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This study examines the reliability and validity of a German version of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) in a sample of 170 Black Germans. The internal consistencies of all subscales are at least moderate. The factorial structure of the MIBI, as assessed by principal component analysis, corresponds to a high degree to the supposed underlying dimensional structure. Construct validity was examined by analyzing (a) the intercorrelations of the MIBI subscales and (b) the correlations of the subscales with external variables. Predictive validity was assessed by analyzing the correlations of three MIBI subscales with the level of intra-racial contact. All but one prediction concerning
the correlations of the subscales could be confirmed, suggesting high validity. No statistically significant negative association was observed between the Black nationalist and assimilationist ideology subscales. This result is discussed as a consequence of the specific social context Black Germans live in and is not considered to lower the MIBI’s validity. Observed differences in mean scores to earlier studies of African American racial identity are also discussed.
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Though there are features common to the identities of all ethnic or racial groups (Phinney, 1990), each racial identity is also formed under the influence of a specific history and specific social conditions of the present (Gaines & Reed, 1994, 1995). African American racial identity is, on the one hand, to be set apart from the identities of any racial or ethnic group in the United States having a dominant social status, as it is inextricably linked to a long history of discrimination and oppression, making it unlike the identity of any group that never experienced the burden of racism. On the other hand, African American racial identity is also different from the identities of other oppressed minorities in the United States, even if the experience of discrimination constitutes a unifying element between these groups. The forced transfer from Africa, subsequent slavery, segregation, and the continuing racism constitute unique and incomparable influences on the racial identity of African Americans—as other specific historical and contemporary forces constitute unique influences on the identities of other racial groups (Gaines & Reed, 1994, 1995).

**BLACK RACIAL IDENTITY**

Racial identity in itself can be considered a consequence of racial oppression, which creates the social category of race in the first place. Racism is based on racialism, that is, the introduction and construction of the category “race” to explain social relations. By the use of racial theories, people are being racialized, that is, they are sorted into different racial groups, which are endowed with usually contradictory characteristics, as for instance industrious versus lazy. As described in system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994), these stereotypes can be used to justify existing inequalities, which thereby do not appear as socially produced but as the consequence of seemingly inherent and natural racial attributes. Due to the fact that racial groups are produced as concrete social groups by the process of racialism, the resulting social identities—Black and White—are also products of racialism and racial oppression. Many psychological theories trying to conceptualize the
experiences of African Americans have incorporated this relationship by dealing with the issue of coming to terms with being discriminated against and with the psychological consequences of racism. They examined the role that racial identity plays with regard to aspects such as self-esteem (Hughes & Demo, 1989), academic performance (Taylor, Casten, Flickinger, Roberts, & Fulmore, 1994), or career aspirations (Helms & Piper, 1994). However, many interrelations and effects of racial identity still have not been examined, and some observations even seem to be contradictory regarding the value of identification with the racial in-group of African Americans. One line of research points to the negative effects of strong in-group identification due to stigmatization and stereotyping (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Penn, Gaines, & Philips, 1993; Steele & Aronson, 1995). A second line of research emphasizes the beneficial effects of strong identification as a protective factor against racism (Azibo, 1992; Baldwin, 1980). Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, and Chavous (1998) consider these inconsistencies to be the result of the use of differing concepts and definitions of racial identity. In order to reconcile these ambiguities, the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) was formulated, whose multidimensional approach was thought to explain the observed differing effects of racial identity (Sellers et al., 1998).

A MODEL OF AFRICAN AMERICAN RACIAL IDENTITY

Furthermore, the MMRI (Sellers et al., 1998) was developed to provide an integrated framework to investigate African American racial identity. It is based on identity theory (Stryker, 1980; Stryker & Serpe, 1982), which links behavioral choices to the salience of role identities. According to identity theory, individuals possess hierarchically ordered multiple identities, the salience of each role identity in a given situation determining the probability that a related behavior is chosen. Correspondingly, the MMRI postulates that race is one of a number of hierarchical identities that African Americans possess. Racial identity has both stable and situationally specific properties that interact to account for behavioral consistency across situations as well as for situational changeability. The MMRI does not use a normative approach to racial identity as it does not consider specific behaviors or attitudes to be definitive or essential to African American identity. Instead, it adopts a phenomenological approach, allowing each individual to determine whether, and to what extent, she or he identifies with being African American and what attitudes and behaviors are related to such an identity. Four dimensions of African American identity are delineated: identity salience, centrality of the identity, associated ideology, and
the regard in which the person holds African Americans. Salience and centrality refer to the individual relevance of race. Ideology and regard concern the perspective that individuals have regarding African Americans and their relationship to other groups (Sellers et al., 1998).

**Salience** refers to the extent to which a person’s race is a significant part of her or his self-concept at a particular moment in time. According to Sellers et al. (1998), it is thought to be influenced both contextually and by the centrality of the person’s racial identity, thus being the dynamic aspect of African American identity. The salience of a person’s racial identity affects the way in which events are construed as well as the subsequent behavioral choice. Salience of racial identity is the necessary condition for the other three dimensions to have implications on the person’s experience and behavior in a particular situation.

**Centrality** refers to the extent to which a person defines herself or himself with regard to race. Implied is a hierarchy of different identities (gender, occupation, religion, etc.), varying in the distance to the individual’s core definition of self. According to the MMRI, centrality and salience are linked in such a way that the more often racial identity is salient, the more likely it is to get a central position in the individual’s hierarchy of identities. Similarly, the more central racial identity becomes, the more likely it is to become salient in a particular situation (Sellers et al., 1998).

**Ideology** constitutes the third dimension of racial identity. It represents the individual’s view of how African Americans should live and interact with other people in society. The MMRI comprises four ideologies: (a) the assimilationist ideology emphasizing the commonalities between African Americans and the rest of the American society; (b) the humanist ideology emphasizing the commonalities of all humans; (c) the oppressed minority ideology emphasizing the commonalities between African Americans and members of other oppressed groups; and (d) the nationalist ideology emphasizing the importance and uniqueness of being of African descent. According to Sellers et al. (1998), the four ideologies are manifested across four areas of functioning: political-economic, cultural-social, inter-group relations, and interaction with the dominant group. Though people typically predominantly endorse one ideology, the ideologies are not mutually exclusive and could also differ between the four areas of functioning (Sellers et al., 1998).

