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<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSIMILATIONIST IDEOLOGY</strong></td>
<td>A Black person who identifies as having an assimilationist ideology believes it necessary to use the inner workings of a system to create systemic and societal change as an interactive participant within that specific system (Sellers et al., 1998). According to Bimper and Harrison (2011), a Black athlete who identifies with the assimilationist ideology may emphasize adapting to mainstream American culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATHLETIC IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td>Athletic identity is the degree to which an individual identifies with the athletic role (Brewer, Van Raalte, &amp; Linder, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACK</strong></td>
<td>Black is a racial designation that includes individuals who are of African descent. This includes, but is not limited to, African-American, African (e.g. Nigerian, Ghanaian, and Senegalese), Afro-Hispanic and Afro-Latino(a), and Afro-Caribbean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMITMENT</strong></td>
<td>Commitment is defined as the level of personal investment demonstrated by an individual when choosing between meaningful alternatives in development (Marcia, 1966).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRISIS</strong></td>
<td>Crisis is defined as period in which a person is engaged in choosing from meaningful and equally valid choices in development (Marcia, 1966).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOUBLE JEOPARDY</strong></td>
<td>Double jeopardy refers to the experience of Black women having multiple identities that are oppressed (e.g. Black and female; Beal, 1970).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPHASIZED FEMININITY</strong></td>
<td>Emphasized femininity (Connell, 1987), refers to the social norm for females to accommodate men's desires for sex, attractive female bodies, power, and control (Korobov, 2011), by demonstrating &quot;weakness&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td>Ethnicity refers to a group classification of individuals that share unique social and culture heritage from generation to generation (Casas, 1984).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td>“Gender refers to the attitudes, feelings, and behaviors that a given culture associates with a person's biological sex. Behavior that is compatible with cultural expectations is referred to as gender normative; behaviors that are viewed as incompatible with these expectations constitute gender nonconformity” (American Psychological Association [APA], 2012, p.11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY</strong></td>
<td>Hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987) describes a prescribed gender identity of men in Western Culture demonstrating aggression, violence, homophobia, sexism, detached fathering, and neglect of health (Korobov, 2011). According to theorists,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


men who are socialized to demonstrate this form of masculinity marginalize and subordinate women and “effeminate masculinity” (e.g. gay men) (Wetherell & Edley, 1999).

**Historically Black College or University (HBCU)**

According to Redd (1998), Federal law (20 USCS 1061) defines HBCUs as “institutions of higher education ‘whose principal mission…is the education of Black Americans’” (p. 33). However, HBCUs have enrolled and graduated many students, regardless of race, ethnicity, and income (Redd, 1998).

**Humanist Ideology**

A Black person who identifies with a humanist ideology does not make distinctions between race, gender, and class lines, and views all people as being equal (Sellers et al., 1998). Bimper and Harrison (2011) assert that humanists are similar to assimilationists because they deemphasize distinguishing individuals based on race.

**Identity Achievement**

Identity achievement occurs when individuals engage in a comprehensive exploration of occupational choices, religions, political beliefs, and sexualities, and make a firm commitment to a position regarding each of these areas (Marcia, 1966).

**Identity Diffusion**

Identity diffusion occurs when an individual has not encountered a crisis relating to establishing an identity; however, the individual has no interest in developing an identity (Marcia, 1966).

**Identity Foreclosure**

Identity foreclosure occurs when an individual prematurely makes a firm commitment to an occupation or ideology (Marcia, 1966).

**Identity Moratorium**

Identity moratorium occurs when an individual has experienced a crisis, but has already begun to establish a commitment to a personal identity, while continuing to explore other possibilities (Marcia, 1966).

**Identity Status Theory**

Identity Status Theory operationalizes identity development in Erikson’s (1956) model of psychosocial development. Identity status theory categorizes identity development as an identity status continuum, and describes a person’s level of commitment and exploration that is divided into four statuses: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement (Marcia, 1980).

**Intersectionality**

Intersectionality refers to the interweaving and interaction of a person’s multiple social and cultural identities. Intersectionality rejects “single-axis” analyses of difference as incomplete. In particular, oppressions based on social identities are not additive, but rather intersect to create qualitatively different experiences (Crenshaw, 1991).
**Medical Scholarship**

A medical scholarship is a form of athletic scholarship given to college student-athletes who can no longer compete due to injury. A player who is designated as having a medical scholarship no longer counts against the allotted number of athletic scholarships for college student-athletes who can compete in NCAA sports. College student-athletes who receive medical scholarships typically receive tuition assistance for their undergraduate education.

**Modern Day Superwoman**

The “Modern Day Superwoman” relates to the idea that Black women are socialized to show strength and demonstrate independence that are not associated with traditional norms of femininity (Thomas, Hacker, & Hoxha, 2011).

**Moratorium.**

Moratorium is defined as a period of time that gives an individual time to resolve the current developmental task (Côté & Levine, 1987). During moratorium, a person is free to experiment and explore various roles, and there is no pressure or expectation for commitment.

**Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI)**

The MIBI is a measure of the MMRI that is used to delineate four dimensions of racial identity proposed by Sellers and colleagues (1997). This measure is used to assess the significance and qualitative meaning of race for Blacks, within four dimensions: racial salience, racial centrality, racial regard, and racial ideology. The MIBI also includes seven subscales: centrality, private regard, public regard, national ideology, oppressed minority, assimilationist ideology, and humanist ideology.

**Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI)**

The Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) is a hybrid of racial identity development models and social identity theory (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012) that is measured using the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997). The MMRI provides a conceptualization of racial identity through interaction with other identities, such as class and gender.

**Nationalist Ideology**

A nationalist ideology emphasizes the significance of race. Black nationalists highlight the exclusivity of the Black experience (Sellers et al., 1997). Sellers and colleagues (1998) asserted that a person who identifies as being a nationalist may intentionally seek participation in Black organizations and activities. Bimper and Harrison (2011) stated that the nationalist ideology may lead Blacks to have an affinity to social environments that have large Black representation (e.g. sports).

**Oppressed**

The oppressed minority ideology highlights the common
MINORITY
IDEOLOGY experiences of oppression faced by Blacks and other perceived oppressed groups (Sellers et al., 1998). Bimper and Harrison (2011) stated that Black athletes are not likely to hold this ideology in sporting contexts, but it may be a coping mechanism in other contexts (e.g. classrooms).

PREDOMINANTLY
WHITE INSTITUTION (PWI) A Predominantly White Institution is an institution that was initially established to educate White Americans while largely not admitting racial minorities. Universities that presently have a White majority student population would also count as a PWI.

PREDOMINANTLY
WHITE INSTITUTION (PWI) A Predominantly White Institution is an institution that was initially established to educate White Americans while largely not admitting racial minorities. Universities that presently have a White majority student population would also count as a PWI.

RACE Race refers to “a sub-group of peoples possessing a definite combination of physical characteristics, genetic origin, the combination of which to varying degrees distinguishes the sub-group from other sub-groups of mankind” (Krogman, 1945, p. 49).

RACIAL
CENTRALITY Centrality reflects the extent to which an individual regularly defines themselves (i.e., within their self-concept) by their race within the MMRI and measured by the MIBI (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012).

RACIAL
IDENTIFICATION Racial identification refers to one’s feelings of connectedness to their culture, and their involvement in group activities and cultural traditions (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012).

RACIAL
IDENTITY Racial identity refers to a sense of group or collective identity based on one’s perception of a shared racial heritage with a particular group (Helms, 2007).

RACIAL
IDEOLOGY Racial ideology refers to the beliefs, opinions, or attitudes that an individual holds regarding how they feel members of their group should either think or act with regard to social issues within the MMRI and measured by the MIBI (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012). The ideologies include: Nationalist, Oppressed Minority, Assimilationist, and Humanist.

RACIAL
REGARD Racial regard attempts to assess an individual’s evaluative judgment of their race (private regard) and their perceptions of how outsiders judge their race (public regard) within the MMRI and measured by the MIBI (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012).

RACIAL
SALIENCE Racial salience refers to the relevance of one’s race to self-concept within the MMRI and measured by the MIBI (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012).

TITLE XI Title XI is one of the Educational Amendments of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Anderson, Cheslock, & Ehrenberg, 2006). Within Title XI, “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be
subjected to discrimination under and educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (pg. 227).
The aim of this study was to examine identity development for Black college student-athletes ($N = 98$) at the Division 1 Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) level. Specifically, the researcher investigated whether racial identity, athletic identity, and gender predicted identity achievement status (hypothesis one). Additionally, the study focused on examining the relationship between athletic identity and racial identity, and gender difference in the identity achievement status and athletic identity of Black college student-athletes at the FBS level. The researcher hypothesized that (a) athletic identity and racial identity would be positively correlated (hypothesis two), (b) more Black female college student-athlete would be categorized as being in moratorium or achieved than males (hypothesis three), and (d) Black male college student-athletes would exhibit higher level of athletic identity than the females (hypothesis four).

The researcher conducted a multiple regression analysis with identity achievement status as the dependent variable, and athletic identity, racial identity, and gender as the predictor variables to examine hypothesis one. Next, the researcher implemented a Pearson product-moment correlation to explore the relationship between athletic identity and racial identity (hypothesis two). Lastly, the research explored
gender difference with identity achievement status (hypothesis three) and athletic identity (hypothesis four) using a two-way MANOVA.

Findings from the study indicate that gender is a viable predictor of identity achievement status for Black college student-athletes. Additionally, a positive relationship existed between racial identity and athletic identity. However, contrary to expectations, the correlation was relatively weak. Furthermore, results from the MANOVA demonstrated a gender difference in identity achievement status, but not in athletic identity. The researcher concludes by providing implications for research and practice.
CHAPTER 1
BLACK COLLEGE STUDENT ATHLETES: AN INTRODUCTION

Within this chapter, the researcher introduces information about the Black college student-athlete population, and the contexts that influence their identity development and functioning. The author states the problem and present a rationale for the proposed study. Furthermore, the chapter encompasses the proposed research questions and methods used to answer the questions.

Self-identity influences an individual’s self-perceptions and overall functioning, and college is a crucial period for the development of self-identity. Black college student-athletes may struggle with the development of self-identity due to having conflicting identities (racial identity and athletic identity). Black college student-athletes may have a stronger connection to the athletic role due to societal expectations, as well as their cultural connections. Moreover, during their college years, they spend a significant amount of time engaging in sports. Identity formation is a crucial aspect of preparing for life after college graduation; and therefore it is important to help college student-athletes in this area because most of them will not play professionally. For Black college student-athletes, racial identification is also important. Minority groups value racial identity, due to the need for them to assert identities that are different than the dominant culture. Therefore, it is important to explore the identity formation of Black college student-athletes.

The Black Athlete in Socio-Historical Context

According to Erik Erikson’s (1956) model of psychosocial development, human development must be analyzed within the cultural and socio-historical contexts. Erikson reported that these contexts influence the manner in which human beings resolve
developmental crises and tasks. Historically, people of color in America have been devalued and oppressed, due to the power structure of societal institutions that establishes White Americans as the norm, which includes the institution of athletics. Additionally, men are preferred within athletics, and thus women are ostracized (Bruening, Armstrong, & Pastore, 2005). Both racial minorities and women are disadvantaged within the athletics field, and it is heightened when oppressed identities (i.e., race and gender) intersect.

Traditionally, Blacks in America were ostracized as athletic patrons by being required to sit in segregated sporting facilities, if they were admitted at all. Discrimination was also prominent in regards to competition (Lomax, 2008), which resulted in segregation and the establishment of professional “Negro Leagues”. There is now integration in the sports world recreationally, collegiately, and professionally. Blacks now compete successfully and have achieved national and international notoriety in the integrated athletic arena. Black athletic performance has been attributed to cultural, physical, and psychological predispositions (Smith, 2014). The success of Black athletes has been exemplified by the attention given to them by American and international media. For example, when Michael Jordan of the Chicago Bulls basketball team visited Paris in the 1990s, the French media commented: “Michael Jordan is in Paris … That’s better than the Pope. It’s like God in person” (Halberstam, 1999).

Athletics, like other institutions, is affected by social phenomena (i.e., racism, sexism, heterosexism, other forms of oppression, and bias). Sports are also a medium for cultural identification and expression. According to Bloom and Willard (2002), “sports have become a cultural terrain on which most racialized groups have contested,
defined, and represented their racial, national, and ethnic identities” (p. 1). Sports are strongly connected to Black American culture, often because of the opportunity for economic advancement (Smith, 2014). The connection of group identity to athletics is hypothesized to be a result of societal expectations, media coverage, and (controversially) the Black family’s influence (Messner, 1989).

Success in athletics has also connected the identities of “Black” and “athlete”, where the two have become synonymous in American culture. Blacks are viewed as having superior physical ability while lacking intellectual ability (Hawkins, 2013). The belief of athletic superiority gained momentum, and in 1989, NBC aired a nationally broadcasted documentary entitled, “The Black Athlete: Fact or Fiction”. The documentary aimed to understand the success of Black athletes and what was the root of their perceived dominance in athletics. In addition to the media, scholars have shown interest in understanding the Black athlete, especially at the college level in regards to experience, academic success, and identity formation.

**Black College Student-Athletes**

Black college student-athletes excelled first at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), and then later migrated to Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) as integration allowed them to attend these institutions (Hawkins, 2013). Black athletes on PWI campuses primarily served as entertainers, generators of school spirit, income for athletic departments, and ambassadors of the university. It is not uncommon for people to know the name of the star athlete on campus, Black or any other race, while not knowing the university president’s name, which illustrates the interest level in athletics and the influence it has on American culture.
Black Male College Student-Athletes

According to Cooper and Hawkins (2014), Black male college student-athletes, in particular, consistently underperform academically when compared to their student-athlete counterparts, including lower academic progress and graduation rates. Researchers assert that this academic underperformance is due to over identification in athletics (Harrison, Sailes, Rotich, & Bimper, 2011). This is no surprise due to the aforementioned literature that asserts a strong connection between sports and Black culture in America, as well as the connection between males and sports. In regards to race, Omi and Winant (2014) reported that people are expected to act out racial identities in the sports world and demonstrate connection to their culture through sports. These assertions are consistent with Beamon (2012), who found that athletic identity was the most salient identity for former Black male college student-athletes, even after retirement. Additionally, researchers have found that Black male student-athletes at PWIs tend to have higher levels of athletic identity, while also having racial identity that aligns with the dominant culture more than their own race (Bimper, 2014; Steinfeldt, Reed, & Steinfeldt, 2010). However, other researchers report that athletics may be a buffer to experiences of racism (Brown, Alabi, Huynh, & Masten, 2011), and that racial identity may shift in importance based on the context of the person’s situation.

Black Female College Student-Athletes

The Black female in America experiences societal pressures of presenting herself as the “Strong Black Woman” and is seen as less feminine than her White counterparts (Thomas, Hacker, & Hoxha, 2011). The Black female has also been successful in athletics both nationally and internationally since, and perhaps before, the 1950s (Lomax, 2008). However, Black female athletes have been silenced in much of
the literature that focuses on the college student-athlete population (Bruening et al., 2005). When focusing on women, researchers typically explore experiences of White female student-athletes, and Black males are usually the focus of research that explores Black college student-athlete experiences (Harper, Williams, & Blackman, 2013). Thus, the literature on Black female college student-athletes has been scant.

A need exists for examining the experiences of Black female college student-athletes because they differ from their male and White counterparts due to their experiences of “double jeopardy”. Double jeopardy refers to the experiences of Black females being a part of multiple oppressed identities—Black and female (Beal, 1970). This recognition of oppressed identities has led to the exploration of intersectionality and how this interaction of identities influences that worldview and experiences of Black female student-athletes. Carter-Francique, Lawrence, and Eyanson (2011) explored the experiences of Black female-athletes (N = 4) and found that they experienced feelings of isolation. These study participants also reported that their ability to play positions that is believed to require higher levels of cognitive and leadership abilities (e.g. pitcher, point guard) were challenged by coaches because of their racial background. Additionally, researchers found that when compared to their White counterparts, Black female student-athletes were monitored more closely, given stricter academic requirements, and were required to present themselves more professionally. They also reported feeling a level of separation, in regards to race, within athletic departments (Foster, 2003). In further examining identity, researchers assert the importance of conceptualizing the experiences of Black female college student-athletes in a holistic manner, rather than attempting to separate identities (Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solorzano, 2003).
2009). Thus, to address the dearth of literature, future studies should seek to understand the intersectionality of Black female college student-athletes.

**Background of the Study**

Three key constructs were examined in this study to understand the influence of the socio-historical, cultural, and institutional contexts that affect Black college student-athletes: (a) racial-ethnic identity, (b) athletic identity, and (c) identity status theory. Racial identity is crucial to understanding Black college student-athletes due to the cultural connection of Blacks (within and outside of Black culture) to sports. Athletic identity is pertinent to this study because a person’s identification with the athletic role may influence one’s self-concept and identity formation. The interaction of athletic identity and racial identity has been a topic of focus in researching Black college student-athletes. Researchers assert that these two identities operate in a parallel fashion (Brown et al., 2003; Harrison, Harrison, & Moore, 2002; Harrison & Moore, 2007) and that they intersect. Finally, the belief that Black people, as a race, are inherently physically superior while being intellectually inferior influences the functioning and formation of the self-concept of Black college student-athletes. This is especially noteworthy in higher education, where Black student-athletes operate within both athletic and academic spheres of college life (Hawkins, 2013). Many of these beliefs of a strong connection between race and athletics have implications on identity formation for Black college student-athletes, considering that college is a key period where the self-concept is in the process of being developed.

Marcia (1966) developed the identity status theory to operationalize Erikson’s (1956) model of psychosocial development. Identity status theory describes a person’s identity development in regards to ideology and interpersonal functioning. Marcia’s
theory conceptualizes identity development through a person’s level of commitment and exploration of meaningful alternatives to form an identity status continuum. These four statuses include: (a) identity achievement, (b) identity moratorium, (c) identity foreclosure, and (d) identity diffusion. Identity achievement is described as being the most mature of the statuses where a person has adequately explored alternatives and has made a commitment (Marcia, 1980). Whereas, identity diffusion is described as a person having neither explored nor made a commitment to ideologies. Smith (2014) asserted that the contexts that Black college student-athletes function within may have a self-fulfilling prophecy effect on these young men and women, inhibiting them from exploring and committing to ideologies that are outside of the realm of sports. Thus, many of these individuals could be categorized as experiencing identity foreclosure by making commitments to ideologies while not adequately exploring meaningful alternatives (Rivas-Quiñones, 2002). The present study will integrate racial identity, athletic identity, and gender to understand how these three identities may predict Black college student-athletes’ identity status achievement. Erikson (1956) stated that cultural and socio-historical factors are important to understanding human development. Thus, the social constructions and institutions of gender, race, and athletics are essential to conceptualizing the identity formation of Black college student-athletes.

**Statement of the Problem**

Athletes have multiple, fragmented, and conflicting identities (Krane & Barber, 2005; Ryba & Wright, 2005) that include both personal and social/cultural identities; all of which influence their functioning and how they view themselves. Black college student-athletes, at PWIs specifically, may have a strong connection to the athletic role due to societal expectations and also cultural connections. Many of these Black college
student-athletes have aspirations to play sports professionally. However, less than 2% of all college student-athletes will compete professionally in athletics (Sandstedt et al., 2004). Additionally, Black college student-athletes constitute a strong percentage of college sports at PWIs that can lead to professional competition (Harper et al., 2013). Thus, the importance of identity development as a key component to preparing for life after graduation is intensified, considering a majority of Black college student-athletes will not be able to compete professionally.

Researchers who have examined Marcia’s (1966) identity status theory have predominantly focused on White populations, while excluding racial minorities (Sneed et al., 2006). This also is true for the development of the identity status continuum, which initially excluded women (Gilligan, 1982) and racial minorities (Jones & Abes, 2013). More research is warranted to examine the application of Marcia’s theory to racial minorities and women. Additionally, studies of racial identity theories have traditionally focused on racial minorities (Schwartz, 2005). Thus, a need exists for more research that integrates identity status theory and theories of racial identity to gain a clearer understanding of how individuals form their respective identities. Further research may greatly benefit Black college student-athletes due to the possibility of identity foreclosure (to be discussed further in Chapter 2) if alternatives are not explored. Finally, a majority of studies that focus on athletics fail to include or conceptualize the experiences of Black females (Bruening et al., 2005). Notably, there are several gaps in the literature in regards to the study of Black college student-athletes.

