

BLACK PROPINQUITY IN 21st CENTURY AMERICA

by

LORENZA LOCKETT

B.S., Kansas State University, 1999

M.S.W., Arizona State University, 2006

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Family Studies and Human Services

College of Human Ecology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

2015

ABSTRACT

There is considerable research on concepts of Blackness in America. Much of this research is conducted within a Eurocentric as opposed to an Afrocentric perspective. Social research has established that ideals, social norms, and values about Black minority groups may be shaped by dominant culture premises and that the dominant culture of any society can influence the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of minority group members coexisting within that culture. The *White racial frame* holds that over time a dominant cultural perspective in the U.S. has installed a positive orientation to “White” and whiteness and a strong negative orientation toward racial “others”, particularly toward Black Americans. The present research explores this phenomenon from an Afrocentric perspective, assessing propinquity preferences of non-native Immigrant and native-born American Blacks toward native-born Blacks.

Utilizing data drawn from *The National Survey on American Life 2001-2003* (Jackson, 2007) the study assessed the degree of *Black propinquity* (i.e., self-identified feelings of closeness and identity preferences with native-born Blacks) expressed *within* and *between* subsamples of *native-born African American* ($n = 3,464$) and *non-native (chiefly Afro-Caribbean) Blacks* ($n = 1,118$). More specifically, it hypothesized that native-born Blacks would display greater propinquity preferences than Immigrant Blacks for native-American Blacks depicted as more *economically-challenged* as well as *socially affluent* and *elite*; also, it expected they would report greater support for *socially undesirable* as well as *socially desirable* Blacks than would Immigrant Blacks.

A series of hierarchical regression analyses modeled the unique and joint predictive variance of socio-demographic, socio-economic, and Black (derived) target characteristics within each Black subpopulation against the primary outcome variable (propinquity). Overall

regression models for each Black group were highly similar in the proportion of explained variance (27% for native Blacks; 26% for Immigrant Blacks) and weighted contributions of three blocks of variables; derived variables for Black target characteristics contributed most of the total variance within each group. No statistically reliable differences for R score values were found between the two Black subpopulations on these derived variables. Findings are discussed in the context of the White racial frame perspective, secondary data methodology, and future research.

BLACK PROPINQUITY IN 21ST CENTURY AMERICA

by

LORENZA LOCKETT

B.S., Kansas State University, 1999

M.S.W., Arizona State University, 2006

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Family Studies and Human Services

College of Human Ecology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

2015

Approved by:

Co-Major Professor
Farrell J. Webb, PhD

Approved by:

Co-Major Professor
Walter Schumm, PhD

COPYRIGHT

LORENZA LOCKETT

2015

ABSTRACT

There is considerable research on concepts of Blackness in America. Much of this research is conducted within a Eurocentric as opposed to an Afrocentric perspective. Social research has established that ideals, social norms, and values about Black minority groups may be shaped by dominant culture premises and that the dominant culture of any society can influence the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of minority group members coexisting within that culture. The *White racial frame* holds that over time a dominant cultural perspective in the U.S. has installed a positive orientation to “White” and whiteness and a strong negative orientation toward racial “others”, particularly toward Black Americans. The present research explores this phenomenon from an Afrocentric perspective, assessing propinquity preferences of non-native Immigrant and native-born American Blacks toward native-born Blacks.

Utilizing data drawn from *The National Survey on American Life 2001-2003* (Jackson, 2007) the study assessed the degree of *Black propinquity* (i.e., self-identified feelings of closeness and identity preferences with native-born Blacks) expressed *within* and *between* subsamples of *native-born African American* ($n = 3,464$) and *non-native (chiefly Afro-Caribbean) Blacks* ($n = 1,118$). More specifically, it hypothesized that native-born Blacks would display greater propinquity preferences than Immigrant Blacks for native-American Blacks depicted as more *economically-challenged* as well as *socially affluent* and *elite*; also, it expected they would report greater support for *socially undesirable* as well as *socially desirable* Blacks than would Immigrant Blacks.

A series of hierarchical regression analyses modeled the unique and joint predictive variance of socio-demographic, socio-economic, and Black (derived) target characteristics within each Black subpopulation against the primary outcome variable (propinquity). Overall

regression models for each Black group were highly similar in the proportion of explained variance (27% for native Blacks; 26% for Immigrant Blacks) and weighted contributions of three blocks of variables; derived variables for Black target characteristics contributed most of the total variance within each group. No statistically reliable differences for R score values were found between the two Black subpopulations on these derived variables. Findings are discussed in the context of the White racial frame perspective, secondary data methodology, and future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	XI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	XIV
DEDICATION.....	XVI
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose.....	2
Significance of Current Research	5
Rationale for the Study	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Part One: Major Research Domain.....	9
White Racial Framing.....	10
Black American Identity, White Racial Framing and Economics	12
Propinquity.....	16
Propinquity and Recent Immigration Trends.....	16
Propinquity and the Racialized “Other”	17
Propinquity and Social Distance.....	19
Propinquity and Black Assimilation Experiences.....	22
Propinquity and Black History.....	24
Propinquity, Stereotypes, and Identity Ideation.....	25
Implications of Literature Review	26
Part Two: Conceptual Orientation, Definitions, and Hypotheses.....	29
Conceptual Orientation	29
Conceptual Definitions of Variables.....	30
Research Question and Hypotheses	33
CHAPTER 3 METHOD.....	35
Data Source	35
Predictor Measures and Outcome Measure	36
Predictor Measures Operationally Defined.....	36
Derived Measures: Factor Analysis	37
Factor Analysis	37

Scaled Variables.....	40
Scale Construction	41
Rationale for Constructs	41
Outcome Measure Operationally Defined	42
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS.....	43
Descriptive Statistics.....	43
General Overview	43
Population Selection Criteria from the NSAL Sample	44
Bivariate Analysis.....	48
Difference of Means Testing	48
First–Order Correlations	49
Multivariate Analyses.....	52
Hierarchical Regression Analysis	52
Sub-Hypothesis Results	53
<i>H_{2a}: Native–born Blacks will have a stronger sense of closeness and feelings toward the economically challenged Blacks than will immigrant Blacks.</i>	53
Sub-Hypothesis H _{2a} Outcome.....	55
<i>H_{2b}: Native–born Blacks will have greater sense of closeness and feelings toward the socially affluent and elite Blacks than will Immigrant Blacks.</i>	57
Sub-Hypothesis H _{2b} Outcome.....	60
<i>H_{2c}: Native–born Blacks will exhibit more support of socially undesirable Blacks than immigrant Blacks will have toward socially undesirable Blacks.</i>	60
Sub-Hypothesis H _{2c} Outcome.....	63
<i>H_{2d}: Native–born Blacks exhibit greater support of socially desirable Blacks than will Immigrant Blacks.</i>	63
Sub-Hypothesis H _{2d} Outcome	67
Central Hypothesis Outcome	67
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	71
Overview.....	71
Connections to the Related Literature.....	72
Summary.....	74

Limitations	76
Implications.....	77
Future Research	78
Conclusions.....	80
REFERENCES.....	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Confirmatory Factor Analysis Depicting Loadings on the Factors of Propinquity....	39
Table 3.2	<i>Reported Means, Standard Deviations and Cronbach’s Alpha Scores and Number of Variables for Each Scale for Selected Scaled Variables used in the Black Propinquity Model.</i>	41
Table 4.1	National Survey of American Life (NSAL) Sample Groups.....	44
Table 4.2	NSAL Survey Population and Selected NSAL Population Meeting the Criteria for Analysis.....	45
Table 4.3	NSAL Sample Population Meeting the Criteria for Inclusion Based on Native–born Black and Immigrant Black Populations.	45
Table 4.4	NSAL Demographic Characteristics for Sample Population Meeting the Criteria for Inclusion in the Analysis based on Native–born Black and Immigrant Black Populations.	47
Table 4.5	Reported Means, Standard Deviations and Median Scores for Age, Social, and Economic Predictor Variables used in the Propinquity Model for Native–born Blacks.	47
Table 4.6	Reported Means, Standard Deviations and Median Scores for Age, Social, and Economic Predictor Variables used in the Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.	47
Table 4.7	Difference of Means between Native–born Black and Immigrant Black Respondents on Selected Measures in the Propinquity Model.	48
Table 4.8	50
Table 4.9	First Order Correlation Matrix for Out-Group (Non-Native Blacks) Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income, Economically Challenged, Social Image, Elite Image, Socially Undesirable and Socially Desirable Traits Controlling for Propinquity Across In- and Out-Group Membership.	51
Table 4.10	Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Economically Challenged for Native-Born Blacks.....	54
Table 4.11	Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size,	

Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Economically Challenged for Non-Native Blacks.....	56
Table 4.12 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.....	57
Table 4.13 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.....	57
Table 4.14 Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Socially Affluent and Socially Elite for Native-Born Blacks.....	58
Table 4.15 Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Socially Affluent and Socially Elite for Non-Native Blacks.....	59
Table 4.16 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.....	60
Table 4.17 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.....	60
Table 4.18 Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Undesirable for Native-Born Blacks.....	61
Table 4.19 Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Undesirable for Non-Native Blacks.....	62
Table 4.20 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.....	63
Table 4.21 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.....	63

Table 4.22 Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Desirable for Native-Born Blacks.....	65
Table 4.23 Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Desirable for Non-Native Blacks.....	66
Table 4.24 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.....	66
Table 4.25 Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.....	67
Table 4.26 Regression Analyses of Propinquity, Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Economically Challenged, Socially Affluent, Socially Elite, Socially Undesirable and Socially Desirable for Native-Born Blacks.....	69
Table 4.27 Regression Analyses of Propinquity, Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Economically Challenged, Socially Affluent, Socially Elite, Socially Undesirable and Socially Desirable for Non-Native Blacks.....	70
Table 4.28 Comparisons of Multiple R Scores for In- and Out-Groups Using Fisher R to Z Transformation Test for the Differences between Multiple R Correlation Coefficients.	70
Table 5.1 Comparisons of Multiple R Scores for In- and Out-Groups Using Fisher R to Z Transformation Test for the Differences between Multiple R Correlation Coefficients.	74

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Any intensive study could not be conducted without the help of a wonderful committee. Due to my circumstances I was blessed with the guidance of two major professors, Dr. Farrell J. Webb and Dr. Walter Schumm. Initially, Dr. Webb, whom I yet hold in the highest regards, was there with me as a friend, mentor, and wise statistician. Your expertise, intelligence, and most important, your patience and commitment—during a highly stressful and demanding time in my life—blessed me in ways you will never know. Dr. Webb, you are amazing sir. You are a gift and I extol you beyond words. Nevertheless, thank you so much! Despite accepting an appointment at another university that immediately imposed high demands on your time, you remained committed to my success in this endeavor and walked with me through completion. Shortly after your departure Dr. Schumm step in as my on-site co-major professor to offer me guidance and reassurance. Your kind spirit, insight into research, and painstaking detailed edit and feedback will always be remembered. Thank you so much Dr. Schumm for your assistance. Dr. Spencer Wood, a remarkable man. Thank you for your realness, friendship, and mentorship. You gave me sound direction and kept me on point during lapses, setbacks, and moments of frustration. I look forward to doing future research with you. Dr. Rick Scheidt, the man of the hour! When I needed hands-on guidance in the spur of the moment—especially down the stretch— you were there in multiple ways. Your down to earth approach, genuine regard for my welfare, high standards of excellence, and selflessness devotion above all expectations was priceless. Thank you sir and friend.

In any study your cohorts are the ones that got you through the difficult days. They are with you during course work; they readily answered your calls during the late night and wee hours of the morning; picked you up when you were down; and offered prayers up in your behalf

to God Almighty. Thank you Lover Chancellor and Vance Theodore for walking with me and responding to my beckoning calls on countless occasions. You are friends indeed! Thank you Kariga Pratt, Chiquita Miller, and Kimmerly Newsom for your time, talent, and temperament in assisting me with coursework and computer snafus that I struggled with. Thank you Adnan. I appreciate your friendship and the time we spent together sharing cultural experiences during long treks in the library as we plowed through course work assignments.

Thank you Connie Fetcher and Denise Fangman for your constant administrative support and help given during numerous midnight crises. Thank you Dr. Jacques Gibbons, my social work colleague and friend for the endless hours spent in the computer lab running analysis, after analysis and patiently walking with me through each tedious process day after day. Thank you Betsy, Janice, Don, Kim, Margaret, Sarah, Jennifer, and David for your encouragement along the way. Thank you Pastor Billy Simar—the best preacher on the planet!—my friend and prayer warrior for your constant spiritual vigilance, support and encouragement. Finally, thanks be to God, the author and finisher of my faith, for giving me the strength, determination, and intellectual capacity to accomplish this task. It is through YOU that I live, that I move, and have my being.

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to Fay, my loving wife, who has supported me during our 42 years of marriage. You faithfully accompanied me through 20 years of active duty in the U.S. Army and through six toiling years of classwork, research, and finally completion of this dissertation. Sometimes I wonder which one was the most demanding, the military or the dissertation! I will always be grateful for your love, support, patience, and kindness. In every way—when you were needed, you were there. Thank you for your devotion to me and for allowing me the privilege of surrendering my heart to you.

I would also like to dedicate this endeavor to our children, Lisa, Teon, and Tennell for your love and encouragement and for enduring my disruptions and absences during this quest. You, along with your mother, gave me intrinsic motivation to continue on when the load was heavy. You are all so unique and special and I love you beyond what words can say. I also dedicate this to our grandchildren, Jessamyn, Teon, Taiyah, and Nakkijah as a pinnacle of attainment to consider for yourselves as you venture through your career paths and life. I love you guys and remember, I'll always be THE BIG CATFISH! Remember to put God first, each other always, and never forget the Lockett Rules: *Finish stronger than you started and always keep reaching for something.*

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“There was a time when there were agreed-upon “Black leaders,” when there was a clear “Black agenda,” when we could talk confidently about “the state of Black America”—but not anymore. Not after decades of desegregation, affirmative action, and urban decay; not after globalization decimated the working class and trickle-down economics sorted the nation into winners and losers; not after the biggest wave of Black immigration from Africa and the Caribbean since slavery” (Robinson, 2010, 4).

Who are we? We are all Black¹ living in America but we are not the same. On one hand, there is a common perception among the dominant population that there is a *monolithic Black community* in America; that all Blacks are alike and that there is little variation on perceptions of on what it means to be Black in 21st century America (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; Feagin, 2013; McAdoo, 2002). However, on the other hand, this stereotypical assumption by the dominant group in America does not hold a monolithic view regarding other groups—such as Asians or Hispanics—but it is clear that these groups, because of their diverse ancestral heritages and backgrounds can be considered as different. Such distinctions are not readily made for Blacks, and yet it is apparent to members of the Black community that Black membership consists of Black people from a variety of ethnicities and backgrounds and that all Blacks are not the same (Burrell, 2009; Muhammad, 2003; Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; Newby & Dowling, 2007; Springer, 2010).

¹To maintain clarity on distinct references to Black group members living in America there are three Black group memberships related to this study are. They are: **Blacks**—US native-born African Americans; **Black Caribbean immigrants**; and **Other Black immigrants** (e.g. Blacks from Somalia, The Philippines, Nigeria, or other nations).

Purpose

This dichotomy—the *outside* monolithic perspective of the dominant group and the *inside* perspectives on how each distinct Black group perceive themselves is central to this study. However, this project focuses on the *inside* perspectives held by Black group members from different ancestral origins on their sense of closeness and identity ideations toward each other. The monolithic view, although important, is not the central theme. Nonetheless, it presents an historical context of American hegemony that is relative to the primary focus of this study—Black propinquity. ***Black propinquity*** is defined as: 1) *Self-identified closeness in ideas and feelings with native-born Blacks, and 2) image ideations toward native-born Blacks living in contemporary America.*

Bobo and Hutchings (1996) postulated that most research mapping the basic distribution of racial attitudes focuses almost exclusively on the *outside* monolithic views of Whites' toward Blacks in America; that they are all alike (Hyman & Sheatsley, 1956; Taylor, Greely, & Sheatsley, 1978; Kluegel, 1990; Bobo & Kluegel, 1993). Research on perceptions of closeness among Blacks revealed that among those who are immigrant Blacks in America, many do not prefer to be identified as *Black*, especially the way this is viewed in the United States, which suggests that there is no variation among Blacks (Orbe & Harris 2001; Snyder; 2012). In spite of the presumptuous monolithic view mentioned earlier, first-generation Black immigrants to America have tended to distance themselves from African Americans, stressing a stronger affiliation to their national origins and ethnic identities as Jamaican or Haitian or Trinidadian (Waters, 1994; Vickerman, 1999). At the same time, however, the dominant culture of any group influences the attitudes perceptions, and behaviors of minority group members coexisting

within that social framework (Barbarian, 1993; Waters, 1994; Muhammad, 2006; Burrell, 1999; Burrell & Webb, 2104).