**Regard** is the fourth dimension of the MMRI. It concerns a person’s affective and evaluative judgment of her or his race and is based on Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) work on collective self-esteem. The regard dimension can be further divided into a private and a public component. Private regard concerns the way individuals feel toward African Americans and their membership in that group. Public regard refers to the extent to which individuals feel that others view African Americans positively or negatively.
MEASURING AFRICAN AMERICAN RACIAL IDENTITY

The Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997) was developed to measure the three stable dimensions of the MMRI: centrality, ideology, and regard. It consists of a centrality scale, four ideology subscales (nationalist, oppressed minority, assimilationist, humanist), and two regard subscales (private and public). Reliability and validity of the MIBI was first tested on a sample of 474 African American college students (Sellers et al., 1997). Cronbach’s measure of internal consistency (Cronbach, 1951) was used to determine the reliability of each dimension. Except for the private (Cronbach’s alpha = .60) and public (alpha = .20) regard subscales, all resulting alpha coefficients ranged between .70 and .79. The public regard scale was removed due to the results of a factor analysis, though a revised scale was used in later studies (alpha = .75; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1998). Construct validity was examined by interrelating the subscales. Of six predicted positive or negative relationships between the scales, five reached statistical significance and one just failed to reach the level of significance. To assess criterion validity, the predictive value of the dimensions was examined concerning race-related behaviors. The MIBI showed criterion validity regarding the prediction of whether one’s best friend was Black or not, regarding the discrimination of people taking Black studies courses from those who did not, and regarding the amount of time spent with both Black and White people. Taken together, the MIBI was evaluated as a valid and reliable measure of three dimensions of racial identity—centrality, private regard, and ideology.

Cokley and Helm (2001) conducted a second validation study using confirmatory factor analysis and correlation. Their results provide partial support for the construct validity and reliability of the MIBI. However, they come to the conclusion that certain conceptual questions remain regarding the definition and operationalization of some of the constructs of the MIBI.

A further validation was carried out in the United Kingdom, which supported the validity of the MIBI for a Black British context (Walsh, 2001), even if several differences regarding the mean level of the single dimensions and the subscales’ predictive value were observed. Other studies investigated the relationship of racial identity as conceptualized by the MMRI with such phenomena as alcohol use and parental support (Caldwell, Sellers, Bernat, & Zimmerman, 2004), psychological stress and maternal support (Caldwell, Zimmerman, Bernat, Sellers, & Notaro, 2002), racial discrimination and psychological stress (Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk- Cone, & Zimmerman, 2003; Sellers & Shelton, 2003), attitudes toward affirmative action (Schmermund, Sellers, Mueller, & Crosby, 2001), and self-esteem (Rowley et al., 1998).
BLACK GERMAN RACIAL IDENTITY

So far, racial identity and its implications have mainly been the subject of psychological research undertaken in the United States. The MMRI, too, was developed to conceptualize the racial identity of African Americans, and, with the exception of the United Kingdom (Walsh, 2001), its validity has only been confirmed in that specific context. The usefulness of the MMRI for other groups of the African Diaspora still has to be tested. One step in this direction was taken within the framework of the interdisciplinary and international Black European Studies (BEST) project, which was set up in 2004 to study the history and present of Black Europe. As part of the BEST project, a social psychological questionnaire study was launched to investigate the identities of Black Europeans and to test current measures of Black racial identity within several European countries. In addition to Black people living in France, the Netherlands, Poland, and the United Kingdom, the MIBI was tested regarding its applicability for Black Germans.

Black people living in Germany are partly subject to similar conditions as African Americans, as they also experience discrimination and oppression (Decker, Brähler, & Geißler, 2006) and can look back at a history of being victims of racism (Antidiskriminierungsbüro Köln & Cybernomads, 2004), still extending from discrimination in the job market or in housing to the chasing, beating, and killing of Black people by neo-Nazis in some areas of Germany (Wahl, 2001). However, there was never a system of slavery or segregation similar to that of the United States—even if the realities of German colonialism and the Nazi period comprised elements of both. Another important difference between African American and Black German history is the fact that there was no central historical event as the middle passage bringing Africans to German territory. Instead, Black German history has been under the influence of several phases of migration of Black people—not only from Africa—to Germany and the existence of five different German states since the end of the 19th century, which set up varying regulations regarding the treatment of their Black or African inhabitants. Finally, other than African Americans, Black Germans live in a country whose national identity is in public discourse defined to be incommensurable with Blackness (Lauré al-Samarai, 2004).

The number of Black people presently living in Germany can only be estimated, because, as a reaction to the Nazi ideology of the past, race is no longer an officially registered category. Estimations (e.g., Saagge, 2004) based on various sources vary between 400,000 and 800,000, that is, about 0.5% to 1% of Germany’s total population of 82 million. Due to this low number of Black Germans, many Black children grew up with only very
infrequent contact with Black people outside their families. Furthermore, because of missing data and records, much is still unknown regarding the living conditions of Black Germans, though recent research has started to attend to this desideratum. Though there were probably meetings and smaller associations of Black Germans before, Wiedenroth-Coulibaly and Zinflou (2004) see the beginning of postwar Black organization not until the mid-1980s, when the Initiative of Black Germans (ISD; now Initiative of Black people in Germany) and Afro-German Women/Black Women in Germany (Adefra) were founded and the seminal book *Farbe Bekennen* (Oguntoye, Opitz, & Schultz, 1986, 1991) was published.

Today, Black communities exist in most of the larger German cities like Hamburg, Berlin, Cologne, Frankfurt, and Munich, and in many more towns, Black businesses such as afro-shops or barber shops have opened. Yet, despite this increasing organization and growing communities, little has changed in many areas of everyday life: Black children in Germany are still likely to be the only Black student of their classes and peer groups. Though there are some Black businesses, interactions between and contact with White people are in many cases inevitable, because there are only very few Black shops or cafés, Black teachers, police officers, lawyers, judges, or city clerks. This experience of being only one of very few Black persons in a White world is likely to affect identity formation and the individual relationship to Blackness, thus posing the question of Black German racial identity and its composition.

