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ABSTRACT

Donte LeShon Bernard: The Moderating Influence of Racial Identity Profiles on the Relationship Between Racial Discrimination and the Imposter Phenomenon
(Under the direction of Enrique W. Neblett Jr.)

This study used two waves of data to examine whether racial identity profiles moderate the association between subtle and blatant racial discrimination and changes in the imposter phenomenon (IP) among 157 African American college students attending a predominantly White institution. Utilizing latent profile analyses, four patterns of racial identity were identified: High Centrality/Multiculturalist, Moderate Black Centrality, Race-Focused, and Humanist. Both forms of racial discrimination significantly predicted increases in IP. Racial identity did not moderate the impact of subtle or blatant racial discrimination; however, students in the High Centrality/Multiculturalist and Moderate Black Centrality groups reported the highest and lowest levels of IP at Wave 2, respectively. Results suggest that IP may significantly differ as a function of the significance and meaning one places on being African American. I discuss how the findings lay the foundation for providing services to African American college students experiencing racial discrimination and feelings of intellectual incompetence.
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Introduction

Racial discrimination has long been a topic of interest in psychological research (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Priest et al., 2013). Sadly, numerous studies suggest that racial discrimination is associated with a host of unfavorable psychological adjustment outcomes such as low self-esteem (Seaton, Caldwell, Sellers, & Jackson, 2010; Seaton, 2009), feelings of anxiety (Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk-Cone, & Zimmerman, 2003), feelings of not belonging (Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993), and life dissatisfaction (Utsey, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Cancelli, 2000). These negative outcomes may be even more salient for African American college students attending predominantly White institutions (PWIs) who, compared with White students, are likely to experience greater stress related to being an ethnic minority (Chao, Mallinckrodt, & Wei, 2012; Neblett, Hammond, Seaton, & Townsend, 2010; Wei et al., 2010).

One negative outcome of racial discrimination that may be particularly relevant for African American college students attending PWIs is the imposter phenomenon (IP; Clance & Imes, 1978; Cokley, McClain, Enciso, & Martinez, 2013). IP refers to the feeling of intellectual incompetence experienced by high achieving individuals and is often followed by maladaptive and distressing consequences such as anxiety, self-consciousness, and depression (Chae, Piedmont, Estadt, & Wicks, 1995; Ross & Krukowski, 2003; Ross Stewart, Mugge, & Fultz, 2001; Sakulku & Alexander, 2011). Repeated exposure to racial discrimination may cause African American young adults to doubt their abilities, increase
feelings of apprehensiveness and/or anxiety, and lead to the development of IP (Chao et al., 2012; Soto, Dawson-Andoh, & BeLue, 2011).

Fortunately, however, not all youth who experience racial discrimination develop IP. One protective factor that may be relevant in the relationship between racial discrimination and IP is racial identity. Although no studies have examined racial identity in the context of this association, racial identity has been shown to buffer the negative effects of racial discrimination on psychological well-being outcomes (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Neblett, Rivas-Drake, & Umaña-Taylor, 2012; Neblett, Shelton, & Sellers, 2004; Sellers et al., 2003; Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006). Scholars have suggested that racial identity might bolster self-esteem, which, in turn, might lead to the development of coping responses that protect against experiences with racial discrimination (Neblett et al., 2004; Neblett et al., 2012; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1998). In the same vein, racial identity might buffer the impact of racial discrimination and decrease the likelihood of African American young adults experiencing the feelings of incompetence that are often associated with IP.

Surprisingly, few studies have examined the interplay among racial discrimination, racial identity, and IP. Furthermore, several shortcomings of the extant literature limit our understanding of the link between racial discrimination and IP. First, scholars have often examined racial discrimination as a unidimensional construct without regard for the subtle versus blatant nature of racial discrimination. It may be that subtle discrimination is a stronger predictor of IP than blatant discrimination experiences due to the rumination that often accompanies instances of more subtle discrimination (Harrell, 2000). Second, the majority of studies examining racial discrimination do so using cross sectional data. Thus,
information regarding how experiences with racial discrimination affect mental health over time is limited. Third, few studies have examined IP in African American college students (e.g., Austin, Clark, Ross, & Taylor, 2009; Cokley et al., 2013; Ewing, Richardson, James-Myers, & Russell, 1996), limiting our knowledge of the correlates of IP during the transition to adulthood. Lastly, relatively few studies examining racial identity have taken into account its multidimensional nature. As such, the ways in which combinations of various dimensions of racial identity may influence the associations between racial discrimination and psychological well-being are not well understood. In light of these limitations, the specific aims of this study are: (1) to longitudinally examine and compare the effects of blatant and subtle racial discrimination on the development of IP; and (2) to investigate the protective role of patterns of racial identity in the relationship between subtle and blatant racial discrimination and IP.

**Defining Racial Discrimination**

Racial discrimination has been defined in a multitude of different yet related ways (see Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Berman & Paradies, 2010; Blank, Dabady, & Citro, 2004; Bonilla-Silva, 1997; Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Priest et al., 2013; Quillian, 2006). For example, racial discrimination has been defined as behavior or attitudes “which maintain(s) or exacerbate(s) inequality of opportunity among ethnoracial groups” (Berman & Paradies, 2010, p.4). Scholars have argued that racial discrimination simultaneously functions on multiple levels and may have discrepant impacts on perceptions of racism experiences (e.g., Berman & Paradies, 2010; Harrell, 2000; Jones, 1997; Paradies, 2006). For instance, Jones (1997) conceptualized racial discrimination as a three-pronged construct representing racial discrimination at the individual, cultural, and institutional levels.
Similarly, Berman and Paradies (2010) explain racial discrimination as co-occurring within internalized (e.g., internalization of negative group stereotypes), interpersonal (e.g., interactions between individuals and between racial groups), and systematic levels (e.g., unequal societal distributions of power which sustain unequal opportunities to racial groups).

**Blatant and Subtle Discrimination**

One conceptual distinction to receive recent attention in the literature is the difference between blatant and subtle forms of racial discrimination (Brody et al., 2014; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002). Although overt racism was once socially acceptable, it is argued that due to changing social norms, prejudice has evolved into more subtle or “hidden” expressions of prejudice (Crosby et al., 1980; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Dovidio et al., 2002; Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2013; Zitek & Hebl, 2007). Due to this shift, scholars have become increasingly interested in the distinction and possible differences in the impact of overt/blatant versus covert/subtle forms of racial discrimination (e.g., Berman & Paradies, 2010; Brody et al., 2014). **Blatant** forms of discrimination often coincide with behaviors or actions that involve obvious or flagrant expressions of prejudiced behavior (e.g., calling someone a racial slur). **Subtle** forms of discrimination coincide with more ambiguous, manifestations of racism. An example of subtle racism may be an African American student who is mistaken for a service worker while at a restaurant.

It is possible that the impact of racial discrimination on IP may vary as a function of the subtle versus blatant nature of racial discrimination. Literature consistently links blatant racial discrimination with negative mental health outcomes such as increased depression (Crouter, Davis, Updegraff, Delgado, & Fortner, 2006), decreased self-esteem (Noh et al., 2007), decreased positive affect, and decreased psychological well-being (Buchanan &
Fitzgerald, 2008). However, given the underlying ambiguity and subsequent ruminations associated with experiences of subtle discrimination (Hoggard, Byrd, & Sellers, 2012; Noh et al., 2007; Nolen-Hoeksema & Jackson, 2001; Sellers et al., 2006), the impact of subtle discrimination on IP may have a more pronounced effect compared to that of blatant discrimination. Extended bouts of rumination following racial discriminatory events might deplete cognitive resources and increase the risk for negative mental health outcomes (Hoggard et al., 2012; Nolen-Hoeksema & Jackson, 2001). Moreover, scholars posit that prolonged exposure to subtle forms of racial discrimination may be more difficult to cope with than blatant discrimination (Bennett, Wolin, Robinson, Fowler, & Edwards, 2005; Noh et al., 2007; Operario & Fiske, 2001; Stetler, Chen, & Miller, 2006; D. R. Williams & Mohammed, 2009), as subtle discrimination may be harder to explicitly identify and make sense of (Pascoe & Richman, 2009).

**Elucidating The Impact of Racial Discrimination on IP**

Several theoretical models may be useful in understanding the link between racial discrimination and IP. The first model guiding this study is García Coll and colleagues’ (1996) integrative model for the study of the development of ethnic minority youth. García Coll et al. argued that social position variables such as race and social class, social stratification mechanisms (e.g., racial discrimination), promoting/inhibiting environments (e.g., neighborhoods and schools), and child characteristics (e.g., racial identity), interact to shape the developmental competencies (e.g., coping with racism, IP) of racial and ethnic minority youth.

In the context of this study, it may be that certain social class variables such as race, lead African American young adults to be more susceptible to experiences with racial
discrimination, especially in less racially and ethnically diverse environments such as PWIs. Individual characteristics such as one’s racial identity may lead experiences with racial discrimination to have differential effects on certain developmental competencies such as coping with racial discrimination and the development of IP. For example, it may be that an individual whose race is central to his/her self-concept would be less likely to develop IP in the face of discrimination compared to an individual whose race is not emphasized in defining his/her self-concept.