Epstein's early exploration of subordinate groups and ethnic identity illustrates the effectiveness of time and generational influences on immigrant families living in dominant societies (Williams, 2009). His research advanced the thinking of intergenerational family forms, and redefined the context of *functioning* in the American family. In addition, he revealed that the host society controls the social dictionary. That is, first generation immigrant families are in 'immediate transition' upon arrival to the host society. The dominant groups' culture defines, not only the reflective imagery of roles and actors in society, but also creates a model for attitudes and behaviors (Williams, 2011, p. 2). Consequently, despite their own self-definitional perceptions of who they are, immigrant Blacks immediately face overwhelming pressures to identify only as "*Black*" by the dominant White and other non-Black minority cultures residing in the United States (Vickerman, 1994; Waters, 1994; Bryce-Laporte, 1972).

This skewed perspective is referred to as "*White racial framing*" (Williams, 2011; Feagin, 2010). This concept, considered "common sense" by White group members goes back to the early 1600s when North American slavery was established in the United States. This generic monolithic perspective includes important negative racial stereotypes, understandings, images, and negative inclinations of White group members to act disparagingly toward minority group members because of negative perceptions originally toward Black slaves—and later extended by Whites to other racial groups such as Latinos. Currently, various forms of racial framing exist among different racial groups in the United States, but a strong White racial frame has prevailed because Whites have long had the power and the resources to impose this reality.

Racial framing is not the central focus of this study but it provides a conceptual framework which explains how such *framing* in contemporary America disrupts *associations* between African Americans and Black immigrant group members, and subsequently interrupts progression in the identity process of Black group memberships in America. A hegemonic situation occurs when people of color consent in various ways to this ideology. Williams (2011) noted that such disruptions are reported as a lack of shared identification and thus, “*division*” pervades the literature in describing the nature of the relationship between different Black groups in America. This is evidenced by how the United States culture among dominant group members’ view of what it means to be American (Burrell, 2009). Burrell (2009) further noted that the formation on the American identity is woven into the social fabric as illustrated by the *American Citizens Handbook* proclaiming that it is important that people who are to live and work together shall have a common mind—a like heritage of purpose, religious ideals, love of country, beauty, and wisdom to guide and inspire them. The construct of hegemony is not readily seen as a factor or goes unnoticed in the works of cultural attitude formulation, specifically as it is related to racial identity formation and attaining the American way of life (Burrell, 2009).

The racialized structures of this society imposed on Black group members by the American slave past and the intersections of contemporary race and identity issues among Blacks may be powerful enough to breed tensions between these ancestral siblings—native-born African Americans; Black Caribbean immigrants; and *Other* Black immigrants (e.g. Blacks from Somalia, The Philippines, Nigeria, or other nations)—brothers of the American slave trade (Williams, 2011; Feagin, 2013).

Despite the influences that White racial framing might present, this investigation explores this phenomenon from *within*—from an *Afro-centric* perspective. Asante (2009) defines afrocentricity as a paradigm base on the idea that people of African descent should reassert a sense of agency in order to formulate novel ways of analyzing information about their perceptions that is based on their own ideals. This approach looks at information from “a Black perspective” as opposed to what had been considered the “White perspective” of most information in the American academy. Asante (2009) emphasized that since immigrant Blacks came to America from different ancestral origins, geographical areas, and historical contexts, it should not be assumed that their perceptions of native-born Black members are congruent or that they readily identify with or have strong affiliations with native-born Blacks. Asante (2009) further stipulated that since assimilation experiences were not the same that these variant experiences might influence perceptions and attitudes across a plethora of life events; affecting, for instance, how close Black group members feel to each other. To address these concerns this study explored the following overarching research question: *What are the possible influences associated with native-born Blacks and immigrant Black group members living in 21st Century America in their sense of “propinquity” (the sense of social distance or closeness) toward each other?*

Significance of Current Research

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore the role that propinquity plays in the perceptions of divergent Black ancestral groups living in contemporary America. It investigates feelings of closeness and identity preferences of immigrant Blacks toward native-born Blacks—such as how they prefer to be identified—as Black first or as their national identities as Caribbean, Trinidadian, or Jamaican first (Vickerman, 2007). There is an abundance of

scholarly literature that examines Black group members from the perspective of ancestral closeness. While it is true that the native-born and immigrant Blacks in America share a common ancestry, they have different historical experiences that shape their present attitudes, perceptions, and identity preferences. For instance, the earlier internal migration of African Americans out of the South coupled with current escalating immigration trends by Afro-Caribbean, Africans, and other Blacks have made most large cities in the United States remarkable multiracial conglomerations (Waldinger, 1989; Bobo & Hutchings, 1996). This has subsequently raised sociological concerns related to the dichotomy of *cooperation* or *competition* among Black group members sharing common space. The growing heterogeneity of urban areas raises questions about whether different Black group memberships view one another as direct competitors for scarce economic, political, and social resources. While respecting how *race and ethnic* identity intersect in ways that impact self and group perceptions among minorities, this examination goes another step—more specifically to address the possible effects or correlates of such intersections upon native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks in America in terms of social distance or *propinquity*.

One meaning of *propinquity* is defined in Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language as *nearness of relationship; kinship* (Guralnik, 1970). Bobo and Hutchings (1996) and Olzak (1993) suggest that the degree of closeness and affinity ideations between native-born Blacks and Black immigrants may provide a possible correlation between the potential for coalition as well as the prospects of open antagonism and conflict. Therefore, this research focuses specifically on the importance of social distance and affinity ideation that exist between these Black racial groups referred to as ***Black Propinquity***.

Black Propinquity is defined as 1) self-identified closeness in ideas and feelings with native-born Blacks, and 2) image ideation toward native-born Blacks living in contemporary America held by the participants in the survey. These image ideations can be negative or positive. They are depicted by the responses from immigrant Blacks on measures relating to perceptions of whether native-born Blacks are lazy, violent, and give up easily; or if native-born Blacks are hardworking, proud of themselves, or intelligent. In addition, variables used in this study assess how close immigrant Blacks felt to native-Blacks are SES, age, region of the country, and loadings from a confirmatory factor analysis on—socially desirable, socially undesirable, socially elite, economically challenged Blacks. They will be operationally defined in the methods section of this document. Thus, this investigation highlights the distinction between *physical distance* that is based on proximity and *social distance* that is based on relationships, personal and professional interactions, and social integration (Bobo & Hutchings, 1996; Robinson, 2010).

Rationale for the Study

The rationale for this study is based on the fact that perceptions are directly linked to attitudes and behaviors (McAdoo, 2002; Peters, 1998; Lawson, 1992; Umoh, 1982). In short, this study addresses the role that attitudes and behaviors play in predicting the climate of propinquity among Blacks in America. Feelings and ideas about *propinquity* incorporate social, physical, and cognitive experiences. Socially, Black group membership experiences vary due to environmental forces that are imposed on all members of society; physically, in that race/ethnicity, skin tone, gender and other factors present unique experiences within and across Black group memberships; and ideologically, in terms of individual or group perceptions of

social closeness mediated by educational achievement, political affiliations, religiosity or spirituality and other factors (McAdoo, 2002; Helms, 1995).

This study explores how or if these constructs are consistent among contemporary native-born Blacks and other Blacks living in America. Relatively speaking, there is a limited amount of research literature dealing with the implications of how Blacks view themselves. As more Black immigrants come to America it is important that intra-racial associations between these newcomers and native-born Blacks are examined from within these divergent Black memberships. Previous research has not fully examined how the unique cultural distinctive within each Black group from different ancestral origins are important in their perceptions of each other; nor has it fully examined how social distance perceptions across Black groups relate to their collective well-being (Burrell, Webb, & White, 2014; Constantine, Richardson, Benjamin & Wilson, 1998; Cross, 1978; Helms, 1995; Baldwin, 1985; & Jackson, 1975).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Part One: Major Research Domain

Social science has devoted much attention to Black group memberships in America through different eras, including slavery, the civil right movement, affirmative action, and present day American life. Some archaic perspectives continue to postulate a monolithic view of the Black community and ignore the understanding that some Black group memberships do not readily identify with a national perspective (Feagin, 2013; Burrell, 2009; McAdoo, 2002). Some social scientists contend that there is a division or disintegration across Black group memberships based primarily on differing ethnic origins (Capps, McCabe, & Fix, 2011; Robinson, 2010; Dyson, 2005; Bobo & Hutchings, 1996). From either perspective, much of the existing literature is rooted in the White hegemonic racialized structure of American society to describe “Black” behavior, performances, and associations (Williams, 2011; Burrell, 2009; Portes & Zhou, 1993). The recent historical shift in immigration patterns has added to the dialog on Black relationships in America. Historically, African American history can be framed in terms of 13 migrations. Only two were involuntary: the transatlantic slave traded which brought the bulk of Africans to the New World, and the US domestic slave trade, which distributed slaves from the original colonies throughout Southern and Western sections of the country. Others include the great migration north after WWII and Caribbean immigration (Scruggs, 2007). To date, much research has been shaped by “the White racial framing” that raises interesting questions regarding bias and theoretical and methodological levels (Feagin, 2013). The majority of scholarship threaded throughout the literature on ethnic kinship ties and racial/ethnic identity

across Black group memberships is via a hegemonic structural framing, that is to say, a dominant White racial framing on Black group memberships in America (Feagin, 2013).

Part of this chapter reviews two primary components related to the racial and ethnic research on Black relationships. First, research on social distance or “propinquity” (including Black propinquity) is the central concept of interest in this study. Second, it is essential to address research and scholarship on “the White racial frame” as it relate to the construction and effects of the *monolithic* view of Blacks in America (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; Feagin, 2013; McAdoo, 2002). Consequently, the White racial framing is suffused throughout this chapter because its influence cannot be discounted as perhaps the most critical element in promulgating tensions that mediate negative associations within and across Black group memberships (Williams, 2011; Schaefer, 2007; Wilson & Smelser, 2001; Waters, 1994; Semmes, 1992; Jackson, 1975). In addition, this chapter integrates how views on propinquity are informed when framed through an Afrocentric perspective (Williams, 2011; Asante, 2009).

White Racial Framing

The central concept of the White racial frame (Feagin, 2013) is one that helps in understanding the operation of racial oppression as it is engaged by different elements of society. For some population and groups, racial oppression has little to no effect on their daily lives. To others, there is a much more profound effect on life and reactions to life events. Several contemporary sciences, especially the cognitive, neurological, and social sciences, have made use of the idea of a perspectival frame that gets embedded in the individual mind, as well as in collective memories and histories, and helps people make sense out of everyday situations. People are “multi-framers.” They have numerous frames for understanding and interpretation in

their minds, and their frames vary in complexity from specific micro–level framing on situations to a broad framing by society.

In examining U.S. racial oppression, Feagin (2013) extended concepts of societal framing and emphasizes the central importance of a broad, long dominant White racial frame. Much historical research demonstrates the existence in North America and elsewhere of a dominant, White–created racial frame that provides an overarching and generally descriptive worldview; one that extends across all divisions of class, gender, and age. Since its early development in the seventeenth century, this powerful frame has provided the vantage point from which White Americans have constantly viewed North American society. Its centrality in White minds is what makes it a dominant frame throughout the country and indeed, in much of the Western world and numerous other areas. Over time, this powerful frame has been elaborated by or imposed on the minds of most Americans, becoming thereby the country’s dominant “frame of mind” and “frame of reference” in regard to racial matters (Feagin, 2013; Thompson & Akbar, 2003; Robertson, 1988).

The White racial frame is broad and complex. Over time White Americans have included in it a beliefs aspect that embraces racial stereotypes and ideologies; racial interpretations and narratives; visual and auditory elements of racialized images and language accents; racialized emotions; and an inclination to action—to discriminate (Feagin, 2013). Moreover, through centuries of operation this dominant White framing has encompassed both a strong positive orientation to White and whiteness and a strong negative orientation to racial “others” who are exploited and oppressed. It assertively accesses a positive view of White superiority, virtue, moral goodness, and action. For centuries the White racial framing of *in–group* superiority and *out–group* inferiority has been part of a distinctive way of life that

dominates major aspects of society (Feagin, 2013). For most Whites, this racial frame is more than just one significant frame among many; it is *'the'* frame that has routinely defined a way of being, a broad perspective on life, and one that provides the language and interpretations that help structure, normalize, and make sense out of our society. There is nothing subtle or ambiguous about these performances that frame and target specific minority groups (Feagin, 2013).

Black American Identity, White Racial Framing and Economics

Greenwald (1988) notes that identity development is a process by which an individual establishes a relationship with a reference group. When this process is actualized it has the potential to influence attitudes and behaviors through adoption of group values, mores, and goals. Thus, it is important to understand the relationship between external social factors and interactions and personal understandings that inform the identity (Thompson & Akbar, 2003).

African American identity was built on two criteria: African ancestry and an ancestral connection to chattel slavery. Physical characteristics such as skin color, hair texture, and the size of noses and lips use to be distinctions that met the first criterion. Prior to the influx of Black immigrants over the last 30 years, the second was assumed: If you were Black and living in America, it was logical to assume that somebody in your family had been enslaved. Those assumptions are now somewhat archaic or at least can be called into question as the landscape depicting the Black community in America has drastically changed in terms of ancestry and ethnicity. In the last 30 years, more than one million people have come to the United States from Africa alone—more than those brought here during the transatlantic slave trade (Scruggs, 2007). This influx raises the questions: To what group do immigrant Blacks identify with—their native-born Black ancestors or the dominant culture? To what degree of affinity, if any, do they feel toward native-born Blacks; and, what factors or impositions spearheads their choice(s)?

All Blacks, whether native-born or immigrant, are eventually faced with the reality of assimilation within mainstream America. In addition, factors such as time, geography, location, gender, skin tone, education, age and SES—to name a few—have varying influences on their assimilation experiences, self-perceptions, and group-perceptions. One thing that is clearly discernible is the distinction in the experiences of immigrants of White descendants to America and immigrants of Black descendants to America. Two such distinctions deserve special attention: color and economics.

Historically speaking, descendants of *European immigrants* who confronted dilemmas associated with assimilation into the American culture were uniformly White. Although some of them may have been of a darker hue than the natives, their skin color did not produce a major barrier to entry into the American mainstream. For this reason, the process of assimilation depended largely on individual decisions to lead the migrant culture behind and embrace American ways. Such an advantage obviously did not and still does not exist for Black immigrants (Portes & Zhou, 1993). Clearly, the history of African Americans in this country has been characterized by oppression, subjugation, and discrimination. Without a doubt, the color of their skin had much to do with how they were received and perceived. A racist ideology that paralleled the need to perpetuate slavery was developed to support the subjugation of people of African descent. This agenda was primarily based on the need to justify cheap labor carried out on the backs of individuals of African descent who were characterized as subhuman, irresponsible, lazy, and stupid (Thompson & Akbar, 2003; Robertson, 1988).

So what relevance does this have for contemporary immigration activities? Feagin (2013) noted that an association with *blackness* ensures that one can realistically assert that being Black is negative, inferior, and pathological. Thus, manifestations of racism and discrimination

impinge on the free-will choice of Black immigrant members. With whom and how Black newcomers choose to identify with could possibly lead to abated social and economic opportunities. Due to the color of their skin alone, economic mobility is reduced as racial and ethnic inequalities that affect all Black group members persist and places added pressure on the groups. In addition, suspicion and tension run high as some native-born Blacks are concerned with “sharing our gains” with interlopers now reaping the fruits of a long history of labors in this county that they took no part in (Scruggs, 2007).

The structures of present-day economic opportunities have changed. Fifty years ago, the United States was the premier industrial power in the world, and its diversified industrial labor requirements offered the opportunity to move up gradually through better paid occupations while remaining a part of the working class. Moving forward, economic conditions have drastically changed in America. High-tech industries and professional occupations requiring college degrees are disproportionately occupied by members of the dominant White society; thus both native-born and immigrant Blacks find themselves competing on a playing field for limited economical resources. National deindustrialization and global industrial restructuring has decrease economic upward mobility and has left entrants to the American labor force confronting a widening gap between the minimally paid menial jobs that immigrant and native-born Blacks commonly accept. Again, disadvantaged institutional structures beyond their control create a dichotomy Black group members find themselves trying to negotiate—cooperation or conflict (Portes & Zhou, 1993).

So, where does that leave Blacks in America in terms of their perceptions, attitudes, and affinity to each other? This investigation examines to the degree to which these changing conditions predict and possibly impacted the sense of propinquity between Black group

members. As noted by Springer (2010) a continued increase of people of color migrating to America—including immigrant Blacks, increases the need for cooperation or competition, not only among themselves, but with the native populous as well. Survival then becomes paramount. The natural tendency of competition and survival presents an alternative to cooperation in view of the historical fracture in the Black diaspora, where African Americans and African Caribbean still struggle to maintain and solidify friendships. Springer (2010) further postulated that until race no longer matters, building racial and ethnic group solidarity are critical to the survival of African Americans and African Caribbeans in the US:

“We cannot hide behind the veil of transnational identities without acknowledging the power of racial and ethnic ties to unify and uplift marginal groups such as African Americans and African Caribbean. Maintaining a sense of community—the diaspora in this case—and your place within it are critical to understand the self” (p. 3).

