

GROUP INDENTITY AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES OF  
AFRICAN-AMERICAN FRESHMAN

A Senior Thesis

By

Shellie Prentiss Birks

1996-97 University Undergraduate Research Fellow

Texas A&M University

Group: PSYCHOLOGY II

# Group Identity and Social Attitudes of African-American Freshmen

Shellie Prentiss Birks  
University Undergraduate Research Fellow, 1996-1997  
Texas A&M University  
Department of Psychology

APPROVED

Undergraduate Advisor: W. J. Wood

Exec. Dir., Honors, Program: Stephanie Russell

**GROUP IDENTITY AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN FRESHMEN.** Shellie P. Birks (Wendy L. Wood), Psychology, Texas A&M University.

This study examined how African American students' attitudes and beliefs change as they align with ingroups and differentiate from outgroups upon entering a predominantly Anglo environment. Eighty-five African-American freshmen participated in two sessions five months apart. In each session, participants indicated their own attitudes and attributes and those of their valued ingroup and derogated outgroup. These attributes covered 5 domains including: campus life, political philosophy, social issues, fashion and taste, and leisure activities. Overall, a tendency emerged, especially on issues of fashion and taste, for participants to rate themselves closer to the group than the outgroup. This tendency was not, however, found consistent across domains and did not increase from first to second assessment. Contrary to predictions, greater similarity to ingroup was not strongly related to self-esteem.

## Group Identity and Social Attitudes of African-American Freshmen

The increasing racial and ethnic diversification of our society suggests the importance of understanding how people develop and maintain their self-concepts as members of minority groups. Minority undergraduate students who involve themselves in social groups on campus have been found to identify with the educational institution and are more likely to stay in school (Mallinckrodt & Sedlecek, 1987). Self-relevant groups create a supportive environment, which may be important for African Americans to maintain their self-esteem in a predominantly Anglo university (Taylor & Hamilton, 1995).

Earlier investigations of ethnic minority members have suggested that individual identity depends on the extent to which people ally with their ethnic group. In particular, people's self-worth has been found to be linked to their evaluations of the reference groups to which they belong (Luthanen & Crocker, 1990). Some evidence has been found that ethnic identity is related to self-esteem (Crocker et al., 1994); however, the results have been mixed and measures of ethnic identity have varied widely.

Nonetheless, ethnic reference groups provide a stable sense of self-identity in changing contexts. A change in environment enhances the salience of identity; one result is that people increasingly affiliate with their ethnic group. For example, research with Hispanic students entering a predominantly Anglo learning institution found that those with a strong ethnic background were less likely to perceive threat to their cultural identity, more likely to become involved in Hispanic activities on campus, and more likely to report an increase in Hispanic identity throughout the year than students entering with weaker ethnic backgrounds (Ethier & Deaux, 1994).

Also, subgroups of one's broader ethnic group may be particularly important sources of self-identity. Thus, Huddy and Virtanen (1995) found that Latino subjects' personal identities were more closely tied to Latino subgroups (e.g., Cubans, Mexicans) than to the broader group of Latinos in general.

When clear ethnic subgroups are present, ethnic minorities encounter multiple groups to which they can belong. Especially when ethnic minorities enter a predominantly Anglo environment, their choice of subgroup identity is especially important for developing and maintaining their self-concept. Thus, understanding how they differentiate from certain subgroups and align with others requires further investigation. For example, when African-American students enter Texas A&M University, they may experience social pressure to adopt a particular subgroup identity (e.g., Corps member, fraternity/sorority member, gospel choir). Their self-concept is likely to depend on both the groups with which they align as well as those with which they choose not.

The purpose of this study is to examine how students' attitudes and beliefs change as they align with self-relevant campus groups and differentiate from other groups. Given that members of groups value their own group identity and derogate alternative groups, it is hypothesized that positive pressures will emerge over time to adopt attitudes and values similar to their own subgroups, and negative pressures will emerge to reject attitudes and values of other groups (Turner, 1991).

