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ABSTRACT

MOVING BEYOND CHOOSING US OR CHOOSING THEM: THE ROLE OF SELF-ESTEEM, SELF-EFFICACY, AND PERCEPTION OF DISCRIMINATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARAB AMERICAN RACIAL IDENTITY STATUS

By

Dahlia Rizk

University of New Hampshire, May, 2007

This research examined the relationship between racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination in Arab American individuals (N=97) utilizing Helms' (1995) People of Color racial identity model as a framework. Participants responded to an online survey including the following instruments: The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, The Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale, The People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale and The Schedule of Racist Events. Correlations revealed significant relationships at each racial identity status consistent with the characteristics outlined in Helms' model. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to determine if there were significant differences between the mean responses of
U.S. born and foreign-born Arab Americans. A significant difference was found in the variability of responses in the PRIAS Conformity subscale. Results were interpreted and implications were discussed.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The schism between the study of society and society itself has never been more apparent. As research addressing the promotion of cross-cultural understandings increases daily, concurrent socio-political climates steadily dichotomized groups into “us” versus “them” factions on both the national and international level. This dichotomization of groups may become particularly problematic for individuals who hold membership in both groups. Among Arab American individuals, for example, the call for nations to be either with or against the United States in the war against terror may create a perception of being forced to choose allegiance politically between the individual’s country of origin and country of residence. A study conducted by Beitin and Allen (2005) supports this observation. Participants in the study related that after 9/11 they, “[felt] pressured to decide if they were Arabs or Americans, with little room in between” (p. 263).

The belief that one needs to determine to which country one holds allegiance may in turn effect the process of identity formation in Arab Americans. Abu-Baker (2006) observed that in determining identity, “external events in the Middle East, internal events, the experiences of Arab immigrants during the process of acculturation, and the political events in the world all combine to form
the self-identity of Arabs in America” (p. 39). In combination, the perception of being forced to choose an allegiance and the seemingly conflicted nature of both identities may create a sense of needing to abandon part of oneself in order to sustain a sense of peace with the whole.

The choosing of one aspect of self over another has been documented to potentially lead to many psychological issues such as frustration, depression, confusion, low self-esteem, maladaptive coping styles, anger, feelings of inadequacy, and a general inability to adjust (Beitin & Allen, 2005; Naber, 2000; Yasui, Dorham, & Dishion, 2004). The need to avoid issues of dichotomy in selfhood through understanding its impact on the individual’s ability to function is vital. Therefore, the focus of this thesis is to examine the relationship between status of Arab American racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination.

**Statement of the Problem**

While literature on the estimated 1.2 million Arab Americans presently residing in the United States (Arab American Demographics, 2000) remains limited, studies seeking to correct misconceptions regarding Arab Americans or add to the small yet growing body of literature on this underrepresented group have been increasing. For example, prior to the attacks of 9/11, Al-Khatah (1999) conducted a study that found that overall Arab students had positive self-concepts. Schwartz (1999), however, pointed to group differences between recent immigrants and Arab Americans, claiming that Arab Americans may risk feeling alienated due to perceived prejudice and ridicule of their ethnicity and
thus have lower self-concepts. In yet another study, Moradi and Hasan (2004) found that perceived prejudice events are linked to lowered mental health and thus self-concept for those who experience such events. The reports on the relationship among identity, self-esteem, efficacy, and perception of prejudice are, overall, conflicted. There may be many contributing factors for the conflict in findings; however, one noted feature in common is the treatment of the ethnic population as a homogenous group with no in-group differences attributed to level of identity development.

**Theoretical Framework**

Helms (1995) explored the identity development of ethnic minorities in her People of Color Racial Identity model, describing identity development as a movement among five statuses including: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, Internalization and Integrative Awareness. The theory proposes that as individuals become more aware of their ethnicity and the inherent oppression from the dominant culture, they move through each status, although not necessarily successively. Utilizing Helms' framework, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between status of identity development among Arab American individuals and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination.

**Research Questions**

1. Is there a relationship between the Conformity status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?
(2) Is there a relationship between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?

(3) Is there a relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?

(4) Is there a relationship between the collapsed racial identity status of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?

(5) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale?

(6) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The General Self-Efficacy Scale?

(7) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale?

(8) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Schedule of Racist Events?
Null Hypotheses

H₁: There is no significant relationship between the Conformity status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₂: There is no significant relationship between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₃: There is no significant relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₄: There is no significant relationship between the collapsed racial identity statuses of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₅: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.

H₆: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The General Self-Efficacy Scale.
H7: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale*.

H8: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The Schedule of Racist Events*.

**Scope and Locale**

The study was conducted with male and female persons of Arab descent over the age of eighteen who reside in the United States. In order to broaden sampling, individuals were invited to participate through the online site SurveyMonkey. While the use of an online survey allowed for a wider range of responses nationwide, rather than from a less limited demographic area, a limitation in this design was that posting to Arab and Arab American sites may solicit individuals at certain levels of ethnic identity development, thus skewing results. To remedy this, an invitation to send the survey’s link to friends was posted at the end of the survey. This allowed participants to direct individuals to the site who may fit the demographic requirements but may not see the posted website.

**Definition of Terms**

*Arab American* – People of Arab descent born and/or raised in the United States (includes individuals considering themselves descendant from the following countries: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan,
Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen).

Ethnic Identity – an individual’s perception of a shared group identity with a particular racial group (Helms, 1993).

Immigrant – A person who leaves one country to settle permanently in another (The American Heritage Dictionary).

Minority – A group whose members have significantly less control or power over their lives than members of a dominant or majority group or a group that experiences a narrowing of opportunities (success, education, wealth, etc.) that is disproportionately low compared to their numbers in society (Schaefer, 1996).

Perception of Discrimination – the appraisal of an event of racist discrimination as stressful (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).

Racial Identity – a surface level manifestation based on what one looks like yet has deep implications in how one is treated (Chavez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999).

Racist Discrimination – Racist events that can be viewed as culturally specific stressors because they are negative events which happen to individuals from a specific racial group because of their race (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).

Self-Esteem – A positive or negative evaluation of the self (Rosenberg, 1965).
**Self-Efficacy** – The optimistic self-belief used when coping with the difficult demands of life. More specifically, self-efficacy is the belief that the person's actions are responsible for successful outcomes (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995).

**Social Identity** – A social category (e.g., nationality, political affiliation, sports team) into which one falls and to which one feels one belongs, provides a definition of who one is in terms of the defining characteristics of the category – a self-definition that is a part of the self-concept (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995).

**Summary**

As stated earlier, research on Arab American populations remains limited. Among the studies that are available, it has been noted that a need to increase literature beyond the basic description of the population is both useful and necessary. Salaita (2005), in an exploration of Arab American identity both before and after September 11, pointed out that Arab Americans "more than anyone...experienced far reaching socio-political implications without generating a corresponding body of internally constructed...scholarship to examine the rapid transformation occurring in the community" (p. 148). Understanding the relationship among self-esteem, self-efficacy, perception of discrimination and ethnic identity development can provide a more comprehensive framework for assisting those who are in the midst of the often difficult and confusing struggle of racial identity development. Promoting a more thorough understanding of the characteristics at each stage would allow clinicians, counselors, educators, and other professionals to be better able to tailor to, and thus meet, their clients' and/or students' needs. This, in turn, may contribute to an environment more
conducive to moving away from the "us" versus "them" or "self" versus "other" thinking that is distinctive not only of the resistance and immersion status in Helms' identity development model, but also in the current political climate.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In seeking to examine and understand identity development, one must also understand the context in which the identity develops. Previous theories of identity development, formulated based on European populations, have been found to be ineffective when applied to minority groups (Tajfel, 1982). The Social Identity (SI) approach sought to incorporate the contextual nature of identity development within its framework. Later theorists drew upon both classical theories of identity development and SI theory to create a framework for identity development that is tailored specifically for ethnic groups. Bandura's alternate view, Social Cognitive theory, later presents a more balanced analysis incorporating the roles of environment, cognitions, and behavior.

For the purposes of this thesis a discussion of Arab American populations will be given, followed by a presentation of Eriksonian and neo-Eriksonian identity development. Ethnic and racial identity development models will then be explored along with their applicability to Arab American individuals. A brief overview of SI theory will then be given with a discussion of the measure of self-esteem and perception of discrimination. A discussion of Social Cognitive theory
and the measure of self-efficacy will be explored followed by, in summary, the relevancy of the literature to the proposed research.

**Arab Americans**

Prior to September 11, Arab Americans were considered by some to be an invisible minority (Al-Hazza & Lucking, 2005; Naber, 2000). Sulieman and Abu Laban explain that until WWII the majority of Arab immigrants participated in their own invisibility by collectively "identifying as white, anglicizing their names, replacing Arabic with English, and restricting their ethnic identity to the private sphere" (Naber, 2000, p. 40). Later political upheavals, revolutions, and wars would slow this trend as the new waves of immigrants arrived not only with an increased sense of Arab nationalism but also with a desire to hold on to previously discarded aspects of ethnicity (Naber, 2000).

While the desire to hold on to previously discarded aspects of ethnicity has been noted as increasing, discrepancies in identification of Arab individuals continue to exist. According to the US Census, there are an estimated 1.2 million Americans of Arab descent living in the United States today (2000). The Arab American Institute, however, estimates that the population is larger (at about 3.5 million people).

Pollster Zogby International (Arab American Demographics Report, 2002) has discussed the discrepancy in the Arab American Institute's estimate and the US Census' estimate. Zogby noted that the methodology of the Census Bureau is designed in a way that does not count many people of Arab descent. The distributed form includes no category for Arabs, leaving those who chose to fill
out the form to check "Other" for ethnicity. This is compounded by the fact that many Arabs do not fill out the questionnaires at all, avoiding what they perceive to be invasive questions (2002).

Arab groups structure society with an emphasis on family, community, and tribal background. This collective focus creates an experience of divided loyalties upon immigration when Arab individuals are often faced with the task of somehow combining both structures in a way that allows them to retain their ethnic identity while seeming assimilated or acculturated enough to fit into the United States. Due to their emphasis on the collective, Arab individuals traditionally perceive themselves through the lens of the group to which they belong. "Whereas a Western individual may internalize social rules and rely on internally derived guilt to amend inappropriate behaviors, an Arab individual is more likely to be sanctioned by external-oriented shame stemming from the attitude of others" (Gorkin, Masalha, & Yatsiv, 1984). This is evident in a common Arabic phrase of censure, "al bawab hay fakar ay" (what will the doorman think) to indicate disagreement with the wisdom of another's actions.