Maintaining a sense of community or solidarity is challenged by group member ideation regarding the *cooperation-or-conflict* dichotomy. Without being redundant in details on the implications of White racial framing and the Black community, it is logical to suggest that such framing plays a role in how Black group members might choose to identify and associate with each other. After all, much of what immigration is about relates to survival needs, better political and economic opportunities, and so on. And, of course, how newcomers are perceived and received by the gatekeepers and the parameters imposed on them by dominant group members may undermine the *cooperation-or-conflict* dichotomy (Thompson & Akbar, 2003).

Propinquity

Propinquity and Recent Immigration Trends

The 2000 Census confirmed what many Americans already suspected—dramatic demographic change was under way in the United States (McClain et al., 2006). Interracial contact is increasingly more common than ever before in the history of the United States. It is reasonable to suggest that living in close proximity has different ramifications—especially if individuals or groups are uniquely different than yourself—than when those members live far from you. It is similar to talking to someone over the phone thousands of miles away as opposed to talking to someone across the fence or face to face. Closeness alters dynamics. Therefore, physical closeness may be relative to feeling of social distance— which refers to how immigrant Blacks and native–Blacks interact socially when competing for similar resources.

Ha (2010) reported that the magnitude and persistence of trends by Black immigrants leads to two notable phenomena of contemporary American society—one being the well–reported antagonism against the new wave of immigrants by native–born Blacks in particular, and Americans in general. Popular commentators and scholars have depicted immigrants, especially undocumented immigrants from Latin America, as a potential threat to labor market stability, cultural unity, and internal security. In addition, the racial composition of the new immigrants from the southern hemisphere, coupled with segregation among American’s four distinct racial groups—Whites, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians is problematic Ha, 2010). Kim (2000) notes that perceptions of Black immigrants by American breeds antiforeigner sentiments and multiracial segregation that are by–products of recent immigration responses that expose Black immigrants to discrimination and social ostracism.

Propinquity and the Racialized “Other”

One particular point of interest is that some immigrant groups, especially Asians, are more likely to assimilate with White America and distance themselves from their darker-skinned contemporaries and native-born Blacks. This social distinction created a new racial structure that began to emerge in the 1990s. Social scientists began to notice a new racial structure that differed from the Black-White divide. What appeared to be forming was a new binary color line—a Black-non-Black divide that highlighted the continuing and unique separation of Blacks. Other *previously* non-White racial/ethnic groups such as Jews, the Irish, and Italians became “White”. Immigrants from Chinese and Japanese ancestry changed their racial status from almost Black to almost White (Lee & Bean, 2007). Loewen (1971), for example documented how Chinese immigrants in the Mississippi Delta made conscious efforts to change their lowly racial status by achieving economic mobility; emulating the cultural practices and institutions of Whites; intentionally distancing themselves from Blacks; and rejecting fellow ethnics who married Blacks and their Chinese-Black children. Today, so extreme is the shift in America’s racial hierarchy that Asians, now donning titles of “model minority” and “honorary Whites,” have become the measure against which other non-White groups are judged and often compared. While non-Black immigrant groups have changed their status from non-White to White or almost White, African Americans and immigrant Blacks have yet to be able to do the same (Lee & Bean, 2007). Warren and Twine (1997, p. 208) said that this occurs because Blackness has been constructed as the racialized “other” against which Whiteness is defined. They explain,

Because Blacks represent the ‘other’ against which Whiteness is constructed, the backdrop to Whiteness is open to non-Blacks. Slipping through the opening is, then, a tactical matter for non-Blacks of conforming to White standards, of distancing themselves from Blackness, and of reproducing anti-Black ideas and sentiments.

For America's newly arrived Black immigrants, the question then becomes, are these immigrant groups becoming racialized minorities who see their experiences as more akin to those of African Americans or do they prefer to distance themselves from those kinship assumptions? Some postulates that this reality moves them closer to the African American community and others postulate the reverse—that there is not a sense of propinquity among immigrant Blacks toward native-born Blacks. Alba and Nee (1973) suggests that instead, many immigrant Blacks, particularly the newly arrivals, tend to be reclusive in their ethnic enclaves for their survival.

Numerous studies have examined the consequences of social distance (more specifically defined as *propinquity* in this study) between Black and White America and most recently, Black and Hispanic America and even Asians Americans. According to the U.S. Census, foreign-born people compose about 10 percent of the nation's population, and among these legal immigrant residents, about 51 percent are from Latin America and approximately 25 percent are of Asian origin (Schmidley, 2001). McClain et al (2006) noted that consistent with this influx is the settling of Latino immigrants in the South. Their study revealed that, for the most part, Latino immigrants hold negative stereotypical views of Blacks and feel that they have more in common with Whites than with Blacks. Yet, Whites do not reciprocate in their feelings toward Latinos. The present study investigates similar concerns between native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks.

What is needed but is missing from this discourse are potential consequences of propinquity exclusively between native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks that has been investigated on an appreciable scale. Inter-ethnic contact among Black group members in America is more common than it was during the late 1960s, but still consists primarily of brief,

superficial encounters, and reported via a White lens (Asante, 2009; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Waters, 1994). Although some studies have examined the consequences of social distance between native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks, relatively little is known about the determinants of such contact. The present study probes the extent and what manner that the Black community—those who self-identify as Black has—(a) changed over the past quarter century and (b) more importantly, the influence of propinquity based on personal characteristics that goes beyond ancestry among Black memberships, and (c) implications for competition and cooperation between Black group memberships. The personal characteristics included in the present investigation are age, education, household size, income, region of residence in the country, and SES. In addition, scale variables from a confirmatory factor—economically challenged, socially affluent, socially elite, socially undesirable, and socially desirable were assessed. These are important and practical domains to consider when analyzing relationship matters within and across differing population groups (Thornton, Taylor & Chatters, 2013; Williams, 2011; McAdoo, 2002; (Burrell, Webb, & White, 2014).

Propinquity and Social Distance

For the purposes of this discussion, *propinquity* and social distance are interchangeable terms and can be expressed in a variety of ways that include both affective and proximal preferences among Black group memberships. The research literature clearly indicates that some Black immigrants desire to exclude themselves from direct ties or social contact with native-born Black Americans. Numerous investigations have shown that intra-racial tensions and negative social distance perceptions pervade relations between communities of foreign-born Black immigrants and native-born Black Americans (Jackson, 2007). Jackson (2007) cautions that such conceptualizations differ based on who is telling the story, how they are telling the story, and the frame of reference of the story teller. For instance, Vickerman (1994, 1999) and

Waters (1991) reported that empirical research on Black immigrant groups consistently shows the likelihood that they will identify with and share a sense of common fate with other Blacks increases with the time spent in the United States. Consequently, U.S.-born Black Caribbean's (second and later generations) will feel notably closer to African Americans than will their immigrant (first generation) counterparts. Therefore, propinquity, as related to the Black community in America can be looked at in several contexts. The most obvious context is African ancestry. The sense of kinship base on common ancestral ties undergirds nearly every study on Black group members in America. However, similarities in skin tone and ancestral roots does not always equate to closeness; especially in terms of social distance or *propinquity*. Black group members can be close in cultural or ethnic identity and yet be quite distant in terms of feeling and social contact with one another.

Jackson (2007), citing numerous studies which illuminate immigrant Blacks' attempts to distance themselves from native-born Blacks noted that these studies include a number of immigrant groups, from Haitian immigrants who attempt to convince Whites that they are different from native-born Blacks, to West Indians who also appear not-so-endearing toward native-born Blacks and resist fusion into Black America even to the point of exaggerating their separateness (Parillo, 2000); to African students who find it easier to associate with Whites than with native-born African Americans (Becker, 1973). Becker (1973), whose study was limited to Black Africans and Black Americans on an American campus, concluded that there is basic incompatibility between African and Black Americans that leads to mutual rejection; almost unanimously, Africans perceived the relation between themselves and Black Americans as negative and used characterizations ranging from "misunderstanding" to "hatred" (p. 177) to define their sense of propinquity. However, before jumping to conclusions one must first be

aware that this is not the case in all Black-on-Black perceptions among Black community members in America; and second, remain aware of the relevance of the potential influence of White racial framing mentioned previously.

Williams (2011) notes that the White racial paradigm lends no consideration or significance to the cross-cultural patterns of behavior—particularly the Black experience which resides farthest from the White experience within the continuum. Black experiences (and behaviors) are not taken into consideration in the construction of instruments which assess or evaluate this behavior. Williams (2011) and Baldwin and Bell (1985) further stipulated that in their attempts at assessing and evaluating Black behavior and experiences, racialized constructs and its corresponding instruments rooted in the dominate White paradigm are grossly inappropriate. Thus, many of the previous studies focused on *cultural factors* that presented Black group members in a generalized manner in terms of social distance dynamics. Conversely, far less attention was given to the potential that *personal and social characteristics* may account for such behavior. For instance, Africans in general readily acknowledge ethnic/cultural differences between themselves and other Blacks from different geographical regions from which they originate; consequently, they readily acknowledge that such ethnic/cultural differences also exist between themselves and African Americans. Williams (2001) suggests that it is precisely on such premises that much of the research focuses its attention and uses these dimensions to characterize the whole of the relationship between immigrant and native-born Blacks. In the process, such investigations failed to encapsulate *individual characteristics* that defined the meaning given to the behaviors of immigrant Blacks that is linked to never previously encountered situational experiences in America. For immigrant Blacks, domestic influences in America, especially when the race- factor was considered, presented a different set

of dynamics than those previously encountered in their predominantly Black home land. Black identity and decisions on Black associations now take on a different hue that is based more on environmental (e.g., socialization) factors rather than cultural norms practiced thousands of miles away.

In their study with second generation immigrants, Portes and Zhou (1993) reported that growing up in an immigrant family has always been difficult. Individuals are torn by conflicting social and cultural demands while they face the challenge of entry into an unfamiliar and frequently hostile world. And yet, the difficulties, challenges, and reactions are not always the same. Gaining a more salient idea of assimilation and other socialization experiences from multiple perspectives of Black group members in the US is helpful in examining the sense of propinquity (*social distance*) among them that is based on their individualized realities. All Blacks are not the same.

Propinquity and Black Assimilation Experiences

This study underscores the importance of employing assimilation theories that are robust enough to capture the unique associations between native-born and immigrant Blacks as it relates to their sense of propinquity in 21st Century American. Such constructs can view these dynamics via a positive point of reference. These theoretical constructs provides a clearer understanding for the basis of the social distance dynamics under consideration. Factors such as assimilation, social class, and feelings of closeness—when not constructed under the influence of negative racial frames in depicting interactions between Black groups in America, can leave room for positive associations between Blacks groups from different ancestral origin. This approach can present alternative views that may be related to or diffuse purported *divisiveness* perpetuated by racialized structures that focus only on outcomes that fuels and perpetuate negative dispersions across Black group memberships (Williams, 2011).

Other theoretical perspectives offer a different view. They account for potential *cooperation* between these divergent groups. As a result of the post-1965 Immigration Act, which signals the unprecedented arrival of new immigrants from parts of Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean and Africa, US neighborhoods are undergoing changes that have impacted more than just their demographic. For instance, a recent influx of 100,000 West Africans into New York City has created an enclave which Harlem residents call “Little Africa” or Africa Town”. Accompanying these Muslim newcomers are their Islamic schools, businesses, religious practices, and associations that are essential for how they are integrating themselves into the landscape of this predominately Black neighborhood. Portes and Zhou (1999) notes that whereas traditional *assimilation theories* taught that newcomers entered the U.S. and followed a “straight-line” path into the dominant Anglo-American culture, current scholars claim that the integration is not straight but segmented. Today’s ethnically diverse migrants are incorporated into the White middle-class, a Black and Latino underclass, or the ethnic community characterized by tight group solidarity and rapid economic advancement. Such view suggests that how immigrant Blacks are introduced to their Black ancestors has much to do with negative or positive perceptions that the newcomers may bring to the table long before the assimilation experience begins. Portes and Zhou (1993) define this as the *pre-assimilation* experience. If pre-assimilation experiences are tainted by negative stereotypes projected via the internet, movies, and other mass media instruments (especially by White dominant group members), a negative tone may already have been embedded in the perceptions of Black immigrant newcomers. For many Blacks coming to America prejudice is not intrinsic to a particular skin color or racial type. Indeed, many immigrants never experienced it in their native lands (as they may actually be from the dominant group within that setting). It is by virtue of moving into a

new social environment, marked by different values and prejudices, that physical features become redefined as a handicap (Portes & Zhou, 1993). Potential assimilation experiences such as this earmark the stain of White racial framing previously visited.

Propinquity and Black History

Solidarity has long been fundamental to the survival of native-born Black in America. However, in their efforts to assimilate—immigrants from predominately Black countries coming to the U.S. in record numbers may be a potential threat to that social buffer. This perceived threat against solidarity in the Black community may not be the intended purpose of the newcomers; nor may the newcomers be aware that their presence creates a threat against solidarity. Is the threat borne out of necessity rooted in the motivation for upward mobility or is it a results of social constraints dictated by the dominant culture that immigrants have little control over? Assimilation—unlike acculturation—dictates conformity to the dominant group. To be complete, assimilation must entail an active effort by the minority-group to shed all distinguishing actions and beliefs in order to gain acceptance within the dominant society. In the United States, the pressure to conform to the dominant White society simultaneously has the potential to weaken bonds of solidarity between native-born Black and immigrant Blacks (Asante, 2009; Capps, McCabe, & Fix, 2011).

Kent (2007) shared that beginning in the 1970s several new developments sparked renewed immigration of Blacks from the Caribbean and African origins; to wit, the African component of this Black foreign-born population, though small, is growing rapidly: 41 percent arrived between 2000 and 2005. New laws opened legal channels for people wanting to immigrate to the US; cheaper and more frequent air travel reduced the physical and psychological distances; better telephone, email and other technical advances connected immigrants to their families back home, and sent news of job opportunities to potential

immigrants. This explosion alone contributed about 17 percent of the growth of the U.S. Black population in the 1990s, and at least 20 percent between 2000 and 2006. In 2005, two thirds of the 2.8 million foreign-born Blacks were born in the Caribbean or another Latin American country and nearly one-third were born in Africa. Another 4 percent (about 113,000) were born in Europe Canada, or elsewhere. Most of these foreign-born Blacks settled in the U.S. raise families, and become part of the American society. Immigrant Blacks voluntarily come to America in search of better economic, social, and political opportunities that are not accessible to them in their country of origin. However, hegemonic constructs, related to assimilation and socialization practices in the new county presented challenges for the Black community in America—many of which the newcomers were not familiar with—that necessitated choices between competition or cooperation among Black groups (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; Williams, 2011; Burrell, 2009; Capps, R., McCabe, K., & Fix, M., 2011; Cashin, 2001; Bobo & Hutchings, 1996).

Propinquity, Stereotypes, and Identity Ideation

This study examines the implications of *propinquity* across group members who are perceived as Black in 21st Century America. As noted in chapter one, some view that there is a monolithic Black community in America with little variation among group members. However, the literature revealed that the Black community is more complex than this monolithic view presents (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; McAdoo, 2002). It is apparent that the modern Black community consists of people from a variety of ethnicities and backgrounds; consequently, Blacks are likely to interpret their experiences from different perspectives (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; Springer, 2010; Burrell, 2009; Newby & Dowling, 2007; Muhammad, 2003; McAdoo, 2002). However, addressing propinquity issues among Black minority group members

is somewhat problematic without touching on the impact of dominant group's racial attitudes prevalent in American society.

As previously stated, the dominant culture of any society influences the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of minority group members within that social framework (Waters, 1994). We are living in a computer-connected, information-rich global society where information is available at lightning speed and has both positive and negative implications that are often not readily examined. Unfortunately, in too many cases, negative stereotypes of African Americans are presented via mass media across the globe (Williams, 2011; Feagin, 2010; Vickerman, 1999). Not only does the American racial framing associate negative stereotypes and images with Blacks and other people of color, conversely, positive views and characteristics are associated with whiteness (Feagin, 2010; Williams, 2011). Research on relationships between mass media and ethnic perceptions suggests that the media shape knowledge, beliefs, and stereotypes of the majority about minority groups and, in turn, influence minority responses to the majority. Racial stereotypes are imbedded in the notion that Blacks, in general are lazy; therefore immigrants seek to put as much distance between themselves and this associated stigma as possible (Williams, 2011; Vickerman, 1999).

Implications of Literature Review

Overall, the research literature on White racial framing and propinquity does not support the idea of a monolithic community among Blacks in contemporary America (Burrell, 2009; Burrell, Webb, & White, 2014) but that a variety of views exists across Black groups that may be related to self-perceptions; i.e., concepts about social distance to others Blacks based on one's self-concept of Blackness. It is evident that the Black community is not monolithic but multidimensional in a variety of domains. For instance, racial identity in America impacts one's

perceptions of self and others and how such perceptions relate to socialization, family dynamics, and a host of other ideals (Schildkraut, 2007; McAdoo, 2002; Smith & Edmondson, 1997; Semmes, 1992). Peters (1998) found similar results in her study as findings by Umoh (1981)—that there is a correlation between the way people perceive themselves, and their perceptions of others. Their studies suggest that it may be safe to infer that Blacks would have positive perceptions about other Blacks from different ancestral origins based on positive concepts of themselves as Blacks. Socially speaking, it is more desirable and comfortable to live among or near those that you identify with and have commonalities that bridge the gap between obvious differences. Theoretical frameworks that reflect the notion that healthy racial identity development is achieved when Blacks process through a series of linear stages that end with internalized positive feelings about themselves, other blacks, and other racial and ethnic groups (Constantine, Richardson, Benjamin & Wilson, 1998).