Group identity is important because it has implications for self-esteem. According to social identity theory, people align with valued ingroups and differentiate from derogated outgroups because they want to establish and maintain a positive self-image (Tajfel, 1982). Thus, in the present study we anticipated that students' self-esteem would increase to the extent that they

viewed themselves as similar to ingroups and different from outgroups. We also expected that convergence with ingroups and divergence from outgroups is likely to increase over time, as students become better acquainted with the relevant groups and more committed to their group memberships. To the extent that people converge with ingroups and diverge from outgroups, then the effects of group membership on self-esteem may become greater with longer duration of group membership. Furthermore, we anticipated that the relations between self-esteem and the ingroup would be larger than with outgroup; information about who one is, or the attributes possessed in common with an ingroup, is typically more useful than information about who one is not, or the attributes of an outgroup that one does not possess (McGuire & McGuire, 1992).

The present research consisted of a two-wave survey of African-American students entering Texas A&M University in the Fall, 1996. They rated themselves and various groups on a wide variety of domains, including campus life, political philosophy, social issues, fashion and taste, and leisure activities. Participants selected one group as their most valued ingroup and another as their most hated outgroup. We predicted that ratings of self would be more similar to ingroup than outgroup, that these group effects would increase over time, and that convergence with ingroup and divergence from outgroup would enhance self-esteem.

Participants also completed a standard racial identity scale, the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (Cross, 1971). We anticipated that participants' racial identity would be highly salient at both assessments, given that they are distinctive in the predominantly Anglo environment of A&M University. Furthermore, racial identity scores should increase the extent to which people converge with ingroups and diverge with outgroups, given that the salience of participants' race increases pressures for self-definition.

## Method

### Participants

A total of 100 African-American students in the entering class of the 1996-1997 school year participated in the first session. Eighty-five were re-contacted for the second session. Most participants were recruited by telephone calls. Other participants were recruited directly from classes with freshmen minorities.

The first session was held in September/October, 1996 and the second in February/March, 1997. Participants received \$10.00 for completing each session.

The 100 students who participated in the first session represent 43.5% of first-year African Americans who entered Texas A&M University in the fall of 1996. The 85 students in the second session represent 37% of first-year African-American students. Freshmen African Americans represented 3.6% of the total freshmen undergraduate class ( $n = 6,387$ ).

The total number of enrolled undergraduates at Texas A&M for the Fall of 1996 was 34,342. The ethnicity of 80% of the students attending Texas A&M was Caucasian. The total African-American representation equaled 3.3%, or 1,129 students.

### Procedure

Attitude profile survey. Participants rated their own attitudes and the attitudes of selected reference groups in five domains. The 5 domains included: attitudes toward campus life, political philosophy, specific social issues, matters of fashion and taste, and leisure activities. The survey included at least 5 questions in each domain.

The survey was divided into three sections. In the first, participants rated their own attitudes, or self. In the second section, participants rated attitudes using the perspective of the typical member of the group most important to them, or ingroup. In the third section, participants

rated attitudes using the perspective of the typical member of the group least important to them, or outgroup. Each section contained the same set of questions.

For the first domain, campus life, participants rated the importance of grades, studying, class attendance, socializing, and employment/job. Ratings were given on 10-point scales ranging from “least important” (1) to “very important” (10).

The second domain, political philosophy, was tapped through seven questions. Participants rated the political party with which they were affiliated (i.e., Democratic, Republican, Other, I do not affiliate with any political party). They also indicated how much they were politically active (voting and participating in political affairs), kept up with current events in the news (i.e., read the newspaper, watch news programs), and discussed current events with friends. Participants then indicated whether they were liberal or conservative. Next they rated how similar their political views were to their parents and then to their friends.

On 10-point scale ranging from “not in favor” (1) to “in favor” (10), participants rated their attitudes toward abortion, affirmative action, gays/lesbians and gay/lesbian rights, censorship of sex and violence in the movies and music, and Texas A&M University requiring a course on cultural and ethnic diversity.