Finding a balance between cultures is not the only task facing Arabs in the United States during the development of racial identity. Public perceptions of Arabs have been, historically, inaccurate. Arabs are typically orientalized or villainized in a series of fallacies and misunderstandings that remain remarkably resilient (Said, 1979). Arab women are typically believed to be either highly sexual, portrayed as seductive harem dwellers, dancers or on the opposite spectrum, as sexually oppressed. Men, on the other hand, are portrayed as
barbaric camel riding nomads who are sneaky, wealthy, and/or backward (Al-
Hazza & Lucking, 2005). Recent conflicts have capitalized on these fallacies,
using the misperceptions to justify attacks in the Middle East, painting a scene in
which “Western culture is humanitarian . . . with Arabs portrayed as diametrically
opposed and following tribal and instinct driven customs, rendering him/her
essentially barbaric” (Muscati, 2002, p. 136). Media and public stereotypes
regarding Arab groups have been noted to influence questions of identity as
evidenced in Beitin’s study, in which participants related that if they identify as
White “they deny their culture, if they identify as Arab, they feel that they are
labeled as terrorists” (2005, p. 263).

Identity Development

The contribution of identity theory to understanding identity development
provides, through Freudian-based psychosocial Eriksonian and neo-Eriksonian
models, a conceptual model that examines identity development at the individual
level. Erikson believed identity development to be the fifth stage in a linear set of
developmental tasks that individuals pass through during the course of their
lifetimes. According to Erikson, each successive stage is conceptualized as a
crisis that either leads to the completion of the task and subsequent graduation to
the next level, or to maladaptive coping responses and behaviors that carry over
from incompleteness of the task.

Erikson described the identity development task as a bipolar spectrum
ranging from the ideal of identity synthesis to maladaptive identity confusion.
Accordingly, this stage is thought to begin with puberty and end at around age
nineteen or twenty. In Eriksonian terms, identity is the “awareness of . . . self-sameness and continuity . . . and] the style of one's individuality [which] coincides with the sameness and continuity of one's meaning for others in the immediate community” (Schwartz, 2001, p. 8). Erikson also theorized that each individual has many distinct components of identity for each role that is occupied by that individual throughout the course of her or his lifetime. The combination of these parts, defined as role identities, can ideally, according to Erikson, be reworked into a larger set of self-identified ideals thus attaining identity synthesis. An individual with identity confusion, on the other hand, is thought to be unable “to develop a workable set of ideals on which to base adult identity” (Schwartz, 2001, p. 9).

Erikson conceptualized identity as a combination of three different types: ego identity, personal identity, and social identity. Erikson felt that ego identity consists of the most central beliefs about oneself. These beliefs are thought to carry any conflicts internalized during the childhood period (Schwartz, 2001). Personal identity, on the other hand, is characterized as the values, beliefs and goals that determine a person’s individuality. This construct is thought to be less unconscious and thus shared with the world as an outward set of behaviors or characteristics. Social identity, then, is the “sense of inner solidarity with a group's ideals, the consolidation of elements that have integrated into one's sense of self from groups to which one belongs” (Schwartz, 2001, p. 10).

Erikson believed that this period in identity development provided a unique opportunity for adolescents and young adults to explore who they are during a
time he termed as psychosocial moratorium. Erikson further recommended that individuals spend this time experimenting and trying different roles before committing to a specific identity or role (Schwartz, 2001). Due to difficulties in operationalizing Erikson's observations, Marcia later defined identity theory around the two central constructs of exploration and commitment (2001). Marcia defined exploration as the behavior of eliciting information about oneself and one's environment in order to better make life decisions; while commitment was considered to be the final adherence to a set of goals, values, and beliefs that are determined during the exploration period.

However, Marcia's operationalization of Erikson's work is not without its criticisms and limitations. Hogg and colleagues argued that what is now known as identity theory, although derived from Erikson's work, "generally stops short of specifying in any detail the cognitive processes and structures that may underlie identity dynamics and may produce conformity to norms" (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995, p. 263). While Erikson had expressed an interest in the reciprocal nature between a young person and her or his context, Hogg observes that current identity theory underplays "the role of immediate context and instead attributes identity changes to changes in roles [and thus changes in behavioral expectations]" (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995, p. 263). Identity theory has thus been criticized for its limitations for use with minority groups. The exploration that is characteristic of identity synthesis is not always suitable when applied to individuals from collectivist backgrounds. Furthermore, Schwartz (2005) notes that the lack of identity theory's attention to ethnic issues, and thus its lack of
applicability to Arab American populations, is "a byproduct of a) the focus primarily on White [populations] and b) the lack of consideration of social and ethnic aspects of identity" (p. 298).

**Racial Identity Development**

In order to include identity development issues relevant to ethnic minorities, Phinney expanded Marcia's concept of identity to include proposed stages of ethnic identity development (French, Seidman, Allen, & Abe, 2006). Phinney's Ethnic Identity Development Model includes three stages. An individual in the first stage is thought to have an unexamined ethnic identity. This individual's lack of concern for ethnic issues is thought to manifest itself as a Diffuse Identity level (Holcomb-McCoy, 2005) in which individuals are thought to have an increased susceptibility to the internalization of negative messages regarding their ethnic identity (Bachay, 1998). An individual at the second stage of identity development is thought to be undergoing ethnic identity search or Exploration. An individual at this level of identity development is described by Phinney as being in moratorium (Holcomb-McCoy, 2005). Common tasks at this stage include coming to terms with cultural differences between the person's ethnic culture and the dominant culture, learning more about one's culture, and clarifying a personal meaning of ethnicity. The final stage proposed by Phinney is Achieved when the individual has formed a firm concept of their ethnicity (and thus her or his identity) through coming to terms with the cultural differences between the respective groups, as well as the lower status occupied by the
ethnic group in society (Halcomb-McCoy, 2005). This stage is thought to be characterized by pride, feelings of belonging, and self-confidence.

Helms (1995) also provided a model for racial identity development titled the People of Color Racial Identity model. While similar to Phinney's model in many respects, Helms' five-status model provides a more comprehensive overview of the changes and characteristics of each status of racial identity development, which includes the following: (a) Conformity, (b) Dissonance, (c) Immersion/Resistance, (d) Internalization and (e) Integrative Awareness. Helms' model differentiates between the development of an ethnic identity and racial identity through the distinction that racial identity incorporates themes of systematic oppression while acknowledging the interplay of race dynamics between the dominant and a minority group (Helms, 1993). Another difference lies in the fact that Helms' model of racial identity development is not intended to be linear in nature. Instead, the common themes linked to each status are described as part of a process, which may be experienced differently by different people or groups, and it is further understood that individuals may move back and forth between stages.

The Conformity status in the People of Color Racial Identity model is associated with a lifestyle in which ethnic identity is of low salience for the identified individual. The individual in the conformity status typically would not recognize or acknowledge racism, discrimination or prejudice. This person would instead identify with the majority culture, internalizing negative social messages and regarding the majority as superior to the person's ethnic group. Movement
into the *Dissonance* status is thought to be spurred by situations in which it is no longer possible for the individual to reconcile current experiences with previous race-free perceptions of reality. A person in the next status, however, is described as *Immersion/Resistance* and as such is characterized by a physical and psychological withdrawal into one’s own racial/ethnic group. An individual in this status will typically begin to explore previously rejected aspects of the self through the seeking of knowledge and the adoption of mannerisms, dress, and other aspects of their respective culture. During the *Internalization* status of identity development, individuals are thought to shift their focus from outward, external concerns to the internal as an integration of positive own-group racial identification and a development of the capacity to realistically appreciate the positive aspects of the dominant group. Issues concerning selfhood are explored as the person at this status begins to find a sense of balance between the dominant and non-dominant groups. At the final status of *Integrative-awareness*, the individual is thought to experience a sense of peace, balance, autonomy, and integration between all aspects of the self.

Both Phinney’s and Helms’ models provide a framework for understanding the unique aspects of identity development for an individual who is exploring selfhood while also mediating between a subordinate and a dominant culture. While both models include aspects that are relatively similar, and the ideal end-stages seem the same, they are not. Helms’ model not only gives a more comprehensive picture of the various characteristics common to each stage, but also provides a more complete picture of identity development by addressing the
concept of dissonance, and resistance/immersion as well as giving consideration to the dynamics of race in identity development. The language utilized in Phinney's model (unexamined, crisis/exploration, achieved) does not explain the process of integrating both cultures (dominant and ethnic) or give any attention to the process of reconciling any anger towards the suppressive dominant groups. A model for ethnic identity development, in order to be comprehensive, should acknowledge that, "identity formation [is not] the discovery of a pre-existing unity but involves an effort to identify or create a sufficient degree of consistency to justify construing the self as singular. The construction of identity, then, need not begin or end with a unitary self but does take unity as a guiding ideal" (Moshman, 1998, p. 5). Helms' model is more consistent in meeting this requirement.

**Social Identity Theory**

The central construct of Social Identity (SI) theory argues that individuals define themselves, in part, according to their social category or group membership (Smurda, Wittig, & Gokalp, 2006). SI consequently was developed out of the need to understand the role of social context in identity formation. Researchers found themselves limited by theories that examined the formation of identity from a purely cognitive point of view that was virtually isolated from any societal context. Accordingly, SI theory "recognizes the metatheoretical and conceptual limitations of theoretical reductionism . . . instead seeking theories that articulate individual psychological processes and wider social forces" (Hogg et al., 1995). In formulating an approach that examines identity within a societal context, identity is understood as a more flexible, reactive variable that changes.
according to environmental shifts. To achieve this understanding, the roles of intergroup relations, categorization, and self-enhancement (Hogg et al., 1995) were defined and widely studied.

Sherif (1966) explained that any interaction between individuals belonging to one group and individuals from another group in terms of their group identification would constitute an intergroup relation, while categorization is used to describe the demarcation of boundaries between one group of individuals and another. This serves to "produce group-distinctive stereotypical and normative perceptions, and actions . . . [assigning people], including self, to the contextually relevant category" (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995, p. 260). Consequently, the group one considers oneself to be a member of is defined by SI theory as the in-group; while any person perceived to be outside this group is considered to be a member of the out-group. Turner, the major contributor to self-categorization theory (a derivative of SI theory), elaborates that the process of categorization can serve several functions; not only demarcating the boundaries between groups, but also accentuating the perceived similar aspects of the self to the in-group while simultaneously accentuating the perceived differences between the self and the out-group (Turner, 1985), with the in-group typically being viewed as superior to the out-group.

