations that were theoretically consistent were added to improve model fit. Correlations were added between the error terms on ROs and Disso ($r = .31$), between the error terms on ROs and Conform ($r = .46$), and lastly between the error terms on Conform and Disso ($r = .67$). The following paths display a positive beta coefficient and a strong relationship, RO to ROs ($\beta = .56, p < .001$), RO to ROI ($\beta = .86, p < .001$), and lastly, RIA to Im–Em ($\beta = .64, p < .001$). Several noteworthy intercorrelation appear between variables including the link between racial identity attitude and immersion-emersion ($\beta = .64, p < .001$); religious orientation and extrinsic social orientation ($\beta = .56, p < .001$); and religious orientation and extrinsic personal orientation ($\beta = .86, p < .001$).

There was a moderate direct effect of RIA on SI ($\beta = .33, p = .001$), indicating that higher RIA is significantly correlated with higher SI. Conversely, there was a weak direct effect of RO on SI ($\beta = .13, p = .036$). The collective model accounted for 16% of the variance in SI. The findings suggest that one’s religious orientation does not impact their level of social integration. These findings also suggest that the higher the sense of racial identity reported, the more likely an individuals were to effectively integrate within
a predominately white setting. There remains a significant portion of unexplained variance among the factors. Thus, it is possible that future researchers might build on this model by including additional variables that might contribute to a better explanation of the parameters that impact Black African and African American college student’s effective integration. Below are the breakdown, explanations, and implications of the three models.

**Racial Identity Attitude and Social Integration**

There are significant differences in the mean value for the racial identity attitude scale for the RIA-initial stage and RIA-latter stage. There is a negative correlation between racial identity attitude and its subscale, conformity as well as negative correlation between RIA and its subscale, dissonance; meaning that when conformity or dissonance increase, RIA decreases with the same magnitude and vice versa. The highest mean score was 3.92 on the internalization scale of zero to five and the lowest mean score was 1.91 on the conformity scale of zero to five. These findings suggest that many of the respondents fell within the internalization-commitment stage. It is at this stage that African American college students endorse a positive sense of racial identity, creating a personal sense of blackness and have a healthy self-actualization (Cross, 1991).

There was a moderate direct effect of RIA on SI ($\beta = .33, p = .001$), indicating that higher RIA was significantly correlated with higher SI. Research on racial identity development in African-Americans, has revealed its impact on socialization, and other factors (Sanders-Thompson & Alexander, 2006; Cook, Kosoko-Lasaki, & O'Brien, 2005). This relationship is also congruent with the research that presumes that an individual with high levels of acculturation and racial identity are well-integrated within
both the White majority group and their respective cultural group (Kitano & Maki, 1997; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Geton, 1993). In addition, these findings also align with research that suggests individuals can have a multicultural view that also includes acknowledging the impact of racism and bias as part of the individual's experience (Thompson, Anderson, and Bakeman, 2000).

Literature has shown that the impact of race and racial identity for African-Americans is multifaceted and complex (Sanders-Thompson & Alexander, 2006; Cook, Kosoko-Lasaki, & O'Brien, 2005). Also, African immigrants are redefining the meaning of “blackness,” Allen (2001) proposed that the conception of a Black sense of self was interdependent and influenced by group socialization processes and experiences. Likewise, Griffin et al.’s (2016) found that Black immigrant and U.S. born Black students recognized that racialized experiences occurred on their campus, but their views on the experiences varied by nationality. Alexander (2004) stated that racial identification is a shared American experience and that living in the United States makes one recognize their race and its implication. The intersectionality framework emphasizes that social identities and categories should not be viewed as independent variables that capture individual characteristics; instead, they should be viewed as markers of institutional processes (Cole 2010).