Next, participants rated four aspects of fashion and taste, involving music, clothes, hairstyle, and slang. On a 10-point scale ranging from “very often” (10) to “not at all” (1), participants rated how often they listened to each of the listed types of music: alternative, classical and jazz, country, metal or rock, pop or R&B, rap, reggae, tejano, and other. When applicable, participants listed an other. On a similar scale, participants rated how often they wore the following apparel: athletic gear or sporty, casual, country/kicker, cultural/ethnic attire, dressy, eccentric, “grunge”, hip-hop, preppie, skater/surfer style, trendy/latest styles, uniform, and other.

When applicable, participants specified the other in the corresponding blank. Participants rated their hairstyle for 16 styles: conservative, finger-rolls, Gheri curled, stacked, natural,, curled, dreads, weave, relaxed/permed, wrapped, tinted, extensions, braided, afro, freeze, other. When applicable, participants checked “Other” and wrote the item in the corresponding blank.

Participants also indicated the slang terms they typically use around their peers (i.e., “what up”, “howdy”, “dude”, “man”, “that rocks”, “chill”, “tight”, “phat”, “dog”, “G”, “krunk”, “girl”, etc.?). Four blanks followed in which participants could write in the slang terms.

For leisure activities, participants rated how often they engaged in the following activities: attending plays/musicals, eating out, exercising, partying, playing sports, shopping, watching sports, bars/clubs/dancing, going out to a movie, watching television, reading for pleasure, hanging out with friends, and other. If applicable, participants specified the “other” item in the corresponding blank and then rated their attitude on the same response scale.

To rate the groups, participants first ranked the three organizations that were most important to them from a list of 30 student organizations. The groups included: ExCEL (program to retain and support minority freshman), Voices of Praise (a gospel choir), Fade to Black Dance Ensemble, NCAA Athletics, church or religious affiliation, College Republicans, the Corps of Cadets, Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Aggies, and Whoopstock Council. Two blank spaces were provided for participants to list additional organizations. Participants then selected the most valued organization and rated the typical member of this ingroup on each of the five domains that they had already completed in ratings for self.

Participants then ranked the three organizations that were least important to them from this list. They selected the most disliked organization as their outgroup and rated the typical attributes of an outgroup member on each of the domains.

Group Relevance. Three questions assessed the relevance of the groups in terms of the extent to which they participate in them. Participants were asked: “Do you plan on holding an office or executive position for any of your chosen organizations?” (participants checked “Yes”, “No” or “Not Sure”); “How long do you intend to be a part of each organization?” (participants checked either “a month or two”, “one semester”, or “both semesters” for each ranked organization); “How much time do you spend with other members in each organization?” (participants checked either “Very frequently”, “Daily”, “Occasionally”, or “Rarely” for each ranked organization).

Participants rated their feelings toward their most important ingroup on a group identification scale devised by Luhtanen and Crocker (1992). This scale was composed of 9 questions. Rating scales ranged from “strongly disagree” (0) to “strongly agree” (9) ( $\alpha$ s = .85 and .94 for the first and second sessions, respectively). Participants then rated their feelings toward the outgroup on the group identification scale ( $\alpha$ s = .87 and .84 for the first and second sessions, respectively).

Self-esteem measure. Participants also completed an individual self-esteem measure (Rosenberg, 1965). Responses were given on a scale ranging from “not at all accurate” (0) to “very accurate” (9) ( $\alpha$ s = .83 and .86 for the first and second sessions, respectively).

Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS). Lastly, the racial identity attitudes of the participants were measured using a 7-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to strongly agree (7) devised by Cross (1971). RIAS contains 4 stages: Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. The pre-encounter stage was excluded from this study because it was deemed inappropriate and possibly offensive. The Encounter stage is illustrated by a shift from an anti-Black to a pro-Black belief system. This stage is prompted by racially

shocking experiences that cause the individual to question prior beliefs or attitudes ( $\alpha$ s = .73 and .78 for the first and second sessions, respectively). The Immersion-Emersion stage is identified by the person radically endorsing African-American values and behaviors to the exclusion of Caucasians ( $\alpha$ s = .71 and .67 for the first and second). Internalization, the last stage in this model, is described by the individual's ability to ascribe selectively to values and behaviors from both Black and White cultures. Persons at this stage have a sense of compassion for all oppressed individuals and are generally more sensitive to individuals at lower identity stage levels. ( $\alpha$ s = .77 and .77 for the first and second sessions, respectively).