**Significance of the Study**

Identity development is a key component during the college years, encompassing students aged 17 to 24 who are emerging into adulthood (Arnett, 2007).
A majority of this time for college student-athletes is dedicated to sports (Nite, 2012), which may not leave sufficient time for a full exploration of alternatives to identity conceptualization. The aim of this study is to address the gaps in the literature related to identity development and provide implications for practice. This includes exploring the possible connection between the constructs of gender, athletic identity, racial identity, and identity status for Black female college student-athletes. Exploring the experiences of this population is of great importance with the increase in diverse populations on college campuses (Schwartz, 2005). Moreover, there has been an increase in Black females’ participation in collegiate sports during the past few decades (Harper et al., 2013).

Although there has been extensive exploration in sociological research on Black college student-athletes as well as research on psychological perspectives in regards to identity development, a need exists for obtaining a holistic perspective on the identity development of Black college student-athletes. Identity development is crucial for transitioning to life after sports for college student-athletes (Brown & Hartley, 1998). According to Rivas-Quiñones (2002), identity formation is most salient during adolescence, which includes the undergraduate college years. A potential consequence of insufficient exploration and commitment is that a person’s identity and self-concept may not develop to its full capacity.

Due to societal expectations and institutions such as sports having been racialized (Hylton, 2008; Smith, 2014), there may be a self-fulfilling prophecy effect on the identity development of Black college student-athletes. Additionally, the relationship between PWIs and Black college student-athletes often emphasizes the salience of the
athlete identity over other identities (Hawkins, 2013). Thus, counselors, university professionals, and athletic department professionals may benefit from being able to conceptualize student development and implement effective interventions using the results of this study.

**Purpose and Research Hypotheses**

The purpose of this study was to examine the athletic identity, racial identity, gender, and identity achievement status of Black college student-athletes. The specific research hypotheses are presented below.

**Research Hypothesis One**

Racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity [MIBI]), athletic identity (as measured by the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale [AIMS]), and gender will predict an individual’s identity status (as measured by the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire [EIPQ]).

**Research Hypothesis Two**

There will be a positive correlation between athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI).

**Research Hypothesis Three**

Black female college student-athletes will have more achieved identity statuses (as measured by the EIPQ) than their male counterparts.

**Research Hypothesis Four**

Black male student-athletes will have higher levels of athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) than their female counterparts.
Delimitations and Assumptions

There are a few delimitations and assumptions associated with this study. It was assumed that the participants in the study provided responses openly and honestly. Additionally, the participants in the study were expected to only be of African descent and to identify as being Black, as defined in the definition of terms.

Ethical Considerations

For this study, little to no discomfort was expected to be experienced by the participants. However, information regarding relevant counseling resources for mental health and career-related problems was available for participants. The researcher obtained approval from the University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the respective athletic departments prior to recruiting participants for the study.

Chapter Summary

This section focused on the contexts influencing Black college student-athletes’ identity development. Black college student-athletes are affected by the larger socio-cultural context of American culture, the smaller contexts of PWIs, and the family. Each of these contexts has an influence on the identity development of these young men and women. Black college student-athletes may be more at risk to identifying themselves with the athletic role, which has limited professional opportunity. Preparation for life after college to transition into adult life is essential. Thus, understanding the identity development of these young men and women could lead to further understanding of how to facilitate a smooth transition to life after sports for those who will not compete professionally.
The research on gender and athletics, racial identity, athletic identity, and identity status has left gaps in how Black college student-athletes’ identity development can be conceptualized. Little is known about the relationship between identity status and racial identity, and research on Black female college student-athletes has been scant in scholarly publications. Thus, this study will aim to integrate athletic identity, racial identity, identity status, and gender for a clear conceptualization of Black college student-athletes. With a clearer understanding, mental health professionals, officials in athletic departments, and professionals in higher education may implement interventions to improve student-athlete educational outcomes. Chapter 2 focuses on discussing the relevant literature related to the constructs of athletic identity, racial identity, identity achievement status, gender, and Black college student-athletes.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Within this chapter, the researcher discusses the literature related to identity
development, racial identity, and athletic identity, as well as gender differences within
each of these topics. Next, the researcher focuses on the experiences of college
student-athletes, with an emphasis on Black college student-athlete males and females.
Finally, the researcher concludes the chapter by presenting research focused on the
integration of racial identity, athletic identity, identity achievement status, and gender.

Adolescence and emerging adulthood are key periods for identity formation
(Arnett, 2000; Erikson, 1956). During college, undergraduate students explore and
commit to several ideologies (Murphy, Petitpas, & Brewer, 1996). College students
grapple with adjusting to a new social environment, obtaining greater independence,
and understanding themselves (Fouad et al., 2006). The experiences of Black college
student-athletes are both similar and unique to the experiences of other college student-
athletes and non-athletes (Sellers & Damas, 1996).

In addition to coping with pressures to perform academically and athletically,
Black student-athletes, at predominantly White institutions, must adjust to the racial
climate (Sellers, Kuperminc, & Damas, 1997). Black female student-athletes have been
largely excluded from the literature as most research with Black athletes has focused on
males (Harper et al., 2013). However, Black female athletes have experiences that
differ from both White female athletes and Black male athletes (Bruening, Armstrong, &
Pastore, 2005; Etzel, Ferrante, & Pinkney, 2002) because they have to negotiate
multiple identities of being Black, female, and a student-athlete (Bernhard, 2014). Thus,
Black college student-athletes grapple with racial identity development, athletic identity,
and overall identity achievement status, as well as gender issues. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to discuss theories that focus on identity development, athletic identity, and racial identity. Additionally, the author will discuss gender considerations. Finally, the author will review the literature about Black college student-athletes and each area of identity development related to this population.

**Erik Erikson’s Psychosocial Development and Ego Identity**

Erik Erikson (1956) explained identity formation through his model of psychosocial development, which progressed according to the epigenetic principal. The epigenetic principal describes development as being constituted of parts that have specific periods of ascendancy, which end in a functioning whole (Erikson, 1959). Erikson formulated an approach that took into account all levels of self, from the most intrapsychically ego conflicts to the individual's embeddedness in a cultural, historical context (Côté, 1993; Schwartz, 2001). Erikson’s conceptualization is considered to be revolutionary; it was first developed because it is interdisciplinary in nature, integrating biology, anthropology, and history (Widick, Parker, & Knefelkamp, 1978). His conceptualization of identity development is considered innovative (Josselson, 1987), due to his theory integrating both psychosexual and psychosocial lenses. Erikson’s theory encompasses the entire life span, rather than focusing solely on childhood experiences (Corey, 2013).

In Erikson’s model (1956), individuals progress through eight stages of development to prepare for the tasks of adulthood. Each stage of development involves a crisis (turning point) where development must move in one direction or another, and thus stimulates growth, recovery, and further differentiation (Erikson, 1968). Each crisis focuses on an individual’s readiness to make decisions within the lifecycle compared
with societal pressure to make decisions during the development process (Côté & Levine, 1987). Each stage of development is affected by context and other factors (i.e., social class, ethnic background, gender). The model is linear and sequential in nature. When a crisis is resolved, a person can proceed smoothly to the next developmental tasks. Within Erikson’s theory, there are developmental tasks, associated with eight stages of life: (a) infancy—trust versus mistrust, (b) early childhood—autonomy versus shame and doubt, (c) preschool age—initiative versus guilt, (d) school age—industry versus inferiority, (e) adolescence—identity versus role confusion, (f) young adulthood—intimacy versus isolation, (g) middle age—generativity versus stagnation, and (h) later life—integrity versus despair (Erikson, 1968).

In the adolescent stage of psychosocial development, attention focuses on the clarification of conflicts that relate to self-identity, life goals, and life meaning (Corey, 2013), specifically focusing on relationships, vocational decisions, and ideological beliefs and values (Jones & Abes, 2013). The adolescent stage usually begins during or after puberty and continues until the late teens, or late twenties (Côté & Levine, 1987). The reasoning behind the long range of years for this stage is due to the differences of psychological, sociological, and historical conditions that affect each individual, as all individuals are unique. There are four required conditions for the occurrence of a “noticeable” identity crisis: (a) cognitive development, (b) puberty, (c) physical growth toward adult stature, and (d) cultural pressures pushing the individual toward an identity re-synthesis (Erikson, 1959; 1968).

Erikson (1956) described adolescence as a stage in which there is more rapid and conscious change than any other stage. However, he proposed that identity
formation was involved in every stage of development. Likewise, every stage involves a moratorium period that gives an individual time to resolve the current task (Côté & Levine, 1987). Adolescence, in particular, is a form of a psychosocial moratorium between childhood and adulthood, with a focus on resolving identity crisis. During moratorium, a person is free to experiment and explore various roles, and there is no pressure or expectation for commitment. Erikson (1956) also proposed that individuals were more likely to suffer from identity diffusion (an inability to establish an identity) during adolescence than during any other development stage. However, Erikson’s approach to identity development is largely theoretical, and difficult to test and apply (Waterman, 1988). Waterman stated that the theory was more focused on understanding an individual’s functioning in a sociological context, than generalizability. Nonetheless, Erikson’s theory laid a foundation for future researchers to operationalize and examine adolescents’ identity development.

**James Marcia’s Ego Identity Achievement Continuum**

Marcia (1966) sought to expand upon Erikson’s theory through identification of psychosocial criteria for determining the degree of ego identity, and exploration of the behavioral consequences of ego identity. Through semi-structured interviews and additional assessments with 86 college males, Marcia assessed ego identity using Erikson’s concepts of crisis and commitment. Marcia defined crisis as a period in which a person is engaged in choosing from meaningful and equally valid choices. Additionally, he defined commitment as the level of personal investment demonstrated by an individual. He also measured four task variables (stressful concept-attainment tasks, level of aspiration, measure of authoritarianism, and self-esteem). Through assessment of these variables, Marcia was able to obtain information regarding
performance under stress, patterns of realistic goal setting, reaction to authoritarianism, and vulnerability to change in self-esteem in reacting to others. The findings resulted in validation of four identity statuses included on the identity achievement continuum: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement (Marcia, 1966; 1980). To illustrate the achievement continuum, Schwartz (2001) described the process of plotting the four identity statuses on an X-Y coordinate graph, where X represents the level of exploration and crisis, and Y represents the level of commitment (See Figure 2-1.).

The level of intersections between crisis and commitment determines where an individual is placed on the identity achievement continuum. Scoring high in both crisis and commitment are associated with the quadrant that aligns with identity achievement, while low scores in crisis and commitment are associated with the quadrant that aligns with identity diffusion. Each of the four statuses are associated with both positive and negative aspects (Marcia, 1980), which will be discussed further in this chapter. This continuum differs from Erikson’s (1956) model because it is not sequential in nature. Additionally, the statuses within the continuum are not fixed, and therefore, individuals have the ability to move between the statuses (Marcia, 1967; 1980; Waterman, 1988).

**Identity Diffusion**

Identity diffusion is the lowest level on the identity achievement continuum. An individual experiencing identity diffusion has not encountered a crisis relating to establishing an identity; however, the individual has no interest in developing an identity (Marcia, 1966). Individuals classified as being diffused are described as being apathetic and uninterested (Marcia, 1980), and having a tendency towards academic underachievement (Berzonsky, 1985), drug problems (Jones, 1992), and depression (Marcia, 1993). Individuals who are diffused lack a basic identity structure that allows
them to make consistent choices through the life cycle due to an apathetic attitude that is often swayed by their environment (Schwartz, 2001). In addition to high levels of moratorium, high levels of diffusion also relate to poor coping skills when experiencing negative emotions (Dumas et al., 2009) and low levels of prosocial behavior and community involvement (Hardy & Kisling, 2006). Furthermore, diffusions are described as being extremely flexible, infinitely adaptable, having no sense of internal self-definition, and are shaped by current external influences (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Luyckx et al., 2010). Therefore, because of the characteristics associated with diffusion, Marcia (1966) first hypothesized that diffusion was at the opposite end of the spectrum from achievement. A diffused individual has not experienced a crisis or a commitment. However, Marcia (1966) later reported that identity foreclosure, instead of diffusion, was the most dangerous status.

**Identity Foreclosure**

Identity foreclosure occurs when an individual prematurely makes a firm commitment to an occupation or ideology (Marcia, 1966). Individuals with identity foreclosure are more likely to have unrealistic and unattainably high goals, vulnerable levels of self-esteem, and poor performance on stressful concept-attainment tasks. Specifically, individuals with foreclosed identities are vulnerable to self-esteem manipulations and tend to change direction in ways that are consistent with feedback from authority figures (Marcia, 1967). However, Waterman (1988) reported that there are also appropriate or healthy reasons for remaining foreclosed with respect to identity goals, values, and beliefs. Individuals with foreclosed identities display behaviors such as low anxiety, good relationships with their parents and other family members, satisfaction with education, and opposition to drug use (Marcia 1980; 1993). Foreclosed
individuals exhibit the strength and self-direction that is associated with the identity achievement status, but they have difficulty in considering alternatives to their current position(s) (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Luyckx et al., 2010). Berzonsky (1985) examined identity foreclosure among high school students and students in their first year of college, and found that individuals with foreclosed identities were at greater risk for academic underachievement. In addressing the identity foreclosure challenge, Petitpas (1978) proposed providing interventions within the school system by exposing students to the benefits of vocational decisions that are based on thorough exploration and meaningful alternatives.

**Assessment of Identity Foreclosure.**

The measurement and assessment of identity foreclosure is a major concern among scholars and practitioners in vocational development. Brisbin and Savickas (1994) examined the effectiveness of assessing identity foreclosure by exploring whether or not career indecision measures could distinguish the four identity statuses within the achievement continuum among 199 college students. They also focused on investigating whether individuals with identity achievement could be distinguished from individuals with identity foreclosure through the use of a career indecision measure. To measure the identity statuses, they administered the Dellas Identity Status Inventory–Occupation (DISI-O; Dellas & Jernigan, 1987) and three measures of career indecision: My Vocational Situation [MVS] (Holland, Gottfredson, & Power, 1980), the Career Decision Profile [CDP] (Jones & Chenery, 1980), and the Career Decision Scale [CDS] (Savickas, Carden, Toman, & Jarjoura, 1992). The researchers found that the three measures could be used to differentiate between individuals’ varying identity statuses; however, individuals who were in the achievement status could not be differentiated
from individuals with foreclosed identities. Based on these findings, Brisbin and Savickas (1994) concluded that career indecision assessments do not measure foreclosure, and they are also insensitive to the difference in the path to self-chosen commitment. Therefore, Brisbin and Savickas recommended that future researchers draw from broader samples of high school and college students, and include questions or subscales that address foreclosure within career indecision measures. Furthermore, counselors need to use caution with interpreting scores and implementing interventions based on the scores.

Blustien, Ellis, and Devenis (1989) proposed that foreclosure might have potential advantages in the career development process by alleviating anxiety and cognitive dissonance. They further posited that the maladaptive and adaptive nature of foreclosure could not be determined due to an absence of a clear definition and a psychometric measure of the construct. Thus, they proposed addressing this issue through the development of the Commitment to Career Choices Scale (CCCS), which encompassed two dimensions: Tendency to Foreclose (TTF) and Vocational Exploration and Commitment (VEC). In using the TTF, researchers described individuals on one end of the continuum as having a strong tendency to foreclose whereas individuals on the other end were described as having openness to the diverse experiences of the commitment process. The CCCS is composed of 28 items that focus on measuring exploration and foreclosure attitudes related to career choice (Linnemeyer & Brown, 2010). Responses are recorded using a 7-point scale that rates responses from ‘1’ (never true about me) to ’7’ (always true about me), where high scores demonstrate a tendency to foreclose on career choices. Internal consistency
reliability was .82 for the derivation sample and .78 for each cross-validation sample (Blustien et al., 1989; Linnemeyer & Brown, 2010). Additionally, the researchers used the VEC to explain a continuum of career exploration that ranged from an exploratory phase to a committed phase. After a lengthy development process, the researchers identified support for using the CCCS to assess the career decision-making process. However, Blustien and colleagues (1989) discouraged practitioners from assessing the exploration and commitment level of clients using only the CCCS.

Jin, Watkins, and Yuen (2009) also used the CCCS to explore the relationship between the Five-Factor model and career decision-making of Chinese graduate students (N=785), where career decision-making self-efficacy was a mediating variable. The researchers found agreeableness to be a significant predictor to the tendency to foreclose, and that high career decision-making self-efficacy related significantly to progress in attaining vocational commitment. The researchers suggested that career development interventions should provide activities that focus on enhancing goal-oriented and responsible behavior, reduce negative emotions that are generalized, and enhance cooperative interpersonal communication skills. Career decision self-efficacy may promote vocational commitment.

**Identity Moratorium**

Identity moratorium occurs when an individual has experienced a crisis, but has already begun to establish a commitment to a personal identity, while continuing to explore other possibilities (Marcia, 1966). People within the moratorium identity status exhibit high levels of exploration, but low levels of commitment (Luyckx et al., 2010). Erikson (1968) proposed that a moratorium is needed for the integration of the identity elements ascribed in the previous childhood stages. During moratorium, individuals
engaged in greater exploration, and are more open-minded and thoughtful (Schwartz, 2001). Kroger and Marcia (2011) describe moratoriums as often having internal conflicts during the process of developing their identities. The positive aspects of this stage are similar to the cognitive complexity and information processing that is demonstrated in the identity achievement status in that they are self-reflective and open to the opinions of others. However, despite the opportunities for growth, individuals with identity moratorium are also typically more anxious than achievement or foreclosed individuals (Marcia, 1967; Podd, Marcia, & Rubin, 1970; Sterling & Van Horn, 1989).

**Identity Achievement**

Individuals within the identity achievement status engage in a comprehensive exploration of occupational choices, religions, political beliefs, and sexualities, and make a firm commitment to a position regarding each of these areas (Marcia, 1966). This identity status demonstrates well-balanced thinking, is the most mature status, and occupies the developed endpoint of the identity achievement continuum (Berzonsky, 2004; Zimmer-Gembeck & Petherick, 2006). Individuals within the identity achievement status generally work more effectively under stress, are reflective in decision-making, have a higher likelihood to be in intimate relationships, and demonstrate higher levels of preconventional moral reasoning (Marcia, 1980). Additionally, Kroger and Marcia (2011) described people within the identity achievement status as being able to maintain flexibility while also not being swayed by the outside world. These individuals are able to make room for the opinions of others and consider them in a non-defensive and reflective manner. Individuals in the identity achievement status are not only open to self-reflection, but also dialogue, which makes them the most open to exploration throughout the lifecycle. However, Waterman (1988) maintains that the identity
achievement status is not static in nature. Individuals may encounter crises throughout their life cycle. Therefore, individuals experience a need for additional commitments to be formed throughout life, resulting in changes to their identity status.

**Assessment of Identity Achievement**

Researchers have developed assessments to measure identity achievement status. Marcia (1976) and Rest (1975) recommended a more developmental and comprehensive way of measuring identity statuses, rather than the semi-structured interview method that had been employed by Marcia (1966). These recommendations resulted in the development of the Objective Measure of Ego-Identity Status [OM-EIS] (Adams, Shea, & Fitch, 1979). The OM-EIS consists of 24 items, with each of Marcia’s four identity statuses addressed within six questions. Individuals are asked to read the questions and indicate to what degree they identify with the statements on a 6-point, Likert scale ranging from ‘1’ (strongly agree) to ‘6’ (strongly disagree). The development of the OM-EIS included four studies with a sample totaling 240 men and women (Adams, Shea, & Fitch, 1979). The researchers found evidence of concurrent and predictive validity with both the male and female samples. The measure included controlling for rater bias and interviewer effects on participant responses that were associated with using Marcia’s (1966) interview approach. However, the researchers had difficulty discriminating between the diffusion and moratorium stages using the OM-EIS. Bennion and Adams (1986) revised the measure to form the Extended Objective Measures of Ego Identity Status-II (EOM-EIS-II), a 64-item scale. Then, Akers, Jones, and Coyl (1998) revised the instrument again to form a 40-item scale, which uses that same 6-point Likert scale. In examining the psychometric properties, Akers and
colleagues (1998) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .74 for the Marcia (1966) identity statuses of achievement, .71 for moratorium, .79 for foreclosure, and .78 for diffusion.