**Religious Orientation and Social Integration**

There was a weak direct effect of RO on SI ($\beta = .13$, $p = .036$). These findings coincide with the research on religious involvement that states that religion is just one of the many identity categories that explain social behavior and that individuals possess multiple, competing group identities that shape their social experiences and attitudes (Read and
However, it is also important to note that the African American sample displayed higher factor loadings on ROs (.67) and ROp (.55) in comparison to the African American sample. The results illustrate that for African Americans, religious orientation is influenced by external factors. Past scholars described the Black church as an “invisible institution” (Frazier, 1963) where Black Americans rely on one another for support in the face of inequalities and racial issues that continue to occur to African American students within higher education today (Barrett, 2010). According to Carroll (1998) the stress some African-American students experience at majority institutions is produced, fostered, and embedded within the fabric of the campus environment. As a result of these environmental conditions, some students may resort to spirituality as a coping mechanism. Furthermore, those at PWIs reported higher levels of spirituality and religiosity than white students at predominantly white campuses (Walker & Dixon, 2002). Though the results continue to reveal mixed outcomes as it pertains to the impact of religious orientation and religion social integration. According to Booker (2010), Black African students may hold particular religious and spiritual values based on the importance of religion and spirituality in their respective country. Unfortunately, Black Africans have been omitted from discourses of religious orientation giving rise to ongoing queries regarding Black Africans religious experiences. Barrett (2010) study concluded that religious involvement can serve as a socializing agent and Bourdieu, (2000) supported Barrett (2010) and added that there were efforts of mainstream institutions to block students from nonmainstream backgrounds (e.g. African American and Black Africans). Chaves (2010) postulates that various identity categories interact with religion across contexts and situations resulting in variable outcomes and making it
difficult to make definite conclusions about the intersection of religious orientation and on social life.

**Racial Identity Attitude, Religious Orientation, and Social Integration**

All three models illustrated a moderate direct effect between RIA and SI. The percent of variance explained by the predictor variables was 18% for the African American model, 16% for the collective model, and 16% for the Black African model. From the results, it can be suggested that individuals who have developed a secure identity and were also comfortable expressing preferences and interests for experiences with other races experienced greater social integration experiences. The findings for the African American college students and Black African college students independently and collectively were fairly consistent with one another. These finding are congruent with that results of the study conducted by Phinney and Onwughalu (1996) which noted that racial identity scores did not differ between Black African international and African American student groups; especially those Black African international students who have been in the U.S. for some time which means that Black African students’ racial identity significantly increased with longer residence in the United States. Furthermore, it appears that within the college milieu the status of one’s racial identity attitude has the potential to influence interpersonal relationships with peers in the boarder social context (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016). Guy (1999) contends that culture is critical in defining people in terms of “how they view themselves and the world around them” (p.6). This implies that culture is an important component in intrapersonal factors and interpersonal relationships. Intersectionality uncovers how individual situations contribute to differences in the
perception and effects of racial discrimination, racial identity attitude, and the psychological tools an individual develops to cope with structural racism. Thus, the results of this study reveal that social categories are not independent and unidimensional but rather multiple and mutually constitutive (Bowleg, 2012).

Final Implications

Racial identity and religious involvement serve to shape and form attitudes, outlooks, and behaviors in an educational setting. Yet, they are just two of the many identity categories that explain social behavior, for individuals possess multiple, competing group identities that shape their social experiences and attitudes. Thus, it is important for both educators, counseling psychologists and researchers alike to continue to seek understanding on how social categories often not only embody institutional policies and practices that structure social inequalities, but how these social categories shape the social integration experiences of African American and Black African college students at PWIs.

The intersectional nature of African immigrants, being both Black and foreign is often discounted in literature. The term African American is often mistakenly used to represent all people of color, negating the variation of cultural identities amongst people of color and places a strong emphasis on skin tone (Hoare, 1991; Smith, 1995). This study argues that intersectionality framework can serve as a helpful tool to understand the interplay between racial and ethnic categories, particularly as they concern Black African college students and African American college students. While a few studies have attempted to gain some conceptual understanding of how Black Africans unique characteristics and their construction of a distinct immigrant and international identity is
different from and may be oppositional to the African American identity (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016) — few have examined the cultural adjustment processes of Black African college students in the United States and how experiences of profound cultural value conflicts affect their academic and personal adjustment in the American educational system (Constantine et al., 2005); in particular, the role that intersectionality plays in social integration experiences.