### Results

Difference scores were formed for each attribute by subtracting participants' ratings of the typical ingroup member from their rating of themselves and then by subtracting ratings of the typical outgroup member from self-rating. These difference scores were analyzed according to a Time (first vs. second assessment)  $\times$  Group (self compared with ingroup vs. self compared with outgroup) analysis of variance, with both factors representing repeated measures. Means and results of the statistical tests are reported in Table 1.

On the campus life measures, the only effect to emerge was that participants judged that, over time, they socialized less with friends than did the typical ingroup or outgroup member. Essentially, then, participants came to see themselves as less sociable than either group members.

On the political philosophy measures, significant time effects also emerged. During the first assessment, both ingroups and outgroups were judged more politically active than participants, whereas at the second assessment participants judged that they, themselves were more active. This is apparent in the time effects for political activity, keeping up with current events, and discussing current events with friends.

Ratings of political party affiliation yielded the anticipated interaction between time and group, with participants judging themselves closer to the ingroup at the second than first assessment and judging themselves further from the outgroup at the second than first assessment.

Similarly, ratings of similarity of participants' political views to their parents yielded the anticipated interaction. During the first assessment, participants rated their views as more similar to their parents than the typical ingroup member was to his/her parents, and this difference between self and ingroup was smaller during the second assessment. For comparisons with the outgroup, however, during the first assessment participants rated their views as more similar to their parents than the typical outgroup member was to his/her parents, but this difference between self and outgroup became larger during the second assessment and participants viewed themselves as less similar to their parents than was the typical outgroup member to his/her parents.

On the social issues measures, significant group effects emerged on all variables except the censorship of sex and violence in the media. Participants rated their attitudes closer to that of the ingroup than the outgroup for the first and second assessments. At both time periods, participants rated themselves more in favor of the issues than either group. The two significant interactions, involving the abortion issue and gay/lesbian rights reflect that, from the first session to the second, the difference between self and outgroup increased. However, convergence between own attitudes and ingroup attitudes remained constant across time.

On the fashion and taste measures, significant group effects occurred for 20 of the 22 variables. Participants' ratings indicate that the frequency with which they listen to particular types of music is closer to the frequency of their ingroup and divergent from the outgroup for alternative, country, and rock. For all types except reggae, participants judged that they listened

to music more often than the ingroup. Participants listened to music more often than the outgroup, too, except for country and rock.

For clothing styles, participants' judged that their apparel was closer to ingroup than outgroup members. Participants consistently judged that group members wore each style more often than they did themselves. Outgroup members sometimes were judged to wear the styles more often than self. Thus, participants judged group members as having more consistent, typical clothing than self.

On the leisure activities measures, a group effect emerged for attending plays/musicals and going to bars/clubs. Participants judged that their frequency of engaging in these activities was closer to the frequency of the ingroup than the outgroup. Both ingroup and outgroup members engaged in these activities more often than the participant. The group effect for eating out was opposite to our predictions, with greater divergence from self occurring with ingroup and out group. A time by group effect was found for going to bars/clubs and watching TV. For going to bars/clubs, mean difference scores of the self to the ingroup converged over time, and mean difference scores of the self to the outgroup diverged over time, as expected. However, the opposite held true for watching TV.

### Self-Esteem

Respondents' self-esteem did not vary across the two time-periods ( $M_s = 7.67$  and  $7.80$ , for the first and second assessment, respectively,  $ns = 85$ ).

We had anticipated that high levels of self-esteem would be associated with aligning oneself with a valued ingroup and also with differentiating oneself from a derogated outgroup. To test the relation between self-esteem and similarity of self to ingroup, we computed correlations between respondents' self-esteem scores and the absolute value of the difference between ratings

separately for each assessment.

Few significant relations emerged, but those that did suggested that higher self-esteem was associated with smaller discrepancies with ingroups and larger discrepancies with outgroups:

During the first assessment, higher self-esteem was linked to smaller discrepancies between self and ingroup for frequency of listening to country music,  $r(84) = -.23$ ,  $p < .05$ , and for frequency of wearing trendy clothes,  $r(84) = -.24$ ,  $p < .05$ . During the second assessment, higher esteem was linked to smaller discrepancies with ingroup for frequency of wearing eccentric clothes,  $r(84) = -.22$ ,  $p < .05$ , and frequency of eating out,  $r(84) = -.31$ ,  $p < .10$ .