Several studies have examined the tendency, described as in-group bias, to view one's group favorably at the expense of the out-group. Brown (2000) notes in an analysis of several studies that it "is now common-place that group members are prone to think that their own group (and its products) are superior
to other groups (and theirs), and to be rather ready behaviorally to discriminate between them as well" (p. 747). Branscombe and Wann add, “In fact it is the desire to see the self favorably [that] appears to be even more powerful than either the desire to accurately assess the self or to verify strongly held beliefs about the self” (1994, p. 642).

The need to see oneself as favorable becomes particularly significant when examined in light of intergroup relations. Described as self enhancement when applied at the individual level, Hogg and colleagues (1995) further assert that “because social identities have these important self-evaluative consequences, groups and their members are strongly motivated to adopt behavioral strategies for achieving or maintaining in-group/out-group comparisons that favor the in-group and thus of course the self” (p. 260). The positive evaluation of the in-group and the consequent negative evaluation of the out-group and thus any member of the out-group, then, is considered to be discrimination based on group membership. This discrimination becomes particularly problematic both for minority groups who frequently hold little to no power as well as for individuals who hold membership in more than one group.

**Perceptions of Discrimination**

Social Identity theory’s predictions for in-group/out-group evaluations are readily apparent in the current international impasse. As both sides steadily derogate the other, Salaita pointed to the effects on Arab American identity as Arab Americans may increasingly feel "removed from the Middle East but equally removed from the United States" (2005, p. 153). Helm’s (1995) People of Color
Racial Identity model recognizes the role of threat to social value in the use of racial identity status. As explored earlier, negative social messages play a central role in the development of racial identity development. As such, these effects may become particularly problematic as the threat to aspects of the self leads to questioning or negating portions of identity as is suggested by the Conformity or the Immersion/Resistance statuses. Smurda's (2006) research implies that in cases like this, "intergroup discrimination [can be] a strategy for restoring threatened self-esteem [and] no relationship between self-esteem and intergroup discrimination may be observed when threat is absent" (p. 185).

**Self-Esteem**

Further consideration should be given to Smurda’s observation. If self-esteem is a function of viewing one’s group positively, and self-concept is at some level constructed based on how others perceive the person, it logically would follow that those whose groups are viewed negatively by society would have a lower self-esteem. This would seem particularly true among Arab American individuals in light of the earlier observation that Arab individuals base their self-concept on public perception, which currently with this group is negative. However, empirical evidence has shown the opposite to be true. Those in lower status groups have been found to have higher levels of self-esteem than socially favored in-groups (Crocker & Major, 1989). Furthermore, Branscombe and Wann (1994) found that when the dominant out-group threatened social identity, defensive processes were utilized in order to maintain positive self-esteem.
An individual whose group is stigmatized or devalued socially is predicted to react to perceived threats to self-esteem in several ways including redefining comparative measures, collectively protesting, and/or disidentifying from the stigmatized group. Brown discusses how groups redefine comparative measures to maintain collective self-esteem. He notes that the group may perceive the devalued status of their group as illegitimate and thus negligible. The group may also re-evaluate the importance of the dimensions projected by the dominant group, followed by the substitution of alternate dimensions, or the finding of alternate out-groups for comparison purposes (2000). Collective protest, correspondingly, describes the feelings of discontent with the stigmatization of one's group. The group may collectively protest the dominant group in order to create a sense of equilibrium between what the group is currently experiencing and what the group feels entitled to. Disidentifying, on the other hand, occurs on a more individual level and is consistent with the Conformity status. A member may disidentify from a group when they perceive that joining the dominant group may maintain that individual's self-esteem through complete disassociation from the stigmatized group.

Social Identity theory, as with any theory gaining in popularity, has been criticized for several limitations. One limitation relevant to this theory addresses the identity protection measures taken by those with low group status to maintain self-esteem. As noted earlier, these measures can include, according to SI theory, redefining comparison dimensions between the groups, contesting the dominant group's right to superior status, or disidentifying from the group. While
researchers agree with the major identity protection measures included in this overview, other measures of identity protection have not been given attention. Brown (2000), in a study of other research on this topic, found that the splitting of in-groups into subcategories (and thus identifying with the less inferior subgroup) was not addressed in SI theory. It was further found that SI theory fails to examine or predict which defense strategies occur under what conditions; although this has been noted as a topic for further research.

Another limitation in the SI approach lies in the measure of self-esteem. There is some controversy as to whether self-esteem has a motivational role or is a by-product of discrimination (Brown, 2000). Brown further points out that while some researchers have presented strong empirical evidence that there is a relationship between self-esteem and social value, other researchers have found no relationship. SI theorists have several explanations for the conflicted findings. First, differences in the use of the term self-esteem are examined. It has been found that while some researchers are studying self-esteem on the individual level, others are studying self-esteem at the group level. Another potential contributor to the conflicting information lies in the self-presentation of the individuals studied. Brown (2000) explains that participants may feel reluctant to express overly high or low self-esteem or to exhibit too much intergroup discrimination, thus skewing results.

The use of self-esteem as a measure with Arab Americans may also be problematic. As discussed earlier, individuals of Arab origin value the collective above the individual. As such, complaints that are on the personal level may not
be readily identifiable. Self-esteem, as a measure of one's own value as an individual, may not be easily conceptualized by Arab individuals and thus may not provide an accurate assessment independent of other variables. In a related example, Al-Krenawi commented that “depression and somatization are so intertwined in Arab culture that it is almost impossible to separate them into two distinct categories as is done in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*” (2000).

**Social Cognitive Theory**

In developing Social Cognitive theory, Bandura noted that the role of the environment in previous theories was both overemphasized and limiting. He theorized that it is the individual's interpretation of their social environment that was more likely to influence their behavior and learning than the direct relationship from environment assumed in social theory. To more comprehensively include the individual's interpretation of events, Social Cognitive theory views functioning as a result of the “interaction between personal factors, (such as cognitions and emotions), behaviors, and environment” (Schunk & Meece, 2005). In this sense, Bandura views individuals as agents by being “products and producers of their own environment” due to the ability to self-reflect, rather than passively react to an environmental force that is outside their control (Pajares, 2000, p. 3). According to Bandura, it is the mechanism of self-efficacy that is the foundation of human agency. The belief that an individual has the power to produce desired effects by their actions carries an important distinction from self-esteem. While self-esteem is a judgment of one's own value,
and is in part based on other's perception of one's value, efficacy is the judgment of one's ability to perform certain tasks "independent of its culturally assigned value" (Pajares, 2000, p. 9). As such self-efficacy may be a more useful tool for use with individuals with a collectivist ideology.

**Self-Efficacy**

According to Bandura, one's efficacy is derived from four sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social messages, and physiological states. Mastery experiences describe a person's own interpretation of their performance. Vicarious experiences, on the other hand, describes the effects of other's actions on the individual. Social messages describe the effect of social messages on an individual's belief in their abilities, while physiological states are the "anxiety, stress, arousal, fatigue and mood states that provide us with information about our self-efficacy beliefs" (Pajares, 2000, p. 7). In Arab American populations, Beitin (2001) found that generally couples "revealed how their immigration experiences were extremely difficult and that the experience gave them the tools to deal with future tribulations" (p. 262). One can infer, then, that for Arab Americans adversity serves in some way to increase self-efficacy as a function of group resiliency; however, the specific impact of social messages on self-efficacy remains unexamined.

**Further Studies**

The reciprocal nature between threat to social identity, self-concept, and ethnic identity development has been gaining academic interest. A study conducted by Phinney, Chavira, and Tate (1993) explored the effect of threat on
self-concept and own-group ratings. Phinney et al. hypothesized that there are two possible reactions to being exposed to threat through negative information about one's ethnic group. The first reaction is considered to occur when the individual develops a negative view of the group; while the second is considered to occur when group members separate themselves from negative perceptions of the group by considering positive aspects of the group. This study sought to determine if threat resulted in higher or lower self-ratings of ethnic group and ethnic self-concept.

One hundred and nine fourteen to seventeen year old ninth grade Hispanic students, 35 girls and 74 boys, from two schools and five classes in Los Angeles participated in this study. The participants were told that they were taking part in a study to learn more about the attitudes and opinions of adolescents about themselves and their world. During the first meeting the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), a scale designed to measure ethnic identity, and the Coopersmith Inventory, a scale designed to measure self-esteem, were administered. The participants were paired by rank order based on their level of ethnic identity, then randomly assigned to one of two conditions, negative threat or neutral.

The students were shown a video, based on their group assignment, of a student talking negatively or neutrally about his or her attitudes or opinions regarding Hispanics. The participants were then asked to complete the collective self-esteem scale, an adjective rating scale, and a manipulation check. To counter any negative effect, the participants were subsequently all shown
positive videotapes followed by discussions emphasizing positive aspects of Hispanic culture. An additional program on Hispanic culture was also presented to further reinforce positive ethnic attitudes in both the classroom and the school (Phinney, Chavira & Tate, 1993).

The data results showed that the threat condition had a small significant, negative effect on the way the participants rated their ethnic group, but not on group self-concept. This result is particularly interesting as it is consistent with Sue and Sue's observations regarding individuals in the Conformity stage. Individuals at this status are predicted to maintain self-esteem by distancing themselves from the stigmatized group. The results also indicated that there was little evidence supporting the hypothesis that self-esteem and ethnic identity mediated the impact of threat. While the study acknowledged different levels of ethnic identity development by ranking the students before pairing them, no further attention was given to the specific numbers of students at each level of identity development. Examining the groupings of participants by level of ethnic identity development would have strengthened this study by providing more information about the participants while also increasing the amount of descriptive information resulting from the data gleaned.

Another study conducted by Yasui, Dorham, and Dishion (2004) explores the role of ethnic identity as a protective factor among European American and African American adolescents identified as high risk or successful. The authors' study sought to examine the role of ethnic identity development in social adaptation and mental health. This study, involving 159 high risk and successful
adolescent participants, compared the results of 77 European Americans and 82 African Americans to determine (1) if ethnic identity was associated with mental health outcomes, (2) if ethnic identity is associated with social adaptation, and (3) if the associations are stronger for the African American participants than for the European American participants.

Successful students were identified as those with no disciplinary actions and a grade point average higher than 2.0. High-risk students were identified based on teacher ratings using the Teacher Risk Screening Index. The participants were then administered the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) to measure ethnic identity and its components, the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) to assess childhood depression, the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) to measure youth behavior from the parents' perspective, and the Youth Self Report (YSL) to measure behavior from the participants' perspective.