Hulko suggests viewing intersectionality as a “paradigm,” “lens” or “perspective” As a paradigm is functions as “a cohesive set of theoretical concepts, method of analysis, and belief system” (2009, p.44). As a lens or perspective, it examines multiple social identities simultaneously (Atewologun, 2018). Intersectionality provides a useful framework to recognize the often-hidden identity of Black Africans. Although intersectionality has traditionally been used in the content of Black feminist theory, this study followed the example of other scholars in demonstrating that this multi-category research paradigm has many advantages in the area of diversity and can shed light on an obscured yet ever-growing Black African population.

**Limitations of Study**

The Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale is commonly tested on African American college students. Therefore, Black African college students may interpret the items on the racial identity in a different way than the normalization samples.

There is a dearth of studies that use the I/E-R to explore religious orientation among Black African college students. Thus, it is possible that Black African college students in the current sample may interpret the items on the religious orientation measure in a different way than the normalization sample.
Due to convenience sampling, the results of the study cannot be generalized in context to a larger population, but rather suggested.

Different institutional types may afford different types of student experiences. For example, student experiences at a small, private institution may vary greatly from experiences at a large, public institution. As a result, the researcher cannot control for specific variances within institutions that may impact the study.

My data was analyzed using SEM, meaning that my results are based on the degree of fit observed between my resulting SEM model and the data from the current sample. Therefore, a different model with the same or similar variables may be a better fit for the data. Which? What, for example, can be included in such a model?
Suggestions for Further Research

The intent of this study was to address the undertaking of multi-group comparisons with the aim of comparing structural relationships between African American and Black African college students. This study also sought to tackle a topic on which little previous research has been done. Though, the results did not support the hypothesis, the results of this study revealed a range of reasons and alternative options for future researchers stated below.

The results revealed a weak direct effect of religious orientation on social integration. There is a dearth of studies that use the I/E-R to explore religious orientation among Black African college students; hence, creating a religious orientation or religion measurement scale for Black African college students in particular is warranted as the research reveals that Black African students may hold particular religious and spiritual values based on the importance of religion and spirituality in their respective country (Booker, 2010).

The racial identity attitude scores for the African American college sample and Black African college sample independently and collectively were fairly consistent with one another; concluding that racial identity scores did not differ between Black African college students and African American student groups. The BRIAS was used in this study on account of the BRIAS having been used in another study examining the relations between religious orientation and racial identity attitudes in Black African college students (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016). At the present moment there are other scales to measure black racial identity attitude (e.g. the Cross Racial Identity Scale) for African American college students; yet, there are no black racial identity scales normalized for
Black African college students. Creating a measurement scale for Black African college students is warranted as the research highlights that Black Africans define their race in terms of language, sociocultural heritage, and country of origin and not as Black or African American (Bailey, 2001; Waters, 1991). A scale created exclusively for Black Africans is needed to gain a better conceptual understanding of how their unique characteristics and their construction of a distinct immigrant and international identity is different from and may be oppositional to the African American identity (Sanchez & Gilbert, 2016); in particular, how race may play an especially important role in relation to the cultural adjustment processes of Black African college students in the United States.

Additional Variables that May Impact Social Integration Experiences

Based on the results of this study, additional variables should be added to the model or examined in isolation, in an attempt to further verify the differences between the two groups. A variable that should be further examined and may impact one’s social integration experiences is length of residence in the U.S. According to research, if the cultural gap between Black African and the host population is wide and there are multiple conflicting values, integration may be difficult. In this study, the majority of the respondents lived in the U.S. for 4 or more year; however, if more individuals reported living in the in the U.S. for 3 years or less, the scores on the racial identity scale and religious orientation scale may have been different on account of less likelihood of adaptation of norms and values of U.S. society. Hence, time may be a contributing factor for Black African as it pertains to racial identity attitude, religious orientation and social integration experiences. Consequently, future researchers should determine the impact of time on the aforementioned variables.
Another variable that should be further examined and may likely impact racial identity scores and social integration experiences is the racial composition of one’s primary, middle, and high school. The shift from living in a racially homogenous environment may result in increased exposure to and experiences with racism (Reynolds & Constantine, 2007) and challenges with social integration in their respective PWIs. The shift from living in a racially homogenous environment to a predominantly white environment has the potential to impact racial identity, resulting in efforts to assimilate, acculturate, and/or resist prescribed notions of their identity (De Walt, 2011).