During the first assessment, higher self-esteem was linked to greater discrepancies between self and outgroup for the extent to which they discussed political events with friends,  $r(84) = .27$ ,  $p < .05$ , and for frequency of listening to country music,  $r(84) = .23$ ,  $p < .05$ . During the second assessment, higher esteem was linked to greater discrepancies with the outgroup for frequency of wearing ethnic clothes,  $r(84) = .22$ ,  $p < .05$ , and frequency of wearing skater-style clothes,  $r(84) = .25$ ,  $p < .05$ . Unexpectedly, higher esteem was also linked to smaller discrepancies between self and outgroup in frequency of wearing preppie clothes,  $r(84) = -.23$ ,  $p < .05$ . This was the only effect to counter our predictions and will not be discussed further.

### Discussion

The results of this study provide some general support for the idea that people judge their own attitudes and beliefs to be similar to those of valued ingroups and to be different from those of derogated outgroups. However, this tendency to align with ingroups and differentiate from outgroups did not emerge consistently across the five domains that we studied. When we compared participants' ratings of themselves with ingroups and outgroups, a difference between the groups was most apparent for clothing styles and music preferences, and was also obtained on

attitude ratings for 4 out of the 5 social issues. However, none of the campus life items or political philosophy revealed that participants rated themselves closer to ingroups than outgroups. Also, only a few of the leisure activities demonstrated this effect.

We had anticipated further that convergence with ingroups and divergence from outgroups would increase over time, as participants became better acquainted with the attributes of group members and became more invested in their group identities. However, few differences emerged across the two assessment times.

Participants in the study also reported on their self-esteem at each assessment. According to social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982), aligning with ingroups and differentiating from outgroups is an important contributor to positive self-esteem. To test this idea, self-esteem at each time period was correlated with the difference scores representing similarity between self- and ingroup and between self- and outgroup. Few significant relations emerged. In general, the few effects that were obtained suggested that higher self-esteem was associated with smaller discrepancies with ingroups and larger discrepancies with outgroups. Although we had anticipated that self-esteem would be more closely related to relations with ingroups than outgroups, no such effect was apparent.

Although we did not anticipate any differences across domains, the overall pattern of findings suggests that public indicators of group identity, such as listening to music and wearing certain apparel, conformed most closely to our hypotheses. Assuming that these external attributes represent the important markers of group identity, people may attend to and evaluate these attributes more than the private ones of political philosophy and campus life. That is, people may be more likely to perceive themselves as group members when they have acquired publicly presentable attributes of their desired group and discarded the public attributes of derogated

outgroups. Thus, self-ratings were more consistently linked to ingroup versus outgroup identity for public, self-presentational attributes.

The analyses conducted so far aggregate across attributes and across groups. We anticipate, however, that not all of the attributes we evaluated are equally important for each group identity. To determine the uniquely important attributes for each group rated, we have had a separate group of 10 raters identify the 10 most important attributes of each student organization and the five least important ones. These ratings will allow us to conduct additional analyses that use only the attributes closely linked to group identity. For example, we anticipate that the political philosophy items will be important for groups such as the Aggie Democrats and College Republicans. Our participants who selected one of these groups as an ingroup are likely to judge themselves similar to the group on these issues. However, leisure activities such as watching TV or shopping may be less central to these groups and thus participants are less likely to perceive that the groups are similar to themselves. Furthermore, participants' self-esteem is more likely to be based on similarity to ingroup on criterial attributes than on irrelevant ones. Thus, a more fine-grained analysis that considers the relevance of each attribute for group identity is more likely to yield support for our hypotheses than the aggregate approach reported in this thesis.

Another limitation to the present design is that we relied on participants' ratings of self and prototypic group members. Because we have no validation for participants' ratings of typical group members, we are relying on their estimates of group attributes. Thus, our findings must be interpreted as participants' perceptions of similarity between self and groups and do not reflect actual similarity.