**ASSESSING BLACK GERMAN RACIAL IDENTITY**

The first step into the inquiry of the racial identity of Black Germans was to find or develop adequate psychological instruments to be used for further research. It was assumed that, despite the mentioned differences between past and present conditions of African Americans and Black Germans, there would also be similarities because of the similar experience of being racially discriminated against, of being part of a global African Diaspora, and of the sometimes close connections and cultural exchange between African Americans and Black Germans. As a result of these assumed similarities, the MMRI was included in the concepts adapted from American Black psychology to examine Black German identities. To assess the validity of the MIBI within a German context, an approach similar to its validation for an African American sample was taken. The same six hypotheses were tested to examine the construct validity of the German version of the MIBI that Sellers et al. (1997) had already formulated and
tested: (a) Centrality is supposed to be positively associated with private regard; (b) centrality is to be positively associated with nationalist ideology; (c) centrality is to be negatively associated with humanist ideology; (d) nationalist ideology is to be negatively associated with humanist ideology; (e) nationalist ideology is to be positively associated with private regard; and (f) nationalist ideology is to be negatively associated with assimilationist ideology.

In addition to Sellers et al. (1997), further predictions were made regarding the associations of the MIBI subscales and several external variables. Cultural mistrust, that is, the mistrust that Black people feel toward White people, is supposed to be negatively associated with public regard, assimilation ideology, and humanist ideology, as these three concepts comprise the belief of good relations between Black and White people (Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 1c). Acculturative stress, that is, the stress experienced in the presence of people outside one’s race, and perceived racism, are also expected to correlate with some of the MIBI subscales. Firstly, both are to be positively associated with centrality (Hypotheses 2a, 2b). As Crocker and Major (1989) have shown in their research on attributional ambiguity, members of minorities experiencing discrimination face uncertainty concerning the source of their negative treatment. It could be either group based and due to negative attitudes of the other, or individual based and due to one’s own individual characteristics or behavior. The importance given to one’s racial identity, centrality in other words, influences the appraisal of this ambiguity, whereas individuals strongly identified as Black tend to perceive more instances of discrimination. Secondly, acculturative stress and perceived racism are also supposed to constitute reasons to withdraw from White people, thus being positively related to Black nationalist ideology (Hypotheses 3a, 3b). And thirdly, both acculturative stress and perceived racism are to be negatively associated with public regard (Hypotheses 4a, 4b). Finally, self-esteem is assumed to be positively associated with both private and public regard, which can be considered specific aspects—public collective and private collective in the terms of Luhtanen and Crocker (1992)—of self-esteem (Hypotheses 5a, 5b).

Similarly to Sellers et al. (1997), criterion validity was assessed. The relationship between racial identity and the level of intra-racial contact was examined, and the following predictions were tested: (a) Centrality is to be positively associated with the level of intra-racial contact; (b) private regard is to be positively associated with intra-racial contact; and (c) nationalist ideology is to be positively associated with intra-racial contact.
PARTICIPANTS

A total of 208 participants completed the online form of the questionnaire. Of these, 38 were excluded as they were either younger than 18 years, had lived in Germany for less than 10 years, or did not self-categorize as Black and/or African on any of the respective items asking for ethnic or racial self-identification (race does not constitute an officially registered category in Germany). Consequently, the final sample consisted of 170 Black Germans.

One hundred five (62%) female and 65 (38%) male participants took part. The mean age was 30.1 years ($SD = 8.71$), the youngest participants were 19 years of age, and the oldest was 60. About 62% of the sample were between 19 and 30 years of age, 23% were between 30 and 40 years, about 12% of the participants were between 40 and 50 years, and only less than 3% were older than 50. One hundred seven (63%) participants were born in Germany, 37 (22%) came to Germany as young children, and 26 (15%) indicated that they had been socialized outside Germany. Ninety-seven (57%) participants specified the ethnic background of their mother as German, 54 (32%) as African, and 19 (11%) as Other. Seventeen (10%) participants specified the ethnic background of their father as German, 107 (63%) as African, and the remaining 36 (22%) as Other. One hundred twenty-seven (75%) participants indicated that they possess German citizenship. About half of the sample was still in education, that is, school or university students in most cases. Twenty percent worked as white-collar employees, about 12% were self-employed, and the remaining 17% either worked as civil servants, worked as blue-collar workers, were unemployed, did not specify their profession, or mentioned further professions. The median reported monthly family income was between €1,000 and €1,999 (approximately between $1,465 and $2,930).

INSTRUMENTS

The questionnaire was administered online. It was programmed and made available to the participants with Umfragecenter 5.1 (Globalpark, 2007), using the unipark license. A self-programmed routine was used to check the validity of the participants’ e-mail accounts. Before being able to access the questionnaire, participants had to enter their e-mail address, to which the routine automatically sent the link to the online questionnaire and a personalized password needed to log into the questionnaire. It was possible to pause the completion of the questionnaire and to log in later again using
the personalized password, which became invalid after the completion of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was completed by Black people in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, and the United Kingdom in the respective national language. Only the data of the German sample were used for the present study.

PROCEDURE

Data collection took place for 3 months in spring 2007. Mainly institutions and associations of Black people living in Germany were used for recruitment. Two parallel approaches were employed: Firstly, online sites of Black German organizations were contacted and used to find potential participants. Participants could easily follow a link to the questionnaire, register, and begin. Secondly, real-world meeting places of Black people such as afro-shops, barber shops, culture clubs, or specialized food shops were contacted by surface mail and asked for their support. They received a letter informing about the background and purpose of the study, one or more posters, and several leaflets with contact details for interested customers or members. To increase the number of participants, all participants completing the questionnaire were entered into a raffle and had the chance to win a prize with a value between €50 and €70 (approximately $70-100).