**Comparison of Erikson and Marcia Models**

Marcia (1966) was able to provide clarity regarding a proposed continuum of identity statuses, and formed an operational theory to assess an individual's ego identity. Exploration and commitment determines where an individual is placed on the identity achievement continuum. This continuum differs from Erikson’s (1956) model given that it is not sequential in nature. Additionally, the statuses are not fixed and individuals have the ability to move between them based on their context throughout the life span (Marcia, 1967; 1980; Waterman, 1988). Thus, Marcia’s identity achievement status continuum provides a tool to help explain how an individual defines oneself.

Researchers have, however, claimed that Marcia’s identity achievement status continuum does not accurately conceptualize Erikson’s model of psychosocial development (Côté & Levine, 1988; Schwartz, 2001; van Hoof, 1999). According to Côté and Levine (1988), Marcia’s identity status continuum addresses the formation of commitments during identity formation from a psychological perspective, but does not include socio-historical perspectives. Additionally, Côté and Levine (1988) reported that Erikson (1956) made no distinction upon a continuum of “identity maturity”, and that constructs such as moratorium, diffusion, and commitment were not accurately defined. Thus, they concluded that Marcia’s identity achievement status continuum is an example of construct underrepresentation (Cook & Campbell, 1979), stating that all facets of the ego identity were not accurately incorporated into the status continuum. In contrast, Erikson’s (1956) model is interdisciplinary and encompasses sociological, biological, historical, and psychological aspects of individual development. Therefore,
Côté and Levine posited that there was little overlap between Marcia’s and Erikson’s work.

Van Hoof (1999) expanded upon these critiques and showed that definitions of constructs differ between Marcia and Erikson. For example, Marcia defined moratorium as a psychological state of conscious consideration of identity choices. However, Erikson articulated a psychosocial and institutional moratorium, where psychosocial moratorium is a period of exploration and attending college is an example of institutional moratorium (van Hoof, 1999). Additionally, van Hoof reported that Marcia failed to include the subjective experience of identity and the identity statuses. The acknowledgement of this divergence is consistent with other studies (i.e., Côté & Levine, 1998; Schwartz, 2001). Côté and Levine, and Schwartz claimed that the lack of an individual and subjective experience in identity development was a weakness of Marcia’s identity theory. The subjective experience is key to Erikson’s model of psychosocial development because of the proposed interaction between the individual and the socio-historical and cultural contexts. However, van Hoof challenged the idea that Marcia’s theory lacks sufficient overlap (Côté & Levine, 1988; Waterman, 1988), but the constructs (i.e., the identity statuses) within the theory may not be clear. Like Côté and Levine (1987), van Hoof concluded that Marcia’s identity achievement status continuum only grasped a portion of Erikson’s model, and he additionally questioned the overall structure of the continuum and the ability for behaviors to be differentiated between individuals who fall in different statuses.

In contrast to van Hoof’s critique, Waterman (1999) aimed to highlight both the limitations and the contributions of Marcia’s identity status achievement continuum.
According to Waterman, the Marcia continuum has been useful for integrating a constructivist information-processing framework (Berzonsky, 1990), an existentialist philosophy (Bilsker, 1992), and also a feminist perspective (Archer, 1992). Thus, Marcia’s theory has proved to be useful when employing a number of philosophies and perspectives. Additionally, Waterman reported that constructs such as crisis and exploration, and ideology and occupation that are employed by Marcia (1966) are true to Erikson’s theory. Overlap between Marcia and Erikson was found to be quite substantial, but not identical. According to Waterman, Erikson’s theory is so complex that it would be extremely difficult to operationalize all concepts within the construct of identity. Furthermore, Waterman refutes van Hoof’s (1999) claim that Marcia placed more importance on his explained facets of the Erikson model, and points out that many other theorists also omitted several Eriksonian concepts in their expansion of the model.

In short, the discussion of the accuracy and validity of Marcia’s (1966) identity achievement status continuum has yielded a rich discussion that has examined both the strengths and weaknesses of the theory. While the Marcia identity status theory may not fully represent the Erikson model of psychosocial development, there has been considerable effort to research identity status theory (Waterman, 1999). Studies that have employed the Marcia status have contributed to a rich understanding on identity development; however, there are still further critiques that must be taken into account.

**Gender Critiques of Ego Identity Development**

According to McEwen (2003), many theories are representative of the worldviews and experiences of those who construct them. Developmental theories have been described as “White guys who studied White students” (Jones & Abes, 2013), which communicates the perceived lack of diversity in theorists and whom the theories are
relevant for in practice. Erikson’s (1968) model was questioned in regards to its use in application for non-White males and women. In regards to women’s psychosocial development, Erikson stated, “I think that much of a young women’s identity is already defined in her kind of attractiveness and in the selective nature of her search for the man (or men) by whom she is sought” (Erikson, 1968, p. 283). This statement has created strong criticism. However, one should keep in mind that Erikson’s theory was based in the socio-historical context and reflected the culture of that time period. Carol Gilligan (1979) proposed that Erikson’s theory is rooted in the “eight stages of man” and is inherently biased towards males, while excluding the development of women. Erikson (1968) postulated that for men, identity development is more salient than intimacy and generativity. Erikson’s theory also focuses on individualism, autonomy, and mastery of the technical world (Streitmatter, 1993). Though Erikson was aware of gender differences in development, he made no attempts to capture the development of women (Gilligan, 1979). Gilligan argued that interpersonal relationships and generativity are most salient for women in regards to identity development. This perspective was supported by Miller (1986), who expounded upon the concept of a women’s identity development being rooted in relationships:

One central feature is that women stay, build on, and develop in a context of connection with others. Indeed, women’s sense of self becomes very much organized around being able to make and then maintain affiliations and relationships. Eventually, for many women the threat of disruption of connections is perceived not as a loss of a relationship but as something closer to a loss of self (p. 83).

Connectedness to others, as well as intimacy, nurturance, and contextual thought are generally considered feminine traits (Belenky, 1986). Miller (1986) stated that individuals should view feminine qualities as strengths in the development of
identity. However, psychology and developmental theories have conceptualized women’s development and female characteristics from a deficit-based perspective, or ignored them in research altogether in examining the formative stages of theory development (Gilligan, 1982). This is in contrast to the wealth of research devoted to understanding autonomy and independence, and abstract critical thought. These attributes are often associated as male characteristics (Belenky, 1986). Gilligan (1982) stated that including women’s experiences in developmental research can serve as a way to expand the knowledge and understanding of human development. With this in mind, researchers are tasked with developing an understanding of gender differences (Josselson, 1987). However, criticism arises related to research focused on gender differences in identity development because the research has typically aimed to understand how women diverge or conform to theories that were normed for men (Belenky, 1986).

Identity Formation and Gender

Marcia was aware that psychoanalytic theory, which Erikson’s (1956) psychosocial theory of development derived from, viewed female development from a deficit-based perspective, and that Erikson (1968) had only devoted one article to understanding female psychosocial development. Additionally, Marcia’s original study (1966) that generated the identity achievement status continuum only included a sample of college males. Thus, Marcia and Friedman (1970) sought to extend the use of the identity achievement status continuum to women through a sample of 49 female college seniors. To expand the identity statuses to women and remain consistent with Erikson (1968), Marcia and Friedman developed questions to explore attitudes in regards to premarital intercourse. There were several research hypotheses: 1) identity
achievement participants would choose more difficult majors than identity participants, 2) foreclosure participants would demonstrate higher levels of self-esteem and lower levels of anxiety than other statuses, and 3) moratorium participants would demonstrate higher levels of anxiety than the other statuses. These hypotheses were expected to be consistent with the findings from Marcia (1966). Each of these hypotheses was supported by the results from the study. Thus, the researchers concluded that the identity statuses could be applied to both females and males. However, many of the women in the sample could be categorized as being foreclosed. The statuses seemed to be applicable to women, however additional research is needed that focuses on comparing self-esteem levels and anxiety levels of foreclosed men and women.

Researchers have also undertaken the task of understanding gender differences in regards to the identity achievement status continuum. Zimmer-Gembeck and Petherick (2006) examined the possible association between relationship satisfaction and the interaction of identity formation and intimacy dating goals, age and sex differences, and age/sex as moderators of associations among identity formation intimacy dating goals and relationship satisfaction. In sum, they aimed to answer the questions, "Who am I?" and "What do I want in a relationship?" (pg. 176). They expected that individuals who had achieved identity formation would be more oriented toward intimacy goals when dating, and they also expected a stronger association between intimacy dating goals and relationship satisfaction among those who have formed an identity in sex roles and vocation. Additionally, they hypothesized age and sex differences in intimacy dating goals and identity formation. However, they found no gender difference in associations among intimacy goals, identity formation, and
relationship satisfaction. The findings demonstrated that both males and females exhibited similar characteristics in identity formation in regards to vocation and relationships; gender did not moderate associations in the study. The researchers suggested that past studies that have found gender differences in identity formation (Douvan & Adelson, 1966) and gender difference in intimacy styles (Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981) should be conceptualized in regards to the context that they were conducted in (e.g. time period, country). Conceptualizing the results in this manner is consistent with Erikson’s (1956) assertions that identity formation is subject to the socio-historical context of the individual. Furthermore, Zimmer-Gembeck and Petherick recommended that future studies explore how identity formation is impacted by social context.

Anthis, Dunkel, and Anderson (2004) examined gender and identity status differences in adolescents’ possible selves, and compared the theoretical differences of Erikson (1968) and Gilligan (1982). Possible selves (Markus & Nurius, 1986) is defined as the cognitive manifestation of enduring goals, aspirations, motives, fears, and threats. Markus and Nurius believed that an understanding of possible selves could provide a link between self-concept and motivation. Furthermore, Anthis and colleagues (2004) posited that the understanding of the possible self could also prove useful in studying gender differences in how adolescents contemplate identity issues. The researchers hypothesized that there would be a main effect of females having a greater number of possible selves reflecting interpersonal relationships than males, and also that there would be an interaction between ego identity status and gender in prediction of possible selves. The findings reflected that the females’ possible selves were related
to fear in regards to future interpersonal relationships. The females also were more likely to believe in the likelihood of negative outcomes for future interpersonal relationships. Additionally, the researchers found that females focused more on intimacy in regards to feared and balanced possible selves regarding interpersonal relationships. No significance was reported in regards to the interaction of gender and identity status and how it may predict possible selves. Overall, the researchers concluded that the results provide no support for proposed theoretical gender differences, and that future research should be conceptualized through socio-historical contexts.

Although researchers have proposed that females mature and develop differently in several ways (Blyth, Simmons, & Zakin, 1985; Gilligan, 1982), including psychosocially (Streitmatter, 1993), there are few gender differences noted in regards to identity formation. Subsequently, researchers have asserted that females and males proceed through the identity status continuum in a similar manner (Archer, 1992; Kroger, 1997). However, Archer (1989) found that males were more likely to be foreclosed in regards to political ideology, and females were more likely to hold a moratorium or an achievement status in regards to family. In addition, there are no reported relationships regarding occupation, politics, religion, sex roles, and relationship domains (Kroger, 1997). Furthermore, Schwartz and Montgomery (2002) reported that women were more likely to be classified as having an achieved status, and men were more likely to be classified as being within the carefree diffusion status in regards to both interpersonal and ideology domains.
There is evidence that suggests gender differences in classification of identity status, but not gender differences for identity development. The lack of empirical evidence of gender differences in identity development research has caused scholars to believe that identity development is complex in nature. Studies that focus on gender difference in identity development should move past the argument that women focus on interpersonal relationships, while men focus on ideology (Archer, 1993). However, the criticisms and contributions of Carol Gilligan cannot be understated, as it has led to a thorough exploration of women’s development. For example, the original Objective Measure of Ego-Identity Status (Adams, Shea, & Fitch, 1979) only measure domains that are ideological in nature. The updated version of the assessment, the Extended Objective Measures of Ego Identity Status-II (Bennion & Adams, 1986) now includes domains that relate to ideology and interpersonal components of identity. This is no doubt in response to criticisms of Gilligan (1979; 1982) and others who have called for an inclusion and recognition of characteristics that are associated as being feminine (e.g. interpersonal relationships). Findings have shown to not present gender differences in regards to ego identity development, but criticisms of Erikson’s theory of psychosocial and ego identity development have propelled developmental research to be more comprehensive and expand upon original modes of inquiry. Moving forward, researchers may explore self-definition (Kroger, 1997) and race (Syed & Mitchell, 2013), which relates to identity status and includes socio-historical contexts.

**Racial Identity Development**

Race is an important aspect of identity throughout the lifespan (Brown et al., 2011). Additionally, racial identity progresses through sequential and permeable ego-identity statuses (Helms, 1993). Helms drew from Krogman’s (1945) definition of race
which articulates it as “a sub-group of peoples possessing a definite combination of physical characteristics, genetic origin, the combination of which to varying degrees distinguishes the sub-group from other sub-groups of mankind” (p. 49). Within this definition, there is a focus on physical attributes that are believed to differentiate one set of people from another. This is different from ethnicity, which is described by Casas (1984) as a group classification of individuals that share unique social and culture heritage from generation to generation. Ethnicity is also focused mostly on socio-cultural factors that influence group classification. Nonetheless, researchers have indicated that it is difficult to distinguish between race and ethnicity (Quintana, 2007). Quintana stated that research (e.g. Helms & Talleyrand, 1997) has focused on the social implications of race that is often derived from ethnicity. Furthermore, institutions (i.e., government) now divide people by ethnicity to separate groups (e.g. Hispanic and non-Hispanic), making race and ethnicity now somewhat synonymous in American society. Based on these definitions, it is clear that race and ethnicity are not the same. However, due to the link between them, in this chapter, race and ethnicity will be used interchangeably to discuss the literature. This, however, is not an assumption of homogeneity between race and ethnicity.

Though race has no clear behavioral implications, historically there are social implications, such as slavery and the one-drop rule (Martin & Nakayama, 2012). Given that it is a socio-political construct, race impacts socialization experiences (Helms, 2007). However, the belief that race has behavioral, intrapersonal, and interpersonal implications has led to the study of racial identity development. Racial identity development is a sense of group or collective identity based on one’s perception of a
shared racial heritage with a particular group (Helms, 2007). A person thus establishes their racial identity based on a perceived sense of commonality with others in their racial group. It is noted that there is an Eriksonian distinction between identity and identification (Walker & Syed, 2013), where identification relates to an individual’s racial/ethnic label. Racial/ethnic identification will be discussed later in this chapter.

**Black Racial Identity Development**

According to Helms (1993), “Black racial identity theories aim to explain how Blacks can identify, or not identify, with other Blacks and/or adopt or abandon identities resulting from racial victimization” (p. 5). Chavous, Rivas-Drake, Smalls, Griffin, and Cogburn (2008) further defined Black racial identity as cognitions and attitudes related to individuals’ attempts to integrate their status as Blacks into their self-concepts. In reviewing the history of Black racial identity development, Helms (1993) stated that the first theories arose in the 1970s in response to the Civil Rights Movement and the Black Power Movement. Researchers conceptualized the theories with the Black client (or person)–as–problem (CAP) and the Nigrescence or racial identity development (NRID) perspectives (Helms, 1993). The CAP model described Black racial identity development from a deficit-based perspective, and was more focused on providing counselors with ways to conceptualize and cope with possible reactions from Black clients. Vontress (1971) provided an example of a CAP perspective by proposing that there are three types of Black people, “Black”, “Colored”, and “Negro”. Within this proposed typology, each had assigned inter and intra-racial thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. According to the theory, a “Black” person would value their African physical features, understand and identify racial discrimination of their group, and be intolerant of racial discrimination that they experienced in life. “Negroes” were individuals who would
accommodate Whites who demonstrated racist behaviors. Lastly, “Coloreds” were Black people who would perceive and evaluate themselves as Whites perceived them. Using this typology, counselors could determine how easily therapeutic relationships could be established, where Negroes would be most easy to work with, followed by Coloreds, and then Blacks being the least amendable in establishing a therapeutic relationship.

In contrast, researchers used Nigrescence models to explain the process in which individuals “become black” (Helms, 1993). The most widely known and used Nigrescence model (Cross, 1971) explored how individuals progressed from being “Negro” to “Black”. The current and revised Nigrescence model proposes that individuals progressed through three stages: (a) pre-encounter, (b) immersion-emersion, and (c) internalization/commitment (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012; Vandiver et al., 2002). The pre-encounter stage is characterized as a rejection of Black culture and identification with White culture. Encounter is characterized as demonstrating hatred towards White people, and one’s “Blackness” becomes most salient (Vandiver et al., 2002). Lastly, Vandiver and colleagues reported that during the internalization/commitment stage, recognition of Black membership is achieved, yet there is a commitment to fighting for the rights of all versus oppression.

**Black Racial Identification:** Within Black racial identity development, there are four models of conceptualization: 1) social development, 2) afrocentric, 3) affiliation-commitment, and 4) multidimensional (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012). The theory of Nigrescence is described as falling within the social development model, and is aimed toward understanding racial identity within stages and along a continuum. However, affiliation-models focus on racial identification (Walker & Syed, 2013) through
understanding feelings of connectedness, and exploring and involvement in group activities and cultural traditions (Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012). Racial identification is similar to the idea of social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978); however, the key aspect of distinction is involvement in cultural activities, in addition to feelings of connectedness. Racial identification is important to members of racial minority groups because there is a need to assert identities that are different than the dominant culture (Phinney, 1992; Rahim-Williams et al., 2007). Strong racial identification can serve as a catalyst to coping with discrimination and messages that conflict with one’s culture (Masten, Telzer, & Eisenberger, 2011). Additionally, racial identification is central to developing a strong self-concept among racial minority individuals (Sellers, Chavous, & Cooke, 1998).

**Black Racial Identity and Gender**

Robinson, Esquibel, and Rich (2013) stated that like race, gender is a social construct that shapes an individual’s experiences and is a significant component of an individual’s identity. The social construction of both race and gender directly relates to the concepts of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991), where multiple identities interact to complete a person’s identity. Understanding intersectionality is a key aspect to capturing the multidimensionality of identity for women of color (Crenshaw, 1991) because the experiences of Black women differ from those of White females and Black males (Collins, 2000a; Houston, 2000) due to their statuses of being both women and Black. Thus, it is important to use the conceptualization of “Black female” rather than “Black” and “female” when discussing this specific population and understanding their lived experiences.
In “double jeopardy” (Shorter-Gooden & Washington, 1996), Black women are subject to multiple oppressions stemming from race and gender. Black women have unique values and beliefs that have an impact on their identity and functioning, such as having more neutral or liberal gender roles and expectations than White women (Davenport & Yurich, 1991; Harris, 1996). Additionally, Black girls and young women are socialized to show strength, and appear tough, resilient, and self-sufficient (Shorter-Gooden & Jackson, 2000; Thomas & King, 2007). Theorists have argued that this is a result of the legacy of slavery, due to the requirements for heavy labor and sexual victimization (Bell, 1992; Fordham, 1993; Greene, 1997; West; 1995). The legacy of slavery is evident through the systems of racial and gender oppression that still continue in society (Hooks, 1981). The expectation and pressure to show strength influences Black females to imbue the image of the “Modern Day Superwoman” and the “Strong Independent Black Woman” (Thomas, Hacker, & Hoxha, 2011). However, the assertion that Black women are socialized to show strength and demonstrate independence appears to contradict Gilligan’s (1979) theory that connection and relationships are tantamount to women’s development. Therefore, more research is needed in understanding the ego identity development and intersectionality of Black women. While research has focused on understanding how Black women cope with multiple oppressions and identities (Collins, 2000a; Staples, 1973; Watkins & David, 1970; Williams, 1975), there is limited research on the intersections of identity for adolescents (Rogers, Scott, & Way; 2014; Thomas et al., 2011).

Pyant and Yanico (1991) explored how racial identity and gender-role identity development predicted psychological well-being for Black women, and they found that
racial identity attitudes were related to psychological health for this population. Findings were concurrent with the Nigrescence Model (Cross, 1971) that demonstrated that endorsement of pro-White/anti-Black attitudes explained more psychological symptoms and lower self-esteem among college students ($N = 78$). Gender role attitudes were not a significant predictor to mental health variables. Thus, Pyant and Yanico concluded that race and racism may have a greater influence on Black women.

Shorter-Gooden and Washington (1996) conducted an exploratory study that was aimed at generating hypotheses about ego identity development in late adolescent Black females. The researchers were interested in (a) how central race and gender were in the sample, (b) what identities are most salient and how invested in these identities are the individuals, and (c) how identity is portrayed by Black adolescents. In considering the findings about race and gender, the researchers suggested two possible conclusions: either race was more salient for Black women, or participants’ gender issues had already been resolved in development. Additionally, consistent with Gilligan’s (1979) work, the researchers found that interpersonal relationships were salient in regards to identity formation. Furthermore, showing strength was reported as a possible reaction to coping with racism and sexism. Shorter-Gooden and Washington recommended future research that focuses on examining the interweaving of Black female identities using qualitative or quantitative methods with more representative samples.