The present study evaluated the group identity of African-American college students

during their first year at a predominantly Anglo institution. This is a particularly interesting group to study because they are likely experiencing social identity pressures during this transition period and are likely to be sensitive to ingroup and outgroup identities. We anticipated that their self-esteem during this transition period would be especially responsive to similarities to ingroups and differences from outgroups. However, our analyses conducted to date do not provide much support for this approach. It may be that our follow-up analysis that considers the important attributes for each group identity will be more successful.

Part of the impetus for conducting this study was our assumption that students are more likely to feel good about themselves and maintain their self-esteem to the extent that they feel welcome in the university community and find groups with which they can identify. The increasing numbers of such groups as ExCEL and Fade to Black indicate that an ethnic minority identity is important to at least some minority students on campus. Additional analyses might consider whether the various kinds of ingroups have comparable effects on self-esteem. It may be that ethnic identity ingroups are more important for participants' self-esteem than other ingroups (e.g., athletics).

Ensuring that incoming ethnic minority students are accepted, valued members of campus groups may be important for recruitment and retention of these students at the university. Of the 100 students who completed the initial survey in the fall, ten could not be recontacted for the second assessment. It is possible that these ten students dropped out of the university. Follow-up data will be collected from the registrar's office to identify those students who continue to be enrolled at the university and those who drop-out. This information can then be used as an outcome measure of success at the university, and might prove to be correlated with the extent to which participants align with ingroups and differentiate from outgroups.

## References

- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, Stephanie (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among white, Black, and Asian college students. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, (5), 503-513.
- Demo, D. H. & Hughes, M. (1990). Socialization and racial identity among Black Americans. Social Psychology Quarterly, 53, (4), 364-374.
- Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 243-251.
- Helms, J E.(1994). The conceptualization of racial identity and other “racial” constructs. Human Diversity: Perspectives on people in context (285-311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Huddy, Leonie, & Virtanen, Simo (1995). Subgroup differentiation and subgroup bias among Latinos as a function of familiarity and positive distinctiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 97-108.
- Jackson, J. S., McCullough, W. R., Gurin, G., & Broman, C. L. (1991). Race identity. Life in Black America (pp. 238-253). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Jones, W. T. (1983). Perspectives on ethnicity. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 6, 154-173, 1983.
- Lee, Y. T. Ingroup preference and homogeneity among African American and Chinese American students. Journal of Social Psychology, 133, (2), 225-235.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1990). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 302-318.

McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V. (1992). Cognitive-versus-affective positivity as asymmetries in thought systems. European Journal of Social Psychology, 22, 571-591.

Osbourne, J. W. (1995). Academics, self-esteem, and race: A look at the underlying assumptions of the disidentification hypothesis. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, (5), 449-455.

Parham, T. A., Helms, J.E. (1985). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem of Black students: An exploratory investigation. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, (2), 143-147.

Stamps, D.B. Self-concept of ability, self-esteem, locus of control and perception of the opportunity structure as predictors of coping ability among selected Black college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, (5-a), 1565.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social identity and intergroup relations. Cambridge, GB: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Taylor, C. M. & Howard-Hamilton M. F. (1995). Student involvement and racial identity attitudes among African American males. Journal of College Student Development, 36, (4), 330-336.

Turner, J. C. (1991). Social influence. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Washington, A. C. (1970). Self acceptance and group identification among a group of black Upward Bound students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, (6-B), 3695.