Another model that is pertinent to understanding the links among racial discrimination, racial identity, and IP is Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) theoretical model on stress, appraisal, and coping. This theory hypothesizes that cognitive appraisal and coping are two processes that can act as mediators of the relationship between stress experiences and long term well-being. In short, Lazarus and Folkman define stress as the imbalance between demands and resources stemming from the relationship and interactions between individuals and their environments. Cognitive appraisal is defined as the evaluative process in which individuals perceive situations as stressful or not. Coping is defined as any emotional, cognitive, or behavioral attempt to alleviate or overcome stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). According to the theory, individual (e.g., racial identity) and situational factors together interact to influence the coping process.

Lazarus and Folkman argue that if the relationship between individuals and their environments is appraised as stressful by the individual, it holds the potential to negatively affect his or her well-being. Yet, it may also be that certain individual factors such as racial identity may influence the appraisals of racial discriminatory experiences. For example, discriminatory experiences may be appraised and coped with differently by an individual.
who emphasizes race as central to his/her self-concept as compared to an individual whose race is not a focal point in defining his/her self-concept. Due to the ambiguity of subtle forms of racial discrimination, cognitively appraising a subtle discriminatory event as stressful or not may be more difficult than appraising a blatant event. As such, prolonged exposure to subtle forms of discrimination may exhaust coping resources above and beyond that of blatant forms of racial discrimination which, in turn, may increase risk for the development of negative psychopathological stress responses such as anxiety, depression, and anger (Clark et al., 1999; Gallo & Matthews, 2003). Given that the majority of these symptoms are also strongly associated with IP (i.e., Clance & Imes, 1978; McGregor, Gee, & Posey, 2008; Ross & Krukowski, 2003), it is possible that IP may be another maladaptive psychopathological stress response in the face of racial discrimination experiences. In line with previous research revealing the commonality and deleterious effects of racial discrimination within the lives of African American college students attending PWIs, the aforementioned models support the idea that exposure to racial discrimination can have significant negative effects on the psychological development of African American young adults.

**Developmental Significance**

While the previous models are useful in understanding how experiences with racial discrimination can shape mental health outcomes, none have noted how the developmental significance of the transition into adulthood may factor into the links among racial discrimination, racial identity and IP. Emerging adulthood is a developmental period during which individuals grapple with identity and begin experiencing life in new environments outside that of the familiar familial context (Arnett & Brody, 2008; Arnett, 2000). It may be during this time period that young adults are most susceptible to IP development, as Harvey
(1982) suggests that one’s experience of IP is greatest upon entering a new role (e.g., a college freshman, a first year graduate student).

Given that the risk of developing IP may be at its peak during the transition to emerging adulthood, it is important to consider the experiences of African American youth in this context. African American college students often must contend with race-related stressors (e.g., culturally insensitive instructors, negative stereotypes, discrimination; Austin et al., 2009; Cokley et al., 2013; Franklin-Jackson & Carter, 2007; Utsey, Chae, Brown, & Kelly, 2002; Wei et al., 2010) while also contending with school related stress (e.g., academic stress, social stress; Arnett & Brody, 2008; Cokley et al., 2013). Previous studies suggest that such stressors may be exacerbated within PWIs (Ewing et al., 1996; Neville, Heppner, Ji, & Thye, 2004; Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007), as African American students are more likely to experience racial discrimination in environments which are predominantly non-Black (Arnett & Brody, 2008; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Scottham, Sellers, & Nguyen, 2008). This finding is consistent with previous work suggesting that African American students face an uphill battle in personal development and academic success when attending PWIs (Allen, 1992). Allen (1992) attributes these struggles to the lack of necessary resources in place for students of color to succeed (e.g., tutoring programs, organization for students of color; cultural programs). As such, while African American students are grappling with their own identity and what it means to be Black, they are also contending with the unique racial stressors (e.g., exposure to racial discrimination, racial and ethnic underrepresentation in academic courses, strained relationships with peers and professors of other racial groups, and being the first in the family to attend college; Greer & Brown, 2011; Greer & Chwalisz, 2007), that come with being a racial minority on a predominantly White campus. Within such
environments (e.g., PWIs) the opportunity for identity exploration and development for African American students may be fairly limited due to restricted opportunities and experiences with racial discrimination (Arnett & Brody, 2008; Blank et al., 2004; Way, Santos, Niwa, & Kim-Gervey, 2008). Taken together, myriad unique racial stressors African American students encounter during their transition to adulthood may ultimately influence IP experiences.

**Imposter Phenomenon**

Imposter phenomenon is a particular negative psychological outcome that may be associated with blatant and subtle experiences of racial discrimination. Coined by Clance and Imes (1978), IP was first observed during individual psychotherapy sessions, in which high achieving women described intense feelings of fear that their accolades, achievements, and success would be exposed as fraudulent. Contrary to Clance and Imes’s (1978) original conceptualization of IP, recent literature has illustrated that experiences of IP can affect both males and females (e.g., Cokley et al., 2013; King & Cooley, 1995; Langford & Clance, 1993; Topping, 1983) regardless of occupation (Mattie, Gietzen, Davis, & Prata, 2008; Prata & Gietzen, 2007). Individuals who report experiencing IP commonly attribute their success to external forces (luck; situational forces; good social contacts) rather than internal forces (intelligence, ability, or both). Regardless of academic accomplishment, advanced degrees, or professional status, these individuals believe that they have deceived others regarding their intellect and constantly fear others discovering their perceived lack of ability (Clance & Imes, 1978; Harvey & Katz, 1985).

As alluded to previously, IP has been linked to numerous adverse psychological traits such as higher levels of anxiety (Topping, 1983), depressive symptoms (McGregor et al.,
2008), low self-esteem (Sonnak & Towell, 2001), proneness to shame (Cowman & Ferrari, 2002), fear of failure (Fried-Buchalter, 1997) and self-doubt (Gibson-Beverly & Schwartz, 2008; Ross & Krukowski, 2003) particularly in high achieving individuals (Clance & O’Toole, 1988; Gibson-Beverly & Schwartz, 2008). Furthermore, research examining IP in relation to personality traits suggests IP is positively associated with neuroticism (Ross et al., 2001), introversion (Chae et al., 1995), and perfectionism (Ross & Krukowski, 2003) and negatively related to extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Bernard, Dollinger, & Ramaniah, 2002; Castro, Jones, & Mirsallimi, 2004; Chae et al., 1995; Ross et al., 2001). Additionally, IP has also been associated with various attribution styles such as self-handicapping (Cowman & Ferrari, 2002; Ferrari & Thompson, 2006). This association between IP and self-handicapping is consistent with Clance and colleagues (1978) initial conceptualization of IP, suggesting that individuals who experience IP often attribute their success to unstable external factors (e.g., luck) rather than stable internal factors (e.g., actual intellectual ability) (Castro et al., 2004). In sum, it is evident that individuals who experience IP, persistently perceive themselves and their environments in a maladaptive way (Ross & Krukowski, 2003), which can ultimately have detrimental effects on psychological adjustment.

**Racial Discrimination and IP**

Consistent with the aforementioned theoretical models and the developmental significance of racial discrimination experiences during the transition to emerging adulthood, cross-sectional and prospective studies (e.g., Banks, 2010; Krieger, Kosheleva, Waterman, Chen, & Koenen, 2011; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003) document a link between racial discrimination and a host of unfavorable
psychological well-being outcomes in African American young adults such as anxiety, depressive symptoms, and general psychological distress (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Chao et al., 2012, Harrell, 2000; Hurd, Sellers, Cogburn, Butler-Barnes, & Zimmerman, 2013). In light of the association between racial discrimination and negative mental health outcomes, it is possible that such discriminatory experiences may also be associated with African American young adults’ experiences of IP.

As an example of this link, imagine a first year African American student being mistaken as a janitor or being called a racial slur on campus by a member of another race (e.g., a peer or professor). In order to make sense of the interaction, the student may replay or relive the discriminatory event, which may, in turn, lead to feelings of stress and self-doubt regarding his or her own abilities and competencies compared to his or her peers. Such feelings might lead this student to feel anxious, depressed, and even fearful of situations or interactions in which evaluations will take place by others of different races. Over time, these trepidations may impede on this student’s ability to internalize his or her success, as he or she may attribute doing well to external factors (race, luck, connections) rather than internal factors such as actual intellectual ability.

In light of the unique stressors that African American young adults may experience while transitioning into emerging adulthood (e.g., insensitive comments by peers, negative stereotypes, racial discrimination experiences), it is not surprising that African American students report feelings of alienation, isolation, and anxiety related to academic perceptions and performance (Levin, van Laar, & Sidanius, 2003). As a result, African Americans who are enrolled in higher education programs may feel more anxious and apprehensive about their performance compared to nonminority students, leading to an increase in IP.
experiences. Such feelings of apprehension would be consistent with studies of IP in graduate students that have found IP to be particularly relevant amongst racial minorities in higher education (Ewing et al., 1996; Murakami-Ramalho, Piert, & Militello, 2008).