The online questionnaire consisted of different pages on which the measures were presented. Navigation buttons could be used to proceed to the next page or return to the previous one. Participants entered their answers by clicking on the respective answer or typing it in, depending on the kind of question. When proceeding to the next page, the current page was checked for completeness of answers. A reminder appeared if one or more questions were not answered. However, the completion of each page was not mandatory and participants could proceed without answering all questions. The contents of each page, that is, the answers to the items, were saved every time the participant proceeded to the next page. On average, participants took 55 minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

MEASURES

The MIBI was administered as part of a questionnaire battery that was developed and compiled to allow for a wide and exploratory assessment of the identities of Black Europeans. The following tests and questions were included in the questionnaire, listed in the order of their presentation: (1) Personal information part 1: demographic details, education, contact with other Black people; (2) list of identifications (e.g., local, national); (3) Multigroup
Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992); (4) Biracial Identity Scale (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002); (5) Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (Sellers et al., 1998); (6) cultural mistrust items (self-developed); (7) Essentialism Scale (Verkuyten & Brug, 2004); (8) Multicultural Ideology Scale (Berry & Kalin, 1995); (9) Acculturative Stress Scale (Williams-Flournoy & Anderson, 1996); (10) Comprehensive Race Socialization Inventory (Lesane-Brown, Brown, Caldwell, & Sellers, 2005); (11) Perceived Racism Scale (McNeilly et al., 1996); (12) Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1989); (13) WHO Well-Being Index (Bech, 2004); (14) list of stereotypes (about Black and White people); and (15) Personal information part 2: living conditions, religion and spirituality, languages. All measures were presented in German and words from the original questionnaires such as America or American were changed to Germany and German when required. The term African American was usually substituted by Black German. The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, the MIBI, the Essentialism Scale, the Multicultural Ideology Scale, the Acculturative Stress Scale, and the Perceived Racism Scale were used in shortened versions. For a thorough documentation of the used measures, please see Wandert et al. (2007).

Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity. The MIBI was transferred into German using back translation. A 7-point Likert-type scale was used for all dimensions ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). All subscales were shortened, resulting in the following structure of the measure and its six subscales (examples of the items are given in English; the German translation is presented in the Appendix). Centrality was assessed using four items, including the following: “In general, being Black is an important part of my self-image.” Private regard was measured using three items, for example, “I am happy that I am Black.” Public regard was assessed using four items, for example, “Overall, Blacks are considered good by others.” Assimilationist ideology was measured using four items, for example, “Blacks should try to work within the system to achieve their political and economic goals.” Humanist ideology was measured using four items, for example, “Being an individual is more important than identifying oneself as Black.” Oppressed minority ideology was assessed using four items, for example, “The racism Blacks have experienced is similar to that of other minority groups.” Nationalist ideology was measured using four items, for example, “It is important for Black people to surround their children with Black art, music and literature.”
Further measures. Two items asked the participants to indicate how often they see other Black people respectively have contact with other Black people outside their families. A 5-point rating scale was used ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (several times a day).

Cultural mistrust was assessed with the following item: “Generally speaking, Black people can trust White people in Germany.” Answers were given on a 7-point rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree).

Acculturative stress was measured with an instrument developed by Williams-Flournaly and Anderson (1996). It consists of six items and a 5-point rating scale, which ranges from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree). One sample item is presented: “I get especially nervous going into a room full of people if I am going to be the only one of my racial group.” Cronbach’s alpha in the present study was .82.

Perceived racism was assessed with 31 items adapted from an instrument developed by McNeilly et al. (1996). It has a 5-point rating scale from 1 (almost never) to 5 (several times a day) and measures the perceived frequency of specific racist incidents in different everyday situations. A sample item is “When I go shopping, I am often followed by security guards or watched by clerks.” Cronbach’s alpha in the present study was .97.

To assess self-esteem, a German translation of the scale by Rosenberg (1989) was used (Collani & Herzberg, 2003). It includes 10 items and a 4-point rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). One sample item is presented: “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.” Cronbach’s alpha in the present study was .89.

RESULTS

Because the MIBI was not used in its original English version, the first step of validation was to confirm if all three conceptually assumed dimensions and related subscales could be reproduced in a factor analysis. Thus, a first explorative principal component analysis followed by varimax rotation was conducted. Regarding all but one item, the resulting factor solution corresponded in a very high degree to the hypothesized dimensional structure. Only the first item of the private regard subscale showed almost no loading on the respective (loading of .05) or any other factor, but the one corresponding to the centrality dimension (loading of .74). The specific item was excluded and a second factor analysis was conducted with the remaining items, the results of which are presented in Table 1. Using the Kaiser-Guttman criterion, seven factors with an eigenvalue larger than 1 were discovered, together explaining approximately 69% of the variance. All items of the centrality scale load highest on
Factor 2, explaining about 13% of the variance. The two items belonging to the private regard scale have the highest loadings on Factor 7, which explains about 6% of the variance. The items of the public regard scale all load highest on Factor 1, which explains about 13% of the variance. On Factor 3, explaining about 11% of the variance, all items of the assimilation ideology scale load highest. All but one item of the humanist ideology scale load highest on Factor 5, explaining about 9% of the variance. Item 2 of that subscale has higher loadings on Factors 1 and 3, but also a sufficiently high loading (.32) on Factor 5 to remain within this subscale. Except for one item, all items of the oppressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F 1</th>
<th>F 2</th>
<th>F 3</th>
<th>F 4</th>
<th>F 5</th>
<th>F 6</th>
<th>F 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private regard 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private regard 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public regard 1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public regard 2</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public regard 3</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public regard 4</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist 2</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist 3</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**: Values in boldface correspond to the supposed underlying dimensional structure as predicted by the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI). For each item, the highest loading is marked in italics. Only loadings above .30 are presented. F = Factor.
minority ideology subscale have the highest loading on Factor 6, which explains approximately 8% of the variance. Only Item 1 of this subscale loads highest on Factor 5, yet it is followed by the loading on Factor 6 (.36), which is considered high enough for this item to be part of the oppressed minority ideology subscale. Factor 4 represents the nationalist ideology scale, whose items all load highest on this factor, explaining about 6% of the variance.