The last variable that should be further examined and have the propensity to impact racial identity attitude, religious orientation, and social integration experiences is gender. Results of this study were based on the responses of 344 participants. Of the 344 participants, 273 (79.4%) were female and 71 (20.6%) were male. Gender adds another layer of complexity; therefore, due to the prevalence of female respondents, further research is needed to determine the difference between sexes. Research has noted that men and women of the same ethnic origin have more or less the same problems in relating to a new cultural environment.

In summation, the results partially support the literature related to social integration. Recommendations for further research include examining the additional variables that may possibly impact racial identity, religious orientation and social integration experiences. (Such as?) In addition to conducting both quantitative and qualitative studies on the experiences of Black African undergraduate students studying at PWIs in the U.S. As Wilson (2009) observed, “There is something about each groups experience that provides for us a particular perspective” (p.203). Continuing to
investigate how Black African identities might impact college experiences might stimulate a reworking of the intersectional approach for Black immigrant and international college students. It is imperative to encourage dialogue about similarities and differences that can teach mutual understanding and respect among those broadly categorized as racially Black but with important ethnic differences that should not be ignored (Nsangou & Dundes, 2018).
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

STATISTICAL OUTPUTS
### Zero-Order Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROi</th>
<th>Ros</th>
<th>ROp</th>
<th>Disso</th>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Conform</th>
<th>Im_Em</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>-.199**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROi</td>
<td></td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.276**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.085</td>
<td></td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>-.291**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.688**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.201**</td>
<td>.642**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Social Integration Model - Collective Sample

Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)

Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)

Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intercept Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>65.698</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>43.834</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>62.769</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>93.398</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>46.155</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>3.349</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>89.073</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>40.783</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>3.721</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>96.071</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Covariances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>4.942</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>10.331</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>7.439</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>5.231</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

- **RIA** <-> **RO**: 0.411
- **e5** <-> **e8**: 0.672
- **e2** <-> **e8**: 0.462
- **e2** <-> **e5**: 0.310

### Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>4.081</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>13.096</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>11.741</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>10.591</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>3.186</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>13.096</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>13.096</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e8</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>13.096</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e9</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>13.016</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROi</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Integration Model – Black African Sample

**Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)**

**Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)**

**Maximum Likelihood Estimates**

#### Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>&lt;--- RO</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td>&lt;--- RO</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>&lt;--- RO</td>
<td>3.011</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>3.090</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-3.169</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>10.681</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-1.561</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&lt;--- RO</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.906</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rop</td>
<td>&lt;--- RO</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>&lt;--- RO</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roi</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&lt;--- RO</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&lt;--- RIA</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>&lt;--&gt; RIA</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>&lt;--&gt; e8</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>7.191</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>&lt;--&gt; e8</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>5.528</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>&lt;--&gt; e5</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>4.585</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>RIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>e8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>e8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>e5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>9.192</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>8.690</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>8.197</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>9.192</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>9.192</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e8</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>9.192</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e9</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>9.127</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Squared Multiple Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roi</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rop</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Integration Model - African American Sample

Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)

Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)

Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td>1.223 .197</td>
<td>6.210 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>1.724 .280</td>
<td>6.150 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>-.303 .086</td>
<td>-3.533 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>.583 .053</td>
<td>10.996 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>-.175 .082</td>
<td>-2.133 .033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.188 .114</td>
<td>1.648 .099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.308 .069</td>
<td>4.496 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.171 .045</td>
<td>3.799 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>.557 .076</td>
<td>7.351 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.313 .061</td>
<td>5.168 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.167 .057</td>
<td>2.933 .003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>RIA</th>
<th>e8</th>
<th>e8</th>
<th>e5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>3.494</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>9.301</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>8.211</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>6.757</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>9.301</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>9.301</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e8</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>9.301</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e9</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>9.242</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Squared Multiple Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Em</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disso</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROi</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROs</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROp</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent

Purpose
You are invited to participate in a research project titled “The Interplay of Racial Identity Attitude and Religious Orientation on the Social Integration Experiences of African Immigrant College Students and African American College students Attending Predominantly White Institutions.” The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of religious orientation and racial identity attitude on social integration within a college/university setting.