Although it makes intuitive sense that experiences with racial discrimination may lead to IP, not very many empirical studies have explicitly examined this association. One study that may provide some insight into the association between racial discrimination and IP was conducted by Cokley and colleagues (2013). In a study of 240 self-identified racial minorities including 50 African Americans who ranged in age from 17 – 39, Cokley et al. (2013) examined the association among IP, minority status stress, and mental health. Cokley et al. (2013) defined minority status stress as an amalgamation of unique stressors that racial minorities experience in their daily lives (e.g., experiences with racial discrimination, traumatic stress, educational hegemony, insensitive comments, questions of belonging on a college campus).

Cokley et al. found that minority status stress was positively correlated with IP and psychological distress and negatively associated with positive predictors of well-being. Furthermore, IP was found to be the only significant and unique predictor of both psychological distress and psychological well-being. Given that IP and minority status stress are significantly positively correlated and are associated with similar symptomology (e.g., anxiety, depression, and low self-esteem), it may be that experiences of IP and subsequent mental health are contingent upon initial experiences of minority status stress (e.g., experiences with racial discrimination). Given that such experiences with racism and discrimination may negatively affect identity development, and subsequent mental health, it
is crucial to identify individual factors (e.g., racial identity) that may buffer the deleterious effects of racial discrimination.

**The Protective Role of Racial Identity**

As alluded to earlier, there is heterogeneity in the way in which African Americans are psychologically influenced by experiences with racial discrimination. One protective factor that has garnered significant attention with regard to the effects of racial discrimination on youth outcomes is racial identity (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Neblett & Carter, 2012; Neblett et al., 2012; Sellers et al., 2006; Seaton, 2009). For example, Seaton (2009) found that in the face of racial discrimination, individuals who reported certain dimensions of racial identity were protected against depression and low self-esteem. In addition, a recent meta-analysis examining the association between racial identity and well-being in youth of color, provided evidence that racial identity is positively associated with psychological well-being (Smith & Silva, 2011). Taken together, racial identity has the potential to buffer the negative effects of racial discrimination and promote positive mental health through bolstering self-esteem, self-concept, and coping capabilities (Neblett et al., 2012; Neblett et al., 2004; Rivas-Drake et al., 2014). In light of the potentially beneficial effects of racial identity, it is possible that the same protective mechanisms (e.g., bolstering self-esteem, self-concept, and coping capabilities) may play a role in protecting against the subsequent development of IP in African American young adults.

One theoretical framework commonly used to conceptualize racial identity is the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI). The MMRI operates under four main assumptions: (1) identities can be both stable and situationally influenced; (2) individuals have a number of different hierarchically ordered identities; (3) the most valid indicator of an
individual’s identity is one’s own views of their racial identity; and (4) the MMRI focuses only on the current status of one’s racial identity as opposed to focusing on the development of one’s racial identity (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998).

The MMRI is comprised of four focal dimensions: salience, centrality, regard, and ideology. As defined by Sellers and colleagues, racial salience denotes the extent to which one’s race is a relevant part of one’s self concept at any given moment (Sellers et al., 1998). Racial salience is considered a dynamic variable that is subject to change based on situational factors. Racial centrality refers to the degree to which an individual defines him or herself with regard to race. Said another way, racial centrality represents the extent to which being Black is important in defining oneself. Unlike salience, racial centrality is considered relatively stable over time and across situations. According to the model, racial salience and centrality represent the significance of race in defining oneself (Sellers et al., 1998).

In contrast, racial regard and ideology encapsulate the qualitative meaning of what it means to be Black. Racial regard is described as “the extent to which an individual feels positively about his or her race” (Sellers et al., 1998, p.26). Racial regard is made up of two unique components, private and public regard. Private regard refers to how one positively or negatively one feels about being African American and about others who are African American. An individual who is high in private regard would feel positively about being African American and others who are African American. An individual who is low in private regard feels negatively about being African American and others who are African American. Alternatively, public regard refers to how individuals feel that African Americans are viewed by others (e.g., positively or negatively) in the broader society. Said another way, an individual who is high in public regard perceives others to view African Americans in a
positive light. In contrast, an individual who is low in public regard perceives that others view African Americans in a negative light. Racial ideology refers to an individual’s personal beliefs, opinions, and attitudes about how African Americans should interact with the broader society. Sellers and colleagues state that there are four ideologies that individuals may endorse: assimilationist, humanist, oppressed minority, and nationalist. However, it is also important to recognize that while individuals may favor one dominant ideology, they likely hold a variety of viewpoints that inform how African Americans function (Sellers et al., 1998).

Assimilationist ideology reflects stressing importance on the similarities between African American experiences and the broader American experience. Individuals with this mindset often try to enter the mainstream as much as possible, believing that working within the system is the optimal vein for change. Humanist ideology stresses the importance of the similarities between all humans regardless of race. Individuals favoring this mindset are often concerned with the “big picture” issues facing all humans (e.g., world hunger, homelessness, peace), and, as such, do not restrict their perspective in terms of group or individual distinctive characteristics. The oppressed minority ideology focuses on the similarities and shared experiences between African Americans and other oppressed groups (e.g., LGBT, Jews, ethnic groups of color). Individuals favoring an oppressed minority ideology often believe that alliance building with other oppressed groups is the most useful strategy to bring about change. Lastly, the nationalist ideology reflects beliefs of emphasizing the uniqueness of being Black. African Americans favoring this particular ideology would assert that the experience of African Americans is unlike that of any other group. As such, it is common for
these individuals to prefer social environments in which those around them are also of the same race (Sellers et al., 1998).

**The Significance of Racial Identity**

Literature has consistently illustrated the complex relationship between racial identity, racial discrimination, and psychological well-being (Neblett et al., 2004; Seaton et al., 2010; Seaton, Neblett, Upton, Hammond, & Sellers, 2011; Sellers et al., 2003, 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Wakefield & Hudley, 2007; Yoo & Lee, 2008). Although no studies have examined racial identity in the context of IP, several studies have indicated racial identity to be a protective factor that may bolster positive coping responses and attenuate the deleterious effects of racial discrimination. In particular, racial centrality, racial regard and racial ideology have been shown to act as protective factors against the negative effects racial discrimination can have on mental health (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007). For example, Sellers and colleagues (2003) found that African Americans high in racial centrality reported more experiences with racial discrimination but also reported lower depressive and anxiety symptoms compared to those lower in racial centrality. Similarly, Neblett and colleagues (2004) found that racial centrality buffered the effects of racial discrimination on psychological distress in African American college students (e.g., anxiety, stress, depressive symptoms). In sum, it may be that individuals who describe race as central to their identity are more attuned to perceiving discrimination in their surroundings. As a result, these individuals may be more cognitively prepared to cope with such experiences, which may protect against the development of negative mental health outcomes such as IP.

Literature also suggests that other racial identity dimensions such as regard and ideology may buffer the effects of racial discrimination. For example, Sellers and Shelton
(2003) found that individuals who reported higher nationalist ideology also reported being bothered less by discriminatory experiences. Furthermore, the relationship between experiences with racial discrimination and global psychological distress (e.g., depressive symptoms, anxiety, and perceived stress) was found to be weaker in individuals with higher nationalist beliefs. Similarly, studies by Sellers and Shelton (2003) and Sellers et al. (2006) found public regard to have similar moderating effects on the relationship between racial discrimination and psychological well-being such that lower endorsements of public regard ideology were related to individuals being less bothered by perceived discrimination (Sellers et al., 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). These studies suggest that certain combinations of dimensions of racial identity might be linked to positive psychological well-being in the face of racial discrimination (Quintana, 2007). Moreover, certain combinations of racial identity dimensions might attenuate the effects of IP in the face of racial discrimination experienced by African American young adults.

While many studies have suggested that racial identity can attenuate the association between racial discrimination and well-being, it is also important to recognize that racial identity can confer risk or act as a vulnerability factor in the face of racial discrimination. For example, research has shown that individuals high in racial centrality are more sensitive to perceiving racial discrimination in more ambiguous situations (Operario & Fiske, 2001; Sellers & Shelton, 2003), and may report increased psychological distress (McCoy & Major, 2003) as a result of their increased perceptions of racial discrimination experiences. Furthermore, Sellers and Shelton (2003) found that African American college students high in public regard had greater negative emotional reactivity to racial discrimination than those low in public regard. These findings suggest that the moderating impact of racial
discrimination may depend on the particular dimension of racial identity in question and even the subtle versus blatant nature of the racially discrimination experiences.

**Racial Identity as a Moderator**

How might racial identity moderate the association between racial discrimination and IP? One possibility is that racial identity might be protective against IP development, as certain dimensions of racial identity are thought to bolster one’s self-concept through engendering feelings of pride, self-confidence, and higher self-esteem. Studies examining private regard and racial centrality have found these dimensions to be associated with a positive self-concept and increased self-esteem (Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006; Rowley et al., 1998). Thus, one who reports higher centrality and private regard may be more likely to report lower IP experiences, as these individuals feel positively about being Black and may feel more confident about their abilities compared to those who report higher IP experiences.