Similar to Sellers et al. (1997), the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was used to evaluate the observed factor solution. According to this test, a factor solution is to be considered adequate if the resulting KMO reaches a value of at least .60. A KMO value of .79 was observed for the present factor solution. Taken together, after the exclusion of the first private regard item, the remaining subscales represent the underlying dimensional structure considerably well. All items have a loading of at least .32 on that factor corresponding to the subscale they are hypothesized to be part of. Moreover, in most cases, the loading is highest on the corresponding factor.

After determining the factorial structure of the MIBI, the next step was to analyze the reliability of the single subscales using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). As presented in Table 2, alphas ranged between .71 (humanist ideology) and .91 (public regard), demonstrating moderate to good internal consistency of the subscales. In comparison to the results of Sellers et al. (1997), the alphas of the centrality, private regard, public regard, and assimilationist ideology subscales are higher for the German sample, and the internal consistencies of the remaining subscales are similar to those of the original African American sample.

Means and standard deviations of the MIBI scales are displayed in Table 3 for the present Black German sample, the original sample of African

### Table 2
Cronbach’s Alphas of Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) Subscales by Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private regard</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public regard</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.20 (.75)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. The alpha of the public regard subscale in parentheses resulted from a revised scale used by Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, and Smith (1998).*
Americans (Sellers et al., 1997), and a sample of Black Britons examined by Walsh (2001). Looking at the German sample, the assimilation ideology subscale received the highest rating, followed by humanist ideology, private regard, centrality, and the oppressed minority ideology subscale. Further down are nationalist ideology and, attracting the lowest rating, public regard. A repeated measures $F$ test was conducted regarding the differences between the means of the ideology subscales. It reached statistical significance, $F(3, 167) = 91.72, p < .001$. All subsequent pairwise comparisons showed the differences between the ideology subscales to be highly statistically significant ($p < .001$ in each case), except for the difference between the humanist and oppressed minority ideology, which just failed to reach statistical significance ($p = .065$).

As the African American sample consisted of college students, the German sample was also divided into students ($n = 86$) and non-students ($n = 84$). Subsequently, the means of all subscales were compared for these two groups, using $t$ tests. Only one of the tests reached statistical significance: Students ($M = 2.88, SD = 1.18$) indicated that they possess a higher level of public regard than non-students ($M = 2.45, SD = 1.16$), $t(168) = -2.41, p < .05$. However, due to a statistically significant negative relationship between age and public regard (see below), an additional covariance analysis was computed in order to control whether student status and age were possibly confounded. This seemed to be the case, as no statistically significant relationship could be observed between student status and public regard, when

### TABLE 3

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) Subscales for German ($N = 170$), American ($N = 474$), and British ($N = 95$) Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>German M</th>
<th>German SD</th>
<th>American M</th>
<th>American SD</th>
<th>British M</th>
<th>British SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private regard</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public regard</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The public regard subscale was not employed in the African and British samples. A later study (Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1998) with African American college students used a revised public regard scale, resulting in a mean score of 3.22 ($SD = 1.05$).
age was included as a covariate, $F(1, 167) = 2.00, p = .16$. Since there is no observable difference between the means of German students and non-students, it seems justifiable to compare the means of the whole German sample both to the African American sample of college students (Sellers et al., 1997) and to the British sample, which probably contained only some students (Walsh, 2001). Centrality was rated slightly lower by the German sample than by African Americans, but higher than by Black Britons. Black Germans rated private regard lower than both the American and British samples. The means of the public regard subscale were detailed neither in the American (Sellers et al., 1997) nor British (Walsh, 2001) validation study. The scale was, however, used in a revised form by Rowley et al. (1998), resulting in a mean of 3.22 ($SD = 1.05$), as rated by African Americans. In comparison, public regard was rated lower by the German sample. The agreement with the items of the assimilation subscale was higher in Germany than in the United States or the United Kingdom. The rating of the humanist subscale was about the same in Germany as in the United States, but lower than in the United Kingdom. Oppressed minority ideology received higher ratings by Black Germans than by both American and British participants. Nationalist ideology was rated lower in Germany than in the United States and, if only slightly, than in the United Kingdom.

The individual endorsement of any of the MIBI subscales might be influenced by the racial composition of the personal environment, that is, the existence of Black organizations, meeting places, or business such as afro-shops and barbers. In Germany, Black communities mainly exist in towns and larger cities, whereas in villages and small towns, Black people might live rather isolated from other Black people, at least outside their family. Being able or not being able to see and talk to other Black persons might affect the formation of Black racial identity. For instance, the nationalist ideology might be much easier to endorse living in a large Black community than being the only Black person in a rural area. To assess the racial composition of the personal environment, participants were asked how often they see other Black people outside their family on average. Seeing other Black people does not automatically include having contact with them, contact being an external criterion discussed further below. The relationship between seeing other Black people and the dimensions of Black racial identity was examined by computing Pearson’s correlation coefficient for the frequency of seeing and each of the MIBI subscales. Only the correlation between seeing and private regard reached statistical significance, $r = .3, p < .001$, the more frequent sight of other Black people being connected to a higher level of private regard.
The relations between demographic variables and the MIBI subscales were also examined. For gender, country of birth (Germany vs. abroad), and—as already described above—occupation (student vs. non-student), the respective groups were compared on all of the MIBI subscales with t-tests. Only for two of the demographic variables were significant differences observed: Male participants \((M = 5.52, SD = 1.47)\) expressed a higher level of private regard than female participants \((M = 5.03, SD = 1.58)\), \(t(168) = -2.02, p < .05\). Participants born in Germany \((M = 5.21, SD = 1.25)\) showed more agreement with oppressed minority ideology than participants born outside Germany \((M = 4.78, SD = 1.18)\), \(t(167) = -2.19, p < .05\).

In addition, Pearson’s correlation coefficient was computed for age in years and each of the MIBI subscales, resulting in only one significant correlation between age and public regard: Older participants exhibited lower public regard than younger participants, \(r = -0.17, p < .05\).

Construct validity of the MIBI was assessed by examining the intercorrelations of the six subscales as well as their correlations with four external variables. The results of correlations are presented in Table 4, which also contains the correlation coefficients of the American sample (Sellers et al., 1997) for comparative reasons.