As predicted, the results of this study found that higher levels of ethnic identity were significantly positively related to social adaptation and positive mental health outcomes. The authors claimed that the results also demonstrated the predictive validity of ethnic identity to areas of emotional adjustment and psychological functioning. Yasui et al. (2004) discuss the limitations of their study, including limited sample size and the use of the MEIM as an instrument. The sample size was small and limited to a restricted young age group. The authors suggest a larger sample size with a wider range for further study. The authors also acknowledged that the measure used to identify identity development was restrictive in that it does not establish stages of identity.
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development, but instead conceptualizes identity development as a continuous variable ranging from high to low ethnicity. They suggest larger sampling to allow the examination of developmental changes in ethnic identity; however, utilizing a different measurement or adapting the current measurement may also be needful (Yasui et al., 2004).

Yet another study, conducted by Moradi and Hasan (2004), explored the relationship between reported discrimination experiences, self-esteem, and psychological distress among Arab Americans. Moradi and Hasan hypothesized that perceived discrimination is related to the self-esteem of Arab Americans, and that personal control mediates the relationship between the two.

One hundred and eight Arab Americans ranging from eighteen to sixty years of age participated in this study. Participants were asked to fill out a packet described as a questionnaire about their identities, life experiences, and well-being. The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) was utilized to assess current level of psychological distress; The Schedule of Racist Events (SRE) was used to assess the frequency of experiences of reported racist events; the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (RSE) was utilized to assess self esteem; and the Environmental Mastery (EM) scale was utilized to assess a theoretically based dimension of well being. The instruments were counterbalanced to control for order effects and the procedures were thoroughly outlined in a way that allowed for reproducibility. Additionally, in choosing the appropriate instruments, the researchers included experts in the field of Arab American studies given that the majority of the scales were not normed on Arab American populations.
As predicted, a significant relationship was found between perceived discrimination and psychological distress among Arab Americans. The authors point out that this finding served not only to extend the literature on Arab Americans but also to confirm the generalizability of current findings to discrimination-distress with other minority groups. The authors' research also confirmed that personal control does play a mediating role between discrimination and mental health. Moradi and Hasan (2004) present alternate findings in research conducted on other populations. Finally, the authors suggest that further research should be conducted to determine intervening variables that may change the discrimination-self-esteem relationship noted.

**Conclusions**

The literature examined has not only provided a brief review of historical trends in approaching identity development in ethnic minorities, but also addressed some of the limitations in previous and current theories regarding self esteem, social identity, classical and neo-classical identity development, and ethnic identity development models. The purpose of the current study is to utilize and build upon the above literature in order to further understand and address ethnic identity development status in Arab American populations. Following the frameworks provided by Phinney and Yasui's studies, this study will attempt to extend their findings through the inclusion of Helms' model of ethnic identity development and its application to Arab American populations.

The inclusion of Helms' model will make it possible to determine status of ethnic identity, thus facilitating a more complete understanding of threat to social
value and self-concept as it relates to each individual status of development. Both SI theory and Phinney's model of ethnic identity development, while comprehensive, do not measure different levels of identity development. The lack of attention given to stages of identity development may contribute to limitations discussed earlier, including discrepancies in defense mechanisms and discrepancies in self-esteem results, while the inclusion of self-efficacy as a measure may correct for the limitations in self-esteem discussed. Overall, the study of Arab Americans as a population will allow for research and literature to be extended to a group on whom relatively little research has been carried out (Barry, 2001).
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter outlines the methods used in conducting this quantitative, correlational research project. The relationship between racial identity status (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization/Integrative Awareness) self-esteem, self-efficacy and perception of discrimination in Arab American populations was examined. Given the nature of a correlational design, causation was not determined.

Selection of Sample

This study was conducted with male and female persons of Arab descent who reside in the United States. Demographic variables (Appendix A) collected included age, gender, ethnicity, religion, language spoken at home, length of stay in the United States, region of residency, source of referral for the survey, and whether the individual was U.S. born or not. Screening criteria required participants to be over eighteen years of age, of Arab descent and residing in the United States at the time of the study. Although informed consent could be inferred through the individual's participation in the study, informed consent (Appendix B) was obtained through the electronic signing of a brief paragraph explaining the intent of the study.

Participants were invited to take part in an online study exploring Arab American identity. Invitations (Appendix C) to the survey were posted to 38
Facebook and fourteen MySpace Arab groups. Groups were selected based on their identification as an Arab or an Arab American group. While the use of an online survey allowed for a wider range of responses nationwide rather than from a less limited demographic area, a limitation in this design was that posting to Arab and Arab American groups and sites may have solicited individuals at certain levels of racial identity development, thus skewing results. To remedy this, an invitation to send the survey’s link to friends was posted at the end of the survey. This allowed participants to direct individuals to the site who may fit the demographic requirements but may not have seen the posted website. Additional invitations to participate were posted to the following listservs and websites: CESNET-L (An Active Listserv for Counselor Educators and Supervisors), Counselors for Social Justice (A community of counselors, counselor educators, graduate students, school and community leaders), and CafeArabica.

Selection of Instruments

While limited instruments have been developed specifically to assess identity development in racial groups and perceptions of discrimination, instruments that measure more nonspecific traits such as self-esteem and self-efficacy are many. The following instruments were chosen based on both their widespread use as well as their applicability to minority populations. The People of Color Racial Identity Scale (Helms, 1995) was chosen due to the comprehensive nature of its description of the racial identity development process. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), although normed on white male populations, has been used with Arab American
participants (Moradi & Hasan, 2004) and is widely accepted as a measurement of self-esteem. The General Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) has been widely used and was designed to explicitly assess personal agency as opposed to self-esteem. The scale is available in thirty languages and has been used with Arab populations. Lastly, The Schedule of Racist Events (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) was chosen for its comprehensive assessment of perception of racist events through the measurement of recent racist events, lifetime racist events and appraised racist events.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) (Rosenberg, 1965) (Appendix D) is a ten-item scale designed to measure self-esteem. Participants indicate their degree of agreement with each item on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). Scores can range from 10 to 40, with higher scores indicating higher degrees of self-esteem. Half of the items are reverse scored and phrased negatively. A study involving 108 Arab American participants found that overall Arab Americans had higher self-esteem with a mean score of 34.9 (Moradi & Hassan, 2004). Internal consistency for the scale is indicated at .92, with a test-retest reliability of .88 over a two-week period for a sample of college students. Concurrent, construct, and predictive validity have been well documented (Rosenberg, 1965).

General Self-Efficacy Scale

The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) (Appendix E) is a ten-item measure of an individual's belief that one can
persevere in a broad range of situations. The scale was conceptualized as a construct of optimistic self-belief. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree). Scores can range from 10 to 40, with higher scores indicating higher degrees of self-efficacy. A mean of around 2.9 in most samples is reported (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). However, the use of a cut-off score to categorize participants as being of high or low efficacy is discouraged. Instead, performing a median split is suggested in order to dichotomize the sample (1995). In samples from 23 nations, the GSE was found to be highly reliable, with an alpha ranging between .76 to .90. Validity for the test has also been documented in numerous correlational studies (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995).

The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale

The *People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS)* (Helms, 1995) (Appendix F) is a fifty-item instrument with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This instrument measures four of Helms' (1995) five statuses of racial identity development including: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, Internalization, and Integrative Awareness. In this instrument the Internalization status is combined with Integrative Awareness. Scores for each subscale are determined by summing the scores for the corresponding items. The degree to which an individual identifies with and draws from a certain status is thus determined by how high the score is. Therefore, if the Immersion/Resistance status received a higher score than Dissonance, the respondent is more likely to manifest characteristics found in the
Immersion/Resistance status. Helms', however, clarifies that responses should not be treated categorically (i.e., an individual with a high score in the Immersion/Resistance should not be classified as in the Immersion/Resistance status). Instead, Helms' suggests that individuals have schemas of varying saliency related to multiple racial identity statuses. Therefore, the construct of racial identity development should be examined as a profile in which an individual may hold the characteristics of a specific status or more than one status at any given time (Helms, 1995). Kohatsu's (1992) study among Asian Americans found the following Cronbach alphas: .71 for Conformity, .76 for Dissonance, .74 for Immersion/Resistance, and .76 for Integrative Awareness.

The Schedule of Racist Events

The Schedule of Racist Events (SRE) (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) (Appendix G) measures racist discrimination in the lives of ethnic minorities. The 18-item measure assesses the frequency of racist discrimination (specific, stressful racist events) in the past year (recent events) and over one's entire life (lifetime events). The inventory also measures the extent to which the discrimination was evaluated as stressful (appraised racist events). Scores for the recent racist events range from 18 to 108, scores for lifetime racist events range from 18 to 108, and scores for appraised racist events range from 17 to 102. Higher scores indicate higher perceptions of recent, lifetime, and appraised racist events. A study involving 108 Arab American individuals found a mean (M = 29.47) for recent racist events that was reportedly lower than the mean (M = 40.99) found in previous studies by the authors of the SRE (Moradi &
Hasan, 1996). Studies show the SRE to have extremely high internal consistency and split-half reliability (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).

**Administration of the Instruments**

The Arab American identity survey was created based on supporting literature and was posted from January 2007 until March 31, 2007, to a reputable online survey instrument (Surveymonkey). The data was collected on Surveymonkey's secure encrypted server, thus ensuring confidentiality. Arab American individuals were invited to participate in the online study through an open invitation issued through the Arab American Facebook and Myspace groups, participant referral, as well as various listservs. Participants were directed to an online consent form before beginning the study and were be given the opportunity to refer others to the study.

The Arab American Identity Survey consisted of four instruments: *The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale, The General Self Efficacy Scale, The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale,* and *The Schedule of Racist Events.* *The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale* and *The General Self Efficacy Scale* were administered before the *People of Color Racial Attitude Scale* and *the Schedule of Racist Events* to reduce test bias. At the end of the survey, participants were given instructions on how to enter a raffle (Appendix H). Participants submitted their email address for a drawing for one of two $50 gift cards or one of two $25 gift cards. Participants were directed in a final web page (Appendix I) to close their browser upon completion to ensure confidentiality. The final web page also instructed participants on where to direct any questions, concerns, or comments.
(Appendix J). All data was collected through the web-based instrument, allowing for data to be imported into a statistical program for analysis.

**Statement of Hypotheses**

For the purpose of this study, the following null hypotheses were tested:

H₁: There is no significant relationship between the Conformity status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₂: There is no significant relationship between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₃: There is no significant relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₄: There is no significant relationship between the collapsed racial identity statuses of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

H₅: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale.

H₆: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The General Self Efficacy Scale.
H₇: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale.

H₈: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Schedule of Racist Events.

**Procedure for Analyzing the Data**

**Step 1:** Relationships between the status of racial identity development (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, Internalization/Integrative Awareness) among Arab American individuals and the variables of self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals were investigated to test the hypotheses H₁ to H₄.