However, it also possible that particular dimensions of racial identity may exacerbate the association between racial discrimination and IP. Take for example individuals who feel their race is important in defining their self-concept but also have a high public regard. Previous research suggests that together, high centrality and public regard can increase the effects of racial discrimination (Seaton, 2009). This is consistent with work showing that centrality can increase African Americans’ reports of perceiving racial discrimination (Neblett et al., 2004; Sellers et al., 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). Furthermore, Seaton (2009) argues that previous experiences with racial discrimination may be inconsistent with one’s belief that others feel positively about African Americans (e.g., high public regard). Due to these inconsistencies, individuals with high centrality and high public regard may be more likely to perceive more experiences of racial discrimination and also report higher
feelings of anxiety, due to the potential for future discriminatory encounters. As such, individuals who feel that others view African Americans favorably and also emphasize being Black, yet still experience racial discrimination, may be at an increased risk for IP. Similarly, individuals with certain ideologies that de-emphasize the uniqueness of the African American experience (e.g., assimilationist, humanist) may also be more susceptible to the positive association between racial discrimination and IP. This link between certain ideologies and negative mental health outcomes is consistent with evidence suggesting that individuals who de-emphasize being African American show increased negative outcomes in the face of racial discrimination (e.g., Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Smalls, White, Chavous, & Sellers, 2007). Thus, it may be that an individual will report more depressive symptoms and lower feelings of self-confidence when they devalue the significance of their own race yet still experience racial discrimination.

**Limitations of Existing Studies**

In order to further our understanding of the links among racial discrimination, racial identity, and IP, several limitations must be addressed. First, as noted previously, a paucity of literature exists examining IP in African American populations. Furthermore, only a limited number of studies have examined the link between racial discrimination and IP within African American populations (Cokley et al., 2013). In a similar vein, no study to date has examined how racial identity may inform IP experiences. Due to the lack of studies examining these constructs together, it is unknown how these variables may interact with one another.

Another limitation is that the majority of studies examining racial identity, racial discrimination, and IP often do so through use of cross sectional study designs. However,
given that experiences of racial discrimination may influence IP over time, it is important to consider how racial identity may influence the relationship between racial discrimination and IP. In a similar light, it is difficult to address the temporal order between experiences with racial discrimination and negative mental health outcomes when utilizing cross sectional data (Brown et al., 2000). For example, it may be that African American college students who feel fraudulent in comparison to their peers may be more likely to perceive that they were treated differently due to racial differences. At the same time, greater experiences with racial discrimination may lead one to feel more fraudulent in certain contexts. Due to the possible changes in one’s racial identity, and the potential bidirectional process underlying the association between racial discrimination and IP, this study utilizes a longitudinal design.

In addition, it is also important to consider the few studies that have examined how experiences with different types of racial discrimination (e.g., subtle and blatant) may uniquely affect African American young adult mental health. Given that literature suggests that subtle expressions of racial discrimination have replaced the traditional more overt forms of racial discrimination towards racial minorities (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2002; Noh et al., 2007; Operario & Fiske, 2001; Quillian, 2006), the paucity of studies explicitly examining the unique effects of different forms of racial discrimination is surprising. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, there are significant differences in responses to experiences with racial discrimination in the African American population. As such, it may be that different types of racial discrimination can have varying effects on African Americans’ psychological well-being. Knowing this, it is possible that subtle discriminatory experiences can have a more pronounced effect on negative mental health outcomes such as IP compared to that of experiences of blatant forms of racial discrimination among African American young adults.
Perhaps the most significant shortcoming of the literature is that studies have examined racial identity using a variable-centered approach, for example, only focusing on certain dimensions of racial identity (Chavous et al., 2003; Neville et al., 2004; Seaton et al., 2011; Seaton, 2009). As a result, our knowledge of how each dimension of racial identity may interact with others, different types of racial discrimination, and subsequent mental health is limited. However, because we know that racial identity is informed by multiple dimensions such as various ideologies and the significance of race in defining oneself, it is important to consider how different dimensions of racial identity dimensions interact with one another to influence outcomes. One potential way to do elucidate the unique effect of different combinations of racial identity dimensions is through a profile approach (Chavous et al., 2003). This is important, as studies have noted that the different dimensions of racial identity may not function independently in impacting one’s behaviors and attitudes (Chavous et al., 2003; Seaton, Yip, Morgan-Lopez, & Sellers, 2012; Seaton, 2009; Sellers et al., 1998).

To underscore this point, consider how racial centrality in combination with other dimensions of racial identity might lead to different outcomes as a function of the levels of other racial identity dimensions. On the one hand, a combination of high centrality, high assimilationist ideology, and low public regard, might exacerbate the association between racial discrimination and IP. When an individual sees race as important in defining oneself and feels that African Americans should emphasize similarities with other Americans, but also perceives others hold negative beliefs about African Americans, experiences with racial discrimination may become more salient and difficult to cope with, thus leading to negative mental health outcomes such as IP. In contrast, a person with a combination of high centrality, high assimilationist ideology, and high public regard, might be less likely to
experience IP following racial discrimination. This individual who sees race as important in defining his/herself, feels strongly that African Americans should emphasize similarities with other Americans, and believes that others groups view African Americans favorably, may not be as sensitive in appraising an event as discriminatory. Such a view or perspective may, in turn, shield against negative mental health outcomes such as IP. In light of the different ways in which particular combinations of racial identity may influence the impact of racial discrimination, this study seeks to further our understanding of racial identity by examining the full range of racial identity dimensions as they pertain to different types of racial discrimination and IP in African American young adults.

**The Current Study**

In light of the aforementioned limitations, this study has two specific aims. The first aim of the study is to examine the unique relationship between blatant and subtle racial discrimination and IP. The second aim of the study is to examine the moderating role patterns of racial identity may have in the relationship between specific types of racial discrimination and IP. I will seek to address the following questions:

1. What is the association between different types of racial discrimination (i.e. subtle and blatant) and IP over time?
2. Do patterns of racial identity moderate the association between different types of racial discrimination and IP over time?

In relation to the first question, I hypothesize that IP will be positively associated with both blatant and subtle racial discrimination. Moreover, I contend that the association between racial discrimination and IP will be stronger for subtle discrimination experiences than blatant experiences. This prediction is consistent with the findings of Salvatore and
Shelton (2007), who illustrated ambiguous events of racism to be more stressful than those of blatant racial discrimination. This prediction is also consistent with Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) theoretical model on stress, appraisal, and coping in that individuals may ruminate more and try to make sense about experiences of subtle discrimination which over time may deplete cognitive resources and lead to an increased risk of negative mental health outcomes.

For the second question, although the relationship between racial identity and IP is unknown, previous work examining racial identity and psychological adjustment consistently has shown that certain racial identity dimensions have the ability to moderate the association between racial discrimination and negative psychological outcomes. Although the exact combinations of the profiles in the study sample are unknown, consistent with previous work (e.g., Chavous et al., 2003; Seaton, 2009), I hypothesize that a profile characterized by high reports of racial centrality, high reports of private regard, and low reports of public regard, will attenuate the deleterious effects of blatant and subtle racial discrimination on IP. This prediction is based on prior work suggesting these three dimensions that have been shown to buffer the effects of racial discrimination (e.g., Chavous, Rivas-Drake, Smalls, Griffin, & Cogburn, 2008; Seaton, 2009; Sellers et al., 2006). In contrast, I hypothesize that individuals characterized by racial identity profiles that include high humanist or assimilationist ideology will be more likely to report higher IP experiences in relation to racial discrimination experiences. This is consistent with previous work suggesting that individuals who are in profiles that included high humanist and assimilationist ideology were more prone to depressive symptoms in the face of experiences with racial discrimination (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007). Such depressive symptoms may lead one to feelings of anxiety and self-doubt,
which are both common correlates of IP (Chrisman, Pieper, Clance, Holland, & Glickauf-Hughes, 1995; Ross et al., 2001).
Method

Participants

Data collection was conducted in two waves and consisted of two cohorts of African American students attending a public PWI in the southeastern United States. The first wave was comprised of 157 students (68% female; Cohort 1 = 84, mean age = 19.12; Cohort 2 = 73, mean age = 18.07). The second wave of data was comprised of 137 students (73% female; Cohort 1 = 73, mean age = 19.62; Cohort 2 = 64, mean age = 18.70). Students who participated in both waves 1 and 2 did not differ in gender composition, age, parent educational attainment, racial discrimination, or reports of IP from those who dropped out after wave 1.

Procedures

Following university Institutional Review Board approval, participants were recruited through a list of incoming African American students provided by the university registrar’s office. Students were contacted via email and asked to participate in a longitudinal study examining the impact of stressful life experiences on mental and physical health in African American college students. In order to be eligible to participate, students had to be an African American college student at the university in which the study was conducted, be over the age of 18, and self-identify as African American. Eligible participants completed a battery of online and paper and pencil questionnaires in survey administrations lasting approximately one hour. Participants completed the same battery of questionnaires during the second wave.
of the data collection approximately six months after the completion of the first survey. African American research assistants administered the online questionnaires at each time point. Participants received payment of $15 for participating in each wave of data collection.