At first, the six hypotheses already formulated by Sellers et al. (1997) regarding the intercorrelations of the MIBI subscales were tested. All but one hypothesis reached statistical significance: (a) centrality and private regard are positively correlated.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Centrality</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>−.19</td>
<td>−.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Private regard</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public regard</td>
<td>−.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assimilationist</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>−.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Humanist</td>
<td>−.21</td>
<td>−.06</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>−.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Oppressed minority</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nationalist</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>−.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>−.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural mistrust</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>−.02</td>
<td>−.43</td>
<td>−.38</td>
<td>−.49</td>
<td>−.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturative stress</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>−.38</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>−.30</td>
<td>−.20</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived racism</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>−.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>−.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Intercorrelations presented for German sample (lower left part) and American sample (upper right part). Significant correlations \((p < .05)\) in boldface.

a. Public regard scale not employed in American sample.
regard, \( r = .56, p < .001 \); (b) centrality and nationalist ideology, \( r = .45, p < .001 \); (c) centrality and humanist ideology, \( r = -.21, p < .01 \); (d) nationalist and humanist ideology, \( r = -.24, p = .001 \); and (e) nationalist ideology and private regard, \( r = .29, p < .001 \). No statistically significant relationship was observed between nationalist and assimilationist ideology, \( r = .03, p = .72 \), thus, Hypothesis f could not be confirmed. Except for the latter relationship, the correlations within the German sample are as predicted by Sellers et al. (1997) and form a pattern similar to that observed in the American sample. Further significant relationships between the four ideologies not being predicted by one of the six hypotheses were also observed. As in the American sample, assimilation was positively associated with humanist, \( r = .50, p < .001 \), and with oppressed minority ideology, \( r = .29, p < .001 \), the latter two also being positively correlated, \( r = .40, p < .001 \). Unlike the American sample, there was no negative relationship between assimilation and centrality, \( r = .05, p = .54 \). Expectedly, correlations were evident between public regard and assimilation, \( r = .18, p < .05 \), as well as between public regard and humanist ideology, \( r = .39, p < .001 \). Public regard was also positively associated with private regard, \( r = .20, p < .01 \), and with oppressed minority ideology, \( r = .22, p < .01 \).

In addition, correlations of the MIBI subscales with external variables were also computed to assess construct validity. As predicted, cultural mistrust was negatively associated with public regard, \( r = -.43, p < .001 \), assimilationist ideology, \( r = -.38, p < .001 \), and humanist ideology, \( r = -.49, p < .001 \). It was also related in a positive manner to centrality, \( r = .21, p < .01 \), and negatively to oppressed minority ideology, \( r = -.27, p < .001 \). The assumed positive associations between acculturative stress and centrality, \( r = .40, p < .001 \), and between acculturative stress and nationalist ideology, \( r = .41, p < .001 \), as well as the expected negative relationship of acculturative stress with public regard, \( r = -.38, p < .001 \), were also observed. Acculturative stress was also negatively correlated with humanist ideology, \( r = -.30, p < .001 \), and oppressed minority ideology, \( r = -.20, p < .01 \). Perceived racism showed similar associations with the MIBI subscales as acculturative stress. It was positively related to centrality, \( r = .31, p < .001 \), and nationalist ideology, \( r = .23, p < .01 \), and negatively related to public regard, \( r = -.31, p < .001 \), all three associations thus confirming the corresponding hypotheses. Perceived racism was also negatively correlated with oppressed minority ideology, \( r = -.20, p < .01 \). The last external criterion to be examined was self-esteem. Confirming the predictions, it was positively associated with private regard, \( r = .38, p < .001 \), as well as with public regard, \( r = .21, p < .01 \). Positive correlations could also be observed with assimilationist ideology, \( r = .21, p < .01 \), and humanist ideology, \( r = .19, p < .05 \).
Taken together, the intercorrelations of the MIBI scales as well as their associations with further external variables were, in almost all cases, as predicted. Only the expected negative relationship between assimilationist and nationalist ideology could not be confirmed. But, as in all other aspects, the pattern of intercorrelations was similar to that observed in the American sample, and according to conceptual assumptions, it can be concluded that, for a German sample, the MIBI constitutes a valid measure of Black racial identity.

In order to assess the predictive validity of the MIBI, the associations of its subscales with the level of contact with other Black people were examined. All three hypotheses already tested by Sellers et al. (1997) could be confirmed: Centrality was positively associated with the level of intra-racial contact, \( r = .27, p < .001 \), as were private regard, \( r = .29, p < .001 \), and nationalist ideology, \( r = .17, p < .05 \). In addition, a negative relationship between contact with other Black people and humanist ideology could be observed, \( r = -.22, p < .01 \). The same pattern of associations also results when the frequency of seeing other Black people is considered and the respective variable is partialed out. This seems necessary in particular for the case of private regard, as there is a positive statistically significant association between private regard and seeing other Black people. The associations between intra-racial contact and centrality, \( r = .24, p < .01 \), private regard, \( r = .16, p < .05 \), and humanist ideology, \( r = -.18, p < .05 \), remain statistically significant and the correlation with nationalist ideology, \( r = .15, p = .06 \), is just above the level of statistical significance.

