Race and ethnicity are key dynamics at play in virtually every major issue America is facing. Educational inequities, crime and imprisonment, employment, health and mental health, inter-group conflict, family dysfunction, problems of youth and the aged all have significant racial and ethnic manifestations. Moreover, these concerns are likely to be with us for the foreseeable future. It is both surprising and disappointing to most scholars that America is still struggling with so many of the same race-related difficulties with which they struggled decades ago. Few of us who lived through the tumultuous 1960s and 1970s would have envisioned that after so many years, and after the passing of so much monumental legislation that race, color, and ethnicity would continue to be so powerful as predictors of life events. Still, most Americans would agree that our country has made significant race-related progress.

It is also the case that much has changed demographically in this country over the time. In the 1970s, when the idea for this book originated, one in five Americans was a person of color; today that figure is now roughly one in three (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). Furthermore, this number is projected to increase to one in two by the middle of this century. America’s rapidly changing racial and ethnic demography portends a future of increased cross racial/ethnic interaction. It is also likely to be the case that the disparities and differences which have historically occurred between racial and ethnic groups are likely to sustain themselves and be a cause of concern.

The idea for pulling together a collection of racial/ethnic group-specific instruments occurred to me in 1974. As a doctoral student at the University of Michigan, I came across a volume of scales, “Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes” by John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver (1969). I found this collection of psychological instruments to be both interesting and of considerable use. But even at that time, I felt that a collection of instruments which focused on racial and ethnic groups would also be useful.

Fortunately, Dr. Ray Engel, formerly the associate dean of the School of Social Work here at the University of Pittsburgh agreed to be the co-editor of this volume. He possesses a wealth of expertise and interest in measurement, so together we attempted to bring about what we believe is a valuable collection of instruments. With the help a legion of capable and supportive students, we have created what we believe will be an important resource for those attempting to assess intra- and inter-social psychological group differences.
We are aware that ours is not the first endeavor to gather a collection of instruments having race and/or ethnicity as its focus (Jones, 1996). Yet most efforts to date have focused on but a single racial or ethnic group or addressed primarily health or mental health issues, or concerns of identity. In contrast, the focus of this volume is on intra- and inter-social psychological measures across a number of racial/ethnic groups. Specifically, we have elected to focus on Caucasians, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and African Americans and their perceptions of self and interactions with others. We have also included “Generic” intra- and inter-group measures. Unlike the measures specific to certain racial/ethnic groups, these “Generic” measures are not targeted for use with a specific group. Hence, they can be used broadly and with groups for whom there exists no specific racial/ethnic measure. For example, a researcher may find these to be of value with Native Americans for whom specific measures are in short supply.

We did our best to collect the most up-to-date instruments available, but we are very much aware that there exist many more valuable scales, which for a variety of reasons, are not included here. Some we simply are unaware of and others we were unable to procure permission to use. We hope *Measuring Race and Ethnicity* will be well received by scholars from many disciplines. Clearly the scale development for racial and ethnic intra- and inter-group relations is more developed for some groups than in others. It is evident from the instruments listed here that scale development for some racial/ethnic groups is sorely needed. While these gaps in instrument development are very unfortunate, they highlight areas of significant opportunity for scale development. In particular, we strongly encourage greater development of scales for Native Americans.

**Contents of This Volume**

This volume contains six chapters as well as an appendix, which lists measurement scales that we are aware of, but have not received permission to list and review. We recognize that other racial or ethnic groups might have been included; for example, chapters on various Asian groups, Caribbean, or African immigrants would be beneficial given demographic trends. We have limited our efforts to chapters addressing the major racial/ethnic groupings in America, and have hopes to publish a more inclusive volume in the future.

**About the Volume**

The Chapter 1 focuses on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. It contains eight measurement scales. Each of these scales is an intra-group measure, and has as its goal the assessment of an individual’s level of acculturation. That is, the extent to which individuals are inclined to identify with either Asian or American culture. There are no scales in this chapter which assess inter-group perceptions of Asians
with other groups. For example, given the unfortunate recent history of inter-group conflict between Koreans and African Americans, it would be useful to have a measure assessing Korean/Black perceptions of relations (Hurh, 1998). It would also be worthwhile to have inter-group measures assessing the perceptions of attitudes and interactions between specific Asian ethnic groups, e.g., Chinese and Japanese, as it is the case that these groups have histories of inter-group conflict.