**Measures (See Appendix)**

*Racial Discrimination*: College students’ experiences with racial discrimination during the past year were assessed at Time 1 and Time 2 utilizing the *The Daily Life Experiences Scale* (DLE; Harrell, 1994). However, the Time 1 measure was used as the primary measure of racial discrimination in this study. The DLE is a subscale that is a part of Harrell’s (1994) Racism and Life Experience scale. As a whole, this self-report scale is used to assess past experiences with racial discrimination. The DLE subscale is a self-report measure assessing the frequency and extent to which individuals have experienced 18 independent microaggressions as a result of their race. Recent studies (e.g., Lee et al., 2014) suggest that the DLE is comprised of two factors assessing experiences with blatant forms of racial discrimination (3 items; Time 1: $\alpha = .64$; e.g., being insulted, called a name, or harassed”) and subtle forms of discrimination (13 items; Time 1: $\alpha = .93$; e.g., “Being ignored, overlooked, or not given service”). Responses on the DLE are rated from 0 = *never* to 5 = *once a week or more*, with higher scores corresponding to higher levels of experiences with racial discrimination. Previous studies have illustrated the DLE to have reliable and valid psychometric properties (e.g., Neblett & Carter, 2012; Seaton et al., 2011).

*Racial Identity*: To assess the aforementioned dimensions of racial identity, I utilized a shortened version of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI-S; Martin,
For racial identity, participants’ scores at Time 1 on the MIBI-S measure were used as the primary index of racial identity in the study. Responses on the MIBI-S are rated from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*, with responses assessing the three stable dimensions of racial identity: centrality, regard, and ideology. The *Centrality* scale (Time 1: \(\alpha = .68\)) measures the extent to which being African American is central to respondents’ definitions of themselves (e.g., “In general, being Black is important to my self-image”) and consists of four items. Higher scores on the Centrality scale represented race being a more important aspect in defining one’s self. The *Regard* scale is composed of two subscales assessing Private Regard and Public Regard respectively. The *Private Regard* subscale (Time 1: \(\alpha = .87\)) consists of three items measuring the extent to which respondents have positive feelings toward African Americans in general (e.g., “I feel good about Black people”). The *Public Regard* subscale (Time 1: \(\alpha = .85\)) measures the extent to which respondents feel that other groups have positive feelings toward African Americans (e.g., “Overall, Blacks are considered good by others”) and consists of four items. A higher score on the Public Regard subscale demonstrated a belief that other groups have more positive feelings toward African Americans. In contrast, a lower score on the Public Regard subscale demonstrated a belief that other groups have a more negative view of African Americans.

The Ideology scale is composed of four subscales (Assimilationist, Humanist, Minority, and Nationalist). The *Assimilationist* subscale (Time 1: \(\alpha = .59\)), which assesses the extent to which respondents emphasize the similarities between African Americans and mainstream America, is composed of four items. An example of an item is “Blacks should strive to be full members of the American political system.” The *Humanist* subscale (Time 1:
α = .68), which measures the extent to which respondents emphasize the similarities among individuals of all races, is composed of four items. An example of an item is “Blacks should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race.” The Oppressed Minority subscale (Time 1: α = .65) measures the extent to which respondents emphasize the similarities between African Americans and other minority groups and consists of four items. An example item on the minority subscale is “The racism Blacks have experienced is similar to that of other minority groups.” Lastly, the Nationalist subscale (Time 1: α = .66), which measures the extent to which participants emphasize the uniqueness of being African American, consists of four items. An example of an item is “Whenever possible, Blacks should buy from other Black businesses.” Previous studies utilizing factor and regression analyses have illustrated the construct and predictive validity for the MIBI in large African American college samples (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Jones et al., 2013; Seaton, 2009; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997). Reliability analyses in previous studies have yielded Cronbach’s alphas that range from .61 to .81.

**Imposter Phenomenon:** Clance’s Imposter Scale (CIPS; Clance & Imes, 1978). The CIPS (Time 1: α = .93; Time 2: α = .93) is a 20-item self-report measure that assesses the extent to which individuals experience imposter feelings or worries. Responses on the CIPS are rated from 1 = not at all true to 5 = very true, with higher scores reflecting more intense imposter experiences. Sample items from the CIPS include “At times, I feel my success was due to some kind of luck” and “I often compare my ability to those around me and think they may be more intelligent than I am.” Previous studies have illustrated that the CIPS has sound psychometric properties (e.g., French, Ullrich-French, & Follman, 2008; Kumar &
Results

Preliminary Analyses: Racial Discrimination, Racial Identity, and Imposter Phenomenon

Preliminary analyses consisted of examining means and standard deviations among racial identity variables and experiences with racial discrimination at Time 1, and IP at Time 2 (Table 1). On average, college students reported experiencing the three blatant racial discrimination experiences on the subscale “a few times” in the past year at Time 1 ($M = 1.84; SD = .81$). Participants also reported experiencing subtle forms of racial discrimination (13 items), on average, “a few times” in the past year at Time 1 ($M = 2.23; SD = .77$). A total count score was created by summing the total number of discriminatory experiences indicated by participants in order to accurately capture the total number of times participants reported experiences with racial discrimination in the past year. The modal response for total racial discrimination experiences was nine of the 18 items.

Next, I examined means and standard deviations of students’ reports of each racial identity subscale. Participants, on average, reported high levels of assimilationist ideology at Time 1 ($M = 6.13; SD = .82$). Participants also endorsed private regard ($M = 5.72; SD = 1.24$), humanist ideology ($M = 5.5; SD = .98$), oppressed minority ideology ($M = 5.00; SD = 1.10$), and racial centrality ($M = 4.97; SD = 1.37$) at moderate levels. Participants scored below the midpoint on nationalist ideology ($M = 3.62; SD = .97$) and public regard ($M =
3.18; $SD = 1.16$) suggesting that, on average, these students did not emphasize the uniqueness of being African American nor did they feel that others viewed African Americans favorably.

Next, I examined zero-order correlations among racial identity and discrimination variables (Time 1) and IP (Time 2) (see also Table 1). Blatant racial discrimination was positively associated with subtle racial discrimination ($r = .71; p < .001$). Both blatant ($r = .27; p = .001$) and subtle racial discrimination ($r = .26; p = .002$) were associated with IP.

In terms of racial identity, private regard was positively associated with public regard ($r = .29; p < .001$), centrality ($r = .67; p < .001$), assimilationist ($r = .18; p = .02$), and nationalist ideology ($r = .31; p < .001$). Public regard was positively associated with centrality ($r = .16; p = .046$) and humanist ideology ($r = .17; p = .037$). Racial centrality was positively associated with nationalist ideology ($r = .46; p < .01$) and negatively associated with humanist ideology ($r = -.25; p = .001$). Nationalist ideology was negatively correlated with humanist ideology ($r = -.43; p < .001$). The minority subscale was positively related to humanist ($r = .21; p = .009$) and assimilationist ideology ($r = .29; p < .001$). Humanist ideology was positively associated with assimilationist ideology ($r = .24; p = .003$). Lastly, assimilationist ideology was negatively associated with subtle racial discrimination ($r = -.20; p = .012$).

With regard to IP, private regard and public regard were negatively associated with IP ($r = -.34; p < .001$; $r = -.36; p < .001$ respectively).

**Racial Identity Profiles**

Using the data from the six subscales of the MIBI-S measures at Time 1, six latent class models (ranging from one to six clusters) were estimated. Of the six models estimated,
the four-cluster model appeared to be the most appropriate solution. It had the second lowest BIC (3044.3), a non-significant bootstrap $p$ value (.196), and notable reduction in $L^2$ (15%) relative to the one-class model. Although the five-cluster solution showed a further reduction in $L^2$ (16%), this model also had a higher BIC (3067.9), and a significant bootstrap $p$ value (.04), suggesting that the five cluster model was not as parsimonious as the four cluster model. As a result, I utilized the four cluster model as my final solution.

Next, I used the raw and standardized means of each racial identity variable to describe and label the clusters (see Table 2). The largest cluster was labeled *Moderate Black Centrality* ($n = 47; 36\%$ of sample). This cluster was characterized by scores slightly below the sample mean on six out of the seven racial identity subscales, with the exception of the nationalist subscale, which was near the sample mean. With respect to the raw means, the Moderate Black Centrality cluster had relatively high scores on assimilationist, private regard, humanist, and minority subscales, moderate scores on centrality and nationalist, and low scores on public regard. The second largest cluster was labeled *High Centrality/Multiculturalist* ($n = 34; 26\%$), and was characterized by scores near the mean for nationalist and minority ideology, and high scores relative to the sample mean (approximately .5 SD above the mean) for private regard, public regard, centrality, humanist, and assimilationist subscales. In terms of the raw means, this cluster had relatively high scores on private regard, centrality, minority, humanist, and assimilationist subscales, and moderate scores on the public regard and nationalist subscales. The third largest cluster ($n = 33; 25\%$), *Race Focused*, was characterized by high standardized scores on centrality, nationalist, and private regard, (approximately 1 SD above the mean), scores near the mean for public regard, assimilationist, and minority subscales, and low humanist scores relative to
the sample. With respect to the raw means, the race focused cluster had relatively high scores on private regard, centrality, minority, humanist, and assimilationist subscales, moderate nationalist scores, and low scores on the public regard subscale. The smallest cluster (n = 18; 14%), Humanist, had low standardized scores (approximately 1 SD below the mean) on private regard, centrality, and nationalist subscales, scores slightly above the mean on minority, and assimilationist, slightly below mean level scores on public regard, and high standardized scores on humanist (.9 SD above the mean). In considering the raw means, the humanist cluster had moderately high scores on the minority, humanist, and assimilationist subscales, and moderately low scores on public regard, private regard, centrality, and nationalist subscales. Figure 1 presents a graphic summary of the four racial identity clusters using standardized means of the racial identity variables at Time 1.