**DISCUSSION**

The main purpose of the present study was to examine the validity and reliability of the MIBI for a sample of Black Germans. Using factor analysis, all of the seven MIBI subscales, as described by Sellers et al. (1997), could be reproduced. The resulting factors have a high degree of correspondence with the assumed underlying dimensional structure as postulated by the MMRI (Sellers et al., 1998), after one item of the private regard subscale was deleted. In addition to the results of this factorial validation, all seven subscales were shown to possess moderate to good internal consistency (Cronbach’s alphas between .71 and .91). Predictive validity was assessed by examining the association of the centrality, private regard, and nationalist ideology subscales with the level of intra-racial contact. All respective hypotheses, again according to Sellers et al. (1997), could be confirmed.
To analyze the construct validity of the MIBI, the same hypotheses were tested that had already been examined by Sellers et al. (1997) in their first published validation study of the measure. Only one of the six predicted associations between subscales of the MIBI differed from the expected results: No negative relationship was found between nationalist and assimilationist ideology. Also, different from the African American sample, there was no negative association between centrality and assimilationist ideology. However, this independence of assimilationist ideology from both nationalist ideology and centrality does not necessarily cast a doubt on the construct validity of the MIBI for a German sample, if the different social contexts of Germany and the United States are considered to explain these results. Sellers et al. (1997) assume that for African Americans, assimilationist ideology or greater participation in mainstream activities is opposite to nationalist ideology or the involvement in exclusively Black institutions, relationships, and activities. A precondition for the option of acting according to nationalist ideology, however, is a social environment in which Black people are a substantial and numerous group, making it possible to exclusively have Black friends, join Black institutions, or go to Black clubs. In contrast to the United States, this is not the case for Germany, where, as described above, in many places Black people might not have the choice to exclusively have contact with other Black people and join only Black organizations. Attending institutions, activities, or social events not only together with White people but often as the sole Black person is in many cases inevitable. Thus, the endorsement of assimilationist attitudes may be not only a question of individual choice but, to some degree, also a reflection of the specific social context of Black people in Germany. Brought down to the level of the ideology dimensions of Black racial identity, there may be no need for assimilationist attitudes to be negatively connected to nationalist ideology or the centrality dimension. The social reality and racial composition of Germany probably make assimilation such a self-evident option of how to relate to the White majority that it may be rather unlikely not to endorse it. This specific German context might also be reflected in the different levels of agreement shown towards the four ideology dimensions. Assimilation received the highest level of agreement in the German sample, whereas nationalist ideology received the lowest. The comparison of the ideology dimensions between countries possibly also points to the influence of the social context: Black Germans showed more agreement with the assimilation ideology than American or British participants and less agreement with the nationalist ideology than African Americans and, to a smaller degree, Black British.
In addition to the interrelations of the MIBI subscales, their associations with external criteria were also assessed as a further way of examining the construct validity of the MIBI. All of the predicted associations of the subscales with external variables reached statistical significance. Both the observed internal correlations and the associations with external criteria thus support the construct validity of the MIBI. In hindsight, there are plausible explanations, based on the specific conditions of the German context, for the predicted negative relationship between assimilationist and nationalist ideology not to be observed. Consequently, the failing of the respective hypothesis to be statistically confirmed does not necessarily speak against the construct validity of the MIBI.

In comparison to the African Americans participating in the study of Sellers et al. (1997), Black Germans showed a similar level of centrality, but clearly lower levels of private and public regard, when the Rowley et al. (1998) study is taken as a reference for the latter. Regarding centrality, the similar importance given to racial identity by African Americans and Black Germans might need to be explained, when the much lower level of centrality of a sample of Black Britons as observed by Walsh (2001) is also considered. To explain the differences between British and American participants, Walsh (2001) firstly discussed possible influences of the sample selection and demographic variables such as age and socioeconomic status. As both the African American and the German samples are mainly composed of students or highly educated individuals and are thus different from the British sample, which contained only few students, there may be an effect of social status or age on centrality. Stokes, Murray, Peacock, and Kaiser (1994) already described and observed a positive relationship between socioeconomic status and racial identification for African Americans, their results speaking in favor of an influence of the German participants’ social status on their centrality score.

In addition, other explanations may also be worth considering in order to explain the high level of racial centrality shown by the German sample. According to Sellers et al. (1998), the frequent salience of racial identity is linked to a higher centrality of that identity and, as could be added, racial discrimination is one way of making racial identity salient. Though there are probably many similarities in the form of discrimination experienced by both African Americans and Black Germans, there are also substantial differences due to different historical and contemporary influences. One form of discrimination often experienced by Black Germans is probably unknown to many African Americans: For many White Germans, being Black and being German is incommensurable. Whereas African Americans do not have to struggle for their recognition as Americans, Black Germans are often
addressed as foreigners and are treated as if not belonging to Germany (Mecheril, 2004). This repeated denial of a Black German identity is, for example, expressed in questions about the supposed home country of a Black German or in the astonishment of White persons about Black people speaking fluently German. Treating Black Germans as foreigners is likely to be linked to racial identity becoming salient in the specific situation, as the treatment is connected to perceived skin color and racial group. The frequent salience of Black racial identity may, over time, result in the increase of racial centrality.

To explain the lower private and public regard scores of the German sample in comparison to African Americans, differing social contexts may again be considered. Regarding the self-esteem of African Americans, it was for a long time hypothesized that African Americans internalized and adopted society’s negative view of them, as it was assumed that one’s self-concept reflects one’s appraisal by others (e.g., Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951). Starting around 1970, numerous studies have confuted this assumption showing no decreased self-esteem for African Americans (e.g., Hughes & Demo, 1989). To explain these inconsistencies, the insulation hypothesis was formulated, which argues that due to racial segregation, most African Americans compare themselves with other African Americans and not with the majority of the society (Rosenberg & Simmons, 1971). As a consequence, African Americans are insulated from the majority’s view of them and their self-esteem is protected. Since there has been no comparable segregation in Germany, Black people are not in the same way insulated from the majority’s negative view of them, thus having no protection for their self-esteem. The lower scores of the private and public regard scales in the German sample may be due to this absence of insulation and the resulting missing protection. This interpretation is also supported by the observed relationships between the private and public regard subscales and self-esteem. As predicted, a positive association was observed between self-esteem on the one hand, and both private and public regard on the other hand. In comparison, for African Americans, and according to the insulation hypothesis, no positive association is to be expected between public regard and self-esteem, as these two are supposed to be independent of each other—a prediction confirmed by Rowley et al. (1998). The existing relationship between the two in the German sample may, following the considerations above, be due to the adaptation of the majority’s negative view of Black people and thus also point to the absence of insulating factors for Black Germans.