Thomas, Hacker, and Hoxha (2011) examined the social identity (gendered racial identity) of Black female adolescents to look at the intersectionality of race and gender. The researchers aimed to answer three questions: (a) does the unitary gendered racial
identity conception hold more salience than the separated identities of race and gender, 
(b) are there differences of gendered racial identity across age groups of Black 
adolescents and women, and (c) what are the values, attitudes, and social experiences 
in regards to gendered racial identity. Using a sample of 17 Black females between the 
ages of 15-22, the researchers conducted dyadic focus groups. The researchers 
reported the importance of the intersection of race and gender, rather than assessing 
them as separate constructs. The participants experienced great difficulty in articulating 
a separation of gender and race in reflecting upon their experiences. These findings are 
contrary to theorists who propose that racial identity develops before gender identity 
(Carter & Parks, 1996; Pyant & Yanico, 1991). Thomas and colleagues recommended 
that future research on the intersection of race and gender include larger samples. 
Additionally, they proposed that more research should aim to understand gendered 
racial identity in both males and females.

**Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI)**

 Although there is agreement that both race and gender, as identities, are 
intertwined and influence the conception of an individual’s identity as a whole, there is 
disagreement about the degree to which they are intertwined and if one is more central 
and salient. Thus, Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, and Chavous (1998) devised a 
model and measurement that integrates several constructs within racial identity 
development for Blacks specifically. The Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity 
(MMRI) is a hybrid of racial identity development models and social identity theory 
(Harvey, Blue, & Tennial, 2012) that is measured by the Multidimensional Inventory of 
Black Identity (MIBI, Sellers et al., 1998). Thus, the MMRI is seen as a unique way to
capture the multidimensionality and intersectionality of social identities (race, gender, occupational identity) that could be beneficial in exploring both race and gender.

The MMRI defines racial identity in regards to Black Americans as the “significance and qualitative meaning that individuals attribute to their membership within the Black racial group within their self-concepts” (Sellers et al., 1998, p. 23). Sellers and colleagues (1998) further stated that there are two underlying questions to answer using the MMRI: (a) How important is race in the individual’s perception of self?, and (b) What does it mean to be a member of this racial group? Strengths of this model are the underlying assumption of the contextual nature of Black racial identity and a focus on understanding what it means to be Black through the individual’s experiences and perceptions. The MIBI measures three of the four dimensions of racial identity that Sellers and colleagues used to address the significance and qualitative meaning of race for Blacks: racial centrality, racial regard, and racial ideology (Sellers et al., 1998; See Figure 2-2.). Additionally, there are seven subscales that fall under the four dimensions: centrality, private and public regard, nationalist ideology, oppressed minority, assimilationist ideology, and humanist ideology. According to Sellers and colleagues (1998), racial salience is unstable and changes based on the context of the moments; and therefore, it would be inappropriate to try to measure it. Harvey, Blue, and Tennial (2012) provided a synopsis of the MMRI dimensions in their review of Black racial identity development models. Salience refers to the relevance of race in regards to the individual’s self-concept. Centrality is defined as the extent that the individual defines oneself by their race. Ideology refers to the beliefs, opinions, and attitudes that a person holds in regards to their race, and how they think that they should act in response to
social issues. Thus, it seems that the MMRI could be instrumental in assessing the intersecting identities within the individual, and perhaps racial identification and how identification may influence self-concept.

**Racial Centrality**

Centrality refers to the extent to which a person defines themselves based on race (Sellers et al., 1997). Racial centrality is indicative of the extent to which an individual affirms race to be an important characteristic of his or her identity (Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1998). Blacks who view race as a central component to their identity were more likely to attribute ambiguous discriminatory events compared to those whose racial centrality was lower (Shelton & Sellers, 2000). These findings are supported by Scott (2003) who found similar results. However, Shelton and Sellers (2000) also found no relationship between high levels of racial centrality and coping with perceived racial discrimination. Thus, Schott (2003) determined that racial centrality may not be situational in nature, while racial regard and racial ideology may have more behavioral consequences than centrality.

**Racial Regard**

Regard refers to a person’s affective and evaluative judgment of his or her race (Sellers et al., 1997). The regard dimension is based heavily on the concept of collective self-esteem (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990), which consists of private and public components. Accordingly, regard within the MMRI is comprised of both the thoughts that a person believes that others have of one’s race (public regard), and the thoughts that they personally have of their own race (private regard) (Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk-Cone, & Zimmerman, 2003). Public and private regard include one’s belief of both positive and negative perceptions. According to Sellers and Shelton (2003), Black
students who felt other groups hold negative attitudes towards Blacks (low public regard) reported higher instances of racial discrimination. Researchers have also found a relationship between private regard and self-esteem. According to Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, and Smith (1998), positive levels of private regard were associated with higher levels of self-esteem in a sample of Black high school students ($N = 72$) and Black college students ($N = 176$).

**Racial Ideology**

Racial ideology is composed of four ideologies that can be used to understand an individual's beliefs about how Black people should act, which includes: 1) the nationalist ideology, 2) the oppressed minority ideology, 3) the assimilationist ideology, and 4) the humanist ideology. The nationalist ideology emphasizes the importance of race and the exclusivity of the Black experience in America (Sellers et al., 1997). According to Sellers and colleagues (1998), identification with the nationalist ideology may lead Blacks to intentionally seek participation in organizations and activities that have large numbers of Black involvement (e.g. Black Greek organizations and Black Student Union). Bimper and Harrison (2011) contend that both awareness of Black achievements and marginalization in America can lead a person to align with the nationalist ideology. A nationalist ideology would assert that Blacks be in control of their own destiny with minimal input from other groups (Sellers, Chavous, & Cooke, 1998). The oppressed minority ideology places importance on a shared experience of Black oppression with other oppressed groups (Sellers et al., 1998). The oppressed minority ideology is unlikely to be a dominant philosophy amongst Blacks (Bimper & Harrison, 2011). Bimper and Harrison also asserted that the oppressed minority ideology could be
used as a coping mechanism for Blacks when experiencing stereotyping in varying contexts.

An individual who ascribes to an assimilationist ideology may emphasize adapting to, and becoming a part of, mainstream American culture (Bimper & Harrison, 2011). Sellers and colleagues (1998) assert that an assimilationist would go about making systemic change by becoming a part of the larger American system. Within this ideology, race may not be central to the self-concept (Bimper & Harrison, 2011), but it does not imply a strong de-emphasis of being Black, or a lack of recognition of oppression in American society (Sellers, Chavous, & Cooke, 1998). Within the humanist ideology, there is no distinction between race, gender, and class lines and people are seen as equal—no matter the identities that they occupy (Sellers et al., 1998). Race is not central to a person’s self-concept under the humanist ideology, which encourages the salience of other identities that a person may occupy (Bimper & Harrison, 2011).

Along with racial centrality, racial ideology was found to be significantly related to Black students’ academic outcomes. Sellers and colleagues (1998) found that racial centrality was positively correlated to students’ cumulative GPA, whereas the nationalist and assimilation ideologies were negatively associated with cumulative GPA. Additionally, the researchers found that having high centrality levels and identification with the oppressed minority ideology was related to higher academic performance. Thus, Sellers and colleagues concluded that one’s ideology may have an adverse effect on Black college students depending on the type of institution that they attend (HBCU or PWI), due to perceived reactions to racism.
Researchers have also used the MMRI to assess the interaction of race and gender in Black males (Rogers, Scott, & Way, 2014). There were three research questions in the study: (a) What is the association between, and differences of level of racial and gender identity, (b) How do racial and gender identity change over time, and (c) Do racial and gender identity predict psychological well-being and academic adjustment independently and jointly, concurrently, and over time. Rogers and colleagues (2014) hypothesized that racial and gender identity would be positively correlated and increase over time. The MIBI was used to evaluate both racial and gender identity development in their sample of 183 Black males who ranged in age between 13 and 16. The results of the study indicated a positive correlation between racial and gender identity. Consistent with previous research (Quintana, 2007), there was a high level of racial centrality and private regard. The findings suggest that the Black males see race as central to their self-concept (high centrality), and they additionally have positive personal opinions about being Black (high private regard). Gender centrality and private regard were found to have higher levels within the sample than racial centrality and private regard. These findings may be reflective of the context, being an all-Black male school. Therefore, it is crucial to expand upon this research through the inclusion of a comparison group.

Researchers have identified a need for scholarship that is focused on racial minorities (Syed & Mitchell, 2013) and multiple identities (race, gender, sexuality, class) that intersect to form one single social identity (Cole, 2009; Shields, 2008). For example, research is needed on intersectionality of Black women (Bowleg, 2008), which may provide a greater understanding on how this population weaves their multiple
identities to form one single social identity. Historically, African-American women (and other women of color) have been socialized differently from White women, and they are considered the most oppressed group in America (Smith, 1992). Additionally, nuclear families that are characterized by sex-segregated gender roles are less likely to be found in Black communities (Collins, 2000a). Also, although Gilligan (1982) discussed connection and relationships as key components of development for women, this claim is limited because there was an emphasis on the experiences of middle-class White women (Collins, 2000a). Thus, more research is needed in this area. Furthermore, the MMRI could be a way to conceptualize this population from a multidimensional perspective that considers race, gender, and other identities to better understand the individual and how one’s social identity is formed.

Identity Achievement Status and Racial Identity Development

According to Syed and Mitchell (2013), there is a need to begin to include non-Whites within identity development research, especially identity status. There is an abundance of research on identity status, but a majority of it has focused exclusively on Whites. Addressing this gap is critical due the increasingly diverse U.S. population. It is important to begin to include racial minorities so that findings are more generalizable. Additionally, Schwartz (2005) stated that scholarly inquiry in regards to racial identity development has mostly focused on minorities in comparison to identity status mostly focusing on White samples, which has led to segregation in research. Racial identity is salient in the development of minorities, such as those of Latin American, African, Asian, and Middle Eastern descent in America (Umaña-Taylor, 2011). Furthermore, there are aspects of exploration and commitment in racial identity development (Pahl & Way, 2006; Syed & Azmitia, 2009), but racial identity was not an original domain in
Marcia’s continuum (Schwartz et al., 2011). Though these two constructs are closely related (Schwartz et al., in press), there seems to be a gap in the research that has not connected the two constructs. Thus, there must be an effort to integrate identity status and racial identity theories.

Although the identity status continuum did not originally integrate race as a domain, it provided a means to understand the process of racial identity development and to what extent an individual has explored their racial identity. However, a rich and deeper understanding of the content and meaning assigned to racial identity cannot be understood using the statuses (Yip, Seaton, & Sellers, 2006). According to Phinney (1992), achievement does not equate to being heavily involved in culture and customs. Yip and colleagues (2006) aimed to bridge the proposed gap between identity status and racial identity by studying a sample of adolescents \((n = 204)\) ages 13 to 17, college students \((n = 362)\) ages 18 to 23, and adults \((n = 274)\) ages 27 to 78. The entire sample identified themselves as being African-American. The researchers used the MIBI to assess the content and meaning that Blacks ascribe to race, and also the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure [MEIM] (Phinney, 1992) to assess exploration and commitment in regards to race. There were four goals to the study in regards to racial identity and identity status: (a) assess difference in racial identity content across identity statuses, (b) explore interactions between developmental stage and identity status on identity content, (c) investigate the identity statuses in regards to the three age groups, and (d) examine whether adolescents were more likely to be in statuses outside of achievement. Yip and colleagues hypothesized that individuals who reported higher levels of exploration and commitment from the MEIM would demonstrate higher levels
of racial identity (content-wise) on the MIBI. The findings from the study yielded several interesting results, wherein there was an establishment of an identity status continuum in regards to race. First, within the entire sample, few participants were identified as being racially diffused individuals. Yip and colleagues suggested that these findings are reflective of the salience of race in Blacks in America. In addition, 400 individuals were classified as being racially achieved out of the total sample ($N = 840$), which constituted the largest number of participants in an identity status from the sample. Each of the four identity statuses were composed of people from the three age groups, which is consistent with the idea that racial identity development is cyclical across the lifespan. Furthermore, as the age group increased, more individuals were achieved. Finally, those who were classified in the achievement status were more likely to report positive feelings about being Black. In regards to limitations, the study was not longitudinal, and it may not be representative of the national population because all of the participants came from one region. Additionally, all of the participants representing emerging adulthood were enrolled in college, which is not representative of individuals who did not attend college. The researchers suggested that their findings advance our understanding of racial-ethnic identity from a lifespan perspective. Although this study did not integrate the two constructs of racial identity and identity status, it appears to be the closest attempt at integration to date. Thus, a need exists for future research that focuses on how racial identity and identity status are connected, especially for those who are racial-ethnic minorities.

**Athletic Identity**

Athletic identity is the degree to which an individual identifies with the athletic role (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993), and it is considered important to an individual's
involvement in sports (Perrier, Smith, Strachan, & Latimer-Chueng, 2014). Athletic identity is a social role, in which a person develops a multidimensional self-concept across the lifespan. Additionally, athletic identity is rooted in the idea of the looking-glass self (Cooley, 1922). Within the process of the looking-glass self, a person constructs a self-appraisal that is derived from the attitudes of others towards the self. Brewer, Van Raalte, and Linder (1993) stated that family, friends, coaches, teachers, the media, and the individual all influence the process of identification with the athletic role. Researchers have studied the positive effects (Danish, 1983; McPherson, 1980; Werthner & Orlick, 1986) and risk factors (Linville, 1987; Pearson & Petitpas, 1990; Pyszczynski & Greenberg, 1987) associated with athletic identity and sports participation.

Harrison and colleagues (2014) explored the athletic identity of 79 Division 1 Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) college football players using the 10-item Baller Identity Measurement Scale (BIMS). The researchers found that participants reported positive feelings related to participation in sports and a connection to the term “baller”. Additionally, others perceive the athletes primarily as ball players, but the athletes in the sample did not value athletics as being the most important part of their lives. The researchers proposed that athletes would feel negatively if an injury kept them from competing, or if they did not perform at the highest level. Therefore, it appears that participation in athletics is associated with both positive and negative outcomes.

Researchers also presented confounding findings on the influence of athletic participation. In reviewing previous research, Miller and Hoffman (2009) reported a link between improved mental health and social well-being, and physical and sports participation. They also found that student-athletes experience lower levels of
psychological distress than their counterparts. Specifically, athletics is correlated to lower levels of depression, lower levels of feelings of hopelessness, and suicide attempts (Miller & Hoffman, 2009). Additionally, involvement in collegiate sports includes physical and personal development (Folkins & Sime, 1981), while also having positive effects on social interaction and confidence (Petitpas, 1987). Participation in sports gives athletes a sense of belonging by providing close peer interaction and comradeship with teammates. Furthermore, it is an avenue for cathartic expression through aggression, and involvement also forces student-athletes to remain in a mode of fitness that is emblematic of the American ideal.

There are also concerns regarding involvement in athletics. Athletics is rooted in the ideology of hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005) is the idealist form of masculinity that undermines showing weakness and injury, and reveres those who show strength. Thus, an individual that subscribes to the ideals of hegemonic masculinity would not ordinarily admit to “weakness”, mental or physical. This is something that must be considered when studying samples of athletes, given that this ideal permeates much of athletic culture among all ages. Additionally, researchers found in a sample of current and former college-athletes that levels of depression were higher in current athletes (Weigand, Cohen, & Merenstein, 2013). The researchers posited that current college student-athletes experience feelings of being over-trained and over-worked physically. They inferred that it is possible that former student athletes have lower levels of depression because they may no longer feel the pressure to perform.
Furthermore, they found that the loss of athletic identity may also lead to depression, due to the loss of their once prominent athletic role. However, as one ages, identification with the athletic role diminishes over time (Miller & Kerr, 2003). Overall, it seems that athletic identity and sports participation are associated with having possible negative and positive outcomes. A high athletic identity and heavy participation in sports can provide social relationships and development of skills, however, it can possibly take a toll on mental and physical health. Given both these positive and negative outcomes, continued study of athletic identity could yield beneficial information on how to understand and work with athletes and those who identify with the athletic role.

**Athletic Identity and Gender:** According to Messner (1989), athletics is a key institution in understanding gender and also male-female dynamics. Athletics have long been considered a male-dominated arena. However, female intercollegiate athletics has significantly expanded in the last few decades. From 1995 to 2005, there was an increase of 25,000 female participants in college sports (Cheslock, 2010). The increase in female participation in college athletics may be a result of Title IX, an Educational Amendment within the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Anderson, Cheslock, & Ehrenberg, 2006). Within Title XI, gender discrimination in federally funded educational activities is prohibited.

However, there still remain reports of gender inequality. Specifically, there are fewer opportunities for participation, resources for operation, and scholarships for female athletics (Deaner, 2009). The sports world is often considered to be heavily masculine and male-dominated. In addition, the world of athletics espouses masculine behavior and often requires aggressiveness and competitiveness, which are considered
male social-personality traits (Mawson, 2006). However, in many patriarchal societies, “weak” women are idealized, sexualized, and preferred, even in the world of sports (Segrave, McDowell, & King, 2006). Each of the aforementioned traits are characteristics of emphasized femininity (Connell, 1987), which is the opposite of hegemonic masculinity that was discussed earlier. The relationship between emphasized femininity and hegemonic masculinity encourages strength and dominance for men and weakness and subordination for women (Korobov, 2006). Thus, the societal preference for masculinity is often contrary to the expectations of women who participate in sports, wherein female athletes are often considered effeminate (Tasiemski, Kennedy, Gardner, & Blaikley, 2004). Furthermore, pressure to conform to societal expectations while participating in sports often causes a gender-role conflict in female athletes (Fallon & Jome, 2007).

Murray (2001) examined the relationship between athletic identity, gender role orientation, and drinking behavior among a sample that included American (n = 188) and Australian (n = 60) female undergraduate students. To assess athletic identity, Murray used the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale [AIMS] (Brewer & Cornelius, 2001). The AIMS is one of the most widely used assessments to measure athletic identity. The American undergraduate females were more likely to demonstrate higher levels of athletic identity and masculine gender roles (M = 32.89, SD = 13.14) than those in Australia (M = 27.97, SD = 12.51), F(1,247) = 6.56, p<.05. The researchers suggested that these findings were reflective of the context for the U.S. sample because the American participants attended an institution that was known for intercollegiate athletic success and athletic-related majors (e.g. exercise sciences, physical education).
In relation to these findings, Deaner (2009) compared the athletic identity of female athletes from a women’s college and a co-educational university. Participants who attended the women’s college reported having higher levels of athletic identity and devoting more time to academics. Additionally, female athletes who attended the women’s institution did not report high levels of gender-role conflict, in comparison to the female athletes from the co-educational institution. Findings from Mignano, Brewer, Winter, and Van Raalte (2006) also suggest that athletic identity for female college student-athletes who attend co-educational institutions may be lower than those who attend women’s colleges. Thus, it appears that identification with the athletic role and gender roles in women might be connected with the environment; however, additional research is needed in this area.

Similarly, Lantz and Schroeder (1999) examined the relationship between athletic identity and gender role endorsement in a college student sample comprised of athletes ($n = 113$) and non-athletes ($n = 296$). The AIMS was used to assess athletic identity and the Bern Sex Role Inventory [BSRI] (Pedhazur & Tentenbaum, 1979) was used to assess gender role (e.g. masculine or feminine) endorsement. The researchers hypothesized that high athletic identifiers would endorse masculine gender roles, and that high levels of athletic identity would be positively correlated to high levels of the masculine gender role. The researchers found that the overall sample reported a great disparity in masculine and feminine gender roles for those who were high and low athletic identifiers. Women reported a stronger relationship between athletic identity and gender role endorsement ($r = .39$) in comparison to men ($r = .28$), though it was not statistically significant ($403) = 1.09, p < .05$. Lantz and Schroeder recommended that
future studies include possible moderators of athletic identity and gender, categorizing respondents by the degree of identification, rather than dichotomizing (e.g. high/low) and separating athletes in a sample by sport.