**Cluster Group Differences**

Analyses were conducted in order to assess cluster group differences in age, gender, or mother’s educational attainment. Results suggested no significant cluster differences in gender ($\chi^2 [3, N = 157] = .254$, ns), age ($F [3, 153] = .33, p = .801$), or mother educational attainment ($F [3, 151] = .49, p = .693$).

Two separate analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were utilized in order to assess cluster differences in college student experiences of blatant and subtle racial discrimination at Time 1. Gender, age, and mother educational attainment were included in each model as covariates. No significant main effect was found for cluster membership in experiencing blatant racial discrimination at Time 1 ($F [3, 155] = .892, p = .447$). Similarly, no significant main effect was found for cluster membership in subtle discrimination experiences at Time 1 ($F [3, 155] = 1.37, p = .254$).
Associations among Racial Discrimination, Racial Identity, and IP

To investigate the role of subtle and blatant forms of racial discrimination as risk factors and patterns of racial identity as a resilience factor in the context of IP, general linear model (GLM) analyses of variance (ANOVA) were estimated. Due to the high correlation between subtle and blatant discrimination ($r = .70$), two separate ANOVAs were conducted in order to examine the moderating effect of racial identity in the association between subtle and blatant racial discrimination and IP. Age, gender, mother’s highest level of education completed, and IP at Time 1 were included as covariates in both models. Racial discrimination and cluster group membership at Time 1 were entered as main effects in each model. Finally, separate interaction terms were created between subtle racial discrimination experiences at Time 1 and the cluster group membership variables and between blatant experiences with racial discrimination at Time 1 and the cluster group membership variables. All continuous variables were mean-centered and the interaction terms were the cross-product terms of the centered discrimination variables and the cluster-group membership variable at Time 1.

Covariates of Psychological Adjustment Outcomes

The first GLM ANOVA model included Time 1 blatant racial discrimination and explained 18% of the variance in IP at Time 2 (see Table 3). Gender was found to be a significant covariate in the model, such that females reported significant increases in IP at Time 2 relative to baseline levels of IP ($b = -.36; p = .026$). The level of IP at Time 1 was strongly related to IP at Time 2 ($b = .27; p = .005$). With respect to subtle discrimination, the overall model explained 19% of the variance in IP (see Table 4). Gender was again found to be a significant covariate, such that females reported significantly higher IP at Time 2 ($b = -.34$).
.35; \( p = .028 \)). IP reports at Time 1 were also significantly related to IP experiences at Time 2 \( (b = .29 \ p = .002) \). No other significant covariates were found for either model.

**Racial Discrimination as a Risk Factor for IP**

Analyses revealed that participants who experienced greater instances of blatant discrimination at Time 1 \( (b = .21 \ p = .015) \) reported increases in IP at Time 2 relative to baseline levels of IP at Time 1. Similarly, analyses revealed that participants who experienced greater instances of subtle discrimination at Time 1 reported significant increases of IP at Time 2 \( (b = .24 \ p = .007) \) after controlling for covariates. There was no significant difference found between the predictive ability of blatant versus subtle discrimination in predicting IP.

**Patterns of Racial Identity as Compensatory Resilience Factors**

In the GLM including blatant racial discrimination, the main effect for cluster group membership was significant \( (F [3, 132] = 2.82, p = .042; \) Table 3) which is indicative of certain patterns of racial identity profiles serving as compensatory resilience factors across all levels of racial discrimination. Similar results were found for the GLM including subtle racial discrimination, as the main effect for cluster group membership was significant \( (F [3, 132] = 2.73, p = .047; \) Table 4). Bonferroni post hoc analysis indicated that students in the Moderate Black Centrality group reported significant increases in IP at Time 2 \( (M = 2.93; SD = .115) \), as compared to students in the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group \( (M = 2.43; SD = .136) \) in the GLM including blatant discrimination \( (p = .032) \). Similar post hoc results were found for the GLM including subtle discrimination, as the Moderate Black Centrality group reported significantly higher reports of IP at Time 2 \( (M = 2.93; SD = .114) \), than students in
the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group \((M = 2.44; \ SD = .135)\) \((p = .044)\). No other significant group differences were found in reports of IP at Time 2.

Lastly, the blatant discrimination x IP interaction and subtle discrimination x IP interaction were examined. Analyses yielded no significant interaction between racial discrimination and racial identity as predictors of IP at Wave 2.
Discussion

This study examined the associations among specific types of discrimination, IP, and racial identity in African American college students attending a PWI. The first aim of this study was to examine the unique relationship between blatant and subtle discrimination and IP. Next, I was interested in whether racial identity would act as a protective factor in the context of racial discrimination experiences and IP. Two key findings emerged from the data. First, IP at Time 2 was significantly predicted by prior subtle and blatant forms of racial discrimination. Second, initial racial identity attitudes pertaining to the significance and meaning of race were associated with subsequent levels of IP. These findings extend the prior IP literature and add to the list of negative effects racial discrimination experiences may have on the mental health functioning of African American young adults attending PWIs.

Racial Discrimination as a Risk Factor for IP

Although previous studies have illustrated experiences with race-related stress to be linked to IP, the present study is unique in that it is the first to reveal that both blatant and subtle discrimination experiences may cause changes in IP over time. Due to its overt nature, scholars suggest that blatant discrimination may be easier to cope with, as it is more easily recognized and readily attributed to external factors (Jones et al., 2013). However, the current study suggests that over time, blatant discrimination can still be significantly detrimental to the psychological well-being of African American young adults, as it was a significant predictor of increases in IP approximately six months following prior year reports of racial discrimination. This finding is consistent with work suggesting that encounters with blatant
discrimination can erode positive affect and, over time, lead to more severe mental health outcomes (Noh et al., 2007). In the context of the current study, experiences of blatant discrimination at a PWI may lead to feelings of social isolation—a significant and positive predictor of psychological distress (Negi, 2013)—which may ultimately be a precursor to and perpetuate cognitions of self-doubt and discounting of actual ability. In light of the negative association between blatant discrimination and self-esteem (Noh et al., 2007), it could also be that encounters with blatant discrimination decrease self-esteem and self-confidence which, in turn, manifests as IP. However, because the current study did not explicitly examine social isolation, self-esteem, or self-confidence in relation to discrimination and IP, more work needs to be done to examine how these factors may contribute to IP in African American youth. Taken together, it is crucial for scholars to not overlook the impact of blatant forms of racial discrimination on psychological well-being, as these experiences can still take a significant toll on the psyche of African American emerging adults.

As predicted, subtle forms of discrimination were also significant predictors of IP over time. Jones and colleagues (2013) suggest that in making sense of subtle discrimination, individuals may make internal attributions, or blame themselves to make sense of subtle discriminatory encounters. Given the chronicity of subtle discrimination in the lives of African American youth, it is possible that over time such attributions may become internalized, leading to feelings of depression, anxiety, and decreased self-esteem, ultimately manifesting as IP. Interestingly, although more instances of subtle discrimination were reported, subtle discrimination was not found to be a significantly stronger predictor of IP compared to blatant discrimination. This finding is inconsistent with work suggesting subtle discrimination to be more harmful than that of blatant discrimination. However, given the
seemingly countless ways in which subtle discrimination can be expressed (e.g., Utsey et al., 2002), it is possible that the measure used to assess discriminatory experiences did not fully capture the full range of possible subtle encounters with discrimination (e.g., accusations of “acting White”; hearing insensitive ambiguous comments about race). As such, future work should utilize alternative methods such as experience sampling to more accurately capture the lived experiences of African American youth.

*Racial Identity Profiles*

The second aim of this study was to examine if patterns of racial identity moderated the association between specific types of racial discrimination and IP. Through use of latent profile analyses, four patterns or profiles of racial identity were identified within our sample of African American college students. Overall, these four profiles of racial identity allow us to highlight the heterogeneity within our sample, by providing a more detailed picture of the significance and meaning participants placed on being African American. Through use of a profile approach that considers the complex interplay between all seven dimensions of the MMRI, the current study sheds light on how each identity subscale is related to the others and other relevant variables of interest (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007). Through the profile analysis, four patterns of racial identity that are consistent with profiles found in prior work examining racial identity through a person-centered approach emerged. For example, Banks and Kohn-Wood (2007) also found a Multiculturalist and Race focused cluster in their four cluster solution of racial identity profiles. Similarly, in their profile analyses of racial identity ideology, Rowley and colleagues (2003) found a Multiculturalist cluster as well as an Integrationist cluster that is comparable to the Humanist profile in this study. Moreover, both Banks and Kohn-Wood (2007) and Rowley et al. (2003) observed an “undifferentiated”
cluster, which is similar to the Moderate Black Centrality group, in terms of having similar racial identity scores relative to the mean across each dimension of racial identity.