**Step 2:** A Pearson product moment correlation was computed to determine the relationship between the Conformity status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals. This correlation method was used to test the null hypothesis, H₁.

**Step 3:** A Pearson product moment correlation was computed to determine the relationship between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of
Step 4: A Pearson product moment correlation was computed between the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals. This correlation method was used to test the null hypothesis, $H_2$.

Step 5: A Pearson product moment correlation was computed to determine the relationship between the Internalization and Integrative Awareness status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals. This correlation method was used to test the null hypothesis, $H_4$.

Step 6: Differences in mean responses achieved by Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries were investigated to test hypotheses $H_5$ to $H_6$.

Step 7: An independent samples t-test was computed to determine the difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale*. This method was used to test the null hypothesis, $H_5$.

Step 8: An independent samples t-test was computed to determine the difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in
the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The General Self Efficacy Scale*. This method was used to test the null hypothesis, $H_6$.

**Step 9:** An independent samples t-test was computed to determine the difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale*. This method was used to test the null hypothesis, $H_7$.

**Step 10:** An independent samples t-test was computed to determine the difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The Schedule of Racist Events*. This method was used to test the null hypothesis, $H_8$. 
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents a discussion of the data and the findings generated from the statistical analysis procedures that investigated the following research questions:

(1) Is there a relationship between the Conformity status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?

(2) Is there a relationship between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?

(3) Is there a relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?

(4) Is there a relationship between the collapsed racial identity status of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals?

(5) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab counties as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale?
(6) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The General Self-Efficacy Scale*?

(7) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale*?

(8) Are there group differences between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The Schedule of Racist Events*?

**Findings**

*The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* (Rosenberg, 1965), *The General Self-Efficacy Scale* (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), *The People of Color Racial Identity Scale* (Helms, 1995), and *The Schedule of Racist Events* (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) were presented through an open online invitation to participate. One hundred and eighty four individuals responded to the invitation. Of these, four participant's responses were discarded because they did not meet the minimum age requirement of eighteen years old. An additional 87 participants (47.2%) began the survey but did not complete it in its entirety; their responses were also discarded. A total of 97 participants (52.7%) were found to have both met the requirements for participation and completed the survey in its entirety.

This study was conducted with individuals who self identified as being of Arab descent (N = 97) and resided in the United States at the time of the survey.
Demographic variables (Appendix A) collected included age, gender, ethnicity, religion, language spoken at home, length of stay in the United States, region of residency, source of referral for the survey, and whether the individual was U.S. born or not. Participants included individuals of Arab descent born in the United States (n = 61) and individuals of Arab descent born outside the United States (n = 36). Demographic information was inspected before analyzing the final data for correct data entry and missing observations. A screening of the data showed that no missing values were present.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Participants sampled were both female (n = 68, 70%) and male (n = 29, 30%) with the majority of participants listing their age range between 18 and 29 (82%) (see Table 1). Sixty-three percent of the participants reported being born in the United States while 37% reportedly were born overseas. The majority (49%) of participants listed their length of time in the United States as 5 to 10 years. Participants reported many countries of origin including: Algeria (1%), Bahrain (1%), Egypt (12%), Iraq (4%), Jordan (1%), Kuwait (1%), Lebanon (15%), Libya (2%), Morocco (2%), Palestine (31%), Saudi Arabia (2%), Somalia (1%), Sudan (2%), Syria (19%), Tunisia (1%), United Arab Emirates (2%), and Yemen (2%). Fifty-eight percent of the participants reported speaking English primarily at home while 42% reported speaking primarily Arabic at home. Respondents to the survey hailed from many different regions across the United States. Twenty-two percent reported residing in the Midwest (n = 21), 42% reported residing in the Northeast (n = 42), 22% reported residing in the
Southwest (n = 22), and 11% reported residing in the West (n=12). Sixty-nine percent of respondents self-identified their religion as some form of Islam (Sunni, Shiite, and Druze) while 25% self identified as Christian (Catholic, Roman Catholic, Maronite, Greek Orthodox, Coptic, Melkite, and Antiochian Orthodox). Six percent listed their religion as Agnostic, None or Other. The highest percentage of participants (65%) listed Facebook as the referral source for the survey.

Table 1
Participants' Demographic Information (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast/Southeast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast/Southwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast/West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim**</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MySpace</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other website</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Christian – collapsed identification in denominations (Catholic, Roman Catholic, Maronite, Greek Orthodox, Coptic, Melkite, and Antiochian Orthodox).

**Muslim – collapsed identification in denominations (Sunni, Shiite, and Druze)
Descriptive statistics (i.e., means and standard deviations) were calculated for *The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale, The General Self-Efficacy Scale, The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale,* and *The Schedule of Racist Events* (see Table 2)

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>4.569</td>
<td>13 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Self Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>4.715</td>
<td>20 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>6.534</td>
<td>17 - 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>8.086</td>
<td>20 - 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Resistance</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>7.763</td>
<td>18 - 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Awareness</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>4.039</td>
<td>30 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of Racist Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>13.499</td>
<td>18 - 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>13.833</td>
<td>18 - 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraised</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>21.617</td>
<td>18 - 102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean obtained in the present study for self-esteem \((M = 22.22, SD = 4.715)\) was somewhat lower than that \((M = 34.9, SD = 5.7)\) reported by Moradi and Hasan (1996). The mean found in this study for self-efficacy \((M = 32.78, SD = 4.569)\) was higher than the average mean of many samples \((M = 29)\) reported by Schwartz and Jerusalem (1995). As discussed earlier, however, Schwartz and Jerusalem (1996) did not recommend the use of a cut-off point in determining high or low efficacy. Thus, as suggested, the sample median was calculated \((median = 33)\) and was found to indicate that overall participants had an average level of self-efficacy.
The People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (Helms, 1995) examines the degree to which an individual identifies and draws from each status of Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Integrative/Awareness). Given that an individual is predicted express characteristics of each status at any given time the data produced was not treated categorically. In this sample the means were found to be as follows: Conformity: \((M = 25.47, \ SD = 6.534)\), Dissonance \((M = 38.46, \ SD=8.086)\), Immersion/Resistance: \((M = 38.19, \ SD = 7.763)\), and Integrative Awareness: \((M = 44.53, \ SD = 4.039)\). Higher means indicate a higher degree of identification with each status and lower means indicate lower degree of identification each status, however no study was found utilizing this inventory with Arab American populations therefore, data was not found for the purpose of comparison. The means obtained in the present study for perception of discrimination \((M\text{\scriptsize RECENT} = 32.05, \ SD\text{\scriptsize RECENT} = 13.499, \ M\text{\scriptsize LIFETIME} = 35.23, \ SD\text{\scriptsize LIFETIME} = 13.833, \ M\text{\scriptsize APPRAISED} = 42.74, \ SD\text{\scriptsize APPRAISED} = 21.617)\) were lower than those \((M\text{\scriptsize RECENT} = 40.99, \ M\text{\scriptsize LIFETIME} = 53.93, \ M\text{\scriptsize APPRAISED} = 51.47)\) reported by Landrine and Klonoff (1996) but higher than the mean \((M\text{\scriptsize RECENT} = 29.47, \ SD\text{\scriptsize RECENT} = 13.63)\) found in Moradi and Hasan's (2004) study.

**Analysis of the Data**

**Pearson Product-Moment Correlation**

A Pearson correlation was chosen to test the existence of a relationship between the status of ethnic identity development (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, Internalization/Integrative Awareness) and the variables of self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination among Arab
American individuals. The interval scales included in the PRIAS, GSE, SES and SRE constituted Pearson's r as the appropriate statistical analysis to test the null hypotheses that no relationship exists between ethnic identity status and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination.

**Independent Samples t-test**

The difference in mean responses achieved by Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries was investigated through the use of an independent sample's t-test.

*Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between the Conformity status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.*

The relationships between the Conformity status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination were tested with a Pearson-Product Moment correlation (Table 3). The correlation table revealed a significant negative relationship between Conformity and self-esteem ($r = -0.330$, $p<0.01$), therefore, the null hypothesis ($H_1$) was rejected for self-esteem. The correlation table revealed a non-significant relationship between Conformity, self-efficacy ($r = -0.136$, $p>0.05$), and perception of discrimination ($r_{recent} = -0.063$, $p>0.05$, $r_{lifetime} = -0.067$, $p>0.05$, $r_{appraised} = -0.061$, $p>0.05$). Therefore, for self-efficacy and perceptions of discrimination, the null hypotheses ($H_1$) were not rejected.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>conf</th>
<th>gse</th>
<th>ses</th>
<th>recent</th>
<th>life</th>
<th>appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>conf</td>
<td>gse</td>
<td>ses</td>
<td>recent</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>appraised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.330**</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>gse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>ses</td>
<td>-.330**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>recent</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>.746**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>life</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.898**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>appraised</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.811**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

Note. Conf = Conformity. GSE = self-efficacy. SES = self-esteem. Recent = Recent racist events. Life = Lifetime racist events. Appraised = Appraised racist events.

**Null Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant relationship between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

The relationships between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination were tested utilizing a Pearson correlation. As indicated in the correlation matrix provided in Table 4, significant negative correlations existed between the status
Dissonance and self-esteem ($r = -0.487$, $p < 0.01$) and Dissonance and self-efficacy ($r = -0.335$, $p < 0.01$). The correlation also indicated that a significant positive relationship existed between Dissonance and the recent ($r = 0.283$, $p < 0.05$) and the appraised ($r = 0.270$, $p < 0.01$) subscales for perception of discrimination. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between Dissonance status and self-esteem, self-efficacy, appraised perception of discrimination, and recent perceptions of discrimination was rejected. The relationship between the Dissonance status and the lifetime subscale of perception of discrimination was found to be non-significant ($r = 0.178$, $p > 0.05$), therefore the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between the Dissonance status and the lifetime subscale was not rejected.
Table 4


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>diss</th>
<th>gse</th>
<th>ses</th>
<th>recent</th>
<th>life</th>
<th>appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>diss Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.335**</td>
<td>-.487**</td>
<td>.238*</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.270**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gse Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.335**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ses Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.487**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recent Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.238*</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>.746**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.811**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appraised Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note. Diss = Dissonance. GSE = self-efficacy. SES = self-esteem. Recent = Recent racist events. Life = Lifetime racist events. Appraised = Appraised racist events.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

In order to test for the relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination a Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted. The correlation (see Table 5) indicated that a significant positive relationship existed between Immersion/Resistance status and the recent
(r = 0.250, p < 0.05), lifetime (r = 0.276, p < 0.01); and appraised (r = 0.367, p < 0.01) subscales of The Schedule of Racist Events, thus rejecting of the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status and perception of discrimination among Arab American individuals. Alternately, no relationship was found between the Immersion/Resistance status and self-esteem (r = -0.055, p > 0.05), or self-efficacy (r = -0.197, p > 0.05). Thus, the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between the Immersion/Resistance status and self-esteem, and self-efficacy was not rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 4**: There is no significant relationship between the collapsed racial identity statuses of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination among Arab American individuals.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to test whether a relationship exists between the collapsed racial identity statuses of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination. The correlation matrix in Table 6 presented the following results. A significant relationship was found to exist between the collapsed status of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-efficacy (r = 0.300, p < 0.01) and self-esteem (r = 0.319, p < 0.01). This indicated that the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the Integrative Awareness status and self-esteem and self-efficacy should be rejected. No significant relationship was found between the Integrative Awareness status and perceptions of
discrimination ($r_{\text{recent}} = 0.040, p > 0.05, r_{\text{lifetime}} = -0.001, p > 0.05, r_{\text{appraised}} = 0.033, p > 0.05$). Therefore, the correlations indicate that this null hypothesis should not be rejected.