Zief (2006) explored the perceptions of sport participation in adolescent girls in middle school ($n = 150$) and high school ($n = 50$) with a specific focus on gender and athletic identity, using an open-ended questionnaire that asked about experiences with sports. Results reflected that involvement in sports provides an opportunity to demonstrate physical prowess, power, and physical competence. These findings are contrary to the societal expectation of feminine gender roles associated with females. Additionally, in reviewing the findings, Zief suggested that participation in sports is salient for this population. However, due to the unique social and political climate in which the study took place, it is difficult to generalize the findings to the larger population. Nonetheless, it appears that context influences how women identify with the athletic role and how this identification is influenced by gender. Therefore, there is a continued need for research on understanding how female athletes, at the college level specifically, construct their social selves and how this may influence their lives.

**College Student-Athletes**

According to Comeaux and Harrison (2011), intercollegiate athletics are an important part of many colleges and universities. Comeaux and Harrison contend that college student-athletes, at the Division I level specifically, hold a level of social prominence that draws both controversy and speculation. Additionally, college student-athletes provide publicity for the academic institution, entertainment for the surrounding community, and help to instill school pride (Sylwester & Witosky, 2004).
The experiences of student-athletes on college campuses, both socially and academically, have received considerable attention from scholars. In comparison to their non-athlete peers, Division I student-athletes experience less academic success (Eitzen, 2012), engage in more frequent alcohol use (Grossbard et al., 2007; Wetherill & Fromme, 2007), exhibit riskier sexual behavior (Faurie, Pontier, & Raymond, 2004; Lynch et al., 2004; Wetherill & Fromme, 2007), and have an increased number of sexual partners compared with their non-athlete peers (Faurie et al., 2004; Grossbard et al., 2007; Hildebrand, Johnson, & Bogle, 2001; Nattiv, Puffer, & Green, 1997; Nelson & Wechsler, 2001). However, Comeaux and Harrison (2011) contended that although there have been considerable efforts made to understand college student-athletes, scholars have failed to explore the influences that affect college student-athletes. This assertion focuses on the importance of identifying and exploring the influences of college student-athletes.

**Transition to College Life and Preparation for Life after College**

College is a developmental period that involves a transition from adolescence to young adulthood and adulthood (Fouad et al., 2006). Students experience a variety of developmental tasks during their college career. Many students struggle with living independently from their family, they negotiate social and romantic relationships, learn self-control and self-discipline, and manage peer pressure while developing greater awareness about themselves. Most college students are within the ages of 17 and 24, which groups them within the identity versus identity confusion stage and the intimacy versus isolation phases in Erikson’s (1956) model. As stated earlier, during the identity versus identity confusion stage, individuals are tasked with determining how they align with political and religious ideologies, their sexuality, and other viewpoints that comprise
identity (Erikson, 1956). During this time period, college students are in the process of answering the questions, “Who am I?, What will I be?” (Knefelkamp, Widick, & Parker, 1978, p. 5). Though Erikson (1956) would conceptualize this time period as being adolescence, a new stage of life has been proposed to explain development. Emerging adulthood (Arnett 2000; 2004; 2007) is a sociological term that is proposed to occur between adolescence and adulthood. Individuals who are within this stage are usually between the ages of 18 and 29, who have experienced the delay of adult roles that are associated with the historical, economic, and social changes associated with many more individuals going to college (Syed & Mitchell, 2013). Arnett (2000; 2004) proposed that there are five major pillars within the stage of emerging adulthood: the age of instability, the age of possibilities, the age of self-focus, the age of feeling in-between, and the age of identity exploration. Concordant with Erikson (1956), Arnett (2004; 2006) sees identity development (age of identity exploration) as being most central and important to this developmental phase. Individuals who have attended college are often described as being a part of this newly proposed life stage of emerging adulthood.

College is a moratorium period where a person is given the opportunity to explore where they stand in regards to these identities and ideologies (Murphy, Petitpas, & Brewer, 1996). College provides: (a) an opportunity for experimentation with various roles, (b) the experience of choice, (c) meaningful achievement, (d) freedom from excessive anxiety, and (e) time for reflection and introspection (Widick, Parker, & Knefelkamp, 1978). This occurs while college students struggle to determine their work identity and future career path. Furthermore, adolescence and young adulthood are periods of career development through exploration, crystallization, and implementation.
Thus, college involves implementation of steps that prepare individuals for entering the world of work.

Researchers report a negative influence of athletic obligations on personal, academic, and career development (Sandstedt et al., 2004). In addition to the developmental challenges of the average college student, student-athletes must also cope with the emotional, physical, and mental challenges associated with participating in sports. There is also a substantial time commitment required for participating in intercollegiate sports. Athletes are also more likely than the general college student population to experience problems with career maturity, the clarity of educational plans, and adjustment to college (Watson & Kissinger, 2007). Furthermore, Linnemeyer and Brown (2010) found that college athletes had higher levels of identity foreclosure than general college students and fine arts majors ($N = 326$). Based on these findings, Linnemeyer and Brown reported that there are several barriers that impede the career development of college student-athletes, specifically in career exploration, career decision-making, and identity development. College student-athletes also have to cope with public scrutiny and extensive time demands that are associated with athletic participation in addition to expectations that non-athletes experience (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2001). This illustrates the duality of the student-athlete role.

**Student and Athlete Roles**

According to McCall, Simmons, and Simmons (1978), a person’s roles and identities provide a lens for how one interprets and views the experiences of the past, present, and future. In other words, an individual’s worldview is a result of the number of roles occupied within a given time. The designation of student-athlete denotes a person who is being asked to fulfill two roles. Each role demands time and energy to manage
tasks and goals that are specified, and two systems that have differing cultures. The contexts and cultures of the educational and athletic spheres of college life are particularly confounding because they join together two different sets of motivations and perceptions to create a major part of the experiences of the student-athlete (Woodruff & Schallert, 2008). At times, these motivations and perceptions can differ. Furthermore, researchers report that students feel a major tension between these roles (Bell, 2009), a pull between two worlds that they must navigate between during their entire tenure on campus. Several authors have proposed that the intense time and energy demands of participating in college athletics has led to neglect of academic responsibilities and a focus primarily on athletic development (Alder & Alder, 1991; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Nite, 2012; Settles, Sellers, & Damas, 2002).

The dual roles of student and athlete can prove to be perplexing due to individuals being asked to devote an extensive amount of time and energy into achieving success in academics and athletics (De Knop et al., 1999). Collegiate athletics is a lucrative business that generates significant revenue. In 2011, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) reported revenues totaling $757 million. The amount of money at stake and the responsibilities of both the student and athlete role could cause a conflict of interest. Confusion can arise and students may be put in situations that emphasize one role or identity over the other. Student-athletes are expected to maintain a full-time academic course load while also participating in training, competitions, and/or games (Lance, 1987). This does not include teambuilding exercises, public appearances, and other expectations also involved in being a college student-athlete. As a result, student-athletes may experience difficulty in finding ways to
meet the expectations and demands of each role. Thus, a student-athlete may experience role conflict, which may contribute to a high risk for poor career decision-making skills (Alder & Alder, 1987), and potential isolation within a culture that may not specifically focus on academic outcomes (Bostic, Phillips, & Waters, 1981; Burns, Jasinski, Dunn, & Fletcher, 2013; Steinfeldt, Reed, & Steinfeldt, 2010; Wittmer et al., 1981).

Simons, Van Rheenen, and Covington (1999) found that student-athletes reported that focusing on academic responsibilities could result in less playing time. Findings from this study also reflected that athletes might have been influenced by academic counselors to meet minimum requirements to maintain their academic eligibility. Thus, outside influences may influence college student-athletes’ decisions to emphasize athletics over academics. Messages from individuals within the academic and athletic community can have an effect on the decisions, specifically in regards to careers, of young men and women who compete in intercollegiate sports while on college campuses. According to Nevill and Super (1988), assigned importance of roles at different stages of life govern one’s commitment to and involvement in tasks associated with those roles. Furthermore, Nite (2012) reported additional influences that include family perceptions, positive affirmations for athletic role while on campus, and the perceptions of faculty, staff, coaches, and athletic administrators. Thus, student-athletes receive messages from a variety of individuals that influence their choices regarding role identification.

**Black Male College Student-Athletes**

Black male student-athletes have demonstrated excellent performance in the athletic world by earning awards, ascending to professional leagues, and setting
statistical records (Kelly & Dixon, 2014). Blacks occupy 13% of the U.S. population; however, they represent a large proportion of elite revenue-building athletic participants, accounting for nearly 44-77% of athletes in the National Basketball Association (NBA), National Football League (NFL), and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA; Kelly & Dixon, 2014). These statistics are consistent with and colleagues’ (2013) findings that Black men represented 2.8% of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students on college campuses, yet they represented 57.1% of football teams and 64.3% of basketball teams between 2007 and 2010.

Black male student-athletes have high levels of participation and success in college athletics; however, there are concerns regarding their academic performance (Harrison, Sailes, Rotich, & Bimper, 2011). Harrison and colleagues (2011) found that Black male student-athletes overemphasize on athletic achievement. This is compounded by reports of negative stereotyping from peers and teachers (Jenkins, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2011; Noguera, 2003). Additionally, Black male student-athletes consistently underperform academically compared with their student-athlete counterparts in regards to academic progress and graduation rates (Cooper & Hawkins, 2014). Furthermore, Harper, Williams, and Blackman (2013) reported that 50.2% of Black male student-athletes graduate within six years compared to 66.9% of student-athletes overall.

Similar to the adjustments that non-athletes and student-athletes in other racial/ethnic groups experience, Black male college student-athletes encounter multiple transitions as they enter the college setting such as, academic, social, cultural, athletic, and physical changes (Kelly & Dixon, 2014). One noteworthy difference is the
intersection of the student and athletic roles with the identity of also being Black. During adolescence, an individual’s racial/ethnic group grows in salience to the individual and the world around them (Tatum, 2003). Black adolescents tend to be more connected to their racial identity than White adolescents (Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990).

According to Killeya-Jones (2005), racial identity development is one of the most well-researched area that focuses on Blacks. Within the college environment, racial identity development is believed to have a major influence on Black students’ experiences, and is thought to be tantamount to understanding academic performance and psychological stressors (Hatter & Ottens, 1998). Researchers assert that athletics and racial identity coexists in a parallel fashion for Blacks (Brown et al., 2003; Harrison, Harrison, & Moore, 2002; Harrison & Moore, 2007).

Black athletes as a general population experience a modern day double consciousness in that they harbor the positions of being both Black and athletes, two identities that are salient in their daily lives. They may struggle to negotiate the identities of being Black and an athlete, since the two are considered to be inherently linked, (Steinfeldt, Reed, & Steinfeldt, 2010), and apply meaning to society’s stereotypes. The concept of double consciousness stems from the work of W.E.B. Du Bois (1903), and it refers to the idea that Black people in the U.S. grapple between the identities of being “Negro” and American. Du Bois illustrates the premise of double-consciousness by stating:

The Negro is a sort of a seventh son born with a veil, and gifted with a second sight in this American world – a world which yields him no true-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused
contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness – an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder (p. 16-17).

Du Bois described a struggle between the American identity and the “Negro” identity that is due to the negative view that society has of Blacks and also the self-concepts of Blacks. Though some of this terminology (e.g. Negro and him/he) is rooted in the context of the time-period, this double-consciousness still holds true and can be applied to Black women, which is discussed later in this chapter. Black male student-athletes experience various forms of racism (Kelly & Dixon, 2014), including the societal opinions that Blacks are intellectually inferior, but have superiority when it comes to physical and athletic performance (Hoberman, 1997), and that academic high achievement is abnormal for them (Comeaux, 2010). Carter G. Woodson (1933) stated, “If you control a man’s thinking, you do not have to worry about his actions (p. 84).

Thus, societal expectations may influence the development and self-concept of Black males through the ideology of athletic superiority and cognitive inferiority due to race.

However, in regards to race, some scholars consider racial identity as situational in nature (Shelton & Sellers, 2000). Racial-ethnic group identification can shift in importance based on the context and the interaction with other identities. Brown and Hartley (1998) examined the relationship between athletic identity and racial identity, and found a positive correlation for White-American athletes, but a negative correlation for African-America athletes. Therefore, they inferred that strong identification with the athletic role can often shield Black student-athletes from feeling racially discriminated against, since athletic identity is most salient. Steinfeldt, Reed, and Steinfeldt (2010) recommended that more research focus on the interaction of athletic identity and racial
identity. Harrison, Harrison and Moore (2002) also asserted that future research should involve the use of valid and reliable measures to gain an understanding of the interaction. The study of the amalgamation of race and sport may provide greater understanding about how individuals perceive and manage their self-concepts. This area of inquiry has implications for clinicians in having them revaluate how a sports culture may influence their interactions with minority student-athletes and may also influence how these student-athletes develop their identity and perspectives about themselves.

With this in mind, Steinfeldt, Reed, and Steinfeldt (2010) examined racial identity and athletic identity in a sample of Black male football players ($N = 163$). A portion of the sample attended a Historically Black Colleges and University ($n = 82$), and the remaining participants attended a Predominantly White Institution ($n = 81$). The researchers aimed to describe the relationship between racial identity and athletic identity of student-athletes at HBCUs and PWIs. The researchers hypothesized that student-athletes from the PWIs would demonstrate higher levels of athletic identity than those at HBCUs. Participants who attended PWIs reported higher levels of athletic identity, which may indicate that the athletic role is more salient for Black male student-athletes who attend PWIs. Furthermore, Black male student-athletes at HBCUs were more likely to identify as Nationalists ideologically within the MMRI than those from PWIs. Thus, Steinfeldt and colleagues suggested that Black male student-athletes at HBCUs may have more freedom to explore racial ideologies that do not conform to their dominant culture. However, although the study yielded rich results, limitations include the research design since it has no predictive value in regards to institution type, and its
failure to highlight the unique differences within the Black student-athlete population. Future research may include a sample of participants from other sports, and from a greater age range.

Bimper (2014) examined how racial identity and athletic identity influenced academic performance (GPA) in a sample of Black males from seven PWIs that were Division I football players ($N = 255$). The researcher hypothesized that athletic identity perceptions and the racial identity subscales would be related to GPA. A negative correlation was found between athletic identity and GPA, whereas higher levels of athletic identity were associated with low GPA scores. Racial identity was not related to GPA; however, those who identified with the pre-encounter stage of the Nigrescence model appeared to be connected to the athletic role. Limitation of the study included having only males in the sample and not including a diversity of sports. Future research should seek to account for gender differences and differences in sports. Additionally, the participants’ surrounding context should be considered by accounting for possible institutional differences.

Researchers have also examined the link between athletic identity and identity status achievement in Black male college student-athletes. Beamon (2012) explored identity foreclosure in a sample of 20 male former college student-athletes (ages 22-47). Based on the findings, Beamon concluded that athletic identity was the most salient identity of the self for the participants. Many of the former athletes exhibited foreclosed identities even after retirement, defining themselves athletically and believing that others do as well. A lack of inclusion of female participants was a limitation of the study. Beamon suggested future research focused on the inclusion of women in exploring
athletic identity and identity foreclosure. Further research is needed to provide clarity in regards to the nature of the interaction between athletic identity and identity foreclosure and its implications, including an understanding of the unique experiences and interweaving of identities in regards to Black females.

**Black Female College Student-Athletes**

According to Harper and colleagues (2013), most of the research on Black college student-athletes has focused primarily on males. Black female college student-athletes have often been ignored in the literature. Bruening and colleagues (2005) stated that Black women experience “silencing” within the world of sport, feminism, and race. White females dominate feminism and discussions regarding gender dynamics and men dominate the world of sports, which leaves limited space for the inclusion of Black females. Black athletes exist within the athletic world, academic world, and the world of an oppressed racial minority. In addition to dealing with racism and sexism, there are also barriers socially, economically, and educationally that affect Black women (Gray & Jones, 1987). Black female student-athletes have a female identity, which contributes to an intersection of oppression, defined as convergence (Collins, 2000b). The issue of intersectionality and convergence are important to discuss because racism is multiplied by sexism (King, 1990).

Socially and academically, Black female college student-athletes have fared better than their male counterparts at PWIs (Sellers, Kuperminc, & Damas, 1997). Sellers and colleagues (1997) found that Black female student-athletes do not experience academic issues such as repeating courses, receiving incomplete grades, or being placed on academic probation. Additionally, Black female student-athletes reported that they almost never experienced alienation or abuse, though they did report
levels that were lower than White females and higher than Black males. According to Harper et al. (2013), specifically in the Southeastern Conference (SEC), Black women graduate at higher rates (74.6%) than White athletes (72.9%) and the non-athlete population (68.5%). Black females also have a high concentration of participation in the sports world. Harper and colleagues (2013) found that at 76 institutions of higher education, Black females comprised only 3.7% of the undergraduate population; however, they accounted for 59.4% of women's basketball teams. Additionally, Black females account for 10.4% of all NCAA student-athletes and there are high concentrations of participation in basketball (25.7%), track and field (20.4%), and volleyball (8.4%). Thus, much like their male counterparts, Black females account for small percentages of the general college student population, but have a large representation within specific intercollegiate sports. Nonetheless, there is a paucity of literature focused on this population.

Foster (2003) examined Black female student-athletes’ experiences in an elite collegiate athletic program to understand how the program maximized both athletic and academic potential. The findings reflected the importance of race and gender in shaping the experiences of the participants. Additionally, socialization in regards to race, gender, and academics were commonplace in the athletic department and the smaller team culture. With a focus on track and field, the Black females reported having coaches and staff that emphasized representing themselves in a professional manner, and also having stricter academic requirements in comparison to their White counterparts. The Black female student-athletes reported higher rates of being monitored by the athletic department. However, the experiences and expectations of the Black female student-
athletes were often different from White females. Lastly, though the methods were seen as somewhat intrusive, the Black female student-athletes’ identity development was concluded to be largely shaped by the structure of the athletic department.

Due to the historical disenfranchisement and oppression of Black females (Hooks, 1981), Carter-Francique, Lawrence, and Eyanson (2011) explored Black athletes ($N = 4$) experiences of race and racism throughout their athletic careers. The participants ranged in age from 19 to 22, with one of the participants being a current college student-athlete and one a professional athlete who had participated collegiately. The other two participants had competed in athletics at the high school level. The research questions were: (a) What is significant to the student-athletes experience during their careers in regards to race?; (b) What were their most significant racialized experiences during their athletic careers?; and (c) What are the details of their racialized experiences? Both of the participants who had competed collegiately reported incidents where they felt that race had a negative impact on their careers, such as having their ability to play positions that are believed to require higher levels of cognitive abilities and leadership skills questioned, being chosen to receive awards, and feeling isolated in the team atmosphere. The researchers concluded that Black female athletes might be affected by race emotionally, and in regards to team dynamics, group differences, and stereotyping. Further research could focus on both male and female experiences of racial bias in sports, exploring the racial bias of White athletes, and examining experiences of sexism in Black female athletes.

The research on Black female college student-athletes has been conceptualized from a Black Feminist Thought (BFT) and Critical Race Theory (CRT) conceptual
framework. The Black Feminist Thought began in the 19th century with its roots traced back to abolitionists such as Maria W. Stewart and Frederick Douglass, and continued after emancipation by W.E.B. Du Bois. Collins (2000a) emphasized that at the heart of the BFT is a self-conscious struggle with the goal of empowering both men and women to actualize a humanist vision of community. Additionally, within a BFT perspective, adding layers of oppressed identities can provide a clearer understanding of oppression (Spelman, 1982). A major theme of BFT is the goal of empowerment for all human beings, regardless of race, gender, sexuality, or other identity. This is described as having a humanist vision (Collins, 2000b). This is similar to the term “womanist”. A womanist perspective highlights a commitment to the rights of both male and females and emphasizes solidarity in humanity, rather than separatism (Walker, 1983). A womanist perspective also calls for an end to the ideology of domination (Hooks, 1981).

This viewpoint is exemplified by Chisholm (1970), who stated,

> Working towards our own freedom, we can help others work free from the traps of their stereotypes…. In the end antiblack, antifemale, and all forms of discrimination are equivalent to the same thing – antihumanism…. We must reject not only stereotypes that others have of us but also those we have of ourselves and others (p. 181).

