

Name of Measure: The Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES) (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), and Race-Specific CSES (Crocker et al., 1994).

Purpose of Measure: To measure one's positive social or collective identity

Author(s) of abstract:

Jennifer Crocker  
University of Michigan, Department of Psychology  
jcrocker@umich.edu

Riia Luhtanen  
State University of New York at Buffalo

Bruce Blaine  
State University of New York at Buffalo

Stephanie Broadnax  
State University of New York at Buffalo

Reference: Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian College students. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 503-513.

Description of measure: The CSES is a 16-item measure 7-point Likert-type measure> It asks respondents to consider their perceptions and feelings related to social group memberships that they possess based on ascribed characteristics as sex, race, religion, and ethnicity. Items are rated on a 7 point Likert response scale.

The CSES has 4 sub-scales: 1) Membership Esteem which assesses an individual's judgements of how worthy they are as members of their social groups; 2) Private Collective Self Esteem that measures personal judgements of how good one's social groups are; 3) Public Collective Self Esteem that assesses one's perceptions of how positively other people evaluate one's social groups; and 4) Importance to Identity that assesses the importance of one's social groups memberships to one's self-concept.

The Race-specific CSES is a modified version of CSES. Instead of assessing one's level of esteem related to social group membership, items are re-worded to ask respondents to consider their race in response to each item. For example, the item "I feel good about the social groups I belong to" would be modified to "I feel good about the race I belong to."

Language availability: English

Translation comments: Not applicable.

Description of Asian population: Two hundred and thirty eight undergraduate students enrolled in a large northeastern university participated in the research. They were 40.3% White/Caucasian, 38.2% Black/African American, 14.7% as Asian/Oriental, 6.7% Other.

	% Male	% U.S. Citizens	% English as 1 <sup>st</sup> lang	Median family income
White	54.2	97	94	50,000-59,000
Black	52.7	88	96	30,000-39,000
Asian	62.9	46	14	30,000-39,000

Norms:

Mean scores (standard deviations) on the General and Race Specific CSES and its sub-scales by Race

	White	Black	Asians
<b>General CSES</b>			
Membership	22.28 (3.54)	22.48 (3.85)	19.57 (4.27)
Private	22.43 (3.84)	23.49 (3.98)	20.58 (4.71)
Public	21.28 (3.97)	16.94 (5.90)	19.54 (4.10)
Identity	16.30 (5.51)	20.07 (5.32)	18.51 (4.54)
Total	82.85 (10.97)	83.08 (12.18)	77.79 (14.16)
<b>Race-Specific CSES</b>			
Membership	21.59 (3.70)	24.16 (3.86)	20.02 (4.54)
Private	23.45 (3.24)	25.79 (3.15)	23.05 (4.17)
Public	22.74 (3.57)	12.47 (4.76)	20.50 (3.71)
Identity	13.36 (5.52)	22.16 (4.84)	19.47 (5.14)
Total	81.37 (11.60)	84.57 (10.54)	83.05 (13.98)

Significant race main effects were found on each of the sub-scales of the General CSES and the Race Specific CSES but not on either of the total scores. In terms of the General CSES Asians were lower in Membership CSE and private CSE than either Black or White respondents ( $p < .05$ ). Black and White respondents did not differ significantly from one another. On the Public sub-scale, Black respondents scored lower than Whites and Asians, who did not score differently from one another ( $p < .001$ ). Finally, on Identity CSE, White respondents scored lower than Blacks and Asians, who did not score differently from one another ( $p < .001$ ).

In terms of Race specific CSE, Asian respondents scored lower on the Membership sub-scale than Whites who scored lower than Black respondents ( $p < .001$ ). On the Private sub-scale, White and Asian respondents scored similarly to each other and lower than Black respondents ( $p < .001$ ). On the Public sub-scale, Black respondents scored lower than Asian respondents who scored lower than White respondents ( $p < .001$ ). Finally, in terms of the Identity sub-scale, White respondents scored lower than Asian respondents who scored lower than Black respondents ( $p < .001$ ).

Table reproduced with permission from Sage Publication, Inc.

Reliability: Not calculated separately by race. In an earlier report, Luhtanen and Crocker (1992), report sub-scale alphas in the range of .7 to .8. The internal consistencies for the present combined sample were .63, .79, and .86, for the Membership, Private, Public, and Identity sub-scales, respectively. Coefficient alphas for the Race-Specific sub-scales were .75, .72, .88, and .84 (for the Membership, Private, Public, and Identity sub-scales, respectively)

Validity: see earlier reports

Original reference to instrument(s): Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 302-318.

Crocker, J., Blaine, B., Luhtanen, R., & Broadnax, S. (1994). *Judgement of disadvantage, prejudice, and discrimination: Self-protective strategy or vulnerability factor?* Manuscript submitted for publication.

How to obtain copy of instrument: Please visit Dr. Crocker's website, Contingencies of Self-Esteem Research Program (<http://www.rcgd.isr.umich.edu/stigma>). Dr. Crocker may

be contacted at: Jennifer Crocker, Ph.D. Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan, 3004 East Hall, Ann Arbor, 48109 [jcrocker@umich.edu](mailto:jcrocker@umich.edu)