*Racial Identity as a Compensatory Factor*

Significant cluster differences were found in participants’ reports of IP at Time 2, suggesting that combinations of racial identity can influence increases or decreases in IP across all levels of discrimination. Specifically, on average, students in the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group, reported significantly lower levels of IP at Time 2 compared to the Moderate Black Centrality group (controlling for IP at Time 1). In fact, members of the High Centrality/Multiculturalist cluster reported the lowest levels of IP at Time 2, while members of the Moderate Black Centrality group reported the highest levels of IP at Time 2 compared to all other groups.

Considering the significant differences in reports of IP between the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group and the Moderate Black Centrality group, it is important to unpack the differences between the two clusters in order to understand how racial identity may protect or increase risk for IP in the context of discrimination. In comparing these two profiles, the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group was significantly higher than the Moderate Black Centrality group in centrality, private regard, public regard, assimilationist, and humanist ideology. Given the frequently documented protective utility of high centrality and high private regard in the context of discrimination (Neblett et al., 2004; Sellers et al., 2006, it is not surprising that, on average, the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group endorsed significantly higher levels of centrality and private regard relative to that of the Moderate Black Centrality cluster. As discussed previously, it is possible that possessing positive cognitions and perceptions toward being African American may bolster one’s
general self-esteem (Rowley et al., 1998) and self-esteem about being African American (Sellers et al., 2003). Scholars posit that having a positive image towards oneself and one’s ethnic group can repudiate the development and internalization of feelings and messages of inferiority fueled by discriminatory encounters (Mandara, Gaylord-Harden, Richards, Ragsdale, 2009; Tynes, Umana-Taylor, Rose, Lin, & Anderson, 2012). Furthermore, students in the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group were highest in public regard scores across all four profiles. Rivas-Drake, Hughes, and Way (2008) argue that individuals who perceive that society views their particular ethnic group positively may draw from positive experiences with other racial groups, which may attenuate the deleterious impact of experiences with discrimination. Given this positive frame of reference, predominantly White contexts may be particularly less daunting to individuals who do not perceive that the larger society views African Americans negatively (Chavous et al., 2003). Although empirical work suggests that assimilationist and humanist ideology may exacerbate the association between racial discrimination and negative psychological adjustment outcomes (Sellers, Chavous, et al., 1998), my study suggests that when combined with high levels of centrality and regard, high aspirations to connect with others on the basis of shared human experiences may positively impact appraisals of experiences of discrimination and subsequent psychological well-being.

In comparison to the High Centrality/Multiculturalist profile, students in the Moderate Black Centrality profile had substantially lower private regard and centrality scores, along with the lowest public regard and assimilationist scores of any of the four profiles. In considering private regard, research suggests that low levels of private regard are linked to increases in anxiety and internalizing symptoms, particularly in the context of discrimination (Bynum, Best, Barnes, & Burton, 2008). As such, it may be that individuals in
the Moderate Black Centrality group feel more anxious when faced with discrimination, as they may be faced not only with the harmful effects of discrimination, but also the internal stress of struggling with their own identity. Furthermore, given the moderate centrality levels of this group, it is possible that members of this group may perceive more instances of discrimination (Operario & Fiske, 2001; Sellers & Shelton, 2003), but do not yet have the skills to adequately handle such experiences. Although low public regard has generally been found to be a protective factor in the context of racial discrimination (Neblett & Roberts, 2013; Sellers et al., 2006), the current study suggest that when considered in combination with lower levels of private regard and centrality, low public regard may actually increase risk for negative psychological outcomes such as IP. For example, literature suggests that low public regard is a significant risk factor for perceiving more experiences with racial discrimination (Neblett et al., 2004; Seaton, 2009). Considering that members of the Moderate Black Centrality group generally reported significantly lower levels of centrality and regard compared to that of the High Centrality/Multiculturalist group, it may be that individuals in the Moderate Black Centrality group may cope with discrimination in maladaptive ways (e.g., ruminating about the event), thus increasing risk for negative mental health outcomes. Hammond (2012) suggests that individuals lacking positive coping mechanisms in the face of discrimination, may stand a higher risk to internalize the negative effects of discrimination (e.g., anxiety, depression), which may in turn lead to feelings of intellectual incompetence and significantly impede on academic achievement (Chao et al., 2012). Taken together, these findings highlight the importance of using a person-centered approach in examining racial identity, as alone certain dimensions of racial identity may
operate in considerably different ways than when considered in combination with other dimensions.

**Clinical Implications**

Findings from the current study have important implications that could help to inform treatment of African Americans attending PWIs. First, the current study suggests that regardless of the type of racial discrimination, these experiences are common and are important to consider in relation to the mental health functioning of African American emerging adults. Therefore, clinicians should be willing and able to discuss and process experiences with discrimination with their clients, as individuals who perceive higher levels of discrimination may be at an increased risk for IP and associated negative mental health correlates such as anxiety and depression.

At its core, IP reflects psychologically disparaging cognitions which may impact self-esteem, self-confidence, and academic achievement and motivation. Cognitive behavioral therapy may be a particularly appropriate modality of treatment, when working with clients experiencing IP, as clinicians could work to identify and challenge cognitive distortions that may be underlying feelings of intellectual incompetence.

In addition to addressing experiences of discrimination and cognitive distortions, it is also important for clinicians to consider a client’s racial identity in formulating case conceptualizations, as the current study suggests that particular patterns of racial identity may increase risk for IP in African American college students. As such, clinicians should have at least a basic understanding of what a client’s racial identity may be, particularly when discrimination is salient in their presenting problems. This information could be collected in a number of ways. For example, one could gather racial identity information directly through
administering a racial identity measure such as the MIBI-S in session, or indirectly through having informal conversations that assess what it means personally for the client to be African American, how central being African American is to his/her identity, and their beliefs about how African Americans should interact with the broader society.

Clinicians could then use this information and compare responses to that of the profiles found in the current study. If endorsements of racial identity are similar to that of the Moderate Black Centrality profile, therapists could identify particular dimensions that need to be fostered in order to decrease risk for outcomes such as IP. For example, therapists could recommend different cultural events for a client to seek out in order to bolster centrality and/or low private regard. As shown in the racial socialization literature, messages of racial pride can bolster self-esteem and increase racial identification (Harris-Britt, Valrie, Kurtz-Costes, & Rowley, 2010; Neblett, Smalls, Ford, Nguyen, & Sellers, 2009). Similarly, a therapist could encourage involvement in local organizations whose purpose is to foster a supportive environment for students of color (e.g., Black Student Union), in order to increase positive feelings about being African American and about others who are African American.

While it may be important to engage African American clients around conversations, behaviors and practices that pertain to racial discrimination and racial identity, numerous factors make doing so a challenging enterprise. For example, therapists are often limited in their multicultural competency and may not know how to appropriately address or talk about experiences of racial discrimination. Similarly, clients may be hesitant to speak about race, particularly in contexts that are predominantly White. Furthermore, therapists may not have the knowledge to recommend events or contexts that focus on cultural enrichment. As such,
future work and training initiatives should consider effective and appropriate ways to discuss issues pertaining to race and racial identity, particularly in a therapeutic context.

Study Limitations and Future Directions

This study makes several important contributions to the literature, advancing our knowledge of the relationships among racial discrimination, racial identity, and IP. As with all studies, there are limitations that should be noted. First, the current study may not generalize beyond the present sample. Given that my sample was composed of college students, it is unclear how these findings would apply to African Americans outside of the university context. Similarly, the study used a primarily female sample, and it is possible that my findings may have differed if more males were included. Literature suggests that African American males may be more prone to exposure to racial discrimination (Cooper, McLoyd, Wood, & Hardaway, 2008; Priest et al., 2013). As a result, future work should aim to include a more representative sample in order to further shed light on the interrelations among the constructs of interest. In a similar vein, scholars posit that race-related stressors may significantly differ between a predominantly White and a more racially diverse context (e.g., Seaton & Yip, 2009). In light of the fact that my participants come from a PWI, it is difficult to say whether or not these findings might apply to other samples of African American emerging adults, particularly those attending HBCUs. Future work should begin investigating the different contexts and factors that may exacerbate or attenuate IP within African American populations.

Second, it is possible that the measure used to assess for IP does not adequately capture the unique experiences of African American emerging adults. As discussed previously, Clance’s Imposter Scale was developed to highlight the experiences of high
achieving White women in the late 1970’s, and as a result may overlook the unique race-related experiences that students of color may encounter. Exploratory analyses illustrate that on Clance’s Imposter Scale, African American college students seem to endorse some items (e.g., I can give the impression that I’m more competent than I really am) at a much higher rate than others (e.g., At times, I feel my success has been due to some kind of luck). These findings suggest that the traditional conceptualization of imposter phenomenon may not fully capture imposter related experiences within the African American college student population. Further exploration of the differences in IP endorsement by African American students has the potential to increase our understanding of the ways in which IP may uniquely manifest itself within the African American college student population. Future work should also examine how IP may differ from other race-related barriers such as stereotype threat. Given that stereotype threat is activated in specific situations, it may be that IP reflects a greater internalization or acceptance of negative stereotypical beliefs that is pervasive throughout contexts.