Jackson (2007) notes that although shifting boundaries exists that separate Black Americans from experiencing a more inclusive Black community there are indications of the possibility of such a view coming into fruition. However, it is a view which challenges the pervasive status quo of American racialized structures. Threaded throughout the literature are discussions about social distancing that strongly inferred that the presence of dysfunctional Black communities and their inability to get along, conveys the impression that Black Americans are incapable of functioning in a multicultural society (Jackson, 2007). Williams (2011) suggests that such characterizations are a direct inference of the White racial structuring of American society that asserts that Black behavior is inferior and dysfunctional behavior. This pattern of expression is detrimental to the collective good of the Black community, propagates tensions that disrupt healthy associations between native-born and immigrant Blacks, and further disrupts the

identity process (Williams, 2011, 2007). Feagin (2010) asserts that much of Western social theory is handicapped by the racial socialization of its societal and historical contexts. Feagin (2010) further notes that researcher on interactions between Diaspora Black group members from different ancestral origins living in the US repeatedly focus on negative tensions between these two Black groups. Such a narrow focus (a) transmits the belief that the native-born and immigrant Black intentionally elect to dissociate from each other and thus, lack a shared identification with one another, (b) that such notions perpetuate division between potentially compatible groups, and (c) this focus disrupts subsequent progression in identity processes between biological, ancestral siblings—native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks.

Part Two: Conceptual Orientation, Definitions, and Hypotheses

Conceptual Orientation

In addition to the cultural/ethnic variations among native–Blacks and immigrant Blacks, there are also differing conceptual ideas about the sense of social distance that exist between these groups. Also significant in this discourse is the importance of identity ideation that these Black group members perceive about each other (Thornton, Taylor & Chatters, 2013). Finally, immigrant Blacks soon discover that there is a *hegemonic* view in America which ultimately imposes identity ideation upon all Blacks dwelling within American society (Williams, 2011; Burke, 1991).

Identity ideation—or ideas about who, how, and why we choose to identify with—are important in relationship matters (Cheney & Tompkins, 1987). The Black experience is not a static experience when it comes to identity ideation. Burke (1991) when alluding to *identity control theory* said that the identity process as a self–adjusting, looping system consisting of several components constantly operating in ways that seek congruence on and individual’s internalized *identity standard* with input appraisals from the surrounding environment. Shaw–Taylor, (2007) illuminated the impact of this concept (identity standard) on immigrant Blacks within the framework of Western wisdom and thinking—that the identity of Blackness is too often constructed as *problematic*. Black identity then becomes transfixed as an outlier identity with associated behaviors and characteristics that are unable to receive confirming appraisals rooted in the White racial frame (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014). Immigrant Blacks may not have experienced such an imposing social construct if they migrated to America from an environment where they were the majority population; however, they soon came face to face with these constraining social dynamics. Williams (2001) asserted that “African immigrants and

/or any other people entering American society understand the consequences of association with Blackness: they too will undergo the same distress as African–Americans” (Williams, 2011: 72). Thus, Black immigrants *temporarily* negotiate an alternative identity (Zachery, 2006) that forgoes association with a “Black” identity in the White racial framing of American society, thus blurring the standard to which they seek to adhere. Consider these comments from Williams’ study, *Brothers of the Trade* (2011):

“American racial thinking, rigid in its designation of blackness and ascription of racial status, fabricates a certain level of racial consciousness for all who cross its shores (Shaw–Taylor, 2007: 20). Thus, while they appear to recognize that in America there are consequences rooted in race for associations with African–Americans, because they emerge from a home culture (Feagin, 2010) in their own land that lacks such negative racial experiences, they are unaware of how to engage our counter such experience. As a result, immigrants... come to the United States with well–formed pre–migration, nonracial identities (Johnson 2008), seeking to avoid racial experiences by establishing their foreignness from those with whom association may lead to such experience” (Williams, 2011: 62).

Conceptual Definitions of Variables

It is imperative that the conceptual definitions in this research are clearly defined. Intergroup affiliation and identity are especially critical for immigrant groups. Some perspectives emphasize that migrants Blacks maintain a national identity to their country of origin even while being dislocated from it (Thornton, Taylor, & Chatters, 2013; Lee & Bean, 2007). Other studies reflect that immigrant Blacks do not prefer to be identified as African American (Orbe & Harris 2001; Snyder; 2012). It is in lieu of these perceptions that this study investigates to what sense of closeness and affiliation do immigrant Blacks have with the larger

native-born Black population in America? The following conceptual definitions are specific to the topic of discussion and are used throughout this study.

Propinquity/Black Propinquity. The outcome measure in the present investigation is Black Propinquity. This measure assess how close immigrant Blacks feel toward native-born Blacks. The root definition of propinquity is *nearness or proximity* (Guralnik, 1970). However, this investigation does not limit the experience to *physical distance* but takes propinquity a step further to include *social distance* among Black group members conceptualized as *Black Propinquity: a sense of closeness and feelings and image ideation toward native-born Blacks*. Black propinquity is an abstract construct used to explicate the attitudes and behaviors of Black group members in American toward native-born Blacks. Respondents are native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks who participated in the National Study on American Life survey (Jackson, 2007).

Native-born Blacks. Native-born Blacks refer to those respondents in the NSAL study who were born in the U.S. and who self-identify as Black or African American.

Immigrant Blacks. Immigrant Blacks refer to individuals in this study who are not native-born members of the U.S. and who self-identify as Caribbean, African, or Blacks from other ancestral origins. Intergroup affiliation and identity are especially critical for immigrant groups. Some perspectives emphasize that migrants Blacks maintain a national identity to their country of origin even while being dislocated from it (Thornton, Taylor & Chatters, 2013; Lee & Bean, 2007). With that in mind, the question for this study investigates to what sense of closeness and affiliation do immigrant Blacks have with the larger native-born Black population in America?

Group Status. Group status is one of the predictor measures for this study. It is a composite measure defined by two elements (1) In-group Status, and (2) Out-group Status.

In-group Status. In-group status refers to those individuals in the study who self-identify as native-born Blacks who were born in the U.S.

Age—the actual age of the respondent as self-identified in the NSAL survey. Participant ages ranged from 18 years to over 65 years.

Education. The number of years of formal education respondent identified that they had completed at the time of the NSAL survey.

Household Size. Household size refers to the number of persons sharing a common dwelling at the time that respondents participated in the NSAL survey.

Household Income. Household income is a measure of the aggregate incomes of respondents who shared a common dwelling or place of residence during the time of the NSAL survey.

Region of Residence. This refers to the region of the country the respondents lived in at the time of the NSAL survey. There are four regions of residency identified in this study. They are Northeast, Midwest, South, and West.

Social Economic Status (SES)—Social and economic position in relation to others, based on income, education, and occupation.

Social distance. Social distance is defined as the distance between groups in society. It refers to the degree to which members of society agree to interact with each other (Scott & Marshall, 2009). For this study the focus is on the perceived sense of social distance between immigrant Blacks and native-born Blacks in the U.S.

Closeness. In this present study closeness and social distance are used interchangeably.

Identity ideations. Ideas about who, how, and why we choose to identify with (Cheney & Tompkins, 1987).

White racial frame. The White racial frame is broad and complex. In its centrality this dominant White framing has encompassed both a strong positive orientation to White and whiteness and a strong negative orientation to racial “others” who are exploited and oppressed. It assertively accesses a positive view of White superiority, virtue, moral goodness, and action. For centuries the White racial framing of *in-group* superiority and *out-group* inferiority has been part of a distinctive way of life that dominates major aspects of American society (Feagin, 2013).

Hegemony. This refers to the dominance of one group over another. Although hegemony is not a variable in this study, it presents an historical context that illuminates the importance of the White racial frame imposed on Blacks and other minority groups residing in the U.S. A hegemonic view reinforces inclinations and acts of White superiority over Blacks and other minorities (Williams, 2011).

Research Question and Hypotheses

Social scientists are often interested in what and how individuals form opinions and perceptions about themselves and others. The overarching research for this study is: *What is the sense of “propinquity” of native-born Blacks toward native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks toward native-born Blacks in 21st Century America?* The research question and hypotheses were developed to explicate perceptions of *propinquity* held by the two distinct Black group members (Group Status) in this study; they are:

RI: *To what extent is perceived **Group Status** (native-born Black vs. immigrant Blacks) related to a sense of closeness and feelings among Black groups in the United States when social economic status, age, economically challenged, socially affluent/elite, socially undesirable/desirable traits, and region of the country are considered?*

This general research question led to the development of one central hypothesis with four sub-hypothesis that will were explored in this investigation.

H1: *Native-born Blacks will have a greater sense of closeness and feelings toward the Black groups when social economic status, age, economically challenged, socially affluent/elite, socially undesirable/desirable traits, and region of the country are considered than will Immigrant Blacks.*

These hypotheses assume the presence of SES, age, and region as standard factors to be considered along with the unique characteristics examined by each sub-hypothesis.

H_{1a}: *Native–born Blacks will have a stronger sense of closeness and feelings toward the **economically challenged** Blacks than will immigrant Blacks.*

H_{1b}: *Native–born Blacks will have a greater sense of closeness and feelings toward the **socially affluent and elite** Blacks than will immigrant Blacks.*

H_{1c}: *Native–born Blacks will exhibit more support of **socially undesirable** Blacks than immigrant Blacks will have toward socially undesirable Blacks.*

H_{1d}: *Native–born Blacks will exhibit more support of **socially desirable** Blacks than immigrant Blacks will have toward socially desirable Blacks.*

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Data Source

Data in this investigation were gleaned from The National Survey on American Life (NSAL): Coping with stress in the 21st Century, a study designed to explore racial and ethnic differences in African American and Afro–Caribbean populations in the United States. No other study has accessed such a wide range of psychological, political, and economic factors, in a large, representative longitudinal national sample of Black Americans (Jackson, 2007). The NSAL dataset that includes survey information from over 6,000 respondents representing three distinct Black groups (Native–born Blacks, Caribbean Blacks, and other Blacks) provides an extensive baseline from which to investigate the focus of the present study. Gaining an inside (Afrocentric) perspective on how Black group memberships in America perceive each other (regardless of their ancestral origins) can be an effective tool in stress reduction and conflict resolution within and across Black Diaspora groups (Shaw–Taylor, 2007; Schaefer, 2007). Findings may be used in educational, psychological, and sociological domains to foster positive relations or gain better understand on perceptions about life in America from inclusive cultural perspectives (Shaw–Taylor, 2007).

Interviews occurred throughout the United States in urban and rural centers of the country where significant numbers of Black Americans reside. A total of 6,082 face–to–face interviews were conducted with persons aged 18 or older. Respondents consisted of 3,570 African Americans, 891 non–Hispanic Whites, and, for the first time in a national survey, 1,621 Black respondents of Caribbean descent. However, the non–Hispanic Whites were omitted from

this investigation, reducing the population size to 5,191 respondents who are solely from Black descent groups. The data collected through NSAL will be invaluable in providing a foundation to shed light on the Black community in America as part of a more socially, politically, and economically complex society (Schaefer, 2007; Moore, 1998; Smith & Edmondson, 1997).

Predictor Measures and Outcome Measure

Black Propinquity is the outcome measure in this analysis. In general, this measure assesses the sense of social distance and image ideation experienced by Blacks residing in the U.S. who participated in the NSAL survey. The predictor measures and outcome measure are described more concretely by their operational definitions:

Predictor Measures Operationally Defined

Group Status is the key predictor measure for this study. It is a composite measure defined by two elements (1) *In-group Status*, and (2) *Out-group Status*.

In-group Status (INGROUP)—relates to the perceptions of participants in the NSAL study who self-identified as native-born Blacks.

Out-group Status (OUTGROUP)—relates to the perceptions of participants in the NSAL study who self-identified as immigrant Blacks (i.e., Black Caribbean or other Blacks).

Later in the analysis, *in-group* and *out-group* perceptions are further examined by the following additional predictors: *Social economic status, age, education, household income, household size, economically challenged, socially affluent, socially elite, socially undesirable, socially desirable, and region of the country*. These predictors are operationally defined as:

Age (AGE)—the actual age of the respondent as self-identified in the survey. Participant ages ranged from 18 years to over 65 years.

Education (ED4CAT)—the number of years of education completed. This was based on four categories: (1) 0–11 years (2) 12 years (3) 13–15 years, and (4) greater than or equal to 16 years.

Household Income (HHINC)—Household income is a measure of the aggregate income of respondents who shared a common dwelling or place of residence during the time of the NSAL survey.

Household Size (HHSIZE)—defined by the number of people living in the same home.

Socioeconomic Status (SES)—the economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, and occupation.

Region of residence of the country (REGION)—defined by the region of the residence respondents live in during the time of the survey. There were four geographic regions. They were also dummy coded as NORTHEAST, MIDWEST, SOUTH and WEST so that each could be entered into the equation if necessary.

Derived Measures: Factor Analysis

Factor Analysis

A preliminary confirmatory factor analysis was run to test the relationship between observed variables (that were believed to be related to the concept) to generate the underlying latent constructs that exists. Simple Factor Analysis using Maximum Likelihood Analysis with a Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization extracted the factors. The analysis generated four factors. These orthogonal latent factors indicated that the variables are independent of each other—meaning that they are not correlated (Fields, 2005). The factors are labeled as:

Factor 1—Economically Challenged Blacks: Variables that loaded predominantly on Factor 1 are measures of *CLOSENESS IN IDEA/FEELINGS TO* Poor Blacks, Working-Class Blacks, and Black Opportunity.

Factor 2—Socially Affluent and Elite Blacks: Variables that loaded predominantly on Factor 2 are measures of *CLOSENESS IN IDEAS/FEELINGS TO* Black professionals, Elected Blacks, and Upper-class Blacks (Elite) Older Blacks, Younger Blacks, Religious Blacks (Socially Affluent).

Factor 3—Socially Undesirable Blacks: Variables that loaded on Factor 3 are measures of *HOW TRUE BLACKS ARE* —lazy, violent, and give up easily.

Factor 4—Socially Desirable Blacks: Variables that loaded on Factor 4 are measures of *HOW TRUE BLACKS ARE* hardworking, proud of themselves, and intelligent.

The *CLOSENESS* variables are coded as: (1) Very close, (2) Fairly close, (3) Not too close, and (4) Not close at all. This means that low factor scores on Factor 1 indicate a closer identification with non-affluent Blacks. Likewise, low factor scores on Factor 2 indicate a closer identification with affluent Blacks.

The *HOW TRUE* variables are coded as: (1) Very true, (2) Somewhat true, (3) A little true, and (4) Not true at all. This means that low factor scores on Factor 3 indicate a stronger identification with negative image ideation toward Blacks. Likewise, low factor scores on Factor 4 indicate a stronger identification with positive image ideation toward Blacks.

The greater the sense of closeness and positive image ideation that Black group members have toward native-born Blacks suggests that they are more likely to value their association or identity with that larger membership (Thornton, Taylor & Chatters, 2013). The interpretations that individuals derive from what it means to share a sense of closeness with Blacks and their

image ideation toward Blackness provides instrumentation to measure perceptions of *propinquity* between these distinct Black group memberships. Thornton, Taylor, and Chatters (2013) revealed that both African Americans and Caribbean Blacks reported strong feeling of closeness to their own group, and while not as robust, they also demonstrated affinity to the other group. Furthermore, empirical research on Black immigrant groups consistently revealed the likelihood that Caribbean Blacks identify with and share a sense of common fate with other Blacks as time spent in the U.S. increases (Vickerman, 1994, 1999; Waters 1994).

The second and third factors are treated as independent variables; but they are grouped because of the original conceptualization used and is supported by the literature that would suggested that separating these elements would be problematic (See Table 3.1).

Table 3.1

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Depicting Loadings on the Factors of Propinquity.

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Closeness in ideas/feelings to Black professionals		.701		
Closeness in ideas/feelings to Blacks	.498			
Closeness in ideas/feelings to elected Blacks		.796		
Closeness in ideas/feelings to older Blacks	.704			
Closeness in ideas/feelings to poor Blacks	.648			
Closeness in ideas/feelings to religious Blacks	.613			
Closeness in ideas/feelings to upper–class Blacks		.537		
Closeness in ideas/feelings to working–class Blacks	.695			
Closeness in ideas/feelings to young Blacks	.604			
How true Blacks are hardworking				.636
How true Blacks are proud of themselves				.424
How true Blacks are intelligent				.465
How true Blacks are lazy			.694	
How true Blacks are violent			.676	
How true Blacks give up easily			.563	

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

- a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.
- b. These four factors account for 45.1% of the variance

Scaled Variables

Scaled variables—the additional predictors, identified here as *economically challenged*, *socially affluent*, *socially elite*, *socially undesirable*, and *socially desirable* were constructed based on two things. In order to examine the predictor measures that were hypothesized in this investigation it was necessary to construct scale variables that approximated the ideals that were embodied in the sub-hypotheses. First a factor analysis was done to see what elements contributed toward these constructs. Second, scale variables were developed based on the initial latent constructs identified in the factor analysis.