Researchers
This research is being conducted by Christina Johnson, a PhD student at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan. The research is being supervised by Dr. Dr. Elvin Gabriel, EdD. Results from this research will be used in Christina Johnson’s dissertation and may be published in professional literature or presented at conferences.

Procedure
This study consists of completing a demographic form and three surveys. The demographic form requests age, gender, ethnicity, and educational background. The first survey is the Racial Identity Attitude Scale. It inquires about a one’s thoughts and feelings about black and white racial groups. The second survey is the Institutional Integration Scale which asks about peer-group interactions. The third survey is the Revised Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale which inquires about religious motivation.

Participation
In order to participate, you must be an African American college student or African immigrant college students between the ages of 18-22 and attending a predominately white institution in the United States. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time.

Risks
There is minimal psychological risk in this study. However, for some, exploring racial issues can lead to discomfort. If you experience some feelings of discomfort in response to certain items on the questionnaires, please contact your school’s counseling center.

Benefits
You benefit from being prompted to think about how race and religion influence your social integration experiences on a college/university setting. You will also contribute to scientific knowledge regarding African American college students and African immigrant college students.

Compensation
If you choose to complete the survey you will be awarded points through QuestionPro which are later redeemable for prizes.
Confidentiality
QuestionPro will be responsible for collecting, protecting, and securing the data. No personal identifiers will be entered into the database and data will be coded.

Contact Information
If you have questions at any time about the survey, your participation in this research, or your rights as a participant, you may contact the principal investigator, Christina Johnson at Christina Johnson at (646) 287-4573 (cell) or email: johnson@andrews.edu. You may also contact the research advisor Dr. Elvin Gabriel at (269) 471-6223 (office) or email: gabriel@andrews.edu.

Consent
Thank you very much for your time and participation. Please start the survey by clicking on the Continue button below. By clicking this button, you are giving your consent to participate in the research described above.
APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Questionnaire
Instructions: Please read each item and select your response.

1. I am a black person born in: (Check one of the regions listed below)
   __ America
   __ West Africa
   __ East Africa
   __ Central Africa
   __ North Africa
   __ South Africa

2. My age is:
   __ 18
   __ 19
   __ 20
   __ 21
   __ 22

3. The college/university I currently attend is:
   predominantly white______ predominantly black ____ mixed_______

4. My gender identification is: Male____ Female____

5. At my primary school, the student population was:
   predominantly white_____ predominantly black ____ mixed_______

6. At my middle school, the student population was:
   predominantly white_____ predominantly black ____ mixed_______

7. At my high school, the student population was:
   predominantly white_____ predominantly black ____ mixed_______

8. I have lived in the United States for:
   ____ Less than 1 year
   ____ 1-2 years
   ____ 2-4 years
   ____ 4 or more years
APPENDIX E

SURVEYS
**Peer Group Interaction-Institutional Integration Scale**

**Instructions:** Following is a list of statements characterizing social life at your college/university. Using the scale, please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement, as it applies to your college/university experience during the past few months by marking the appropriate number. Please mark **ONLY ONE** number for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My interpersonal relationships with students have positively influenced my intellectual growth and interest in ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have developed close personal relationships with other students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student friendships I have developed have been personally satisfying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal relationships with other students have positively influenced my personal growth, values, and attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has been easy for me to meet and make friends with students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my dating relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many students I know would be willing to listen and help me if I had a personal problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most students at my college/university have values and attitudes similar to mine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the opportunities to participate in organized extra-curricular activities at my university/college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with my living/residence arrangement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Revised Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale

**Instructions:** Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the items by using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I enjoy reading about my religion.