Lastly, although our data suggests that discrimination may lead to IP over time, we can only speculate as to why that may be, as it was not explicitly measured. As such, future studies may want to take a qualitative perspective in asking participants how discrimination may have led to IP experiences. Such an approach may provide a better perspective of the underlying mechanisms that link discrimination and IP experiences in the lives of African American emerging adults.

Conclusion

This study examined the association among specific types of discrimination, racial identity, and IP in African American emerging adults. Through use of an innovative
analytical approach, my study adds to the scant IP literature investigating the role racial identity may play in protecting or increasing risk for experiencing IP. My results revealed that both blatant and subtle racial discrimination are not only common experiences, but also significantly predictive of increased feelings of self-doubt. Moreover, certain racial identity profiles were found to significantly increase and decrease IP reports in relation to experiences with discrimination. Therefore, racial identity is an important individual factor to take into account in understanding the relationship between discrimination and psychological well-being among African American emerging adults. Future work should continue building on the current study, elucidating the complex underlying mechanisms that link race-related stress and IP in African American youth.
Table 1
Intercorrelations, Means, Standard Deviations for Key Study Variables (N = 157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Blatant RD Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subtle RD Time 1</td>
<td>.707**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IP Time 2</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Centrality</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private Regard</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.341**</td>
<td>.672**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Public Regard</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.359**</td>
<td>.160*</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assimilationist</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.199*</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Humanist</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.252**</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Minority</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.206**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Nationalist</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* RD = Racial Discrimination. IP = Imposter Phenomenon

**p < .01. *p < .05
Table 2
Raw and Standardized Means of Racial Identity Subscales at Time 1
by Racial Identity Cluster  \((N = 157)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Identity Variable</th>
<th>Moderate Black Centrality</th>
<th>High Centrality/Multiculturalist</th>
<th>Race Focused</th>
<th>Humanist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Centrality</td>
<td>4.3 (.91)</td>
<td>5.64 (.79)</td>
<td>6.32 (.53)</td>
<td>4.97 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Regard</td>
<td>5.22 (1.15)</td>
<td>6.47 (.47)</td>
<td>6.65 (.4)</td>
<td>5.72 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Regard</td>
<td>2.86 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.18 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilationist</td>
<td>5.64 (.83)</td>
<td>6.57 (.54)</td>
<td>6.22 (.79)</td>
<td>6.13 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>5.2 (.93)</td>
<td>6.13 (.57)</td>
<td>4.7 (.74)</td>
<td>5.5 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppressed Minority</td>
<td>4.89 (1.00)</td>
<td>5.31 (1.06)</td>
<td>4.72 (1.12)</td>
<td>5.0 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>3.64 (.77)</td>
<td>3.35 (.82)</td>
<td>4.51 (.82)</td>
<td>3.62 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Centrality</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Regard</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Regard</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilationist</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppressed Minority</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Summary of racial identity groups using standardized means.
Table 3
General Linear Model Analysis of Variance Predicting the Imposter Phenomenon
From Blatant Racial Discrimination, Racial Identity, and Control Variables (N = 157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>4.595</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64 (2.0)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.36 (.16)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.074</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05 (.10)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Educational Attainment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.03 (.04)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blatant Discrimination (T1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21 (.08)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>6.112</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposter Phenomenon (T1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27 (.09)</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>8.089</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>1086.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
General Linear Model Analysis of Variance Predicting the Imposter Phenomenon From Subtle Racial Discrimination, Racial Identity, and Control Variables (N = 157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.89 (2.0)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.35 (.15)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09 (.11)</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Educational Attainment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.04 (.04)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Discrimination (T1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.24 (.08)</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposter Phenomenon (T1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.29 (.09)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>74.355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1086.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>97.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A: DAILY LIFE EXPERIENCES SCALE (DLE; HARRELL, 1997)

The next questions ask you to think about how being Black relates to experiences you have had IN THE PAST YEAR. On the left side, tell us how often you have experienced each event because you were Black. On the right side, tell us how much it bothered you when the experience happened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>How often did it happen to you because of race?</th>
<th>How much did it bother you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = never</td>
<td>1 = once</td>
<td>2 = a few times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = about once a month</td>
<td>3 = once a week or more</td>
<td>4 = a few times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = once a week or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 = once a week or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did it happen to you because of race?</td>
<td>How much did it bother you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = never happened to me</td>
<td>1 = didn’t bother me at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = bothered me a little</td>
<td>3 = bothered me somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = bothered me a lot</td>
<td>5 = bothered me extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Being ignored, overlooked or not given service (in a restaurant, store, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Being treated rudely or disrespectfully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Being accused of something or treated suspiciously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Others reacting to you as if they were afraid or intimidated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Being observed or followed while in public places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Being treated as if you were “stupid”, being “talked down to”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Your ideas or opinions being minimized, ignored, or devalued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Overhearing or being told an offensive joke or comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Being insulted, called a name, or harassed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Others expecting your work to be inferior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Not being taken seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Being left out of conversations or activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Being treated in an “overly” friendly or superficial way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Other people avoiding you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Being mistaken for someone who serves others (i.e., janitor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Being stared at by strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Being laughed at, made fun of, or taunted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Being mistaken for someone else of your same race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: MULTIDIMENSIONAL INVENTORY OF BLACK IDENTITY—SHORT FORM (MARTIN ET AL., 2010)

Read the statements below and check the box next to the response that most closely represents how you feel. Do not check more than one response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Overall, being Black has very little to do with how I feel about myself.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It is important for Black people to surround their children with Black art, music, and literature.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I feel good about Black people.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Overall, Blacks are considered good by others.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I am happy that I am Black.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Blacks would be better off if they adopted Afrocentric values.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Black people must organize themselves into a separate Black political force.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. In general, others respect Black people.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Whenever possible, Blacks should buy from other Black businesses.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. I have a strong sense of belonging to Black people.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Blacks should have the choice to marry interracially.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Blacks would be better off if they were more concerned with the</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems facing all people than just focusing on Black issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Being an individual is more important than identifying oneself as Black.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Blacks should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. I have a strong attachment to other Black people.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. The struggle for Black liberation in American should be closely related to the struggle of other oppressed groups.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Blacks should strive to be full members of the American political system.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Blacks should try to work within the system to achieve their political and economic goals.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Blacks should strive to integrate all institutions which are segregated.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. The racism Blacks have experienced is similar to that of other minority groups.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Blacks should feel free to interact socially with White people.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. There are other people who experience racial injustice and indignities similar to Black Americans.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Being Black is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. The same forces which have led to the oppression of Blacks have also led to the oppression of other groups.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. In general, other groups view Blacks in a positive manner.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z. I am proud to be Black.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa. Society views Black people as an asset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: CLANCE’S IMPOSTER SCALE (CLANCE & IMES, 1978)

For each question, please circle the number that best indicates how true the statement is of you. It is best to give the first response that enters your mind rather than dwelling on each statement and thinking about it over and over.

1. I have often succeeded on a test or task even though I was afraid that I would not do well before I undertook the task.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true

2. I can give the impression that I’m more competent than I really am.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true

3. I avoid evaluations if possible and have a dread of others evaluating me.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true

4. When people praise me for something I’ve accomplished, I’m afraid I won’t be able to live up to their expectations of me in the future.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true

5. I sometimes think I obtained my present position or gained my present success because I happened to be in the right place at the right time or knew the right people.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true

6. I’m afraid people important to me may find out that I’m not as capable as they think I am.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true

7. I tend to remember the incidents in which I have not done my best more than those times I have done my best.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true

8. I rarely do a project or task as well as I’d like to do it.
   1                               2                               3                               4                               5
   Not at all true                Very true
9. Sometimes I feel or believe that my success in my life or in my job has been the result of some kind of error.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true

10. It’s hard for me to accept compliments or praise about my intelligence or accomplishments.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true

11. At times, I feel my success has been due to some kind of luck.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true

12. I’m disappointed at times in my present accomplishments and think I should have accomplished much more.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true

13. Sometimes I’m afraid others will discover how much knowledge or ability I really lack.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true

14. I’m often afraid that I may fail at a new assignment or undertaking even though I generally do well at what I attempt.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true

15. When I’ve succeeded at something and received recognition for my accomplishments, I have doubts that I can keep repeating that success.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true

16. If I receive a great deal of praise and recognition for something I’ve accomplished, I tend to discount the importance of what I’ve done.

   1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true  Very true
17. I often compare my ability to those around me and think they may be more intelligent than I am.

Not at all true  Very true

18. I often worry about not succeeding with a project or examination, even though others around me have considerable confidence that I will do well.

Not at all true  Very true

19. If I’m going to receive a promotion or gain recognition of some kind, I hesitate to tell others until it is an accomplished fact.

Not at all true  Very true

20. I feel bad and discouraged if I’m not “the best” or at least “very special” in situations that involve achievement.

Not at all true  Very true
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