Table 5  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>imm</th>
<th>gse</th>
<th>ses</th>
<th>recent</th>
<th>life</th>
<th>appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>imm Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>.250*</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gse Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ses Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recent Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.250*</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>.746**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.811**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appraised Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. Imm = Immersion/Resistance. GSE = self-efficacy. SES = self-esteem. Recent = Recent racist events. Life = Lifetime racist events. Appraised = Appraised racist events.
Table 6

Summary of Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for the Collapsed Statuses of Integration and Integrative Awareness and Self-esteem, Self-efficacy, and Perception of Discrimination (N= 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>int</th>
<th>gse</th>
<th>ses</th>
<th>recent</th>
<th>life</th>
<th>appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>int Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.319**</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gse Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ses Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.319**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recent Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>.746**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.811**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appraised Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Note. Int = the collapsed status of Integration and Integrative Awareness. GSE = self-efficacy. SES = self-esteem. Recent = Recent racist events. Life = Lifetime racist events. Appraised = Appraised racist events.

**Null Hypothesis 5:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Levene's test (see Table 7) yielded a significance
level of 0.304, which is non-significant. This would indicate that the two variances are not significantly different. Additionally, the significance level of the t-test for equality of means exceeds 0.05, thus the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries are approximately equal.

Table 7

Independent Samples t-Test for US Born and Foreign Born Arab American Individuals as Measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>-.417</td>
<td>76.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES = Self esteem as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965).

Null Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The General Self-Efficacy Scale.

To determine if there is a difference in the mean responses made by US-born Arab individuals and foreign-born Arab individuals on The General Self Efficacy Scale a t-test was conducted (Table 8). Levene’s Test indicates a significance level of 0.390, which exceeds the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that the two variances are not significantly different. Additionally, the
2-tailed significance of 0.058 is greater than 0.05 indicating that there is no significant difference in means between the two groups. Therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

Table 8

*Independent Samples t-Test for US born and Foreign Born Arab American Individuals as Measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (N = 97)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>1.922</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>1.922</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: GSE = Self-efficacy as measured by The General Self-Efficacy Scale.

**Null Hypothesis 7:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale.

As illustrated in Table 9, t-tests were conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale. For the subscales of Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and the collapsed statuses of Internalization and Integrative Awareness, the significance levels exceeded 0.05, indicating that on those subscales the means as well as the variances between groups were not significantly different. The Conformity subscale also revealed a non-significant mean; however, it yielded a variance significance level of 0.004, indicating that...
variances in responses for this subscale were significantly different across US-born and foreign-born Arab Americans.

Table 9

Independent Samples t-Tests for US Born and Foreign Born Arab American Individuals as Measured by the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>conf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.546</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>diss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>imm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>int</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>72.781</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Conf = Conformity. Diss = Dissonance. Imm = Immersion/Resistance. Int = the collapsed status of Internalization and Integrative Awareness as measured by The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms, 1995).

Null Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Schedule of Racist Events.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Schedule of Racist Events. Levene's test (see Table 10) yielded significance levels greater than 0.05 on all three subscales of recent racist events, lifetime.
racist events, and appraised racist events. This indicated that the variances are not significantly different. Additionally, the significance level of the t-tests exceeds 0.05. Thus the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries are approximately equal.

Table 10

Independent Samples t-Tests for US Born and Foreign Born Arab American Individuals as Measured by the Schedule of Racist Events (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Recent = Recent racist events. Life = Lifetime racist events. Appraised = Appraised racist events.

Summary

In this chapter, the results of the analyses relating to demographic variables, racial identity statuses, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination were presented. The following chapter will link these findings to the literature reviewed earlier, discuss limitations to the study, examine implications, and identify areas for future research.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This final chapter discusses the findings, relates them to the literature, outlines limitations, explores implications, and identifies areas for further research.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between Arab American ethnic identity development status and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination. The study included 97 male and female self-identified Arab American individuals. Participants responded to The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), The General Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995), The People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (Helms, 1995), and The Schedule of Racist Events (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) through an online survey.

Descriptive statistics including the means and standard deviations of each variable were outlined in the previous chapter. The results indicated that, when not measuring for racial identity status, overall individuals in the population sampled had lower levels of self-esteem than other Arab Americans sampled in previous studies. When compared to other samples, participants in the present study had higher levels of self-efficacy when not accounting for racial identity
development, however when a median split was performed self-efficacy levels were found to be average. High or low group levels of racial identity status could not be explored as no reference group was found for comparison purposes. The means found for perceptions of discrimination were higher than the mean found in a Moradi and Hasan's (2004) study with an Arab American sample but lower than those found by Landrine and Klonoff (1996) in a study with an African American sample.

**Null Hypothesis 1:** There is no relationship between the Conformity status and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination.

The hypothesis of no relationship between the Conformity status and self-esteem was rejected, while the null hypothesis was retained for self-efficacy and perceptions of discrimination. This study found a significant negative relationship between Conformity and self-esteem. This would indicate that in the population sampled higher levels of Conformity corresponds to lower levels of self-esteem.

As discussed earlier, previous studies presented conflicted findings regarding the relationship between self-esteem and minority group membership (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brown, 2000, Crocker & Major, 1989). Furthermore, the People of Color Racial Identity model predicted that issues of race were of low salience to the minority individual in the Conformity status. An individual with high conformity scores was thus predicted to highly identify with the majority culture, internalize negative social messages, regard the majority group as superior, and typically would not recognize or acknowledge racism, discrimination, and/or prejudice (Helms, 1993). This prediction not only supports the finding that there is a
significant negative relationship between Arab American individuals in the Conformity status and self-esteem, but also further supports the finding that no significant relationship was found between the Conformity status and perceptions of discrimination.

The study did not find a significant relationship between individuals in the Conformity status and self-efficacy. While the literature reviewed did not directly address this relationship, Bandura (Pajares, 2000) noted the distinction between self-efficacy and self-esteem. While self-esteem measures intrinsic self worth, self-efficacy instead measures self-belief from several sources. Furthermore, self-efficacy's reliance on mastery (or failure) experiences rather than intrinsic self-worth may make it potentially less reactive to negative (or positive) social messages.

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between the Dissonance status and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination.

The hypothesis of no relationship between the Dissonance status and self-esteem and self-efficacy was rejected. This study found a significant negative relationship between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and self-esteem and self-efficacy. An individual in the Dissonance status is spurred by current experiences to begin to acknowledge issues of race, but also continues to identify with the majority culture and internalize negative social messages on some level. This can create feelings of conflict and confusion that is consistent with the negative relationship between this status, self-esteem, and self-efficacy.
The hypothesis that no relationship exists between the Dissonance status of racial identity development and perceptions of discrimination was rejected on the recent and appraised subscales, but not rejected for the lifetime subscale. Helms' People of Color model predicted that the movement from the Conformity status to the Dissonance status was often spurred by a situation in which the individual is no longer able to reconcile his or her current experiences with previous race-free perceptions of reality (Helms, 1993). This observation corresponds with the positive and significant relationship found between Dissonance and the lifetime and appraised subscales of perception of discrimination.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between the Immersion/Resistance status and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination.

The hypothesis that no relationship exists between the Immersion/Resistance status and self-esteem and self-efficacy was not rejected. These results are consistent with the description given (Helms, 1993) of an individual in the Immersion/Resistance status. Helms described this status as being characterized by physical and psychological withdrawal into one's own racial group. Furthermore, as discussed previously, self-esteem is not predicted to be impacted negatively if the individual does not hold views that implicitly or explicitly acknowledge the superiority of the dominant group. As such, a relationship would not be predicted to exist between this status and self-esteem.
The hypothesis that no relationship exists between the Immersion/Resistance status and perceptions of discrimination was rejected. The results of the study indicated a positive significant relation on all three subscales (recent racist events, lifetime racist events, and appraised racist events) and the Immersion/Resistance status of racial identity development. A characteristic of this status is that the individual begins to recognize and acknowledge issues of racism, discrimination, and prejudice. This characteristic appears to be supported by the findings of the current study.

**Null Hypothesis 4:** There is no relationship between the collapsed racial identity statuses of Internalization and Integrative Awareness and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination.

The hypothesis that no relationship exists between the collapsed racial identity status and self-esteem and self-efficacy was rejected, as significant positive relationships were found. Helms (1993) discussed the characteristics of an individual at the Immersion-Integrative Awareness status. She predicted that at the Internalization status an individual would shift their focus from outward, external concerns to the internal as the positive aspects of both the minority and the dominant groups are appreciated. She also predicted that at the Integrative Awareness status the individual would begin to experience a sense of peace, balance, autonomy, and integration between aspects of the self. These characteristics are consistent with the survey’s results regarding self-esteem and self-efficacy. It is also consistent with the non-significant relationship found between the collapsed status and perceptions of discrimination.
Null Hypothesis 5: There is no difference in the mean responses of US-born Arabs and foreign-born Arabs as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.

The hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was not rejected. No significant difference was found in the variances or in the means of both groups. This result was contrary to the prediction made by Schwartz (1999) regarding group differences between recent immigrants and Arab Americans. This may suggest that it was the common factor of place of current residence (and thus the current environment) that influences self-esteem more strongly than place of birth (past environment), however, this observation would have to be tested further for accuracy.

Null Hypothesis 6: There is no difference in the mean responses of US-born Arabs and foreign-born Arabs as measured by The General Self-Efficacy Scale.

The hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The General Self-Efficacy Scale was not rejected. No significant difference was found in the variances or in the means of both groups. This may suggest that for the variable self-efficacy, place of birth (and hence past experiences) is not as strongly influential as place of current residency (and hence present experiences). This is particularly interesting in light
of self-efficacy's definition as a measurement of mastery experiences as this might be taken to imply that older mastery experiences are not as salient as more recent mastery experiences. Additional studies would be needed to further verify and examine this potential implication.

Null Hypothesis 7: There is no difference in the mean responses of US-Born Arabs and foreign-born Arabs as measured by The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale.

The hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale was not rejected for the subscales Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and the collapsed statuses of Integration and Integrative Awareness. There was no significant difference found in the variances or means for these subscales. The hypothesis was rejected, however, for variance of the subscale Conformity. A significant difference was found between the variability of responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries on this scale ($M_{US-Born} = 24.80$, $SD_{US-BORN} = 5.615$, $M_{FOREIGN-BORN} = 26.61$, $SD_{FOREIGN-BORN} = 7.806$). Foreign-born participants had mean scores that were overall higher than US-born participants. This might imply that the process of immigration might create a higher need to conform and fit in to the dominant culture. Foreign-born participants also had a higher standard deviation from the mean than US-born participants. The finding that foreign-born respondents had more variability in responses might suggest that the immigration process does
not affect each individual similarly and that other factors may influence an individual's Conformity characteristics. This may be include differences in experiences when first growing up as a member of one's own culture then being exposed to the sudden culture shock of becoming an ethnic minority in the United States where racial issues and internalized messages would be more salient.

**Null Hypothesis 8: There is no difference in the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by The Schedule of Racist Events.**

The hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the mean responses of Arab individuals born in the United States and recent immigrants from Arab countries as measured by *The Schedule of Racist Events* was not rejected on all subscales. This might indicate that it is the individual's current experiences in the present place of residency that is more salient in determining perceptions of discrimination than the individual's country of origin. However, further study would be needed to verify this observation.

**Implications**

According to the results of the study and in addition to previous research, it appears that implications can be offered regarding the applicability of Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Model to Arab American individuals and its relationship to the variables self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination. The literature review presented both scarce and conflicting material on Arab American individuals regarding self-esteem, self-efficacy, and
perceptions of discrimination. A possible reason for these conflicting findings was attributed to the treatment of the population as a homogenous group with no within-group differences. Differences noted in both the strength and direction of the relationships of self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination with each status of racial identity development in the current study would indicate that treating the population as homogeneous may have contributed to conflicting findings.

This information can aid researchers, counselors, and educators in dealing with Arab American populations. Understanding how Helms' model applies to Arab American individuals can assist in promoting research that is designed to account for each status of racial identity development yielding research that is more specific. Providing counselors and educators with additional information on this under-represented group will aid in promoting an understanding of Arab American individuals beyond the basic descriptions that is typically found in the current literature, while also beginning to build a baseline for future research as suggested by Salaita (2005) in her discussion of the socio-political implications of the current climate on Arab Americans.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations to the study included sampling strategies, instrumentation, and methodology. Due to the self-selective nature of the online invitation to participate, individuals who identify as both Arab and American were more likely to participate than individuals who did not identify as such, thus potentially skewing results on *The People of Color Racial Identity Scale*. Therefore, it can be
assumed that those for whom racial identity is less salient may not be as highly represented in this study. To correct for this participants were invited to forward invitations to friends who may not have otherwise seen the survey. While a few referred responses were noted, if the responses to The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale were treated categorically, the majority of participants would have reflected higher scores on the Integrative Awareness subscale. This suggests that results may not generalize to individuals with higher Conformity status scores.

Another limitation was found in the use of online sampling. While online sampling further ensured participant anonymity, it also limited generalizability in some respects. For example, while demographic information was gathered with regards to region of residency, it remained unknown whether participants resided in areas with large or small Arab populations. Individuals residing in larger Arab communities may express racial identity development differently than individuals residing in areas with a smaller Arab community. Furthermore, due to differences in demographic variations between online and offline participants, another potential limitation may be in how well an online sample represents the general Arab American population.

The instruments used in the study, while chosen based on the literature presented, were designed for populations other than Arab Americans. As discussed earlier, individuals of Arab descent put the needs of the collective before those of the individual. As such, in some individuals of Arab descent the constructs of self-esteem and self-efficacy may be inappropriate as complaints
that are on the personal level may not be readily identifiable. Self-esteem, as a measure of one’s own value as an individual, may not be easily conceptualized by Arab individuals and thus may not provide an accurate assessment independent of other variables. Lastly, the survey may also have been methodologically limited in its failure to ascertain the generational status of Arab individuals born in the United States.

**Future Research**

Although the literature on Arab American individuals is increasing, there still remains a lack of research on this growing group. In particular, Salaita (2005) pointed out the importance of generating a body of internally constructed literature regarding trends in the community. Future research could expand on this study through the examination of the predictive value of the variables of self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination in relation to racial identity status. Understanding the extent to which one variable predicts the other may assist counselors and educators in understanding and ascertaining specific racial characteristics from the more global traits of self-esteem and self-efficacy.

Another direction for future research is the expansion of this study to include a longitudinal study. This would be useful not only in ascertaining the way in which racial identity status changes over time, but also in determining the way in which the variables of self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perceptions of discrimination react to changes in racial identity status. As discussed earlier, the specific impact of social messages on self-efficacy remains unexamined. Future research can expand on this by not only examining the relationship between
racial identity status, and self-efficacy and perceptions of discrimination, but also further examining the relationship between self-efficacy and perceptions of discrimination. Finally, the increase in sample sizes for all the aforementioned future studies would strengthen the power to find significant differences among the variables under study.
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APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHICS

My age group is: under 18
18-29
30-39
40-49
50-59
60-69
70+

I live in the United States: Yes
No

I was born in the United States: Yes
No

I am originally from: Algeria
Bahrain
Comoros
Djibouti
Egypt
Iraq
Jordan
Kuwait
Lebanon
Libya
Mauritania
Morocco
Oman
Palestine
Qatar
Saudi Arabia
Somalia
Sudan
Syria
Tunisia
United Arab Emirates
Yemen

Gender: Male
Female
I primarily speak _____ at home.  Arabic
               English

I have lived in the United States for the past ______ years.
    0-5
    5-10
    10-20
    20-30
    30-40
    40+

I live in the:    Northeast
                           Southeast
                           Midwest
                           Southwest
                           West

My religious affiliation is:

I found this survey through:
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT

Welcome to the survey on your social and personal attitudes as an Arab American. Before you begin, please review this page. It contains information on your rights as a participant.

- By clicking the "Begin Survey" link below, you state that you are over 18 years of age and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Dahlia Rizk under the faculty advisement of Dr. Loan Phan in the Graduate Program of Counseling at the University of New Hampshire.
- The purpose of this research study is to study the social and personal attitudes of Arab Americans.
- If you choose to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a survey about your social and personal attitudes. It will take approximately 35 minutes to complete.
- All information collected in this study is confidential. The information you provide will be grouped with information other people provide for reporting and presentation, and your name will not be used. Data will be stored on a private computer owned by the student researcher and will be password protected.
- Due to the public nature of the Internet, the possibility of someone intercepting your data is possible, but highly unlikely. If you do not exit or close your Internet browser when you have completed your survey, it is possible that another person using your computer at a later time could view your responses. It is therefore important that you exit your browser after you have submitted your survey.
- I understand that the questions may ask for me to reflect on my personal experiences and opinions and may be sensitive in nature, which may result in some discomfort.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary.
- I also understand that I do not have to answer any question I feel uncomfortable with and that I may withdraw from the study at any time.
- The research is not designed to help you personally, but the benefits to participation include contributing to research on an important, understudied topic. This research may help us understand the social and personal attitudes of Arab Americans.
- Following completion of the survey, you may follow instructions to be entered into a drawing for a $50 or $25 American Express Gift Card.
- If you have any questions about participating in this project, please contact me (Dahlia Rizk at drizk@unh.edu) or my faculty advisor, Dr. Loan Phan at loan.phan@unh.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research related injury, please contact: Institutional Review Board Office, University of New Hampshire, Office of Sponsored Research, Durham, New Hampshire, 03824; (telephone) 603-862-3564.

I AGREE
I DISAGREE

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Dear Friend,

You are invited to participate in a study on the social and personal attitudes of Arab Americans for my master's thesis. In order to participate in this study you must be over 18 years of age, of Arab descent and currently living in the United States.

The survey will take about 30 minutes to complete. At the end of the survey you have the option of entering into a drawing to win one of two $50 or one of two $25 American Express Gift Card. Winners will be notified a week following the conclusion of the survey. The deadline for survey completion is March 31, 2007.

I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study, as it would expand on the scholarship on Arab Americans. In order to begin the survey, please click on the link below. Also, please feel free invite anyone you know of Arab descent to participate in this survey by emailing them this link.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=526193195948

If you have difficulties connecting to the website, please copy and paste the link onto your browser. Once you are on the website you will see an informed consent form which will provide you with further information on the survey.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at drizk@unh.edu. Information for my faculty advisor is also included below. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dahlia Rizk
University of New Hampshire
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2007
drizk@unh.edu

UNH Faculty Advisor
Loan Phan, Ph.D.
University of New Hampshire
Graduate Program of Counseling
Morrill Hall – Rm 111B
Durham, NH 03824
(603) 862-2701
loan.phan@unh.edu
APPENDIX D: ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE
(Rosenberg, 1965)

Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you strongly agree, circle SA. If you agree with the statement, circle A. If you disagree, circle D. If you strongly disagree, circle SD.

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. SA A D SD
2. At times, I think I am no good at all. SA A D SD
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities. SA A D SD
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people. SA A D SD
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. SA A D SD
6. I certainly feel useless at times. SA A D SD
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. SA A D SD
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. SA A D SD
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. SA A D SD
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself. SA A D SD
APPENDIX E: GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY SCALE
(Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M., 1995)

Response Format:
1 = Not at all true
2 = Hardly true
3 = Moderately true
4 = Exactly true

1) I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.

2) If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.

3) It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.

4) I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.

5) Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.

6) I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.

7) I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.

8) When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.

9) If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.

10) I can usually handle whatever comes my way.
APPENDIX F: PEOPLE OF COLOR RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDE SCALE  
(Helms, 1995)  
Modified by Rizk (2007)

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to measure people’s social and political attitudes concerning race and ethnicity. Since 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 item number, mark the number that best describes how you feel.