   **Score:** 1 2 3 4 5
   - I strongly disagree
   - I strongly agree

2. I go to church because it helps me to make friends.

   **Score:** 1 2 3 4 5
   - I strongly disagree
   - I strongly agree

3. It doesn’t matter much what I believe so long as I am good.

   **Score:** 1 2 3 4 5
   - I strongly disagree
   - I strongly agree

4. It is important to me to spend time in private thought and prayer.

   **Score:** 1 2 3 4 5
   - I strongly disagree
   - I strongly agree

5. I have often had a strong sense of God’s presence.

   **Score:** 1 2 3 4 5
   - I strongly disagree
   - I strongly agree

6. I pray mainly to gain relief and protection.

   **Score:** 1 2 3 4 5
   - I strongly disagree
   - I strongly agree

7. I try to live all my life according to my religious beliefs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. What religion offers me most is comfort in times of trouble and sorrow.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prayer is for peace and happiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Although I am religious, I don’t let it affect my daily life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I go to church mostly to spend time with my friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My whole approach to life is based on my religion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I go to church mainly because I enjoy seeing people I know there.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Although I believe in my religion, many other things are more important in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helms BRIAS Social Attitudes Inventory

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to measure people’s social and political attitudes concerning race and ethnicity. As different people have different opinions, there are no right or wrong answers. Use the scale below to respond to each statement according to the way you see things. Be as honest as you can. Beside each statement circle the number that corresponds to your answer for each question that best describes how you feel. Use the scale below to respond to each statement. Please answer all 60 questions to the best of your ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe that being black is a positive experience.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I know through personal experience what being Black in America means.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am increasing my involvement in Black activities because I don’t feel comfortable in White environments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe that large numbers of Blacks are untrustworthy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel an overwhelming attachment to Black people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I involve myself in causes that will help all oppressed people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A person’s race does not influence how comfortable I feel when I am with her or him.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe that Whites look and express themselves better than Blacks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel uncomfortable when I am around Black people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel good about being Black, but do not limit myself to Black Activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When I am with people I trust, I often find myself using slang words to refer to White people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe that Black is a negative experience.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am confused about whether White people have anything important to teach me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I frequently confront the system and the (White) man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I constantly involve myself in Black political and social activities (art shows, political meetings, Black theater, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I involve myself in social action and political groups even if there are no other Blacks involved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I believe that Black people should learn to think and experience life in ways which are similar to White people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I believe that the world should be interpreted from a Black and Africentric perspective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I’m not sure how I feel about myself racially.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I feel excitement and joy in Black surroundings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I believe that Black people came from a strange, dark, and uncivilized continent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>People, regardless of their race, have strength and limitations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I find myself reading a lot of Black literature and thinking about being Black.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I feel guilty or anxious about some of the things I believe about Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I believe that a Black person’s most effective weapon for solving problems to become part of the White person’s world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>My identity revolves around being a Black person in this country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I limit myself to Black activities as much as I can.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am determined to find my Black identity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I like to make friends with Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I believe that I have many strengths because I am Black.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. I feel that Black people do not have as much to be proud of as White people do.

32. I am at ease being around Black people.

33. I believe that Whites should feel guilty about the way they have treated Blacks in the past.

34. White people can’t be trusted.

35. In today’s society if Black people don’t achieve, they have only themselves to blame.

36. The most important thing about me is that I am Black.

37. Being Black just feels natural to me.

38. Other Black people have trouble accepting me because my life experiences have been so different from their experiences.

39. Black people who have any White people’s blood should feel ashamed of it.

40. Sometimes, I wish I belonged to the White race.

41. The people I respect most are White.

42. I have begun to question my beliefs about my racial group.

43. I feel anxious when White people compare me to other members of my race.

44. I tend to bond easily with Black people.

45. A person’s race may be a positive aspect of who he or she is.

46. When I am with Black people, I pretend to enjoy the things they enjoy.

47. When a stranger who is Black does something embarrassing in public, I get embarrassed.

48. I believe that a Black person can he close friends with a White person.
49. Sometimes I think that White people are superior and sometimes I think they’re inferior to Black people.

50. I have a positive attitude about myself because I am Black.

51. I participate in Black culture.

52. I am not sure where I really belong racially.

53. I believe that White people are more intelligent than Blacks.

54. I speak my mind regardless of the consequences (e.g. being kicked out of school, being imprisoned, being exposed to danger).

55. I can’t feel comfortable with either Black people or White people.

56. I often feel that I belong to the Black racial group.

57. I am embarrassed about some of the things I feel about my racial group.

58. Most Blacks I know are failures.

59. I am changing my style of life to fit my new beliefs about Black people.

60. I am satisfied with myself.
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