Critical race theory (CRT) was used in the U.S. in response to the perceived slow racial reform, in the area of law specifically, after the Civil Rights Movement (Howard, 2008), although its origins are also traced back to Du Bois (1903; Yosso et al., 2009). Critical race theory encompasses the study of race, racism, and power dynamics (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000). The core of CRT is grounded in the idea that race and racism are central to understanding inequalities and power dynamics in the U.S. (Bell, 1992). The CRT also recognizes the importance of intersectionality and forms of subordination in regards to classism, sexism, racism, and other forms of oppression.
Scholars have applied CRT to understand oppression in legal, institutional, and educational spheres of society (Howard, 2008). The tenets of CRT include (a) considering intersectionality (Valdes, Culp, & Harris, 2002), (b) challenging dominant ideologies that call for objectivities and neutrality in research (Bell, 1987), (c) offering counterstorytelling as a methodology (Bell, 1992), (d) committing to social justice (Freire, 1970), and (e) incorporating interdisciplinary knowledge in regards to women’s studies and ethnic studies to understand oppression (Calmore, 1997). Thus, through CRT, scholars aim to capture a holistic understanding of oppression through inclusion of multiple identities of populations, questioning traditional modes of inquiry, and extending a voice to those who traditionally have no power in the creation of knowledge. Critical race theory is also instrumental in providing a lens to understanding how the social construction of race and other intersecting identities are influenced by institutions within a university (Yosso et al., 2009). Although scholars have studied CRT and BFT, the majority of the research in these areas is qualitative. Therefore, a need exists for quantitative inquiry in this area.

Identity Achievement Status, Athletic Identity, and Gender in College Student-Athletes

Within the literature, researchers have integrated identity achievement status and athletic identity; however, race and gender were not areas of focus. Researchers assert that a student-athlete’s identity may be prematurely shaped and foreclosed before a variety of career interests and talents are explored and attempted by the individual (Good, Brewer, Petitpas, Van Raalte, & Mahar, 1993; Harris, 1996). Additionally, Shurts and Shoffner (2004) reported that college student-athletes have higher levels of identity foreclosure than their non-athlete peers. However, Rivas-Quiñones (2002) examined
commitment and foreclosure among 174 students (60 student-athletes), and found that the student-athletes did not foreclose prematurely on career decisions as compared to non-athlete students. Rivas-Quiñones recommended that further studies focus on addressing athletic identity, employing more sophisticated methods of analysis, and exploring the identity foreclosure of former student-athletes.

Murphy, Petitpas, and Brewer (1996) examined the relationship between identity achievement status, athletic identity, and career maturity among 124 college student-athletes. The researchers found a nonsignificant correlation between identity foreclosure and athletic identity; however, they were both negatively, independently correlated with career maturity. Thus, the researchers concluded that failing to explore alternative options and having a high level of identification with sports are separate processes. Additionally, no significant findings were reported in regards to gender differences in athletic identity. However, there were several limitations to the study. The researchers suggested that no casual inferences could be made among the three constructs. Also, within the sample, there were unequal distributions of gender, class, and sport. Future research should aim to include a more representative sample across identities.

McQuown-Linnemeyer and Brown (2010) sought to expand upon Rivas-Quiñones’ (2002) findings by comparing the foreclosure levels of college student-athletes \((n = 101)\), fine arts students \((n = 121)\), and general college students \((n = 104)\). Foreclosure findings for student-athletes had a significantly greater level of identity foreclosure than the general students and fine arts students. Thus, the researchers concluded that participation in sports, but not the arts, is related to a greater likelihood
of being foreclosed within the domains of occupation, religion, and politics. Furthermore, they acknowledged a need for further research employing additional assessments to measure these areas, and include a more diverse sample involving other geographical locations and representation from more revenue-building sports (i.e., men’s basketball, and football).

**Summary of the Literature**

The literature on identity status has focused primarily on White individuals with limited research on racial-ethnic identity (Schwartz, 2005; Sneed, Schwartz, & Cross, 2006). Therefore, a need exists for identity status-related research that is focused on non-White individuals. Not surprisingly, a vast majority of racial identity studies focus almost exclusively on racial minorities. Schwartz (2005) stated that there are rapid rates of growth in the adolescent and emerging adult populations in the U.S., and that these age groups are racially and ethnically diverse. Additionally, adolescence and emerging adulthood are key periods in identity development (Arnett, 2007; Erikson, 1956). Identity development is also a key aspect for college student-athletes, as it may affect their preparation for transition into non-sports after graduation (Brown & Hartley, 1998). Furthermore, according to Harrison and colleagues (2009), female athletes may not heavily identify with the athletic role due to fewer opportunities to compete professionally, and also due to athletics being considered masculine in nature. Specifically, although researchers report that Black female athletes differ from White female and Black male athletes (Etzel, Ferrante, & Pinkney, 2002) due to the intersectionality of being Black, female, and a student-athlete (Bernhard, 2014), there is limited acknowledgement of Black female athletes in the literature (Bower & Martin, 1999; Howard-Hamilton, 2003).
In addition to there being a segregation of identity research in regards to racial identity development and identity status, there is also differences in how research is conducted with Black female and Black male college student-athletes. Therefore, a need exists for future studies focused on the integration of racial identity within identity development, with the inclusion of male and female samples with an integration of methodologies. Thus, this study will integrate gender, racial identity, athletic identity, and identity achievement status to obtain a greater understanding of Black college student-athletes’ identity development.
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Figure 2-1. Marcia (1966) Identity achievement statuses, as described. (Schwartz, 2001)
Figure 2-2. Schematic representation of the multidimensional model of racial identity (MMRI; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998)
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Within this chapter, the researcher discusses the methodology implemented for the study. The researcher first discusses the sample and sample selection methods. Next, the author explains the data collection procedures and instrumentation. This chapter also includes data analysis procedures, the research questions, and ethical considerations.

Research Design

This study involves a correlational research design. According to Shavelson (1996), “in correlation studies, the researcher is interested in the following question: “What is the relationship between variable X and variable Y” (p. 145). There were four variables that were included in this study. The aim of the study is to understand the association among the constructs of athletic identity, racial identity, identity achievement status, and gender.

Participants

There were several requirements to participate in this study. The sample was comprised of Black college student-athletes who were enrolled at one of 26 PWIs of higher education within the U.S. The student-athletes were currently enrolled as full-time students and currently competing in at least one intercollegiate NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) sport at the time of participation. Inclusion criteria also included identifying as being Black or of African descent, either male or female, and between the ages of 17 and 24. Black student-athletes who were completing undergraduate or graduate/professional degrees were permitted to participate in the
study. Scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes were both permitted to participate.

**Procedures**

Potential participants were recruited and selected using a purposive convenience sampling method. All participants in the sample were recruited through athletic departments at their respective university. The researcher sent invitations for participation to staff members within the 128 athletic departments that represent the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS; “1-A”) on a monthly basis, or until they responded that they did not want to participate, for a period of seven months (September-March). Twenty-six institutions (20.3%) consented to participation. Of the 26 participating institutions, one institution allowed on-campus data collection and recruitment. The remaining 25 institutions opted to send the recruitment email and a link to the survey via student-athlete list servs. For both methods of sampling, the researcher also used a snowball approach by asking participants to forward information about the study to other Black college student-athletes to recruit them to participate.

The researcher gathered data using the online survey portal Qualtrics, and a paper format of the survey. Data collection commenced during the Fall semester of 2015 and ended during the Spring of 2016. Internet surveys were the primary method of data collection; however, over half of the responses \((n = 57)\) were collected from one institution that consented to on-campus recruitment and use of the paper format of the survey. In regards to data collection methods, researchers have reported a myriad of preferences in research participation, such as telephone, mail, and face-to-face (Groves & Kahn, 1979). However, according to Dillman, West, and Clark (1994), offering more than one method of participation at a time does not improve response rates. This study
implemented a sequential strategy of inviting the target population to participate in the study using one format at a time. Shettle and Mooney (1999) found that the response rate increased after four invitations to participate by mail (68%), telephone follow-up (81%), and finally face-to-face contact (88%). Thus, the first six invitations for participation were offered via the Internet, and the last invitation for participation was offered via face-to-face interactions using the paper format.

Instrumentation

Demographic Questionnaire

Participants were asked to complete a 7-item demographic questionnaire (Appendix D). The demographic questionnaire contained questions related to gender, college classification, sport, scholarship status (e.g., scholarship, walk-on with scholarship, and non-scholarship walk-on), and age.

Identity Status Achievement

Identity achievement status was measured using the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire [EIPQ] (Balistreri, Busch-Rossnagel, & Geisinger, 1995), which is shown in Appendix A. The EIPQ is a 32-item instrument used to assess ego identity in four ideological domains (occupational choice, political preference, religious beliefs, and personal values) and four interpersonal domains (friendships, dating, sex roles, and family). The items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale that ranges from ‘1’ (strongly disagree) to ‘6’ (strongly agree). Sixteen of the items assess current commitment and 16 items assess current exploration (Dunkel & Anthis, 2001), in accordance with Marcia’s (1966) identity status theory. Each of the ideological and interpersonal domains are assessed by two items. Balistreri and colleagues (1995) reported internal consistency to be .76 for the exploration scale, and .75 for the commitment scale.
Additionally, Anthis, Dunkel, and Anderson (2004) reported internal consistency to be .75 for exploration, and .72 for a British adolescent sample that compared identity status according to gender differences. Furthermore, Schwartz and Montgomery (2002) reported test-retest reliability coefficients of .90 and .76.

Consistent with previous research that implemented the EIPQ (Anthis, Dunkel, & Anderson, 2004; Balistreri et al., 1995; Schwartz, Mullis, Waterman, & Dunham, 2000), statuses were assigned using a median split technique. Exploration and commitment scores falling on or above the median were classified as being high, while the remainder were considered low. Within the present study, the average scores, using the EIPQ, were 66.7 (SD = 9.996) for commitment and 60.7 (SD = 8.9) for exploration. Participants’ scores above the mean were considered high in exploration or commitment, while scores below the mean were considered to be low in exploration or commitment. Participants who scored high on exploration and commitment were considered achieved, while those who scored high on exploration but low on commitment were in moratorium. Additionally, individuals who scored low on exploration but high on commitment were considered foreclosed. Finally, participants who scored low on both exploration and commitment were classified as diffused.

**Racial-Ethnic Identity**

Racial identity was measured using the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity [MIBI] (Sellers et al., 1998), which is shown in Appendix B. The MIBI is a 56-item measure of the three stable dimensions of racial identity (centrality, ideology, and regard) proposed by Sellers et al. (1997) within the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI) for Blacks. The items within the MIBI are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from ‘1’ (strongly disagree) to ‘7’ (strongly agree). There are a total of seven
subscales within the dimensions of the MIBI: centrality, regard (public and private regard), and ideology (assimilation, humanist, oppressed minority, and nationalist). Due to the contextually dynamic nature of racial salience, it is inappropriate to use a questionnaire to operationalize it (Scottham, Sellers, & Nguyên, 2008). Although some researchers have argued that the MIBI does not fully represent and operationalize the MMRI (Cokley & Helm, 2001; Helm, 2002; Simmons, Worrell, & Barry, 2008; Vandiver, Worrell, & Delgado-Romero, 2009), the centrality subscale was deemed appropriate to measure racial identity in the present study. The researcher determined that it would be appropriate to use only the centrality subscale, without using the entire instrument because Sellers and Shelton (2003) reported that the researcher should compute the results of each subscale of the MIBI separately, since the scale is multidimensional in nature. Having one composite score for all of the subscales would be considered inappropriate.

The centrality subscale consists of eight items that measure the extent to which being African-American is central to the respondent’s definition of themselves (e.g., Being “Black is important to my self-image”). According to Sellers and Shelton (2003), a higher score on the centrality subscale is indicative of race being a more important aspect of an individual’s definition of self. Sellers and Shelton (2003) reported that the internal consistency for the centrality scale was .75 and Oparanozie, Sales, DiClemente, and Braxton (2011) reported a range from .66 to .80; therefore, it was deemed appropriate to use for this study.

**Athletic Identity**

Athletic identity was measured using the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale [AIMS] (Brewer et al., 1993), which is shown in Appendix C. The AIMS is a 7-item self-
report instrument that measures strength and exclusivity of identification with the athletic role. The AIMS employs a 7-point Likert scale that rates responses from ‘1’ (strongly disagree) to ‘7’ (strongly agree). Steinfeldt, Reed, and Steinfeldt (2010) reported internal consistency to be .76, which was comparable to the range of .80 to .93 reported by Martin, Eklund, & Mushett (1997). Participants’ answers to items such as “I consider myself an athlete” and “Sport is the most important part of my life” will assess the strength and exclusivity of identifying with the athletic role. Evidence of construct validity of the AIMS is found in the statistically significant differences in AIMS scores across levels of sport participation. Steinfeldt and colleagues (2010) stated that as levels of competitive athletic activity increased, AIMS scores increase. Brewer et al. (1993) reported lower means of AIMS scores for non-athletes in comparison to NCAA Division I athletes, with statistically significant correlations among the AIMS and measures of competitiveness and importance of sports competence.

**Purpose and Research Hypotheses**

The purpose of this study was to examine the athletic identity, racial identity, gender, and identity achievement status of Black college student-athletes. The specific research hypotheses are presented below.

**Research Hypothesis One**

Racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity [MIBI]), athletic identity (as measured by the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale [AIMS]), and gender will predict an individual’s identity status (as measured by the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire [EIPQ]).
Research Hypothesis Two

There will be a positive correlation between athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI).

Research Hypothesis Three

Black female college student-athletes will have more achieved identity statuses (as measured by the EIPQ) than their male counterparts.

Research Hypothesis Four

Black male student-athletes will have higher levels of athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) than their female counterparts.

Data Analysis

The researcher examined research hypothesis one using a multiple regression analysis. The predictor variables (PVs) were (a) racial identity (as measured by the centrality scale of the MIBI), (b) athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS), and (c) gender (male and female). Identity achievement status (as measured by the EIPQ) was the outcome variable (OV) with respondents categorized as being achieved, in moratorium, foreclosed, or diffused.

Research hypothesis two was examined using a Pearson's product moment correlation. Hypotheses three and four were examined using a two-way MANOVA. Within the two-way MANOVA, the predictor variables were gender (e.g. male and female) and identity achievement status (diffused, foreclosed, moratorium, and achieved), and the outcome variables were racial identity and athletic identity. The two-way MANOVA allowed for comparison of the Black male and Black female college student-athletes based on the three constructs. The researcher used a two-way MANOVA because it yielded the data needed to examine the research hypotheses and
it also reduced type I error in comparison to using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Field, 2009).

**Ethical Considerations**

The researcher presented the protocol for this study to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for initial review to make sure that the study met ethical standards. Following IRB review, the researcher sent a copy of the study protocol to athletic departments, within the Football Bowl Subdivision of the NCAA, to obtain access to the target student-athlete population. Participation in the study was not expected to cause any negative effects in regards to physical harm, or the triggering of any emotional responses. However, the researcher had contact information available for the following campus resources: Counseling and Wellness Center, Dean of Students Office, Career Services, and University Athletic Association staff within the athletic department at their respective institution should any emotional responses to participating in the study occur. Participants also had the opportunity to opt out of participation at any point of the study without repercussions. Lastly, it is possible that there may have been individuals in this population that did not identify as either being male or female. However, for the purposes of this study, participants were asked to identify as being one or the other, and also given the option to identify as transgender or self-identify. Any possible individuals who did not identify as being male or female were not required to participate in the study, and they had the choice to opt out of the study at any point. However, no respondents in the sample identified as transgender or other.

**Chapter Summary**

Chapter 3 focused on the methodology for the study. The study involved implementation of multiple regression, Pearson’s product-moment correlations, and
MANOVA analyses to examine the research hypotheses. Additionally, the researcher discussed considerations regarding the sample, including sample size and recruitment.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The study was focused on examining the athletic identity, racial identity, gender, and identity achievement status of Black college student-athletes. Within this chapter, the researcher first presents the descriptive statistics to discuss the sample demographics. Then, the researcher reports the results of the statistical analyses that were employed to examine the four research hypotheses.

Sample Demographics and Descriptive Statistics

All 110 FBS Division I college institutions were sent invitation emails. Of these institutions, 47 (42.7%) declined to participate and the researcher did not receive a response from 32 (29.1%) institutions. Additionally, only one institution permitted on-campus face-to-face recruitment and data collection. There were a total of 205 surveys that were started; however, 105 (51.2%) of the surveys were excluded due to (a) completion of less than 50% of the survey items (n = 86, 41.9%), (b) not meeting the inclusion criteria of identifying as Black or of African descent (n = 17, 8.3%), and (c) not indicating gender (n = 2, 1%). Therefore, the researcher examined data from a total of 98 participants.

Fifty-five (56.1%) participants were from one institution that allowed for on-campus recruitment and data collection. The other 43 (43.9%) participants participated online by completing the surveys in Qualtrics, an online survey portal. The researcher used t-tests to compare the data collected in-person and online. Results of the t-test (found in Table 4-11) reflect no statistically significant difference for the AIMS scores or EIPQ scores. However, the variance in MIBI scores was found to be significantly different between the face-to-face responses and on-line responses, (t_{66.960} = -1.315, p
< .05). On average, the racial identity scores (as measured by the centrality scale of the MIBI) for face-to-face responses were 1.899 higher than those who responded on-line. The mean difference can be understood by the context of this portion of the sample. First, many of the responses were completed while the respondents were in the presence of other student-athletes who identified as Black or being of African descent. Additionally, many of the face-to-face responses were also male, and the institution was located in the Southeastern United States. Each of these factors could explain possible effects of social desirability and the impact of possible geographical differences in racial identity.

Table 4-9 summarizes the mean, standard deviation, and internal consistency for the measures. The internal consistency for the measures and subscales are as follows: (a) AIMS .82, (b) MIBI .52, (c) EIPQ .49, (d) EIPQ commitment subscale .706, and (e) EIPQ exploration subscale .64. Table 4-7 provides the internal consistency of the AIMS and MIBI, separated by gender. Lastly, Table 4-10 summarizes the demographic information in regards to gender, academic classification, sport, and scholarship status. All 98 participants identified as being Black or of African descent, and were currently attending a PWI.

**Research Hypothesis One**

The researcher conducted a multiple linear regression analysis to determine if identity achievement status (as measured by the EIPQ) could be predicted by gender, athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS), and racial identity (as measured by the MIBI centrality subscale). G*Power was used to conduct an a priori power analysis. With a level of .05, minimum power established at .95, and a large effect size of .35 (Cohen, 1992), 48 participants were needed to find a statistically significant difference.
Therefore, the number of comparisons in the present study (N = 98) was large enough to justify proceeding with the multiple regression analysis.

The null hypothesis was that the regression coefficients were equal to zero. Multiple linear regression assumptions were tested, but not all were met. Initial review of Cook’s distance, centered leverage values, and scatterplots suggested that there might be a threat for outliers. The researcher calculated the upper and lower limits for both athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI). However, the researcher found that there were no values that fell outside of the upper and lower limits of the AIMS and MIBI scores. Thus, no responses were removed from the data. Scatterplots demonstrated a lack of linearity between identity status achievement (measured by the EIPQ), and athletic identity (measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (measured by the racial centrality scale of the MIBI) separately. There were also values located outside of the band of +/- 2. Unstandardized residuals were reviewed for normality. Skewness (.028) and kurtosis (-.967) statistics did not indicate normality, which was consistent with a statistically significant Shapiro Wilks test (W = .968, df = 98, p < .05). The assumption of independence was met for all variables. Tests for the assumption of homogeneity of variance were also met. In testing for multicollinearity, tolerance for AIMS scores (.912), MIBI scores (.899) and gender (.982) were greater than .10. Variance inflation factor was less than 10 for AIMS scores (1.096), MIBI scores (1.114), and gender (1.018). Also the eigenvalues were not close to zero for AIMS scores (3.872, .087, .026, .015). Lastly, not all of the condition indices were smaller than 15 (1.00, 6.688, 12.186, 15.866). Thus, concern exists regarding the assumption of multicollinearity.
The overall model that included the predictor variables of gender, athletic identity, and racial identity was a good predictor of identity achievement status, $F (3, 94) = 3.49$, $p < .05$ (Table 4-2). The regression equation for predicting identity achievement status of Black college student-athletes is: Identity achievement status = 2.991 - .576 (GENDER) - .003 (athletic identity) - .018 (racial identity). Ten percent ($R^2 = .100$) of the variance in identity achievement status was predicted by the regression model (Table 4-1). Only gender was significantly related to identity achievement status (Table 4-3). Thus, gender is the only accurate predictor of identity achievement status.