Economically challenged—Variables that loaded predominantly on measures of *CLOSENESS IN IDEA/FEELINGS TO*—Poor Blacks, Working-class Blacks, and Black Opportunity from the confirmatory factor analysis.

Socially affluent—Variables that loaded predominantly on measures of *CLOSENESS IN IDEA/FEELINGS TO*—Older Blacks, Younger Blacks, Religious Blacks from the confirmatory factor analysis.

Socially elite—Variables that loaded predominantly on measures of *CLOSENESS IN IDEA/FEELINGS TO*—Black professionals, Elected Blacks, and Upper-class Blacks from the confirmatory factor analysis.

Socially undesirable—Variables that loaded on measures of *HOW TRUE BLACKS ARE*—lazy, violent, and give up easily from the confirmatory factor analysis.

Socially desirable—Variables that loaded on measures of *HOW TRUE BLACKS ARE*—hardworking, proud of themselves, and intelligent from the confirmatory factor analysis.

Scale Construction

These factors were then used to construct scale variables that approximated the group trait measured by these elements. The final result yield five variables that were tested using Cronbach’s alpha and produced the results in Table 3.2. All alphas are “good” except for *Economically Challenged* and *Socially Desirable*.

Table 3.2

Reported Means, Standard Deviations and Cronbach’s Alpha Scores and Number of Variables for Each Scale for Selected Scaled Variables used in the Black Propinquity Model.

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	<i>n of variables</i>
Economic Challenged	1.90	.802	.442	3
Socially Affluent	1.61	.582	.722	3
Socially Elite	2.13	.743	.819	3
Socially Desirable	1.43	.454	.526	3
Socially Undesirable	2.79	.780	.688	3

Rationale for Constructs

It critical to delineate the difference between native–born Blacks and immigrant Blacks. The reasoning behind these distinctions is that the lived experiences of individuals who self–identified as Black but who *did not* experience the psychological and sociological impact imposed on native–born Blacks who were direct descendants of emancipated slaves in America are substantively different than for those who did. As noted previously (William, 2011; Schaefer, 2007; Shaw–Taylor, 2007; Cheney & Tompkins, 1987) native–born Blacks who were descendants of emancipated slaves and/or who experienced Jim Crow racism, the Civil Rights Movement, Affirmative Action, or other socialized encounters unique to the historical context faced by native–born Blacks in American. These experiences created a different psychological and sociological impact than experienced by other Black memberships who share phenotypical

characteristics such as skin color, hair texture, and who immigrated to this country (Washington, 2012; Schaefer, 2007).

Outcome Measure Operationally Defined

Black Propinquity is a measure based on the participant's response to a global measure of closeness in ideas and feelings toward Blacks as one group—the notion of in-group and out-group was not considered when this measure was developed and as a result provides a global viewpoint. However, this investigation ultimately controls for group differences to see how the groups perceived on this measure. This measure asked how close one felt to Blacks.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The primary interest of this inquiry is to examine factors predicting perceptions of propinquity across the two Black population groups in America—native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks. This chapter explains the process used to examine the relationships between these constructs. It is divided into four sections. Section *one* provides information about the sample population derived from simple descriptive analyses. Section *two* provides descriptive statistics on the variables used in this analysis. Section *three* examines the zero-order correlations to assess the relationships between the measures of the outcome variable Black Propinquity—this includes the scaled variables used to assess the hypothesized constructs. Section *four* shows the results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis (HRA) to further differentiate the strength of the predictions.

Descriptive Statistics

General Overview

A general overview provides a window for this investigation. To begin, simple descriptive statistics were used to examine the data. From the original NSAL population (N = 6,082), fifty-nine percent (58.7%) were native-born Blacks; twenty-four percent (23.6%) were Caribbean Blacks; 3 percent (3.0%) are other Blacks and; fifteen percent (14.7%) are non-Latino Whites (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

National Survey of American Life (NSAL) Sample Groups.

Variable	<i>f</i>	%
Black (Native-born Blacks)	3,570	58.7
Caribbean	1,438	23.6
Other Black	183	3.0
Non-Latino White	891	14.7
TOTAL	6,082	100.0

Population Selection Criteria from the NSAL Sample

For purposes of this research the non-Hispanic Whites were removed from the research sample. In addition, survey respondents who self-identified as African-American and were born *outside of the US* at the time of the survey were also omitted from the sample. Finally, survey respondents who self-identified as Black Caribbean or *other* Blacks who were born *in the US* at the time of the survey were omitted from the research sample. This process reduced the analysis specifically to three Black group memberships, namely—native-born Blacks (African Americans), Black Caribbean immigrants, and *other* Black immigrants. This process reduced the number of respondents in the sample to be analyzed from 6,082 respondents to 4,645 respondents that now included only native-born Blacks, Caribbean Blacks and Other Blacks. This changed those who self-identified as native-born Blacks from 58.7% to 74.6%; those who self-identified as Caribbean Blacks from 23.6% to 22.9%; Other Blacks changed from three percent 3.0% to 2.5 (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2

NSAL Survey Population and Selected NSAL Population Meeting the Criteria for Analysis.

<i>Variable</i>	Survey		Propinquity Sample	
	<i>n</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>f</i>
Black (Native-born Blacks)	3,570	58.7	3,464	74.6
Caribbean	1,438	23.6	1,065	22.9
Other Black	183	3.0	116	2.5
Non-Latino White	891	14.7	---	---
TOTAL	6,082	100.0	4,645	100.0

The final step in sample selection used as criteria by respondents who—(1) self-identified as native-born Blacks born in the U.S. of U. S. parents, and (2) self-identified as immigrant Blacks (i.e., Caribbean Blacks and Other Blacks) born outside of the U.S. or to non-U.S. parents. To simplify the analytical process Caribbean Blacks and Other Blacks were combined into one group because both groups met the criteria for foreign-born non-Native or Immigrant Blacks (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3

NSAL Sample Population Meeting the Criteria for Inclusion Based on Native-born Black and Immigrant Black Populations.

<i>Variable</i>	Survey		Propinquity Sample ^a	
	<i>n</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>f</i>
Blacks (Native-born Blacks)	3,570	58.7	3,464	75.6
Immigrant Blacks (non-Native Blacks)	1,621	41.3	1,117	24.4
Total	6,082	100.0	4,581	100.0

^aAdjustments for group identification and missing data results combined to lower overall numbers for each group.

The rationale to combine the two immigrant groups is that (1) Other Blacks lacked the generational history with native-born Blacks due to their short lived experiences in the U.S., and; (2) their relatively small number compared to Caribbean Blacks (n=1,065) was also a consideration. In addition, the lived experiences of individuals who self-identified as Black but who *did not* experience the psychological and sociological impact imposed on native-born

Blacks who were direct descendants of emancipated slaves in America, are substantively different than for those who *did* (William, 2007; Schaefer, 2007; Shaw–Taylor, 2007; Cheney and Tompkins, 1987). Overall, the supposition is that Black immigrants identify differently with feelings of closeness to and image ideation toward native–born Blacks (Washington, 2012). From this point on, all analytical measures were taken based on the *Selected Population*: Native–born Black participants (n = 3,464); Immigrants participants (n = 1,117) (see Table 4.3). The final sample consisted of two sub-samples: Native–born Blacks and Immigrant Blacks.

Tables 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 provide general demographic information across the samples. The samples seem relatively similar in terms of sex. Approximately 60% of both samples were comprised of female respondents. There are some unique differences in terms of geographic location. Among native–born Blacks, 65.2% resided in the South compared to 30.2% of Immigrant Blacks. Additionally, the Northeast region was the home of 68.8% or almost 70% of Immigrant Blacks but only 11.3% of Native Blacks. These regional location differences are linked to the social history of these two groups, particularly as it relates to their port of entry—for Native Blacks who entered in as slaves, the South was the most dominant location. Both groups have an average age of about 43 years.

In order to better understand the relationship between the samples a series of difference of means (t) tests were conducted. The bivariate examination of data provide clues as to how the data support the previous literature and offer preliminary support of the hypotheses.

Table 4.4

NSAL Demographic Characteristics for Sample Population Meeting the Criteria for Inclusion in the Analysis based on Native-born Black and Immigrant Black Populations.

Variable	Coding Scheme	Native Blacks		Immigrant Blacks	
		<i>n</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>f</i>
Sex	Male	1,222	35.3	438	39.2
	Female	2,242	64.7	697	60.8
Region	Northeast	390	11.3	768	68.8
	Midwest	585	16.9	5	0.4
	South	2,260	65.2	337	30.2
	West	229	6.6	7	0.6
Propinquity	Very Close	1,891	55.2	490	44.4
	Fairly Close	1,243	36.3	443	40.2
	Not to Close	240	7.0	145	13.1
	Not Close at All	54	1.6	25	2.3

Table 4.5

Reported Means, Standard Deviations and Median Scores for Age, Social, and Economic Predictor Variables used in the Propinquity Model for Native-born Blacks.

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>n</i>
Age	43.15	16.286	41.00	3,464
Education in Years	12.29	2.498	12.00	3,464
Household Size	2.50	1.463	2.00	3,464
Household Income	\$31,395	\$28,604	\$24,000	3,464

Table 4.6

Reported Means, Standard Deviations and Median Scores for Age, Social, and Economic Predictor Variables used in the Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>n</i>
Age	42.42	15.318	41.00	1,117
Education in Years	12.89	2.872	12.00	1,117
Household Size	2.69	1.526	2.00	1,117
Household Income	\$40,529	\$33,733	\$30,000	1,117

Bivariate Analysis

Difference of Means Testing

The data revealed that there were significant differences between the groups in the means scores for the study's predictor and outcome measures (see Table 4.7). In terms of the demographic measures there was no difference between the mean ages of the sample.

Table 4.7

Difference of Means between Native-born Black and Immigrant Black Respondents on Selected Measures in the Propinquity Model.

Variable	Opinion	N	M	sd	t	n
Age	Blacks	3,458	43.15	16.286	1.347	4,579
	Immigrant Blacks	1,113	42.42	15.318		
Education	Blacks	3,464	12.29	2.50	-6.212***	4,579
	Immigrant Blacks	1,117	12.89	2.87		
Household Size	Blacks	3,464	2.50	1.463	-3.716***	4,579
	Immigrant Blacks	1,117	2.69	1.526		
Household Income	Blacks	3,464	\$31,395.10	\$28,604.550	-8.154***	4,579
	Immigrant Blacks	1,117	\$40,429.01	\$33,733.180		
Economically Challenged	Blacks	3,458	1.87	0.795	-4.042***	4,569
	Immigrant Blacks	1,113	1.98	0.820		
Socially Affluent	Blacks	3,447	1.57	0.574	-9.181***	4,555
	Immigrant Blacks	1,110	1.75	0.587		
Socially Elite	Blacks	3,443	2.10	0.750	-4.067***	4,548
	Immigrant Blacks	1,107	2.21	0.716		
Socially Undesirable	Blacks	3,457	1.42	0.443	-2.393*	4,570
	Immigrant Blacks	1,115	1.46	0.486		
Socially Desirable	Blacks	3,456	2.77	0.789	-4.160***	4,568
	Immigrant Blacks	1,114	2.89	0.747		
Propinquity	Blacks	3,428	1.55	0.694	-7.003***	4,529
	Immigrant Blacks	1,103	1.73	0.772		

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Although Native Blacks ($M = 43.15$, $sd = 16.286$) were slightly older than Immigrant Blacks ($M = 42.42$, $sd = 16.286$) these differences were not significant ($t = 1.347$, $df = 4579$, $p <$

n.s.). In general, native-born Blacks reported less formal education ($M = 12.29$, $SD = 2.500$), smaller household sizes ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.463$) and less income ($M = \$31,395$, $SD = \$28,604.550$) than Immigrant Blacks on Education ($M = 12.89$, $SD = 2.870$), Household Size, ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.526$) and Income ($M = \$40,429$, $SD = \$33,733.180$). This trend continued for the remaining scale measure indicators and the outcome measure—Proximity ($t = -7.003$, $df = 4,529$, $p < .001$). These differences, while important, offer only a partial explanation and because they examine these measures separately cannot offer the picture that a multivariate analysis will be able to provide.

First-Order Correlations

First-order correlations analyses were used prior to applying multiple regression concepts to the analysis. It was necessary to assess the relationships between the predictor measures controlling for the outcome measure before conducting multivariate analyses. In order to determine the strength and effect size relationships between the variables. In this dissertation group membership was the basis for analysis, as such, correlations were conducted on each group controlling for the outcome measure. As can be seen in Table 4.8, *Age* displayed reliable associations with seven of the nine predictor measures among Native-born Blacks. In terms of the most critical measures, there were significant relationships between age and income ($r = -.035$, $p < .05$), economically challenged ($r = -.051$, $p < .01$), socially affluent ($r = -.095$, $p < .01$), socially elite ($r = -.076$, $p < .01$) and socially desirable ($r = .064$, $p < .01$) measures.

Table 4.8

First Order Correlation Matrix for In-Group (Native Blacks) Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income, Economically Challenged, Social Image, Elite Image, Socially Undesirable and Socially Desirable Traits Controlling for Propinquity Across In- and Out-Group Membership.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00									
2	-.032*	1.00								
3	-.290	-.029	1.00							
4	-.224**	-.053*	.009	1.00						
5	-.035*	-.045*	.143**	.397**	1.00					
6	-.051**	.002	.050*	-.072	-.080**	1.00				
7	-.095**	-.073**	-.018	.059**	.023	.286**	1.00			
8	-.076**	-.020	-.007	.050**	.008	.135**	.520**	1.00		
9	.006	.005	-.064**	.227**	.145**	-.074**	.049**	.046**	1.00	
10	.064**	-.044**	-.014	-.019	.026	.097**	.169**	.142**	-.162**	1.00

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

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

1=Age 2=Region 3=Household Size 4= Education 5=Income 6=Economically Challenged 7=Socially Affluent 8=Socially Elite 9=Socially Undesirable 10= Socially Desirable

Other measures where some expected findings were reported included significant relationships between education and income ($r = .397, p < .01$) and with all other measures on closeness except *social desirability*. Income was negatively correlated with being economically challenged ($r = -.080, p < .01$) and positively correlated with socially undesirable ($r = .145, p < .01$)—as one’s income increased so too did their disdain for those who were socially undesirable.

Relationships among the closeness and truth traits scaled variables are strong, significant, and directionally appropriate. Among the scaled variables the relationships between socially affluent and socially elite exhibited a very large and positive correlation ($r = .520, p < .01$) as might be expected. In fact, social affluence and education ($r = .286, p < .01$) were among the largest correlations; also to be expected. Of particular interest was the relationship between

socially desirable traits and undesirable traits where a strong negative correlation was expected and reported ($r = -.162, p < .01$).

When the data were examined for the out-group, immigrant Blacks, there were some interesting contrasts with those of the in-group (see Table 4.9). For example, age was only correlated with household size ($r = -.227, p < .01$), education ($r = -.141, p < .01$) and social affluence ($r = -.067, p < .05$).

Table 4.9

First Order Correlation Matrix for Out-Group (Non-Native Blacks) Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income, Economically Challenged, Social Image, Elite Image, Socially Undesirable and Socially Desirable Traits Controlling for Propinquity Across In- and Out-Group Membership.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00									
2	.056	1.00								
3	-.227**	-.148**	1.00							
4	-.141**	-.087**	-.037	1.00						
5	-.047	-.150**	.154**	.367**	1.00					
6	-.016	-.018	-.028	-.022	.060*	1.00				
7	-.067*	-.003	-.005	.073*	.035	.268**	1.00			
8	-.038	-.015	-.014	-.005	-.011	.099**	.497**	1.00		
9	-.004	-.003	-.038	.153**	.141**	-.016	-.005	.017	1.00	
10	.056	.144**	-.086**	-.072*	-.050	.053	.165**	.088**	-.193**	1.00

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

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

1=Age 2=Region 3=Household Size 4= Education 5=Income 6=Economically Challenged 7=Socially Affluent 8=Socially Elite 9=Socially Undesirable 10= Socially Desirable

Other relevant relationships that were examined included income and education ($r = .367, p < .01$), household size ($r = .154, p < .01$) as well as the scaled measure of socially undesirable ($r = .141, p < .01$). In general the correlations for both in- and out-groups supported the use of the variables in the proposed model of propinquity as conceptualized in this investigation. The

next section of this analysis will focus on the multivariate relationship among these variables and how they can be used to address the hypothesis and sub-hypotheses in this investigation.