Chapter 2 focuses on Hispanics. Like the Asian American group, the Hispanic population is composed of a number of ethnic groups. There are 16 scales reviewed in the chapter. In our review of these measures, we found no measure that specifically focused on race-related relationships between Hispanics and other minority groups or between Hispanics and Whites. Therefore, this section focuses solely on intra-group measures that assess acculturation among Hispanic Americans.

Chapter 3 inspects African Americans. Because of its long history in America, this group has been researched and studied most pervasively. Research has been done on African Americans ranging from chronicling their history and culture to employment and crime. Researchers have studied between-group and within-group differences among African Americans. However to date, very little research attention has been given to group differences between African Americans and other minority groups of color. In this chapter, we review measures of intra-racial phenomena such as racial identity and acculturation. We also review instruments which attempt to assess inter-racial prejudice, prejudicial attitudes, cultural mistrust, and race-related stress. Fourteen scales are reviewed in this chapter.

Chapter 4 focuses on Caucasians. There are eight scales presented and reviewed in this chapter. All eight scales are inter-group assessment measures that focus on the inter-racial phenomena of racial prejudice and discriminatory attitudes. Most research in this area is focused on racism, discrimination practices, stereotyping, and prejudice. Additionally, some instruments focus specifically on perceived interactions between Caucasians and African Americans. But scales assessing race relations between Whites and other groups are scarce.

Chapter 5 is a compilation of generic scales. These scales are in principle suitable for use with any racial or ethnic group. They are the scales which researchers might employ when there is no known existing measure for a particular racial/ethnic group. There are 17 of these scales. Six of these scales measure intra-group phenomena focusing on ethnic identity and acculturation. Eleven scales measure inter-group racial phenomena focusing on issues ranging from attitudes toward diversity to racial attitudes/prejudice and cultural identification.

Chapter 6 is, clearly, an aspiration on our part. It focuses on Native Americans and has but one entry. We are certain that other scales exist, but we do not as yet have them. Still, scales assessing the perceptions and attitudes of Native Americans toward themselves as well as others are important. We, of course, view this as an area in great need of attention but one which, again, also presents tremendous opportunities for those who might construct such scales.

Finally, we have included an appendix listing measures for potential use across all racial/ethnic groups. We have neither reproduced the actual scales here, nor have we reviewed them for their psychometrics properties. Instead, we have merely listed
them so that readers would be made aware of their existence and possible availability for use. At present, those wishing to use them will have to contact the authors to obtain the actual instrument and permission to use it.

**Rationale for Selection of These Scales**

The instruments were selected following a thorough review of the social science literature; in particular, we utilized psychological abstracts. Indeed most of our instruments were located in journals such as *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Journal of Hispanic Studies*, *Journal of Social Psychology*, *Black Psychology*, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, and the *Journal of Personality Assessment*.

The study of race and inter-group relations in America has a long history, Dubois (1903), Drake and Cayton (1945), Clark and Clark (1947), Franklin (1968) and Bennett (1962). Most of this early work focused almost exclusively on Blacks and their perceptions about themselves, or on Whites’ attitudes or their perceptions. Rarely did these early measures address other racial or ethnic groups such as Asian Americans or Hispanics. Moreover, with respect to the procurement of race-focused instruments, we were unsure how far to go back in our inclusion of scales. Clearly, some measures of inter-racial interaction are classics such as the Bogardus (1932) scale. While many classic instruments such as the Bogardus scale warrant mention, many are no longer being used by present day researchers. The reasons for their discontinuation vary; some simply address topic areas in which there is presently little interest. Indeed, since the 1920s the study and thinking of race and ethnic relations in America has changed considerably (Duckitt, 1992). Researchers are asking different questions about different racial and ethnic groups. Furthermore, racial and ethnic groups over the time come to think about themselves differently, e.g., Colored versus Negroes versus African Americans. It is also true that significant racial and ethnic demographic changes have brought about new configurations of inter-group interactions. There is also an increasing group of Americans who view themselves as multiracial. That is, they report belonging to more than one racial/ethnic group and are classified by the census as being of mixed race. This is a potentially exciting and fruitful area of intra- and inter-racial/ethnic research.

Each of these changes has important implications for research scholars. We have tried to make the best decisions as to which scales were simply most important to the topics of interest for researchers today. Making these decisions as one might imagine were difficult and frequently dependent upon the availability of a specific scale. Again, this collection of instruments is very much a work in progress. It is our intent to revise this volume over time and add more newly developed scales, as well as some important ones which we were unaware of or were unable to get permission to use at the time of the publication of this volume.
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