**Research Hypothesis Two**

The research conducted a Pearson product-moment correlation to examine research hypothesis two: There is a positive correlation between athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale on the MIBI). The estimated marginal mean of the AIMS for Black male college student-athletes was 38.51 (SE = 1.035) and for Black female college student athletes it was 39.56 (SE = 1.306), as reported in Table 4-4. Additionally, the total means are reported in Table 4-7. The researcher examined the tests of assumptions for the Pearson product moment correlation analysis. The assumption of measurement was met. Both athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the racial centrality subscale on the MIBI) are continuous interval variables. The assumption of normality was tested and revealed non-normal distributions for both AIMS scores and MIBI scores. The distributions of both variables were negatively skewed. Thus, the assumption of normality was violated. The researcher elected not to transform the data, since transformation is posited to not be useful (Glass, Peckham, & Sanders, 1972).
Additionally, the researcher expected a negatively skewed distribution considering the homogeneity of the sample in the present study.

The Pearson product-moment correlation analysis revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between athletic identity and racial identity (.293), as illustrated in Table 4-5. Thus, the results of the analysis support hypothesis two. Figure 4-1 illustrates that responses are clustered towards the higher end of the range of scores. This is expected due to the homogeneity of the sample and the expectation that many of the respondents would identify strongly with athletics and their race.

**Research Hypothesis Three**

For research hypothesis three, the researcher predicted that Black female student-athletes would align more with achieved or moratorium statuses, while the Black male student-athletes would align more with identity diffusion and foreclosure. A 2 x 2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were mean differences in athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI) based on gender and identity achievement status (measured by the EIPQ). Prior to analysis, athletic identity (measured by the AIMS) and racial centrality (measured by the MIBI) were examined for accuracy in regards to data entry, missing values, and the extent to which multivariate assumptions were met. Frequency distributions of the independent variables suggested the range of values were within the expected ranges. An examination of means and standard deviations suggested data accuracy.

The researcher then examined the tests of assumptions for MANOVA, including multivariate normality of dependent variables, homogeneity of variances/covariances, linearity, and the absence of multicollinearity. The results of the tests of assumptions is
relevant for research hypothesis three and four. The assumption of independence was met. In terms of normality, the data were examined univariately using histograms. Results from the histogram revealed a non-normal distribution of MIBI and AIMS scores (negatively skewed). However, the researcher expected a negative skew of scores in the distribution because the sample was composed of Black athletes exclusively. Brewer and colleagues (1993) reported that athletes on average score higher than non-athletes on the AIMS, which is consistent with the results from the present study. Additionally, there was a non-normal distribution of scores for identity achievement status (positively skewed). Thus, the assumption of normality was not met for racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI) and athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS). The researcher elected not to transform the data, since transformation is posited to not be useful (Glass, Peckham, & Sanders, 1972).

The data was also examined for the presence of outliers. The histograms and scatterplots provided visual evidence for the possible presence of outliers. However, in examining the upper and lower limits for both athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality scale of the MIBI), the researcher found no outliers. Thus, no values were removed from the data. Additionally, in considering homogeneity of variances/covariances, the researcher examined the results from the Box’s M ($M = 31.59$), which provided evidence of equal covariances, $F(21, 3407.58) = 1.35, p = .131$. Furthermore, regarding multicollinearity, scatterplots of AIMS and MIBI scores suggest a weak linear relationship (Figure 4-5). The lack of linearity was also evident from the lack of substantial overlap between independent variables based on the correlations, with all correlations under .75 (see Table 4-5).
Table 4-7 provides a description of the responses and categorization according to the identity statuses for the two-way MANOVA. The variables of interest for hypothesis three were coded as follows: gender (male was coded as 0 and 1 as female), and identity achievement status (0 was coded as diffusion, 1 as moratorium, 2 as foreclosure, and 3 as achievement). There were a total of 55 (56.1%) responses for male Black college student-athletes and a total of 43 (43.8%) responses for female Black college student-athletes. For the total sample, there were 25 (25.5%) Black college student-athletes who were categorized as achieved, 27 (27.6%) in moratorium, 29 (29.6%) foreclosed, and 17 (17.3%) diffused (Table 4-6). Regarding gender for the categorization of identity achievement status, female Black college student-athletes represented 15 (60%) of those categorized as achieved, 15 (55.5%) in moratorium, 9 (31%) foreclosed, and 4 (23%) diffused. Additionally, male Black college student-athletes represented 10 (40%) of the participants categorized as achieved, 12 (44.4%) in moratorium, 20 (68.9%) foreclosed, and 13 (76.4%) diffused. These results are illustrated in Table 4-7. Additionally, Figure 4-2 provides a graphical illustration of the gender differences in identity achievement status categorization.

The researcher presents the results of the two-way MANOVA in Table 4-8. The overall Wilks' lambda was not statistically significant for the main effect of gender, $F(2, 89) = 1.06, p >.05$, which demonstrates that there is not a statistically significant effect of gender on both athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial centrality (as measured by the centrality scale of the MIBI). The overall Wilks' lambda for the main effect of identity achievement status was found to be statistically significant indicating AIMS scores and MIBI scores combine differed on average between identity statuses, $F$
(6,178) = 2.17, p < .05, partial $\eta^2 = .068$. Partial eta squared suggests a small main effect of identity achievement status. The overall Wilks' lambda for the main effect of the interaction of gender and identity status was not statistically significant, $F (6, 178) = .047, p > .05$. The interaction of gender and identity achievement status does not produce differences, on average, in athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI). However, the data supports hypothesis three, based on the frequency of the categorization in identity achievement status scores.

**Research Hypothesis Four**

For research hypothesis four, the researcher predicted that Black male student-athletes would have higher levels of athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) than female Black student-athletes using the two-way MANOVA. The researcher conducted a 2 x 2 MANOVA to determine whether there were mean differences in athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the racial centrality subscale of the MIBI) based on gender and identity achievement status (as measured by the EIPQ). G*Power was used to conduct an a priori power analysis. With a level of .05, minimum power established at .95, and a large effect size of .35 (Cohen, 1992), 54 participants were needed to find a statistically significant difference. Therefore, the number of comparisons in the present study ($N = 98$) was large enough to justify proceeding with the two-way MANOVA analysis.

Prior to conducting the MANOVA, athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI) were examined for accuracy in data entry, missing values, and the extent to which multivariate
assumptions were met. The results from the tests of assumptions are the same as the information presented for research hypothesis three; and therefore, they are not presented again here.

The range of athletic identity scores (as measured by the AIMS) was 7 to 49 for all participants \((M = 38.69, SD = 7.72)\). As reported in Table 4-7 regarding athletic identity, there were a total of 55 (56.1\%) responses for male Black college student-athletes \((M = 38.75, SD = 8.34)\), and 43 (43.9\%) responses for Black female college student-athletes \((M = 38.63, SD = 6.96)\). Thus, there was a very slight difference in the mean score for athletic identity according to gender (Table 4-7). Results of the two-way MANOVA are illustrated in Table 4-8. The overall Wilks’ lambda was not statistically significant for the main effect of gender, \(F (2, 89) = 1.06, p > .05\). This finding demonstrates that there is not a statistically significant effect of gender on athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) or racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI). Thus, the data does not support hypothesis four.

Chapter Summary

Within this chapter, the researcher has presented the results related to examining the four research hypotheses. The results provide support for a prediction model that explains identity achievement status. The results also indicated a relationship between athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial centrality (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI). Furthermore, the results of the study demonstrated a gender difference in the categorization of identity achievement status, but not in athletic identity. Thus, the results provide implications for future research and practice discussed in chapter 5.
Table 4-1. Model summary predicting identity achievement status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.317(^a)</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.01326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Gender, AIMS Score, MIBI Score
Table 4-2. ANOVA table of multiple regression predicting identity achievement status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>10.757</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.586</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>.019b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>96.509</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.265</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Identity Achievement Status
b. Predictors: (Constant), Gender, AIMS Score, MIBI Score
Table 4-3. Regression coefficients of multiple regression predicting identity achievement status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIBI Score</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS Score</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.576</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Identity Achievement Status
Table 4-4. Estimated marginal means of racial centrality and athletic identity separated by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIBI Score</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.939</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>33.089</td>
<td>36.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.100</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>34.764</td>
<td>39.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS Score</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.515</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>36.459</td>
<td>40.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.560</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>36.964</td>
<td>42.155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-1. Scatterplot of the correlation between athletic centrality and racial centrality.
Table 4-5. Correlational data of athletic identity, racial centrality, gender, and identity achievement status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIMS Score</th>
<th>MIBI Score</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Identity Achievement Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIMS Score</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIBI Score</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.288**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>-.288**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 4-6. Between-subjects factors of MANOVA analysis comparing identity achievement status by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-7. Descriptive statistics of MANOVA analysis comparing identity achievement status by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Identity Achievement Status</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIBI</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.60</td>
<td>6.552</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>6.647</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>6.730</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>9.004</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>7.933</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>5.815</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>6.777</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>3.162</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.12</td>
<td>5.864</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>5.996</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>6.672</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>6.085</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>8.299</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>7.122</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>7.011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>7.088</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>5.748</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>32.69</td>
<td>11.161</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>8.340</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.47</td>
<td>8.114</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>6.791</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>3.468</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>7.932</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.63</td>
<td>6.966</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.72</td>
<td>7.700</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>6.816</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>40.31</td>
<td>5.224</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>11.340</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.69</td>
<td>7.729</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-8. Two-way MANOVA results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai's Trace</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>Roy's Largest Root</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>39.910</td>
<td>39.910</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1776.006(^{b})</td>
<td>1776.006(^{b})</td>
<td>1776.006(^{b})</td>
<td>1776.006(^{b})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington's Trace</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai's Trace</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>Roy's Largest Root</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.062(^{b})</td>
<td>1.062(^{b})</td>
<td>1.062(^{b})</td>
<td>1.062(^{b})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai's Trace</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>Roy's Largest Root</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>2.172(^{b})</td>
<td>2.197</td>
<td>4.065(^{c})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>180.000</td>
<td>178.000</td>
<td>176.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achievement Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai's Trace</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>Roy's Largest Root</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Identity</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Status</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>1.458(^{b})</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>2.965(^{b})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>180.000</td>
<td>178.000</td>
<td>176.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Design: Intercept + Gender + Identity Achievement Status + Gender * Identity Achievement Status
b. Exact statistic
c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.
Table 4-9. Descriptive statistics of measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIBI Score</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>7.122</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS Score</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38.69</td>
<td>7.729</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Achievement Status (EIPQ)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.3878</td>
<td>1.05158</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-10. Demographic data of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Field</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Sport Athlete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Athlete</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously a Scholarship Athlete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-On</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Scholarship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-11. Independent samples tests for face-to-face and on-line responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIBI Score</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.799</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-1.315</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-1.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.246</td>
<td>66.960</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS Score</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>-1.103</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-1.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.074</td>
<td>79.489</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Achievement Status</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.38647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>87.802</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Status</td>
<td>Male (n)</td>
<td>Female (n)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure (Low x, High y)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement (High x, High y)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion (Low x, Low, y)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moratorium (High x, High y)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(x)*
Level of Exploration and Crisis

*(y)*
Level of Commitment

Figure 4-2. Graphical illustration of identity status categorization by gender
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter begins with a summary of the study and research methodology. Next, the researcher focuses on reviewing the results related to each research hypothesis presented in Chapter 4, and comparing the results to previous research focused on Black college student-athletes and the constructs of identity achievement status, racial identity, athletic identity, and gender. Finally, the researcher addresses limitations of the study, outlines recommendations for future research, and discusses implications for practice.

Summary of the Study

The overarching purpose of this study was to examine the constructs of identity achievement status, racial identity, athletic identity, and gender for Black college student-athletes. The researcher examined these constructs within the Black college student-athlete population at the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), “Division 1-A”, level at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). The researcher aimed to understand the relationships among the constructs. Additionally, a major goal of the study was to further understand identity status using gender, athletic identity, and racial identity.

The researcher examined four hypotheses in this study. The author employed a multiple regression analysis to examine the ability for racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI), athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS), and gender to predict identity achievement status (as measured by the EIPQ). Additionally, the research utilized a two-way MANOVA to examine gender difference in levels of identity achievement status and athletic identity.
Participants

The researcher analyzed responses from 98 participants. Fifty-five (56.1%) participants identified as male and 43 (43.9%) identified as female. A majority of the Black college student-athletes participated in football (n = 37, 37.8%) and track and field (n = 32, 32.6%), with participants also reporting engagement in volleyball (n = 11, 11.2%), basketball (n = 7, 7.1%), baseball (n = 4, 4.1%), soccer (n = 3, 3.1%), tennis (n = 2, 2%), and softball (n = 1, 1%). The present study expands upon the existing literature regarding college athletics and Black college student-athletes. In previous research, scholars have focused on a specific gender (i.e., Black male student-athletes [Bimper, 2014; Rivas-Quiñones, 2002; Steinfeldt et. al, 2010], Black female student-athletes [Carter-Francique et. al, 2011; Foster, 2003]) or have not included an adequate representation of Black college student-athletes from revenue-building sports (i.e., McQuown-Linnemeyer & Brown, 2010). Thus, the current study expands on existing research through the inclusion of a sample with both Black males and females and both revenue-building and non-revenue-building sports at the Division 1 FBS (1-A) level.

Research Hypothesis One

In examining the ability to predict identity achievement status using athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS), gender, and racial centrality (as measured by the centrality scale of the MIBI), the researcher found that the overall model was statistically significant. However, when examining each of the variables (athletic identity, gender, and racial centrality), gender was the only variable that was statistically significant in the model.

Scholars propose that identities of student-athletes, as a population, may be prematurely shaped and foreclosed before a variety of career interests and talents are
explored and attempted (Good, Brewer, Petitpas, Van Raalte, & Mahar, 1993; Harris, 1996). Furthermore, there is a need for the exploration of identity achievement status using predictive methodologies that are more sophisticated than correlations (Rivas-Quiñones, 2004). Thus, the present study adds to the literature by implementing a method that examines identity development using a prediction model. However, athletic identity and racial identity may not be key determinants in a Black college student-athlete’s process of commitment and exploration. Concordantly, Murphy et al. (1996) found that identification with the athletic role, specifically, and commitment and exploration of meaningful alternatives may be two separate processes. Additionally, the findings of the present study do not support claims that racial identity is a major component of identity development (Brown et al, 2011) and progresses in a similar process to ego-identity statuses (Helms, 1993).

McQuown-Linnemeyer and Brown (2010) found that participation in athletics, when comparing college student-athletes to non-athletes, was a key predictor in identity achievement status (foreclosure specifically). The current model demonstrates the capability for gender to predict identity achievement status. Women were more likely to have higher identity achievement status scores than men, which translate to higher occurrences of moratorium and achievement than men. Once gender is taken into account, there is no longer a mean difference with identity status difference based on AIMS and MIBI scores. The data of the present study yielded useful findings that shed light on the prediction of identity achievement status for Black college student-athletes at PWIs. However, there may be additional variables that are salient (e.g academic classification, scholarship status, and sport of participation) in the process of
commitment and exploration of ideologies in regards to the Black college student-athlete population.

**Research Hypothesis Two**

Hypothesis two focused on an expected positive correlation between athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial identity (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI). The results supported hypothesis two; however, the correlation was small (.293). Though a positive relationship is evident, these results do not support Hawkins’ (2013) report that there is a strong relationship between Black culture and athletics. Additionally, the results of the present study also contradict Brown and Hartley’s (1998) findings that a negative correlation between athletic identity and racial identity exists for Black college student-athletes.

In considering these results further, Murray (2001) reported that the context of where (i.e. PWI vs. HBCU campuses) Black college student-athletes compete influences their level of athletic identity. In the present study the sample encompassed students who were exclusively from PWIs with sports that compete at the highest level of collegiate athletics. Thus, the findings in the present study are not surprising considering the study involved participants with two specific identities (Black and athlete) that differentiate these students from a majority of the college student population. Many college students at PWIs are not Black, and Black college student-athletes are a small population within the Black student population at PWIs. The context of attending a PWI, a requirement in this study, may also enhance a Black college student-athlete’s awareness of being different than the majority of college students at the institution. Furthermore, Black college student-athletes at PWIs may identify with the athletic role because of the social capital and fame that is associated with this role.
Thus, Black college student-athletes’ awareness of, and connection to, the athletic role and to Blackness may be a product of the context of PWIs.

**Research Hypothesis Three**

The researcher hypothesized that Black female college student-athletes would show greater levels of exploration in regards to ideology on the EIPQ, and that they would be more likely to be achieved or in moratorium. There were 25 (25.5%) Black college student-athletes who were categorized as achieved, 27 (27.6%) in moratorium, 29 (29%) foreclosed, and 17 (17.3%) diffused. Female Black college student-athletes represented 15 (60%) of the participants categorized as achieved, 15 (55.5%) in moratorium, 9 (31.0%) foreclosed, and 4 (23.5%) diffused. The two-way MANOVA model was found to not be statistically significant, $F(2, 89) = 1.06, p > .05$. The results revealed a statistically significant difference between gender and identity achievement status in regards to categorization. A greater number of females were classified as being achieved and in moratorium and more males were classified as being diffused or foreclosed.

The sports world is male-dominated (Messner, 1989) and societal expectations and professional opportunities may cause males to prematurely commit to the athletic role. In comparing the results from this study to previous research, Schwartz and Montgomery (2002) found gender differences in identity achievement status among non-student-athlete populations (Schwartz & Montgomery, 2002). In contrast, other researchers have found no gender difference among identity formation of adolescents (Anthis, Dunkel, & Anderson, 2004), and college students (Zimmer-Gembeck &

A majority of the student-athletes in the present study (68%) were involved either football or track and field. Specifically, 56% of male participants played football, a revenue-building sport that has higher instances of professional competition and is associated with high pay. Additionally, 46% of female participants were involved in track and field. Track and field has fewer opportunities for professional competition and does not yield the average pay of professional football and other revenue-building sports (e.g. basketball & baseball). Thus, one may conclude that the females represented in the study are more likely to be categorized as achieved or in moratorium because of the lack of professional opportunity for female athletes. This assertion is supported by Harrison and colleagues (2009), who reported that females are less inclined to have athletics as the sole focus of their overall identity. Additionally, these results parallel those found by Beamon (2012), where many former Black male college student-athletes were classified as foreclosed. Thus, the results of this study provide support for gender difference in identity achievement status for Black college student-athletes.

**Research Hypothesis Four**

The researcher hypothesized that Black male college student-athletes would exhibit higher levels of athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) than Black female college student-athlete. Although the world of athletics is perceived as a male-dominated and a masculine arena (Messner, 1989), the results of the present study do not support hypothesis four. On average, the difference between Black male student-athlete AIMS score ($M = 38.75, SD = 8.34$) and the Black female student-athlete AIMS score ($M = 38.63, SD = 6.97$) were not significantly different, $F(2, 89) = 1.06, p > .05$. 
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Results from this study contradict Deaner’s (2009) findings, where female student-athletes at co-educational colleges and universities were less likely to identify strongly with athletics. In the present study, both female and male Black college student-athletes identified strongly with their athletic identity. Furthermore, the present study differs from Deaner’s (2009) study in that it specifically focused on race (Black college student-athletes). Therefore, race may have contributed to higher levels of athletic identity.

Participation in athletics is also often contrary to social gender roles that are ascribed to women in the U.S. (Tasiemski et al., 2004), but these ascribed gender roles may not represent the beliefs of the participants in this study. Again, Harrison and colleagues (2009) suggested that female student-athletes have fewer opportunities to participate professionally because there is a greater focus on male professional sports. This in turn affects how seriously females are invested in athletics during the college years. However, given that no difference in athletic identity was found, one can conclude that black female college student-athletes in this study view their athletic role similarly to their male counterparts. Thus, these findings provide support for the assertion that Blackness and connection to Black culture through athletics may be more salient for the females in this study than salience of gender.

Athletic identity is contextual, and it is crucial to consider the proposed importance of athletics to Black Americans and the connection of athletics to Black American culture. The connection between Black Americans and athletics may be more salient for the female respondents in this sample than the theorized relationship between gender and athletics. Additionally, Blacks on the campuses of PWIs are
socialized to prioritize their athletic role (Smith, 2014), which may supersede gender differences in athletic identity, when drawing conclusions from the results of this study.