Multivariate Analyses

Hierarchical Regression Analysis

In order to test the hypothesis and the sub-hypotheses it was necessary to use a multivariate technique, in this case hierarchical regression analysis. This procedure was used because it allows assessment of the influence of three components on the outcome measure while at the same time maintaining the integrity of the model. Employing these groups helped to establish the usefulness and veracity of the model. All analysis were performed using SPSS (Version 22).

A series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to determine the influence of the predictors on the outcome measure of propinquity while controlling for group membership. There were two regression analyses done for each hypothesis and sub-hypotheses. Each equation had three blocks. The first group (Block 1) examined the influence of the basic socio-demographic measures on the outcome measure. The second group examined the influence of the socio-economic measures and its influence on the outcome measure while accounting for the presence of the socio-demographic variables. Finally the third group (Block 3) introduced each of the factors related to the specific sub-hypothesis examined. These models were applied to the separate groups. The summary regression tables show the unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) regression coefficients along with the standard error (SE) and the adjusted squared regression (R^2_{adj}) and change in the r-square changed (ΔR^2) for each block as more variables are entered into the model.

Sub-Hypothesis Results

Because this study explores predictors of propinquity, this section examines evidence relating to the sub-hypotheses. The hierarchical analyses used for the sub-hypotheses allows examination of the influence of the scaled components and assists in addressing whether or not the hypotheses should be sustained or rejected. The overall linear regression follows and provides a general perspective that pulls together the elements in a coherent and logical fashion.

H_{2a}: Native-born Blacks will have a stronger sense of closeness and feelings toward the economically challenged Blacks than will immigrant Blacks.

For the first group it is clear that although the overall R^2 is small, there were important contributions from Age, Region, and Household Size on Propinquity in this model (see Table 4.10). Block 2 for these data revealed that income and education were not strong predictors when the demographic variables were present. Unlike the analyses for Native-born Blacks, the demographic variables of Age, Region, and Household Size were not reliable predictors of Propinquity among Non-native-born Blacks. Indeed, the variable Economically Challenged was the largest (and only) reliable predictor of Propinquity (Block 3) among Non-native-born Blacks, similar to its predictive strength among Native-born Blacks (see Table 4.11). The resultant $R^2 = .012$, although still small, produced significant change (see Table 4.12) for overall summary). The final Block 3 continued to show the influence of some of the demographic variables Age ($\beta = -.061$, $p < .001$) and Region ($\beta = -.060$, $p < .001$) and the scaled variable of Economically Challenged ($\beta = .348$, $p < .001$).

Table 4.10

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Economically Challenged for Native-Born Blacks.

Model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	-.002	.001	-.054**	.011	.011***
Region	-.063	.016	-.069***		
Household Size	.024	.008	.050**		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	-.003	.001	-.061***	.012	.002*
Region	-.065	.016	-.071***		
Household Size	.024	.009	.051**		
Income	.000	.000	-.023		
Education	-.009	.005	-.031		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	-.002	.001	-.037*	.130	.119***
Region	-.055	.015	-.060***		
Household Size	.014	.008	.030		
Income	.000	.000	-.006		
Education	-.002	.005	-.009		
Economically Challenged	.307	.014	.348***		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

These variables accounted for 13% ($R^2_{adj} = .132$, $F(1,3419) = 473.246$, $p < .001$) that revealed a significant increase in the overall R^2 change ($\Delta R^2 = .119$, $p < .001$). These results tend to support the hypothesis insofar as it reveals a relationship between the variables as specified.

The results for the out-group in terms of sub-hypothesis H_{1a} (found in Table 4.11) indicate that the model explaining the relationship garnered significance in terms of Block 3 when the

scale variable, Economically Challenged was added to the equation (see Table 4.11). The amount of variance explained by the overall model was 14% ($R^2_{adj} = .144$, $F(1,1096) = 180.316$, $p < .001$) with a significant increase in the R^2 change ($\Delta R^2 = .140$, $p < .001$). Although a similar amount of variance explained is revealed between the two models the lack of substantial contribution by the variables in Block 1 and Block 2 suggested some difference between the groups (see Table 4.12 and Table 4.13).

Sub-Hypothesis H2a Outcome

In order to determine if the sub-hypothesis is support it is necessary to test the overall R for both the in-group and out-group models. The Fischer Transformation test meets this criteria and revealed that there were no differences between the overall results of the two regression models ($z = -0.74$, $p < .459$). The transformation test results can be found in Table 4.28 that appears at the end of this chapter. These results indicate that the hypothesis was not sustained. In other words, we must reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis that Native-born Blacks have no stronger sense of closeness and feelings toward the economically challenged Blacks than immigrant Blacks.

Table 4.11

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Economically Challenged for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	.000	.002	-.006	.001	.001
Region	.024	.025	.029		
Household Size	.013	.016	.025		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	-.001	.002	-.013	.004	.007*
Region	.014	.025	.017		
Household Size	.015	.016	.030		
Income	.000	.000	-.063		
Education	-.011	.009	-.041		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	.000	.001	-.007	.144	.140***
Region	.020	.023	.024		
Household Size	.007	.015	.014		
Income	.000	.000	-.030		
Education	-.009	.008	-.034		
Economically Challenged	.359	.027	.376***		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.12

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F Change	R ² Change
1	.108 ^a	.012	.011	13.473	.012***
2	.117 ^b	.014	.012	3.467	.002**
3	.364 ^c	.132	.131	473.246	.119***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income and Economically Challenged.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.13

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F Change	R ² Change
1	.036 ^a	.001	.001	0.479	.001
2	.093 ^b	.009	.004	4.021	.007*
3	.386 ^c	.149	.144	180.316	.140***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income and Economically Challenged.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

*H_{2b}: Native-born Blacks will have greater sense of closeness and feelings toward the **socially affluent and elite** Blacks than will Immigrant Blacks.*

As in the first series, the model reflect small changes between Block 1 and Block 2 with all of the social demographics measures contributing strongly toward the overall variance explained, albeit very small. Nevertheless, there was a significant change between the two Blocks (see Table 4.14). The final block introduces the scale variables of Social Affluence ($\beta = .370, p < .001$) and Social Elitism ($\beta = .141, p < .001$) along with Household Size ($\beta = .060, p < .001$). The final model revealed that 22% ($R^2_{adj} = .226, F(1,3419) = 474.494, p < .001$) that resulted in a significant overall R² change ($\Delta R^2 = .214, p < .001$) see Table 4.16.

Table 4.14

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Socially Affluent and Socially Elite for Native-Born Blacks.

Model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	-.002	.001	-.053***	.011	.011
Region	-.063	.016	-.069***		
Household Size	.023	.008	.049**		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	-.003	.001	-.061***	.012	.002*
Region	-.066	.016	-.072***		
Household Size	.023	.009	.049**		
Income	-.009	.000	-.019		
Education	.000	.005	-.034		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	.000	.001	-.002	.226	.214***
Region	-.026	.014	-.028		
Household Size	.029	.008	.060***		
Income	.000	.000	-.019		
Education	-.011	.005	-.039*		
Socially Affluent	.449	.023	.370***		
Socially Elite	.131	.017	.141***		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.15

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Socially Affluent and Socially Elite for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	B	SE	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	.000	.002	-.006	.001	.001
Region	.022	.025	.027		
Household Size	.013	.016	.026		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	.001	.002	-.013	.004	.008*
Region	.012	.025	.015		
Household Size	.015	.016	.030		
Income	-.000	.000	-.063		
Education	-.012	.009	-.043		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	.001	.001	.015	.195	.191***
Region	.011	.023	.014		
Household Size	.017	.014	.033		
Income	.000	.000	-.053+		
Education	-.014	.008	-.052+		
Socially Affluent	.445	.044	.337***		
Socially Elite	.160	.036	.148***		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. + $p < .10$.

Data for the Immigrant Blacks yielded no meaningful results for Block 1 and Block 2. The final Block revealed that Socially Affluent ($\beta = .337, p < .001$) and Socially Elite ($\beta = .148, p < .001$) contributed to the final model (see Table 4.15). Overall, this series of equations explained 20% ($R^2_{adj} = .195, F(1,1096) = 130.558, p < .001$) resulting in a significant R^2 change ($\Delta R^2 = .191, p < .001$) see Table 4.17.

Table 4.16

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F Change	R ² Change
1	.107 ^a	.011	.011	13.233	.011***
2	.116 ^b	.012	.012	3.374	.002**
3	.477 ^c	.280	.226	474.494	.214***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income, Socially Affluent and Socially Elite.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.17

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F Change	R ² Change
1	.036 ^a	.001	.001	0.474	.001
2	.094 ^b	.004	.004	4.148	.008*
3	.447 ^c	.195	.191	130.558	.191***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income, Socially Affluent and Socially Elite.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Sub-Hypothesis H_{2b} Outcome

The Fischer Transformation test showed no differences between the overall results of the two regression models ($z = 1.11, p < .267$). The transformation test results can be found in Table 4.28 that appears at the end of this chapter. These results indicate that the hypothesis was not sustained. In other words, we must accept the null hypothesis that Native–born Blacks have no stronger sense of closeness and feelings toward affluence and elitism among Blacks than Immigrant Blacks.

*H_{2c}: Native–born Blacks will exhibit more support of **socially undesirable** Blacks than immigrant Blacks will have toward socially undesirable Blacks.*

The pattern of the demographic variables contributing heavily toward the final model continues in Blocks 1 and 2 of the current model (see Table 4.18)

Table 4.18

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Undesirable for Native-Born Blacks.

Model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	-.002	.001	-.053**	.010	.011***
Region	-.061	.016	.007***		
Household Size	.023	.008	.048**		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	-.003	.001	-.061***	.012	.002*
Region	-.064	.016	-.070***		
Household Size	.023	.009	.049**		
Income	.000	.000	-.020		
Education	-.009	.005	-.031		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	-.002	.001	-.055**	.025	.014***
Region	-.061	.016	-.066***		
Household Size	.019	.009	.041*		
Income	.000	.000	-.011		
Education	-.002	.005	-.006		
Socially Undesirable	-.107	.015	-.122***		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The final model, Block 3, revealed that these demographic measures Age ($\beta = -.055, p < .01$), Region ($\beta = -.066, p < .001$) and Household Size ($\beta = .041, p < .05$) contributed toward the outcome measure along with the scaled measure of socially undesirable traits ($\beta = -.122, p < .001$). These overall measures accounted for 3% ($R^2_{adj} = .025, F_{(1,3419)} = 48.996, p < .001$) of the variance explained. The overall R^2 change ($\Delta R^2 = .014, p < .001$) presented only a small amount of variance explained (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.19

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Undesirable for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	.000	.002	-.005	.001	.001
Region	.025	.025	.030		
Household Size	.012	.016	.024		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	-.001	.002	-.012	.004	.007*
Region	.015	.025	.018		
Household Size	.015	.016	.029		
Income	.000	.000	-.063+		
Education	-.011	.009	-.040		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	-.001	.002	-.012	.012	.009**
Region	.016	.025	.019		
Household Size	.012	.016	.025		
Income	.000	.000	-.028		
Education	-.008	.009	-.052		
Socially Undesirable	-.099	.031	-.096**		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. + $p < .10$.

For Immigrant Blacks the general model (see Table 4.19) generated little in terms of explanation. Only social undesirability contributed toward the final model in a significant way ($\beta = -.096, p < .01$). Little variance could be explained by this model ($R^2_{adj} = .012, F(1,1096) = 9.862, p < .001$). Yet despite significant changes from Block 1 to Block 3 ($\Delta R^2 = .009, p < .001$) the model was not as meaningful as it was hypothesized to be (see Table 4.21).

Table 4.20

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F Change	R ² Change
1	.106 ^a	.011	.010	12.890	.011***
2	.114 ^b	.013	.012	3.204	.002*
3	.164 ^c	.027	.025	48.996	.014***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income and Socially Undesirable.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.21

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F Change	R ² Change
1	.036 ^a	.001	.001	0.488	.001
2	.092 ^b	.009	.004	3.974	.007*
3	.132 ^c	.017	.012	9.862	.009***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income and Socially Undesirable.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Sub-Hypothesis H_{2c} Outcome

The Fischer Transformation test showed no differences between the overall results of the two regression models ($z = 0.95, p < .342$). The transformation test results can be found in Table 4.28. These results indicate that the hypothesis was not sustained. In other words, we must reject the null and accept the alternative hypothesis that Native-born Blacks demonstrated no stronger sense of support toward socially undesirable Blacks than did Immigrant Blacks.

*H_{2d}: Native-born Blacks exhibit greater support of **socially desirable** Blacks than will Immigrant Blacks.*

The sub-hypothesis examining the influence of social desirability for Native Blacks demonstrated that the socio-demographic measures along with the social desirability measures ($\beta = .217, p < .001$) provided some useful data in helping to understand the outcome measure (see

Table 4.22). In fact, the final model explained about 6% ($R^2_{adj} = .058$, $F(1,3419) = 170.093$, $p < .001$) of the variance in propinquity for this group. The R^2 change measure indicated that there was a significant change in variance ($\Delta R^2 = .047$, $p < .001$) for the final model (see Table 4.24).

The final sub-hypothesis for Immigrant Blacks revealed that only Social Desirability ($\beta = .186$, $p < .001$) and to a lesser extent Income ($\beta = -.061$, $p < .10$) explained approximately 4% ($R^2_{adj} = .037$, $F(1,1096) = 38.341$, $p < .001$) of the variance. The same pattern was revealed in the amount of change from one Block to the next within the model. The model results (see Table 4.25) show that there was substantial and significant growth in the amount of variance explained from Block 1 and Block 2 to the final Block ($\Delta R^2 = .034$, $p < .001$).

Table 4.22

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Desirable for Native-Born Blacks.

Model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	-.002	.001	-.054**	.010	.011***
Region	-.061	.016	-.067***		
Household Size	.023	.008	.048**		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	-.003	.001	-.061***	.012	.002*
Region	-.064	.016	-.069***		
Household Size	.023	.009	.049**		
Income	.000	.000	-.020		
Education	-.009	.005	-.031		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	-.003	.001	-.070***	.058	.047***
Region	-.052	.015	-.057***		
Household Size	.023	.008	.048**		
Income	.000	.000	-.027		
Education	-.007	.005	-.025		
Socially Desirable	.340	.026	.217***		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.23

Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Propinquity (Block1), Propinquity with Age, Region and Household Size (Block 2), Propinquity with Age, Region, Household Size, Income and Education and (Block 3) Propinquity Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, and Socially Desirable for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	B	SE	β	R^2_{adj}	ΔR^2
<i>Block1</i>					
Age	.000	.002	-.005	.001	.001
Region	.025	.025	.030		
Household Size	.012	.016	.024		
<i>Block2</i>					
Age	-.001	.002	-.012	.004	.007*
Region	.015	.025	.018		
Household Size	.015	.016	.029		
Income	.000	.000	-.063+		
Education	-.011	.009	-.040		
<i>Block3</i>					
Age	-.001	.002	-.016	.037	.034***
Region	-.005	.025	-.005		
Household Size	.020	.016	.040		
Income	.000	.000	-.061+		
Education	-.007	.009	-.026		
Socially Desirable	.295	.048	.186***		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.24

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Propinquity Model for Native Born Blacks.

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F Change	R^2 Change
1	.106 ^a	.011	.010	12.929	.011***
2	.114 ^b	.013	.012	3.160	.002*
3	.245 ^c	.060	.058	170.093	.047***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income and Socially Desirable.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.25

Adjusted R Squared for Sequential Regression for Proximity Model for Non-Native Blacks.

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>Adjusted R</i> ²	<i>F Change</i>	<i>R</i> ² Change
1	.036 ^a	.001	.001	0.488	.001
2	.092 ^b	.009	.004	3.974	.007*
3	.205 ^c	.042	.037	38.341	.034***

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region Household Size.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, and Income.

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Region, Household Size, Education, Income and Socially Desirable.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Sub-Hypothesis H_{2d} Outcome

The Fischer Transformation test showed no differences between the overall results of the two regression models ($z = 1.22, p < .223$). The transformation test results can be found in Table 4.28. These results indicate that the hypothesis was not sustained. In other words, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that Native-born Blacks demonstrated no stronger support of social desirability than Immigrant Blacks.

Central Hypothesis Outcome

H1 *Native-born Blacks will have a greater sense of closeness and feelings toward the Black groups when social economic status, age, region, and economically challenged, socially affluent/elite, and socially undesirable/desirable traits than will Immigrant Blacks.*

While the hierarchical regression models were able to provide some clues as to how the variables interacted with the outcome measure as suggested by the sub-hypotheses, the overall question required the inclusion of all variables in one final regression model. Table 4.26 provides the data on the model that addressed the question. All indicators were within acceptable standards of tolerance and did not exhibit any untoward traits in terms of the final model as was suggested in the initial correlational analyses.

The measures that revealed the strongest relationships to the outcome measure in the model were Age ($\beta = .041, p < .01$) and the scaled variables of Economically Challenged ($\beta = .181, p < .001$), Socially Affluent ($\beta = .284, p < .001$), Socially Elite ($\beta = .132, p < .001$), Socially Undesirable ($\beta = -.086, p < .001$), and Socially Desirable ($\beta = .072, p < .001$), contributed to the overall percent of variance explained. In fact, 27% ($R^2_{adj} = .271, F(10,3418) = 127.988, p < .001$) of what accounts for propinquity among Native Born Blacks was revealed by this model.