Table 1

## Analysis of Variance on Repeated Measures

Attributes	Time 1		Time 2		F(1,84)		
	Self to Ingroup	Self to Outgroup	Self to Ingroup	Self to Outgroup	Time	Group	Time by Group
Campus Life	0.02	0.30	-0.27	-0.47			
Grades	0.53	0.88	0.41	-0.34			
Studying	0.44	0.74	0.21	0.48			
Attendance	0.78	1.02	0.53	0.58			
Socializing	-0.46	-0.22	-1.20	-1.01	8.78 *		
Job	-1.18	-0.94	-1.08	-2.07			
Political Philosophy	-0.22	-0.13	0.20	0.11	19.80 **		
Party affiliation	-0.42	-0.06	0.27	-0.33			16.09 **
Political activity	-0.63	-0.81	0.62	0.91	51.64 **		7.45 *
Reading newspaper, etc.	-0.15	-0.15	0.08	0.18			
Discussing events	-0.24	-0.27	0.26	0.45	31.20 **		
Liberal or conservative	0.08	0.05	-0.01	0.07			
Parents' views	0.08	0.60	0.05	-0.73	27.27 **		29.33 **
Friends' views	-0.21	-0.24	0.13	0.22	12.36 *		
Social Issues	0.33	0.84	0.58	0.34			6.05 *
Abortion	0.48	0.19	0.49	-0.92		4.70 *	7.25 *
Affirmative action	0.17	2.85	0.53	2.46		32.36 **	
Gays/lesbians and rights	0.80	-1.67	1.27	-2.40		50.29 **	5.64 *
Censorship in media	-0.25	0.06	0.47	0.74			
Multiculturalism course	0.44	2.78	0.12	1.81		24.90 **	
Fashion and Taste							
Music:	0.54	0.64	0.57	0.02			
Alternative	1.19	-1.82	1.28	-3.04	4.48 *	91.44 **	7.85 *
Classical and jazz	0.41	0.41	0.14	-0.27		111.47 **	
Country	0.36	-3.58	0.33	-3.61	8.20 *	173.00 **	
Rock	0.36	-3.80	0.02	-4.77	36.01 **	173.00 **	
Pop or r&b	0.85	5.27	1.21	5.31		206.17 **	
Rap	0.11	4.43	0.96	4.64		144.78 **	
Reggae	-0.26	2.23	0.35	1.96		42.18 **	
Tejano	0.43	-0.45	0.55	-0.93		32.57 **	
Other music	1.39	1.95	0.29	2.05		12.05 **	5.10 *
Clothing:	-0.64	-0.71	-0.61	-0.97			
Sporty	-0.17	1.39	-0.04	0.96		23.15 **	
Casual	-0.02	2.18	-0.18	1.20		64.39 **	4.08 *
Kicker	-0.57	-3.41	-0.64	-3.91		125.06 **	
Ethnic	-2.07	-0.63	-1.45	-0.43		20.29 **	
Dressy	-1.54	0.11	-2.21	-0.38		43.18 **	
Eccentric	-0.56	-2.50	-0.48	-3.10		37.82 **	
Grundle	-0.08	-3.11	-0.11	-3.41		89.06 **	
Hip-hop	-1.25	0.69	-0.57	1.23		293.44 **	
Preppie	-0.33	-0.06	-1.08	-0.35			
Skater	-0.27	-2.74	-0.04	-3.05		96.40 **	
Trendy	-0.71	1.86	-0.51	1.24		44.52 **	
Uniform	-0.88	-3.01	-0.48	-2.68		47.18 **	
Other gear	0.19	-0.01	-0.19	0.10			4.63 *
Hair Style:	5.70	7.11	5.50	7.11			
Leisure Activities	-0.39	-0.25	-0.49	-1.30			
Attending plays	-0.29	-1.18	-0.91	-1.79	4.98 *	14.96 **	
Eating out	-0.33	0.08	-0.45	-0.11		4.49 *	
Exercising	0.38	0.19	0.54	-0.29			
Partying	-1.04	-1.05	-0.55	-1.16			
Playing sports	-1.10	-0.24	-1.05	-1.81			
Shopping	-0.63	-0.19	-1.01	-1.44			
Watching sports	-0.19	0.49	-0.29	-0.74			
Going to bars and clubs	-1.75	-3.12	-1.14	-4.74		19.29 **	5.54 *
Going to a movie	-0.93	-0.41	-1.13	-2.39			
Watching TV	0.02	0.88	-0.19	-0.35			5.30 *
Reading for pleasure	-0.61	-0.77	-0.93	-1.95			
Hanging out w/ friends	-0.06	0.25	-0.13	-0.33			
Other activities	1.45	1.76	0.92	0.15			

\*  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .001$ .