College student-athletes who receive a scholarship to play competitive sports represent a stigmatized group on college campuses (Stone, Harrison, & Mottley, 2012). Additionally, racial stereotyping has established achievement in athletics as a trait of “Blackness”, whereas achievement in academics is a trait of “Whiteness” (Murty & Roebuck, 2015), and Black student-athletes are aware of this stereotypes (Fuller, 2013). Additionally, Brown and Hartley (1998) hypothesized that identifying strongly with the athletic roles may serve as a buffer for racial discrimination for Black college student-athletes. Brown and colleagues (2003) found that Black athletes with high levels of athletic identity tended to believe that racial discrimination was no longer a problem in the U.S. Thus, perhaps identifying strongly with athletics and Black culture may serve as a buffer for discrimination and microaggressions that are associated with gender in regards to Black female college student-athletes.

As previously discussed, participation in athletics is related to hegemonic masculinity and demonstration of “strength” (Mawson, 2006; Messner, 1989). In turn, the modern female athlete is presented with addressing the societal question of whether a woman can be strong, aggressive, competitive, and still be considered feminine (Brownmiller, 1984). Athletics, which is an institution that serves as a key demonstration of masculinity (Messner, 1989), positions females at odds with the societal expectation of emphasized femininity proposed by Connell (1987). Additionally, the intersectionality of being Black and female (Foster, 2003) adds additional layers, influencing the identity development of Black female college student-athletes. Shorter-Goeden and Washington
(1996) proposed that Black females exhibit strength as a possible coping mechanism for experiences of racism and sexism. When pairing Shorter-Goeden and Washington’s findings with the results of hypothesis four in the present study, one may conclude that when Black female athletes identify strongly with the athletic role, they exhibit the societal expectation of Black females to embody the role of the “Modern Day Superwoman” suggested by past researchers (Thomas, Hacker, & Hoxha, 2011). Thus, the Modern Day Superwoman challenges the gender dynamic of hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity. American culture, and experiences of oppression, may influence Black female college student-athletes to exhibit identities and roles considered masculine. Thus, a strong identification with the athletic role, coupled with no exploration and commitment in regards to identity, may enact for Black female college student-athletes a self-fulfilling prophecy of the “Strong Black Woman” stereotype.

In summary, the present study was the first known study to examine racial identity, identity status, gender, and athletic identity. Additionally, the present study addressed a gap in previous identity status research that involved Black female college student-athletes. The examination of the research hypotheses and the exploratory analysis yielded useful results that serve as a basis for implications for research and practice. The findings parallel the work of Bimper and Harrison (2011) and Fuller, Harrison, and Bukstein (2016) who ascertained that Black College student-athletes constantly negotiate the significance of multiple identities. In this study, gender was a major factor in determining differences in exploration and commitment to meaningful alternatives of ideologies. However, there may be additional factors to examine to
provide a clearer understanding of how racial identity, athletic identity, gender, and identity status possibly coexist.

Based on the findings from the present study, Black female college student-athletes prioritize their athletic role similarly to Black male college student-athletes. However, they are more likely to explore other identities and roles outside of athletics, as well as other professional careers. Furthermore, the results of this study support the research concluding the high achievement of Black female college student-athletes (Harper et al, 2013). Black female student-athletes demonstrated higher occurrences of having the ability to explore meaningful ideological alternatives and also in commitment to meaningful alternatives after exploration. These results also refute research that Black male college student-athletes overemphasize athletic achievement and identification (Harrison et al, 2011), when compared to other populations (e.g. Black female student-athletes).

**Limitations**

As with all studies, there are limitations that are involved with sampling and methods. In regards to methodology, multiple regression was not an optimal mode of data analysis to use in this study, due to identity status not being a binary variable. The researcher attempted to address this by using a range of scores from 0 to 3, where diffusion = 0, moratorium = 1, foreclosure = 2, and achievement = 3 for the identity achievement status continuum based on Marcia’s findings (1966). Also, the distribution of scores for athletic identity (as measured by the AIMS) and racial centrality (as measured by the centrality subscale of the MIBI) were both found to not demonstrate a normal distribution. Furthermore, the mean difference between those who completed the survey in-person vs. online demonstrated that those who completed the survey in-
person, on average, had higher scores on the MIBI. Again, many of the responses were completed while the respondents were in the presence of other student-athletes who identified as Black or being of African descent. Additionally, many of the face-to-face responses were also male, and the institution was located in the Southeastern United States. As stated previously, each of these factors could explain possible effects of social desirability and the impact of possible geographical differences in racial identity. Thus, findings of the present study should be interpreted with caution. Additionally, the study was cross-sectional and did not employ a longitudinal method of data analysis. Thus, the results are considered to be a snapshot about the participants. Additionally, as discussed in the literature review, racial identity, athletic identity, gender, and identity status are contextual and fluctuate in response to the environment surrounding the individual and group. Furthermore, there was a limitation in regards to data collection. On-line data collection proved to be less fruitful in comparison to face-to-face data collection; however, face-to-face data collection was only approved at one institution.

In regards to sampling, more than half of the sample \( n = 55 \) was obtained from face-to-face data collection at one university. Researchers are urged to place emphasis on sampling from a diverse number of Division 1 FBS schools to enhance generalizability. There was also a lack of diversity of sports represented in the sample. A majority of the male participants competed in football, while a majority of female participants competed in track and field. Nonetheless, the sample in the present study is consistent with reports of a high percentage of Black males in football and Black females in track and field (Harper et. al, 2013).
Implications for Research

As stated previously, the present study was the first of its kind to integrate athletic identity, racial identity, gender, and identity status achievement. The intersection of race, athletics, and other variables (i.e., identity status achievement) remains an issue that must be confronted by college campuses. Additionally, there is a growing body of literature and coverage focusing on the experiences and outcomes of Black college student-athletes (Fuller, Harrison, & Bukstein, 2016), which highlights the pertinence of this issue.

Qualitative Research

Fuller and Colleagues (2016) acknowledged that the relationship between athletic identity and racial identity has often been explored; however, few studies have examined how these constructs are related to subsequent outcomes. The present study aimed to explore the relationship between athletic identity, racial identity, and gender and how these constructs could possibly explain outcomes in identity status achievement. Future research may examine additional possible outcomes (i.e. major choice, career choice, and engagement in college campus involvement) that relate to racial identity and athletic identity. Fuller and colleagues (2016) examined whether racial identity and athletic identity predicted academic outcomes, which also has an underlying connection to career and professional development. An expansion of the present study could involve researchers qualitatively exploring the decision-making practices of Black college student-athletes and how this relates to the outcomes outlined above.

Additionally, Black males are often the focus of research in college athletics because they comprise a high percentage of revenue-building sports (Gill & Farrington,
However, findings from this study highlight the importance of the inclusion of Black females in college student-athlete research. One possible direction for future research is increased attention to the relationship of gender and identity achievement status in research. Scholars may also seek to compare differences in gender and identity achievement of different races to Black college student-athletes through qualitative research. The present study adds to the literature of research that has proposed gender differences in identity status classification (Schwartz & Montgomery, 2002). Thus, future researchers should qualitatively explore how gender may impact how Black college student-athlete identity formation and conceptualization in regards to gender, race, and athletics.

**Quantitative Research**

Many questions about the mélange of race and sport still remain (Bimper & Harrison, 2011). One possible area for further examination is the racial identity and athletic identity of Black college student-athletes who participate in non-revenue-building sports. In the present study, there was an underrepresentation of Black college student-athletes in non-revenue-building sports. Future research may also focus on examining whether identity status achievement differences are associated with gender, sport, classification, or scholarship status using the AIMS, MIBI, and EIPQ. Closely investigating difference along these key demographics may yield useful information for researchers and practitioners.

Continuing the integration of racial identity and identity status in research would yield results that have scholarly and practical implications. A majority of research that has employed Eriksonian identity theories continues to focus on White populations, while racial identity has focused mostly on racial minorities (Sneed, Schwartz, & Cross, 2014).
Researchers are encouraged to continue to bridge the gap between identity achievement status and racial identity. Census projections indicate that White Americans will no longer constitute a numerical majority of the U.S. population in the near future (Day, 1996; Hall, 1997). Integration of identity status theory and racial identity contributes to culturally relevant research, as well as addressing the demands of a growing racially diverse American society. Additionally, the rise of diversity in the U.S. population is in accordance with the increase in female participation in college sports (Cheslock, 2010).

In regards to methodology, this researcher found difficulty in contacting many of the athletic departments at Division 1 FBS schools and obtaining permission to collect data. The researcher found that these athletic departments were generally very protective of their student-athletes. Therefore, researchers should be aware that it may take an extensive amount of time to connect with the appropriate professional to obtain permission to conduct research within athletic departments. Additionally, several Division 1 FBS athletic departments have their own review process for research proposals before allowing access to staff and student-athletes. This researcher also had difficulty obtaining permission for face-to-face data collection on campuses. However, in person data collection may help increase response rate when compared to online data collection. Furthermore, collecting data during times of the year when student-athletes are not participating in their sport may also enhance the success of data collection for future researchers. The present study collected data during the Fall and early Spring semesters, which is when competition for football, basketball, volleyball, and track & field primarily occur. Lastly, future researchers should be aware that there may be a
possible threat to acquiescence if Black college student-athletes complete surveys in the presence of peers who identify as being Black or of African descent. The geographical region of the college or university may also impact responses.

**Implications for Practice**

There is a strong connection between Black culture in America and athletics (Hawkins, 2013). Specifically, Black males constitute a large portion of the college student-athlete population, which leads to the “Treadmill to Oblivion” (Messner, 1989). The “Treadmill to Oblivion” describes a strong commitment to sports with few competing in professional sports, and having no professional alternatives after their careers are over. Thus, career and academic counseling is crucial for Black male college student-athlete.

The findings of the current study demonstrate a lack of gender difference in the salience of the athletic role for Black college student-athletes at the Division 1 FBS level. However, there are fewer opportunities for participation, resources for operation, and scholarships for female college athletes (Deaner, 2009). Therefore, the results of this study illuminate the need for athletic departments within the NCAA to revisit the current funding and resources allotted to women’s sports at the college level.

Specifically, universities need to implement programs that focus on the personal, academic, and professional development of Black female college student-athletes, as well as college female student-athletes in general. An establishment of such programs would meet the parameters of Title IX, ensuring the optimal and holistic development of female college student-athletes. Additionally, Black college student-athletes are heavily influenced by their peers in regards to both academic and athletic achievement (Harrison, Martin, & Fuller, 2015). Thus, programs that enforce peer accountability may
be beneficial in helping Black college student-athletes to have balanced identities and explore identities outside of athletics.

Black American youth are also socialized by both their community and broader society to believe that athletics is the primary means of “self-realization and social-economic advancement” (Harrison, 1998). Specifically, institutions such as the media, education, economy, and family unit (Messner, 1989) influence Blacks to pursue professional athletics almost exclusively. Stereotypic threats, such as these that influence decision-making, are key determinants for Black college student-athletes (Stone, Harrison, & Mottley, 2012) in the pursuit of athletic and academic success. Often, stereotypic threats are thought to come from outside of Black culture. However, Black student-athletes from families and neighborhoods who do not emphasize life beyond sports involvement might be at risk to compounded stereotypic threats on campus (Harrison, Martin, & Fuller, 2015). Thus, the discussions of stereotypes of athletes that are held in a number of contexts, race and the influence of culture, and gender may prove beneficial in facilitating optimal development of Black college student-athletes, as well as student-athletes overall.

Possible areas of focus for program development include: (a) ways to explore careers and professions within and outside athletics, (b) topics of gender and intersectionality of identities, and (c) the role of culture on decision-making and future planning. One specific program model that focuses on Black college student-athletes is the Indivisible Self: An Evidence-Based Model of Wellness (IS-WEL; Meyers & Sweeney, 2005). The IS-WEL model, depicted in Figure 5-1, is a holistic and strengths-based approach that focuses on intersectionality, multiple roles, and contexts in a
person’s life. Based on the beliefs of Alfred Alder (1954), the IS-WEL model conceptualizes individuals through the belief that indivisibility of the self (holism) is the key to understanding human behavior.

In using the IS-WEL model with Black college student-athletes, the focus would be on emphasizing the interaction of the whole person, rather than the individual identities, issues, and background. Grounded in Adlerian theory, the IS-WEL model is composed of five factors: (a) essential self, (b) social self, (c) creative self, (d) physical self, and (e) coping self (Meyers & Sweeney, 2005). Based on the results from the present study, a focus on the essential self, coping self, and the social self might be efficacious. Gender and cultural identity are facets of the essential self that influences the meaning-making process in regards to life, self, and others. Counselors, student affairs professionals, and professionals within athletic departments may address how race, gender, and culture affect Black college student-athletes’ decision-making and priorities in regards to the college experience. The coping self is comprised of realistic beliefs, stress management, self-worth, and leisure. As discussed before, the likelihood of playing a professional sport is very low, and both the identity exploration process and competing in NCAA sports at the FBS level are both stressful. Professionals who work with Black college student-athletes may emphasize this likelihood in order to facilitate realistic future and present beliefs. Black college student-athletes may also receive support in exploring academic and career options through career counseling. Lastly, the social self is comprised of friendship and love. To address the social self, professionals may encourage Black college student-athletes to engage in campus activities. Involvement with the larger campus community and balance of interacting with both
athletes and non-athletes may benefit Black college student-athletes. Student affairs professionals and professionals within athletic departments should encourage involvement in the larger campus community, especially for Black college student-athletes in revenue-building sports.

One specific intervention program, the Scholar Baller Curriculum (Stone et al., 2012) focuses on bridging the gap between education, sport, and entertainment. The program also focuses on self-identity and social identity, and seeks to engage student-athlete development in and outside the classroom (Comeaux & Harrison, 2011). Thus, the Scholar Baller Curriculum focuses on the whole person and facilitates the tenets of the IS-WELL model. Furthermore, Harrison et al. (2015) reported that a loss of confidence of performance in academics occurred mostly during freshman and sophomore year. Thus, it may be efficacious to target underclassmen specifically as a starting point for intervention and maintain longitudinal programs through matriculation.

Overall, a need exists for continued efforts in exploring the social, cultural, and political contexts of being Black and student-athlete, specifically while attending Predominantly White Institutions (Fuller, Harrison, & Blukstein, 2016). Scholars have asserted that Black college student-athletes at PWIs have both positive and negative experiences that influence their development (Hodge, 2015). Future research may continue to provide a basis for scholars and practitioners to be better equipped in understanding how identity formation develops and may influence academics and career development.

**Conclusion**

The connection between Black Americans and sports is described as an “…Athletic manifest destiny internalized by many within the African American
community…” (Fuller, Harrison, & Blukstein, 2016, pg. 2). This promotes the idea that pursuit and achievement of excellence in sports is a primary way of becoming successful; and therefore, exploration of meaningful alternatives becomes less significant. A lack of focus on exploring the connection of Black American culture to sports may contribute to a “triple tragedy:” (a) African American youth obsessing over the pursuit of sports goals that most will never attain; (b) the personal and cultural underdevelopment of African Americans due these unsuccessful pursuits; and (c) cultural and institutional underdevelopment of African American society as a consequence of talent being allocated towards sport and away from other professional careers. In contrast, student affairs, athletic departments, career counseling and advising professionals, and higher education administrators are in key positions to provide interventions that address social, cultural, and political contexts for Black college student-athletes. Scholars who continually explore the identity development of Black college student-athletes, and professionals who work with them, may serve as catalysts that counteract the issues of stereotypic threat and self-fulfilling prophecy within the Black community, the athletic community, and within institutions of higher education.
Figure 5-1. Myers, J. E., & Sweeney, T. J. (2005). The Indivisible Self: An Evidence-Based Model of Wellness (reprint). *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 61(3), 269 – 270 (Page 272, Figure 2).
APPENDIX A
EGO IDENTITY PROCESS QUESTIONNAIRE (EIPQ)

Listed below are a number of statements describing adolescent behavior. Please indicate how you feel about each statement.

Example: Politics are very important in my life.

Write a 1 if you strongly disagree.
Write a 2 if you disagree.
Write a 3 if you slightly disagree.
Write a 4 if you slightly agree.
Write a 5 if you agree.
Write a 6 if you strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1) Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2) Disagree</th>
<th>3) Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4) Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5) Agree</th>
<th>6) Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have definitely decided on the occupation that I want to pursue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t expect to change my political principles and ideals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have considered adopting different kinds of religious belief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There has never been a need to question my values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am very confident about what kinds of friends are best for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My ideas about men’s and women’s roles have never changed as I became older.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will always vote for the same political party.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have firmly held views concerning my role in my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have engaged in several discussions concerning behaviors involved in dating relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have considered different political views thoughtfully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have never questioned my views concerning what kind of friend is best for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My values are likely to change in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When I talk to people about religion, I make sure to voice my opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>3 Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>4 Slightly Agree</td>
<td>5 Agree</td>
<td>6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>I am not sure about what type of dating relationship is best for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>I have not felt the need to reflect upon the importance I place on my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>Regarding religion, my beliefs are likely to change in the near future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>I have definite views regarding the ways in which men and women should behave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>I have tried to learn about different occupational fields to find the best one for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19)</td>
<td>I have undergone several experiences that made me change my view on men’s and women’s roles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20)</td>
<td>I have consistently re-examined many different values in order to find the ones which are best for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21)</td>
<td>I think what I look for in a friend could change in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22)</td>
<td>I have questioned what kind of date is right for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23)</td>
<td>I am unlikely to alter my vocational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24)</td>
<td>I have evaluated many ways in which I fit into my family structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25)</td>
<td>My ideas about men’s and women’s roles will never change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26)</td>
<td>I have never questioned my political beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27)</td>
<td>I have had many experiences that led me to review the qualities that I would like my friends to have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28)</td>
<td>I have discussed religious matters with a number of people who believe differently than I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29)</td>
<td>I am not sure that the values I hold are right for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30)</td>
<td>I have never questioned my occupational aspirations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31)</td>
<td>The extent to which I value my family is likely to change in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32)</td>
<td>My beliefs about dating are firmly held.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scoring the EIPQ

Items comprising the Commitment Scale:
   1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 29, 31, 32

Items comprising the Exploration Scale:
   3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30

Reverse-score the following negatively-worded items:
   4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21, 26, 29, 30, 31

To score, reverse the numerical values for the negatively-worded items (1→6, 2→5, 3→4, 4→3, 5→2, 6→1).

Then sum the items for each scale separately. The range of possible scores is from 16 to 96, with higher values indicating greater commitment/greater exploration.
APPENDIX B
MULTIDIMENSIONAL INVENTORY OF BLACK IDENTITY (MIBI) RACIAL CENTRALITY SCALE

Please circle the number that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the question regarding how central being Black is to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall, being Black has very little to do with how I feel about my.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In general, being Black is an important part of my self-image.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My destiny is tied to the destiny of other Black people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Being Black is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to Black people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have a strong attachment to other Black people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Being Black is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Being Black is not a major factor in my social relationships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX C**

**ATHLETIC IDENTITY MEASUREMENT SCALE (AIMS)**

---

### 7-Item Version of the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS)

Please circle the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement regarding your sport participation.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I consider myself an athlete.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have many goals related to sport.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Most of my friends are athletes.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sport is the most important part of my life.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I spend more time thinking about sport than anything else.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel bad about myself when I do poorly in sport.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I would be very depressed if I were injured and could not compete in sport.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study, Black College Student-Athlete Identity Achievement: An Intersection of Racial Identity, Athletic Identity, and Gender. The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information about you to help the researcher better understand and conceptualize your responses. Please fill these questions out to the best of your ability.

For the following questions, please choose one answer:

1. What is your age? (Drop down list)
   - 17
   - 18
   - 19
   - 20
   - 21
   - 22
   - 23
   - 24

2. Do you identify as being Black or of African descent?
   - Yes
   - No

3. What gender do you identify with?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Transgender
   - Other (Fill in blank)

4. What is your current academic classification?
• Freshman
• Sophomore
• Junior
• Senior

5. How many years of NCAA eligibility do you have left to play sports?
• 1 year
• 2 years
• 3 years
• 4 years

For the following question, please choose all that apply:

6. What NCAA sport(s) do you currently participate in? (Drop down selection. Mark all that apply)
• Basketball
• Baseball
• Cross Country
• Football
• Golf
• Gymnastics
• Lacrosse
• Soccer
• Softball
• Tennis
• Track & Field
• Volleyball

For the following question, please choose one answer:

7. What is your current scholarship status in regards to sports at the university?

• Previously a scholarship athlete but no longer
• Scholarship athlete
• Walk-on

Thank you for completing the demographic questionnaire.
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