Among Immigrant Blacks (see Table 4.27) only the scale measures contributed toward the final outcome. The overall results showed that Economically Challenged ($\beta = .249, p < .001$), Socially Affluent ($\beta = .220, p < .001$), Socially Elite ($\beta = .149, p < .001$), Socially Undesirable ($\beta = -.055, p < .05$), and Socially Desirable ($\beta = .073, p < .01$) all had strong relationships in the anticipated directions in the final model which explained about 26% of the variance ($R^2_{adj} = .256, F(10,1088) = 38.709, p < .001$).

Table 4.26

Regression Analyses of Propinquity, Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Economically Challenged, Socially Affluent, Socially Elite, Socially Undesirable and Socially Desirable for Native-Born Blacks.

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>
Age	.000	.001	-.001
Region	-.022	.014	-.024
Household Size	.019	.007	.041**
Income	.000	.000	-.004
Education	-.001	.005	-.005
Economically Challenge	.160	.014	.181***
Socially Affluent	.343	.024	.284***
Socially Elite	.122	.017	.132***
Socially Undesirable	-.075	.014	-.086***
Socially Desirable	.113	.024	.072***
Constant	.532***	.105	
R ²	.273		
R ² _{adj}	.271		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The overall results for Native Blacks explained 27% of the variance while the results for the Immigrant Blacks accounted for 26% of the variance explained. In order to verify the hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses a comparison of the results had to be employed. This was accomplished by using the Fisher Transformation test which allows the comparisons of Multiple R (the initial correlation that is used to generate the R²). The results of the test comparisons are in Table 4.28. The results show the Multiple R actual scores and the resulting z transformations as well as an indication of whether or not they hypotheses were supported after the comparisons were made.

Table 4.27

Regression Analyses of Propinquity, Age, Region, Household Size, Income, Education, Economically Challenged, Socially Affluent, Socially Elite, Socially Undesirable and Socially Desirable for Non-Native Blacks.

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>
Age	.000	.001	.010
Region	.009	.022	.011
Household Size	.012	.014	.024
Income	.000	.000	-.026
Education	-.009	.008	-.033
Economically Challenge	.238	.027	.249***
Socially Affluent	.290	.045	.220***
Socially Elite	.161	.034	.149***
Socially Undesirable	-.057	.028	-.055*
Socially Desirable	.116	.044	.073**
Constant	.447*	.190	
R ²	.262		
R ² _{adj}	.256		

Dependent Variable: Propinquity.

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4.28

Comparisons of Multiple R Scores for In- and Out-Groups Using Fisher R to Z Transformation Test for the Differences between Multiple R Correlation Coefficients.

Hypotheses Examined	In Group Native Blacks R	Out Group Immigrant Blacks R	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	Hypothesis Supported
H _{1a} Economically Challenged	.364	.386	-0.74		No
H _{1b} Socially/Elite	.477	.447	1.11		No
H _{1c} Socially Undesirable	.164	.132	0.95		No
H _{1d} Socially Desirable	.245	.205	1.22		No
Overall H ₁	.523	.512	0.44		No

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview

The aim of this study is to examine how Native-born Blacks perceive themselves and how they are perceived by Immigrant Blacks from different ancestral origins living in America. These phenomena were guided by the overarching concept of Black Propinquity, which is defined as 1) *a felt sense of closeness in ideas and feelings with native-born Blacks*, and 2) *positive image ideations toward native-born Blacks*. The final chapter discusses the results, integration of findings, implications of findings, limitations and future directions for research.

In this research two groups are represented as either *In-group* (which refers to Native-born Blacks) or *Out-group* (which refers to Immigrant Blacks) in the sample. The following research question was explored; to what extent is perceived group status related to a sense of closeness among Black groups in the United States when socio-economic status, age, education region of residence, household size, household income; and economically challenged, socially affluent/elite, and socially undesirable/desirable traits are considered? The following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses were tested. The results of each is reported here and in Table 5.1.

H1 *Native-born Blacks will have a greater sense of closeness and feelings toward Black groups when social economic status, age, education, household income, household size, region, and economically challenged, socially affluent/elite, and socially undesirable/desirable traits than will Immigrant Blacks. (Not Supported).*

H1a: *Native-born Blacks will have a stronger sense of closeness and feelings toward the economically challenged Blacks than will Immigrant Blacks. (Not Supported).*

H1b: *Native-born Blacks will have greater sense of closeness and feelings toward the socially affluent and elite Blacks than will Immigrant Blacks. (Not Supported).*

H1c: *Native-born Blacks will exhibit more support of socially undesirable Blacks than immigrant Blacks will have toward socially undesirable Blacks. (Not Supported).*

*H_{1a}: Native-born Blacks will exhibit more support of **socially desirable** Blacks than immigrant Blacks will have toward socially desirable Blacks. (Not Supported).*

Hierarchical Regression Analysis (HRA) was used to describe the findings for the four models—each with three steps—for each group which established the basis for comparison of the results. To examine the general hypothesis all variables were included in the model without regard to a hierarchical relationship because there was no implied order of entry for that hypothesis. Although the results showed that none of the original hypotheses were supported they were not different from some of the research literature that suggested that there were no real differences between how Blacks perceived each other because of the strong sense of cooperation constructs (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; Feagin, 2013; McAdoo, 2002) that existed within the community.

Connections to the Related Literature

In the models tested, the null forms of the hypotheses were rejected. Although the data revealed that there were differences between how both Native-born Blacks and Immigrant Blacks perceived Blacks the final statistical analyses revealed no significant difference between the models. It is helpful to know that the variables used to explain the final outcome for the two groups, although very similar, differed in terms of which variables contributed to the final model outcome. However, a comparison between the variables was not conducted and because there were only a few differences it did not influence the overall results. Table 5.1 offers a complete summary of the model comparisons across all ten regression models.

These results for hypotheses are not congruent with some of the extant literature which suggested that there is no difference in how Native-born Blacks and Immigrants view the generalized concept of Blackness as (Thornton, Taylor & Chatters, 2013; Williams, 2011,

McAdoo, 2012). Other sources indicate the Immigrant Blacks are not favorably disposed in their view of Native-born Blacks due to cultural influences and racial stereotypes that come to influence how Blacks view each other (Hyman & Sheatsley, 1956; Bob & Kluegel, 1993; Robinson, 2010; Vickerman, 1999, Williams, 2011).

The absence of agreement in the literature suggests that the issues may be more complex than the research on this topic has been able to capture. This research supports the notion that there are no statistical differences between in-group and out-group perceptions of Blacks, but that there may be more subtle differences that were not revealed in the broad analysis conducted here. Due to the limitations imposed by the data and the hypotheses tested in this research, it would be risky to speculate further about the meaning of these results with respect to the disposition of immigrant Blacks toward Native -born Blacks without more in-depth analyses preferably one with a longer-term focus and more historical perspective.

The simple bivariate analysis might have suggested that the literature may be accurate when it reported that some immigrant Blacks do not want to be characterized as African American. This speculation suggested that the root of immigrant Blacks' perceptions of negative stereotypes about African Americans were due to social and economic spheres such as joblessness, welfare dependency, and family disorganization attributed to Native-born Blacks (Robinson, 2010; Hwang, Fitzpatrick & Helms, 1998; Wilson, 1987). The overall multivariate analysis suggests that such views are not necessarily indicative of the overall concept of propinquity that both groups exhibited toward one another. In short, previous investigations which did not utilize a multivariate approach were prone to draw the same conclusions because they were not able to see how these elements operated in concert with each other. This is

perhaps why the hypotheses as written were not sustained. Perhaps there is a stronger sense of cooperation than competition despite what has been revealed in some previous investigations.

Table 5.1

Comparisons of Multiple R Scores for In- and Out-Groups Using Fisher R to Z Transformation Test for the Differences between Multiple R Correlation Coefficients.

Hypotheses Examined	In Group Native Blacks R	Out Group Immigrant Blacks R	z	p	Hypothesis Supported
H _{1a} Economically Challenged	.364	.386	-0.74		No
H _{1b} Socially/Elite	.477	.447	1.11		No
H _{1c} Socially Undesirable	.164	.132	0.95		No
H _{1d} Socially Desirable	.245	.205	1.22		No
Overall H ₁	.523	.512	0.44		No

Summary

In summary, although a broader understanding of Black Proximity emerges from the inclusion of the study variables, there are no statistical differences in how it is perceived based on group membership. The data shows that both in-group (Native-born Blacks) and out-group (Immigrant Blacks) reflected similar perceptions and as a result had a very similar reaction to the outcome measure. Although this is somewhat disappointing it is not surprising given the strength of American hegemony and how it influences the concept of race and relations between, among, and across groups within the United States (Burrell, 2019; Burrell, Webb, & White, 2014; Feagin, 2013). The fact that those variables entered the regression equation and remained statistically significant demonstrates their contribution to this analysis.

Based on the literature, the assumption is that there is no difference in perceptions of closeness in ideas and feelings and image ideation toward Blacks by either group was supported. As with social science research there were prevailing views among social scientists that social

relationships between native-born Blacks and Immigrant Blacks will result in either *cooperation* or *competition* between the two Black groups (Hyman & Sheatsley, 1956; Bob & Kluegel, 1993; Robinson, 2010).

On the one hand, the *cooperation* construct supports a monolithic image of Blacks; that Blacks are more alike and that there was variation or friction within the Black community (Burrell, Webb & White, 2014; Feagin, 2013; McAdoo, 2002). On the other hand, the *competition* construct insist that there is a splintering or disintegration within the Black community in America that affects the sense of closeness or social distance and image ideation between native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks (Hyman & Sheatsley, 1956; Bob & Kluegel, 1993; Robinson, 2010).

The findings of the current research indicate that both cooperation and competition models may exist between these two groups. However, that is not as easily discerned as suggested by the literature. The complex nature of race relations and the strong prevailing hegemony can and does masks some of the outcomes because it is not possible to predict with great accuracy why some feel the way they do—in this case, the data could only account for notions of propinquity for about 25% of the time.

The overall findings of this study suggest that the perceptions of native-born Blacks and immigrant Blacks toward native-born Blacks are mixed, and yet there is no statistical difference in the overall findings, further pointing out the conundrum that often face researchers when addressing the complex issue of race in America.

According to the research literature, perceptions are influenced by sociological and psychological factors imposed on members of a given society. Not surprising, the results were similar because the effects of living in America seemed to outweigh any cultural differences.

This is perhaps because the general experiences by both groups are similar because of the lack of difference seen among them by the general American society. What was both surprising and to an extent uplifting was that this investigation revealed that Immigrant Blacks have as strong a sense toward the measures of Black Propinquity as Native-born Blacks; further enhancing the notion that the strong socialization that takes place in America is not lost on both Native and Immigrant groups alike.

Limitations

While all investigations have limitations, there are some that were more unique to this investigation than others. Clearly the use of secondary data analysis poses a problem, especially if the research question demands a quality from the data that is marginal at best. In this case, defining the outcome measure was problematic because the question as conceptualized required a much more highly refined outcome measure than the existing data set had. In short, although the data are of excellent quality, the questions are not as specific as one might prefer, including the critical demographic measures. Nevertheless, the items did allow some fundamental answers to emerge about the research question.

Another troubling aspect of using secondary data is that many of the critical variables that could have been used for more detailed analysis were limited because of restrictions placed on the data by the principal investigators when they released the information for public use. Still another limitation of the data came about in terms of how the data were characterized—in other words, how some of the data missed out on what I would have termed as key indicators about the respondents. For instance, it would have been good to know the source of respondents' attitudes and beliefs about the in-group or out-group. Although there were general questions in this vein, they were not specific enough to allow one to mine the data in the most useful way.

The measure of propinquity may not be the most appropriate one for extracting the subtle differences in in-group and out-group perceptions on feelings of social distance. There may be many more highly refined concepts of how people view each other that go well beyond the simple perception of group membership. Another factor may be the history between members of the in- and out-groups that was not acknowledged. It is clear that race and ethnicity are complex issues, and when you add these to the current racial dynamic and history of Black people in the United States it is easy to see how much more work must be done before definitive conclusions can be drawn around the in- and out-group construct among Blacks.

The financial and economic issues may be more important to tease out than the social issues for some of the respondents in the sample. This possibly would have helped to identify why and how some of the results appeared as they did. Because there was no such ways to discern this in the present investigation some very powerful and important distinctions may have been missed. Finally, the preexisting data used in this investigation had built in limitations that did not always suit the focus of this investigation.

Implications

The lack of difference between these two groups must be considered. However, I would caution against over interpreting the findings for three reasons. The current social history may account for some closeness that had previously not been in existence. For example, the presence of prominent historical figures and the social mobility of many African Americans may engender in both groups a certain sense of closeness and pride that heretofore had not been seen. While it is tempting to assume that the results are externally valid across time, it is not prudent to do so since it is clear that there are many more questions that were raised by this study than were

answered by it. It must be pointed out that for both groups the influence of economics and economic status played a role in how people developed a sense of self.

There needs to be greater exploration of the influence of economics. The presence of the influence of economics revealed there are also some social class elements that could have had some influence. Unfortunately, that was not the central focus of this investigation so it was not explored in any greater depth other than to suggest that there were influences from these measures.

In terms of the overall findings, one can see while the z scores were not significant for the overall model, there were some differences between and across measures that were not tested but nevertheless did show that the groups had some differences in terms of values that were not examined in this investigation. Finally, the lack of difference does not mitigate the findings from other investigations, it only serves as a marker that more research is needed to understand the complex way in which race and context coalesce in the lives of Black people in the United States. Such findings could help develop and test a broader model on racial socialization that relates to the effects of in-group/out-group relationships in familial, political, economic enterprises, and the day-to-day events in the lives of Black Americans co-existing in 21st century America.

Future Research

Future research needs to examine in greater depth what it means to be close to or have an affinity for members of one's own group. In addition, there needs to be a more careful consideration of how subtle difference between and among groups works against the monolithic viewpoint that others (both in- and out-group) have about group membership.

Studies that intend to examine Black life in America must also include components about criminal justice involvement and how that influences images of people in this society. Social scientists must also do a careful examination of the history of the groups not just in the country but also consider the role regional location plays. It is necessary to do this given the overall strength and massive harm involvement in the criminal justice system has had on the Black and Hispanic communities in America.

The results of this investigation point toward the need to work more diligently on uncovering the subtle yet very strong elements of socialization in American society that influence how we see and respond to each other. To that extent, there needs to be further study that examines how such concepts also come to play in the lives of the many Hispanic and Asian American groups in the United States. The idea of the monolithic group may be more true for those who have been here for more than two generations but not necessarily be true for those here for less time. Additionally, researchers can examine what the values that support or reduce the sense of group membership are among all of these groups.

Another future study could look at all the different racial and ethnic groups in America in an effort to see just how close they are to themselves and to others and what is the overall effect of such closeness. The idea of social distance is not a new one, but it is one that has not been investigated, at least not on a national level with comprehensive samples; rather it is one that has been accepted and just allowed to exist because by its very nature it is thought to be logical and correct, when in fact it is more a reflection of the hegemonic structure of America that has not been challenged or explored.

Conclusions

This inquiry examined propinquity—defined as *closeness in ideas and feelings and image ideations toward among native-born Blacks* on specific social dimensions as had been discussed in the literature. Modeling the dimensions using regression analysis for both groups revealed that no significant differences were reported although the models for both groups explained about one-quarter of the variance in propinquity. The use of a representative sample, which has been different from other investigations, where much smaller numbers of Blacks were available, could perhaps be the difference for why those findings were not sustained.

The central question asked, to what extent does *Group Status—in-group and out-group*—inform on the sense of closeness and feelings and image ideations among Black groups in the United States? It has long been believed and is often demonstrated in the literature that Blacks as a group are different from Whites and others. The assumption that there is a monolithic Black community has been fed by our own history with slavery and other systems of racial apartheid that led to this conclusion. However, the literature revealed that the Black community is much more complex than previously thought, as each construct (race, gender, and ethnicity) is more multifaceted (Burrell, 2009). Such distinctions are not readily made for Blacks, and yet it is clear that the modern Black community in America consists of Black people from a variety of ethnicities and ancestral backgrounds. In short, all Blacks are not the same but see and judge each other on the dimensions in similar ways (Feagin, 2013; McAdoo, 2002). Earlier works on the relationships between racial identity attitudes and other racial constructs revealed that racial identity attitudes were significant in predicting self-esteem, both collectively and individually and that these identities had their roots in ancestral backgrounds (Bianchi, Zea, Belgrave, & Echeverry, 2002).

This study used the National Survey on American Life (NSAL) which consisted of 6,082 face-to-face interviews were conducted with persons aged 18 or older—3,570 African Americans, 1,438 Black respondents of Caribbean descent, 891 non-Hispanic Whites, and 183 other Blacks to help me address this question. This marked the first time that African Americans were so highly represented in a national survey. Given the interest of this investigation the data were further refined to include only Blacks (3,461) and immigrant Blacks (1,621).