The racial composition of the individual social environment was operationalized by the frequency of seeing other Black persons outside the participant’s family. Possible effects of this variable were assessed by analyzing
the relationship between all of the seven MIBI subscales and the frequency of seeing other Black persons. Of all the subscales, only the level of private regard was positively associated with the frequency of seeing. This association is not unexpected, when Sellers et al.’s (1997) definition of private regard is considered: psychological closeness or the extent to which individuals feel positively or negatively toward Black people and their membership in that group. To feel psychological closeness to other Black persons, it may be necessary for other Black persons to be actually present and perceivable in the social environment and to allow the formation of individual bonds. Thus, the frequency of seeing other Black people may have the function of a limiting factor or precondition for higher levels of private regard, resulting in a positive association of the frequency of seeing with private regard. In this context, it might be worth considering why there is no need for a relationship to exist between the frequency of seeing other Black persons and the individual level of racial centrality. Different from private regard, centrality may not need to be associated with the racial composition of an individual’s social environment but may also result from the frequent salience of racial identity due to repeated racial discrimination.

Taken together, the results of the present study suggest the adaptability and applicability of the MIBI for the assessment of Black German racial identity. However, the conclusions to be drawn from these results ought to be scrutinized for at least two reasons. One limitation to their generalizability in terms of psychometric standards is constituted by the small sample size of 170 participants. For a measure of a comparable item number, Tabachnik and Fidell (2006) recommend having at least 300 cases for factor analysis, and Comrey and Lee (1992) consider a sample size of 200 as only fair, that is, sufficient but not good. Further limitations to the generalizability of the findings might result from the fact that the sample of the present study was rather homogeneous. It consisted mainly of younger, highly educated people—about half of them being students. Furthermore, the ways used to recruit participants might have produced a sampling effect. Though it was not controlled how and where participants learned about the study, the online form of the questionnaire as well as the use of Web sites and online bulletin boards of Black organizations for recruitment might have resulted in an overrepresentation of specific groups of Black Germans and the underrepresentation of others. As a consequence, it is highly desirable to assess the validity of the MIBI for further groups of Black Germans in order to increase the heterogeneity of participants and to compare the results of the present study to those based on larger samples.

In addition, future research might look into the associations of the dimensions underlying the MIBI with other aspects of racial identity and
related phenomena. Issues to be investigated can be the relationship of racial identity to self-esteem and perceived racism, which were already shortly discussed in the present study, as well as to physical and psychological health or political attitudes and social or political participation. Regarding the particularities of the German context, the examination of which kind of racial socialization Black Germans have experienced and how these experiences are linked to their racial identities may also be worthwhile. Finally, as part of the BEST project, the MIBI was validated not only in Germany but also in France, the Netherlands, Poland, and the United Kingdom. Further publications will present the results of the respective validation studies and compare Black European identities between countries. This comparative multi-national approach will help to determine both commonalities of and context-specific influences on the identities and experiences of Black people in Europe.

APPENDIX

German Items of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) Listed by Subscales

Centrality

1. Schwarz zu sein ist im Allgemeinen ein wichtiger Teil meines Selbstbilds.
2. Ich habe ein starkes Gefühl der Zugehörigkeit zu Schwarzen Menschen.
3. Ich habe eine starke Bindung zu anderen Schwarzen Menschen.
4. Schwarz zu sein ist eine wichtige Reflexion davon, wer ich bin.

Private Regard

1. Ich habe ein gutes Gefühl zu Schwarzen Menschen. [excluded in final version]
2. Ich bin glücklich, dass ich Schwarz bin.
3. Ich bin stolz darauf, Schwarz zu sein.

Public Regard

1. Im Allgemeinen denken anderen Menschen gut über Schwarze.
2. Andere Menschen respektieren Schwarze im Allgemeinen.

(continued)
APPENDIX (continued)

3. Im Allgemeinen sehen andere Gruppen Schwarze in einer positiven Weise.

Assimilationist Ideology

1. Schwarze sollten sich bemühen an politischen Vorgängen in Deutschland teilzuhaben.
2. Schwarze sollten versuchen innerhalb des Systems zu arbeiten um ihre politischen und wirtschaftlichen Ziele zu erreichen.
3. Schwarze sollten sich bemühen, in allen Institutionen Integration zu errei-
chen, in denen Trennung herrscht.

Humanist Ideology

1. Schwarze sollten die Wahl haben, Weiße zu heiraten.
2. Schwarzen würde es besser gehen, wenn sie sich mehr mit den Problemen befassen würden, die alle Menschen betreffen, anstatt sich nur um die Angelegenheiten von Schwarzen zu kümmern.
3. Es ist wichtiger, ein Individuum zu sein, als sich selbst als Schwarz zu iden-
tifizieren.
4. Schwarze sollten Weiße als Individuen beurteilen und nicht pauschal als Weiße.

Oppressed Minority Ideology

1. Die selben Kräfte, die zur Unterdrücken der Schwarzen geführt haben, haben auch zur Unterdrückung anderer Gruppen geführt.
2. Der Kampf von Schwarzen Menschen in Deutschland sollte eng mit dem Kampf anderer unterdrückter Gruppen verbunden sein.
3. Der Rassismus, den Schwarze erlitten haben, ähnelt dem, den andere Minderheiten erdulden müssen.
4. Es gibt andere Menschen, die rassistische Ungerechtigkeit und Demütigungen erleben, die denen Schwarzer Deutscher ähnlich sind.

Nationalist Ideology

1. Für Schwarze Menschen ist es wichtig, ihre Kinder mit Schwarzer Kunst, Musik und Literatur zu umgeben.
APPENDIX (continued)

2. Schwarzen würde es besser gehen, wenn sie afro-zentrische Werte annehmen würden.

NOTES

1. No distinction is made in this study between Black Germans—holding the German citizenship—and other Black and African people living in Germany. Both groups are included in the sample, and no difference between the two was found regarding the mean scores of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity scales. The terms “Black Germans” and “Black people living in Germany” are used interchangeably.
2. Black Germany has also been the subject of several recent publications in English, for example, Campt (2005), El-Tayeb (2003), Fehrenbach (2005), Gilroy (1993), Lusane (2003), and Wright (2004).
3. Probably due to the long period of time needed to complete the questionnaire—almost 1 hour on average—a large number of participants did not fully answer all items and dropped out at some point. Of a total of 347 participants who started to fill out the questionnaire, only 208 completed more than 90% of it and were considered for further analysis.
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