5 4 3 2 1  
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Uncertain  Agree  Strongly Agree

Mark here:

1. In general, I believe that Whites are superior to other racial groups.  
   5 4 3 2 1

2. I feel more comfortable being around Whites than I do being around Arabs.  
   5 4 3 2 1

3. In general, Arabs have not contributed very much to American society.  
   5 4 3 2 1

4. I am embarrassed to be an Arab.  
   5 4 3 2 1

5. I would have accomplished more in life if I had been born an White.  
   5 4 3 2 1

6. Whites are more attractive than Arabs.  
   5 4 3 2 1

7. Arabs should learn to think and act like Whites.  
   5 4 3 2 1

8. I limit myself to White activities.  
   5 4 3 2 1
9. I think Arabs blame Whites too much for their problems.
   5  4  3  2  1

10. I feel unable to involve myself in Whites experiences, and am increasing my involvement in experiences involving Arabs.
    5  4  3  2  1

11. When I think about how Whites have treated Arabs, I feel an overwhelming anger.
    5  4  3  2  1

12. I want to know more about my culture.
    5  4  3  2  1

13. I limit myself to activities involving Arabs.
    5  4  3  2  1

14. Most Whites are untrustworthy.
    5  4  3  2  1

15. White society would be better off if it were based on the cultural values of Arabs.
    5  4  3  2  1

16. I am not really sure where I belong.
    5  4  3  2  1

17. I am determined to find my cultural identity.
    5  4  3  2  1

18. Most Whites are insensitive.
    5  4  3  2  1

19. I reject all White values.
    5  4  3  2  1

20. My most important goal in life is to fight the oppression of Arabs.
    5  4  3  2  1
21. I believe that being an Arab has caused me to have many strengths.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

22. I am comfortable wherever I am.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

23. People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

24. I think Arab and White cultures differ from each other in some ways, but neither group is superior.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

25. My Arab cultural background is a source of pride to me.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

26. People of Arab culture and White culture have much to learn from each other.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

27. Whites have some customs that I enjoy.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

28. I enjoy being around people regardless of their race.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

29. Every racial group has some good people and some bad people.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

30. Arabs should not blame Whites for all of their social problems.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

31. I do not understand why Whites treat Arabs as they do.
   
   5 4 3 2 1

32. I am embarrassed about some of the things I feel about Arabs.
   
   5 4 3 2 1
33. I have begun to question my beliefs.
5 4 3 2 1

34. Maybe I can learn something from Arabs.
5 4 3 2 1

35. White people can teach me more about surviving in this world than Arabs can, but Arabs can teach me more about being human.
5 4 3 2 1

36. I don’t know whether being an Arab is an asset or a deficit.
5 4 3 2 1

37. Sometimes I think Whites are superior and sometimes I think they’re inferior to Arabs.
5 4 3 2 1

38. Sometimes I am proud to be an Arab and sometimes I am ashamed of it.
5 4 3 2 1

39. Thinking about my values and beliefs takes up a lot of my time.
5 4 3 2 1

40. I’m not sure how I feel about myself.
5 4 3 2 1

41. White people are difficult to understand.
5 4 3 2 1

42. I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who are Arab.
5 4 3 2 1

43. I feel anxious about some of the things I feel about Arabs.
5 4 3 2 1

44. When an Arab does something embarrassing in public, I feel embarrassed.
5 4 3 2 1
45. When both White people and Arabs are present in a social situation, I prefer to be with the Arabs.
   5  4  3  2  1

46. My values and beliefs match those of Whites more than they do the Arabs.
   5  4  3  2  1

47. The way Whites treat Arabs makes me angry.
   5  4  3  2  1

48. I only follow the traditions and customs of Arabs.
   5  4  3  2  1

49. When Arabs act like Whites I feel angry.
   5  4  3  2  1

50. I am comfortable being an Arab.
   5  4  3  2  1
We are interested in your experiences with racism. As you answer the questions below, please think about your ENTIRE LIFE, from when you were a child to the present. For each question, please circle the number that best captures the things that have happened to you. Answer each question TWICE, once for what happened to you IN THE PAST YEAR, and once for YOUR ENTIRE LIFE HAS BEEN LIKE.

Use these numbers:

Circle 1 = If this has NEVER happened to you
Circle 2 = If this has happened ONCE IN A WHILE (less 10% of the time)
Circle 3 = If this has happened SOMETIMES (10%-25% of the time)
Circle 4 = If this has happened A LOT (26%-49% of the time)
Circle 5 = If this has happened MOST OF THE TIME (50%-70% of the time)
Circle 6 = If this has happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70% of the time)

How many times have you been treated unfairly by your teachers and professors because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employers, bosses, and supervisors because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by your coworkers, fellow students, and colleagues because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (store clerks, waiters, bartenders, bank tellers and others) because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs (doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, social workers, and others) because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by neighbors because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by institutions (schools, universities, law firms, the police, the courts, the Department of Social Services, the Unemployment Office, and others) because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How many times in your entire life? 1 2 3 4 5 6
How stressful was this for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
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APPENDIX G (continued)

How many times have you been treated unfairly by people that you thought were your friends because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
How many times in your entire life?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
  Not At All  Extremely
How stressful was this for you?  1  2  3  4  5  6

How many times have you been accused or suspected of doing something wrong (such as stealing, cheating, not doing your share of work, breaking the law) because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
How many times in your entire life?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
  Not At All  Extremely
How stressful was this for you?  1  2  3  4  5  6

How many times have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because you are Arab American?

How many times in the past year?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
How many times in your entire life?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
  Not At All  Extremely
How stressful was this for you?  1  2  3  4  5  6

How many times did you want to tell someone off for being racist but did not say anything?

How many times in the past year?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
How many times in your entire life?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
  Not At All  Extremely
How stressful was this for you?  1  2  3  4  5  6

How many times have you been really angry about something racist that was done to you?

How many times in the past year?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
How many times in your entire life?  1  2  3  4  5  6  
  Not At All  Extremely
How stressful was this for you?  1  2  3  4  5  6
APPENDIX G (continued)

How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some racist thing done to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times in the past year?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many times in your entire life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How stressful was this for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How stressful was this for you?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many times have you been called a racist name like a terrorist, sand nigger, towel head, rag head, sand monkey, or other names?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times in the past year?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many times in your entire life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How stressful was this for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How stressful was this for you?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many times have you gotten into an argument or fight about something racist that was done to someone else?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times in the past year?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many times in your entire life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How stressful was this for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How stressful was this for you?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because you are Arab American?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times in the past year?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many times in your entire life?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How stressful was this for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How stressful was this for you?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G (continued)

How different would your life be now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in a racist and unfair way?

In the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same</th>
<th>A little different</th>
<th>Different in a few ways</th>
<th>Different in a few ways</th>
<th>Different in a few ways</th>
<th>Totally different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your entire life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same</th>
<th>A little different</th>
<th>Different in a few ways</th>
<th>Different in a few ways</th>
<th>Different in a few ways</th>
<th>Totally different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: DEBRIEFING/PRIZE DRAWING INFORMATION

Thank you for your responses to this survey!

You have just participated in a survey examining the relationship between stages of identity development among Arab American individuals and self-esteem, self-efficacy, and perception of discrimination. If you would like to review the results of this survey or for more information on the stages of ethnic identity development please send an email to drzk@unh.edu with your request and any feedback you may have.

In appreciation of completing the survey, you are eligible to enter a prize drawing for one of two $50 or one of two $25 American Express Gift Cards. If you would like to be entered in the prize drawing please email the researcher at drzk@unh.edu with [Yes, please enter me in the prize drawing] in the Subject line. After the last day of the survey, winners will be notified at the email address submitted.

Click next below to submit your responses.
APPENDIX I: CLOSE BROWSER REMINDER

Your responses have been successfully submitted.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, we would like to hear from you. Please feel free to contact us:

Dahlia Rizk
University of New Hampshire
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2007
drizk@unh.edu

UNH Faculty Advisor
Loan Phan, Ph.D.
University of New Hampshire
Graduate Program of Counseling
Morrill Hall – Rm 111B
Durham, NH 03824
(603) 862-2701
loan.phan@unh.edu

Please remember to close or exit your Internet browser.

Thank you!
APPENDIX J: COMMENTS FROM SURVEY

The following are comments from participants in the study on Arab American social and personal attitudes. Comments are in their original format and spelling. [ ] Indicates that information was omitted to protect the participants confidentiality.

1. hey good luck with your masters.

2. I just took your survey, found it very interesting, but I think my answers may be very misleading because of my particular situation. Specifically, I often had a great deal of discrepancy between what has happened to me in the past year and what has happened in my lifetime. The reason for this is that what i meet strangers, I can normally pass for American (blue eyes, blond hair type), even if I am around arabs (my husband can't pass), so when I took my scarf off a few years ago my experiences (as far as strangers go) changed drastically. It certainly was not for lack of racism because I am very open about my ethnicity and religion and have had plenty of situations recently where I have been put in a difficult situation where it was known I was arab. I also do experience it 2nd hand when I'm with visibly arab/muslim friends and family.

Not sure what that means as far as your study is concerned, but I know that this experience greatly shaped my answers so I thought it may be of interest to you.

3. Fantastic!
I'm glad you had a good number of participants!
Your research is important and I wish the best of luck with it,
I'd be interested in seeing the results whenever your finished working on it.
My mailing address is: [ ] thanks again! [ ]
[This individual was one of the drawing winners and was replying to the drawing notification]

4. I'm also interested to hear about what your study is looking at specifically as well as your results.
5. Hi, I just completed your online survey, I found a link to it from a facebook group.
   I would like to be entered into the drawing,
   I also think your project is important, and I can relate in a way...I'm a BFA student at [ ] and my senior thesis show is going to center around my hometown [ ] and the large population of arab immigrants there (something like the most outside of the middleeast). There is also the first and only Arab-American Museum in [ ] as well. anyways, good luck with your study! [ ]

6. cool suvey! * [ ] *

7. Your sister sent me the link to your survey and I was wondering if the results of the study would be available. Also, are you publishing your dissertation somewhere public, as I would be more than interested to read what you have to say. Thanks! [ ]

8. Hi,
   I took your survey and when available, I'd be interested to know the results.
   Thanks, [ ]

9. Hi Dahlia - I would be interested in receiving the results of your study when it is complete.
   Thank you, [ ]

10. I would love some more information on the findings from your survey.
    The questions were interesting and I would like to know what results you were able to find from the information.
    Thanks! [ ]

11. Thought I was the only Arab to think whites were superior, actually had that feeling just the other day, and it was the first time in my life, i think. It was at an interview with a Harvard alum, and I felt as if I didn't deserve have the ability to go to a "white" school.
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