A confirmatory factor analysis generated five latent measures which were included in final model for this investigation. The results revealed that for both Native Born Blacks ($R^2_{adj} = .271$ or 27.1% ($F_{10,3408} = 127.988$, $p < .001$) and Immigrant Blacks ($R^2_{adj} = .256$ or 25.6% ($F_{10,1088} = 38.709$, $p < .001$) about 26% of the variance in propinquity could be accounted for using the dimensions in this model. In addition, Fisher r-to-z transformation showed no significant differences between these final scores.

There are three main issues that are important with the outcomes of this study. *First*, there is a need to have clear concepts around how groups come to view themselves in American society is important to both the sustainability and overall well-being of these groups. *Second*, the issue of race and ethnicity continues to be an important construct and despite the belief that we now live in a post-racial society, there are many more issues that should and must be explored, especially given our racially charged history and the new spate of racially based incidents that are now coming to light in America. *Third*, and although it may make us uncomfortable, the issues of race and ethnicity must continue to be included in our social policy discussions and must not be brushed aside by policymakers.

To date, there is no model to date that has examined the ideas presented in this investigation. Thus, it is a starting point for helping to develop a more comprehensive or

meaningful theory of what seems to be a core issue on well-being for families—understanding and concretizing their experiences into some meaningful paradigm that will allow us to process the many important and subtle dynamics that make up the racial/ethnic dynamic in America. This is underscored by the many questions that could not be addressed by this investigation.

In conclusion, the measure of propinquity used may not be the most appropriate one for extracting the subtle differences that we revealed in a previous investigation, nevertheless they point out that there are some underlying factors present. Second, while the z scores were not significant, effects were discovered for the overall model, there were some differences between and across measures suggesting that with better measures there might have been some real differences; therefore, refinement of the concepts is indicated. Finally, the lack of difference does not mitigate the findings from other investigations, it only serves as a marker that more research is needed to understand the complex way in which race and context coalesce in the lives of Black people in the United States. Such findings could help develop and test a broader model on racial socialization that relates to the effects of in–group/out–group relationships in familial, political, economic enterprises, and the day-to-day events in the lives of Black Americans co-existing in 21st century America.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, Z. (2009). African brothers in the hood: Immigration, Islam, and the Black encounter. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 82 (1), 37–62.
- Akyeampong, E. (2000). Africans in the diaspora: *The diaspora and Africa*. *African Affairs*, 99. 183–215.
- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 826–874.
- American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (4th Ed.) (2009). Houghton Muffin.
- Amissah, C. K. (1996). Sub-Saharan Africans in the U.S. Labor Market: The Cost of and theoretical challenges. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31, 105–125.
- Asante, M. K. (2009). *Afrocentricity*. South Africa: South African City Press.
- Babbie, E. (1973). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. (1986). *The practice of social research* (4th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. (2012). *The practice of social research* (13th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baldwin, J. A. & Bell, Y. (1985). The African–Self–Consciousness Scale: An Afrocentric personality questionnaire. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 9(2), 61–68.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prince–Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self–efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Barbarin, O. A. (1993). Coping and resilience: Exploring the inner lives of African American children. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 19, 478–492.

- Baron, R., & Kenny, D. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1173–1182.
- Becker, T. (1973). Black Africans and Black Americans on an American Campus: The African view. *Sociology and Social Research*, *57*(2), 168–181.
- Bianchi, F., Zea, M., Belgrave, F., & Echeverry, J. (2002). Racial identity and self–esteem among Black Brazilian men: Race matters in Brazil too! *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *8*, 157–169.
- Bobo, L. & Hutchings, V. L. (1996). Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer’s theory of group position to a multicultural social context. *American Sociological Review*, *61*(6), 951–972. Retrieved April 15, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2096302>.
- Bobo, L. (1997). The color line, the dilemma, and the dream. 31–35. *Civil Rights and Social Wrongs*. John Higham, editor. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Bonilla–Silva, E. (2004a). From bi–racial to tri–racial. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *27*(6), 931–950.
- Bonilla–Silva, E. (2004b). We are all Americans. *Race and Society*. *5*(1), 3–16.
- Bullock, A. & Trombley, S. (1999). *The Norton dictionary of modern thought* (2nd Ed.). New York–London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Burke, P. J. (1991). Identity processes and social research. *American Sociological Review*, *56*(6), 836–849. .

- Burrell, J. V. (2009). *The influences of gender, generation, and racial/ethnic groups on adaptations to hegemony in contemporary America*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.er.lib.k-state.edu/docview/304914605?accountid=11789>.
- Burrell, J.V., Webb, F. J. & White, V.A. (2014). Americans' perception of strong commitment to families across race and ethnic groups. *Marriage & Family Review, 50*(3), 199-215.
- Capps, R., McCabe, K., & Fix, M. (2011). *New Streams: Black African Migration to the United States*. Washington, DC. Migration Policy Institute.
- Cashin, S. (2001). Middle-class Black suburbs and the state of integration: A post-integrationists vision for metropolitan America. *Georgetown Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper no. 241245*, 729–776.
- Cheney, G. & Tompkins, P. (1987). Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment. *Central States Speech Journal, 38*(1), 1–15.
- Cheng, A. A. ((2001). *The melancholy of race: Psychoanalysis, assimilation, and hidden grief*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Cherry, K. (2011). Social learning theory: An overview of Bandura's social learning theory. *Developmental Psychology*. Retrieved January 12, 2014 from psychology.about.com/developmentalpsychology/a/sociallearning.html.
- Constantine, M. G., Richardson, T. Q., Benjamin, E. M., & Wilson, J. W. (1998). An overview of Black racial identity theories: Limitations and considerations for future theoretical conceptualizations. *Applied & Preventive Psychology, 7*, 95–99.
- Cooper, M. L., Russell, M., & Frone, M. R. (1990). Work stress and alcohol effects: A test of stress-induced drinking. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 31*, 260–276.

- Cross, W. E. (1971). The Negro to Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World*, 20, 13–27.
- Cross, W. E. (1978). The Thomas and Cross model of psychological Nigrescence: A literature review. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 4, 13–31.
- Cross, W. E. & Fhagen–Smith, P. (2001). In *New Perspectives Racial Identity Development* (1st Ed.; pp. 243–268). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Crowder, K. (1999). Residential segregation of West Indians in the New York/New Jersey metropolitan area: The roles of race and ethnicity. *International Migration review*, 33, 79–113.
- Davis, D. B. (2001). *In the image of God: religion, moral values, and our heritage of slavery*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deaux, K., Bikmen, A., Gilkes, A., Ventuneac, A., Joseph, Y., Yasser, A., Steele, C., & Steele, P. (2007). Becoming American: Stereotype threat effects in Afro–Caribbean immigrant groups. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70(4), 384–404.
- Dyson, M. R. (2005). Racial free–riding on the coattails of a dream deferred: Can I borrow your social capital? *The William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 13(3), 967–995. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.lib.k-state/docview/201630851?accountid=11789>
- Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic Racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Feagin, J. R. (2010). *The White racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter–framing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Feagin, J. R. (2013). *The White racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter–framing* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Fears, D. (2002, December 26). People of color who never felt they were Black. *The Washington Post*, p. A01.
- Fennese, J. (1968). The general linear model: A new perspective on some familiar topics. *American Journal of Sociology*, 7(1), 1–27.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: And sex and drugs and rock n' roll* (3rd Ed.). London, England: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Fitzgerald, K. J. (2007). *Beyond the white ethnicity: Developing a sociological understanding of Native American Identity reclamation*. Lanham, KY: Lexington books.
- Fix, M., Zimmerman, W., & Passel, J. S. (2001). *The integration of immigrant families in the United States*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Foner, N. (2001). West Indian migration to New York: An overview. In N. Foner (Ed.). *Islands in the city: West Indian migration to New York* (pp. 1–22). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Glass, G. V. (1976). Primary, Secondary, and meta-analysis of research. *Educational research*, 5(10), 3–8.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Greenwald, A. G. (1988). *A social-cognitive account of the self's development*. In D. Lapsley & Power (Eds.). *Self, ego, identity: Integrative approaches* (pp. 30–42). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Guralnik, D. B. (1970). *Webster's new world dictionary of the American language*. New York and Cleveland: The World Publishing Company.

- Ha, S. E. (2010). The consequences of multiracial contexts of public attitudes toward immigrants. *Political Research Quarterly*, 63(1), 29–42.
- Hall, R. E. (1995). The bleaching syndrome: African Americans' response to cultural domination vis-a-vis skin color. *Journal of Black Studies*, 26(2), 172–184.
- Haney-Lopez, I. (1996). *White by law*. New York University Press.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling*, 92–122. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hwang, S., Fitzpatrick, K. M., & Helms, D. (1998). Class differences in racial attitudes: A divided Black America? *Sociological Perspectives*, 41, 367–374.
- Jackson, B. E. (1975). Black identity development. *Journal of Educational Diversity*, 2, 19–25.
- Jackson, B. E. III & Wijeyesinghe, C. L. (2001). *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 243–270). New York: New York University Press.
- Jackson, J. S. (2007) National Survey on American Life (NASL), 2001–2003 (ICPSR 00190). Retrieved December 12, 2003 from <http://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR00190.V1>.
- Jackson, J. S., Forsythe-Brown, I. & Govia, I. O. (2007). Age cohort, ancestry, and immigrant generation influences in family relations and psychological well-being among Black Caribbean family members. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(4), 729–743. Retrieved April 14, 2014 from www.rcgd.isr.umich.edu.
- Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2012). Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches (4th Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

- Kasinitz, P. & Rosenberg, J. (1996). Missing the connection: Social isolation and employment of the Brooklyn waterfront. *Social Problems*, 43(2), 180–196.
- Kearsley, G. (2014). The theory into practice database. *Instructional Design*. Retrieved January 16, 2014 from <http://InstructionalDesign.org>.
- Kent, M. M. (2007). Immigration and America's Black population. *Population Bulletin: A publication of the Population Reference Bureau*, 62(4). Retrieved April 21, 2014 from www.prb.org/pdf07/62.4immigration.pdf.
- Kim, C. J. (2000). Bitter fruit: The politics of Black–Korean conflict in New York City. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- King, J. E., & Wilson, T. L. (1994). *Being the soul–freeing substance: A legacy of hope in AfroHumanity*. In M. J. Shujaa (Ed.). *Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox for Black life in White society*, pp. 9–27. Trenton, NJ: African World Press.
- Lee, J., & Bean, F. (2007). *Reinventing the color line: Immigration and America's new racial/ethnic divide*. *Social Forces*, 89, 561–586.
- Loewen, J. (1971). *The Mississippi Chinese*. Harvard University Press.
- Mastro, D. E. & Greenberg, B. (2010). The portrayal of racial minorities on prime time television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44(4), 690–703. DOI: 10.1207/s15506878jobern4404_10. Retrieved from Kansas State University Libraries on April 14, 2014.
- McClain, P. D., Carter, N. M., DeFrancesco Soto, V. M., Lyle, M. L., Nunnally, S. C., Scott, T. J., Kendrick, J. A., Grynawiski, J. D., Lackey, G. F. & Cotton, K. D. (2006). Racial Distancing in a Southern City: Latino Immigrants' Views of Black Americans. *Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 571–584.

- McLeod, S. A. (2008). Social identity theory. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved January 16, 2014 from <http://www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html>.
- Moore, S. (1998). *A fiscal report of the newest Americans*. Washington, DC: National Immigration Forum and Cato Institute. How much “there” is there? *The Journal of Politics*, 69(3), 597–615.
- National Urban League (2010). *The state of Black America 2010: Jobs Responding to the crisis*. New York.
- Newby, C.A., & Dowling, J.A. (2007). Black and Hispanic: The racial identification of Afro-Cuban immigrants in the southwest. *Sociological Perspectives*, 50(3), 343–366.
- Parillo, V. N. (2000). *Strangers to the shores: Race and ethnic relations in the United States*. 6th Ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Peters, L. A. (1998). *Perceptions across the great divide: A study on how Black Africans perceive African Americans*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.er.lib.k-state.edu/docview/304484609?accountid=11789>.
- Phinney, J. S. & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurements of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 54(3), 271–281.
- Portes, A. & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Politics and Science*, 530, pp. 74.
- Robertson, I. (1988). *Sociology* (3rd Ed). New York, NY: Worth Publishers, Inc.
- Robinson, E. (2010). *Disintegration: The splintering of Black America*. New York, NY: Double Day.

- Rouet, J., Britt, M. A., Mason, R. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1996). Using multiple sources of evidence to reason about history. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(3), 478–493.
- Schaefer, R. T. (2007). *Race and ethnicity in the United States* (4th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2007). Defining American Identity in the twenty–first century: How much “There” is there. *The Journal of Politics*, 69(3), 597–615.
- Schlafly, P. (2005). Parents are right about math gay ideology censors free speech congressmen need constitution tutorials: Who defines American culture? *Eagle Forum*, 40(6), Retrieved January, 8, 2008. Taken from *The American Citizens Handbook*, Hugh Birch-Horace Mann Fund, National Education Association (4th Ed.), 1951, 591 pp.http://www.unitedpatriotsofamerica.com/Home/Popup_Article_Details/Params/articles/154/default.aspx.
- Schmidley, A. D., Bledsoe, T., Welch, S. & Combs, M. W. (2001). Profile of the foreign–born population in the United States: *2000 US Census Bureau Current Population Reports*. Series P23–206. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Scott, J. & Marshall, G. (2014). *Oxford dictionary of sociology* (4th Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Scruggs, A. E. (2007). What kind of Blacks are we? *Washington Post*, July 29, 2007.
- Semmes, C. E. (1992). Cultural hegemony and African American development. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Shaw–Taylor, Y., & Tuch, S. A. (2007). *The other African Americans: Contemporary African and Caribbean immigrants in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- Singer, A. (2004). *The rise of new immigrant gateways*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Smith, J. P., & Edmondson, B. (1997). *The new Americans: Economic, demographic, and fiscal effects of immigration*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Springer, J.T. (2010). Fractured Diaspora: Mending the strained relationships between African American and African Caribbeans. *Wadabagei: A Journal of the Caribbean and its Diaspora*. 13(2), 2–34. Retrieved September 25, 2013 from ProQuest Database.
- Stepick, A., Grenier, G., Castro, M. & Dunn, M. (2003). *This land is our land*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. 33–74.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austins (Eds.). *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, 7–24. Chicago, IL: Nelson–Hall.
- Thomas, K.A. (2012). *A demographic profile of Black Caribbean immigrants in the United States*. Washington, DC. Migration Policy Institute.
- Thomas, R. E. (2003). *Black Americans and Black immigrants: The influence of ethnic identification on perceptions of race, prejudice, and individual success in American society*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.er.lib.k-state.edu/docview/305302620?accountid=11789>.

- Thompson, V. L. S. & Akbar, M. (2003). The understanding of race and the construction of African American identity. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 29(2), 80–88.
- Thornton, M. C., Taylor, R. J. & Chatters, L. M. (2013). African American and Black Caribbean mutual feelings of closeness: Findings from a national probability survey. *Journal of Black Studies*, 44(8), 798–828.
- Trochim, W. (2005). *Research Methods: The concise knowledge base*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- U. S. Department of Homeland Security. (2006). *2004 yearbook of immigration statistics*. Washington, DC.
- Umoh, S. (1982). *Comparing the social attitudes and perceptions that Black African and Black American students hold toward one another and variables affecting their relationships*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.er.lib.k-state.edu/docview/303254739?accountid=11789>.
- Vickerman, M. (1994). The responses of West Indians to African–Americans. *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations*, 7(83), 83–128.
- Vickerman, M. (1999). *Crosscurrents: West Indian migrants and race*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wagmiller, R. L. (2007). Race and the spatial segregation of jobless men in urban America. *Demography*, 44(3), 539–559.
- Warren, J. W., & Twine, F. W. (1997). White Americans, the new minority? *Journal of Black Studies*, 28(2), 200–218.

- Waters, C. M. (1994). Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation Black immigrants in New York City. *International Migration Review*, 28(4), 795–820. Retrieved January 15, 2014 from <http://Jstor.org/stable/2547154>.
- Waters, M., & Jimenez, T. R. (2005). Assessing immigrant assimilation: New empirical and theoretical challenges. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31, 105–125.
- Webster's New World Dictionary (1970). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- White, J. M. & Klein, D. M. (2002). *Family theories* (2nd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Williams, V. V. (2011). *Brothers of the trade: Intersections of racial framing and identity processes upon African-Americans and African immigrants in America: Ancestral kinsmen of the American slave trade*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved December 12, 2014 from <http://search.proquest.com.er.lib.k-state.edu/docview/885230751?accountid=11789>.
- Wilson, J., & Smelser, N. (2001). *America becoming: Racial trends and their consequences*. National Academy Press.
- Zachary, G. P. (2006). The Hotel Africa. *The Wilson Quarterly*, 30, 48–55.