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**Introduction**

Researchers have developed generic scales for use among immigrants of different ethnic backgrounds (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000; Stephenson, 2000), which may not be appropriate for studies focusing on specific cultural groups and immigration contexts because each acculturation context and immigrant group is unique (Berry, 2003). Therefore, any useful scale needs to be relevant to the specific population under investigation. According to the Office for National Statistics ([ONS], 2013), the population of England and Wales has become more diverse over the last 60 years with increases in populations due to persons from non-UK countries of birth, of which Nigeria is one of the top ten countries in the list. These immigrant populations have produced second and third generations who navigate through their own heritage cultures and the dominant UK culture, adopting either both, neither, or one of the cultural dimensions (integration, marginalisation, assimilation, or separation, respectively) at different levels.

The acculturation process among migrants comprises antecedent factors/acculturation conditions (such as the characteristics of the receiving society, country of origin, and migrant groups and individuals) and acculturation orientations (styles and attitudes) (Prokopiou, Cline, & De Abreu, 2012), which impact on the way immigrants choose to relate to their host culture in relation to their heritage culture (cultural adoption or cultural maintenance respectively). These individual choices and attitudes can result in four major patterns: integration, marginalisation, assimilation, or separation (Celenk & Van de Vijver, 2011). Finally, there is the component of consequences or acculturation outcomes, which could be either internal adjustments (psychological) or external adjustments (behavioural).

Research shows that there are two major theoretical perspectives related to cultural orientation: dimensionality and domain-specificity (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003). Both unidimensional and bi-dimensional models are used to describe aspects of dimensionality (the relations between cultural adoption and cultural maintenance). The unidimensional model proposes that an individual only adapts to the host culture, thereby assumes that the acculturation process subsists within a single continuum, where immigrants successively become assimilated into the new context and lose their heritage culture; which is viewed as a weakness (Benet-Martínez, 2012). On the other hand, the bidimensional models treat the relations between cultural adoption and cultural maintenance as two distinct and unrelated dimensions that can show weak or negative correlations (Berry, 1997; Huynh, Howell, & Benet-Martinez, 2009). The advantage of this model is that it is conceptually possible to maintain the heritage/non-dominant culture and adopt the mainstream/dominant culture as well (Van de Vijver, 2015). However, the multi-faceted nature of acculturation and migration itself (multi-culturalism, global, multiple, and inclusive identities, domain-specificity, cosmopolitanism, dance, music, religion) has tended to diminish the advantages of conceptual independence inherent in the bidimensional models (Van de Vijver, 2015). These aspects of acculturation, which remain elusive to both unidimensional and bidimensional models are incorporated within the multidimensional models.

In a large cross-national study (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006), the four acculturation attitudes (Berry, 1980) were measured among a UK sub-sample of Indian migrants (N = 120 adolescents). ‘Integration’ was the outstanding strategy adopted in navigating the challenging terrain of the old and new cultures, followed by ‘Separation’ and ‘Assimilation’, while ‘Marginalisation’ was the least employed strategy. However, these choices may be influenced by different acculturation conditions, such as immigration policies of the host country, prejudice, discrimination, religion, as well as the contexts within which multiple identities are negotiated (Prokopiou et al., 2012).

Also, different domains within which these acculturation patterns are negotiated account for the choices endorsed by various immigrant groups. For example, acculturation patterns for the same group/individual could vary depending on whether the context is public of private/home (Tip, 2013). Particularly, African immigrants in the UK were shown to endorse different acculturation orientations in private and public domains (Okoh & Brown, 2014), showing that their preference to keep their heritage culture rather than integration was more realistic in the absence of external factors or pressure from the mainstream culture. These differences in acculturation patterns due to different contexts (conditions and domains) show that the modalities of acculturation strategies preferred by different ethnic and religious groups are heterogenous, but a general pattern of culture maintenance existed among minority members in the UK, that show less interest in cultural adoption (Brown, Zagefka, & Tip, 2016).

To find appropriate and relatively short acculturation measures with subscales measuring all four acculturation orientations and African belief systems among Nigerians in the UK, four of the main scales assessed included the improved and revised versions of the African American Acculturation *Scale* (AAAS, AAAS-R) (Klonoff & Landrine, 2000), the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA) (Ryder et al., 2000), and the Measurement of Acculturation Strategies for People of African Decent (MASPAD) by Obasi and Leong (2010). The other scales considered for use were the African American Acculturation Scale (AAAS-R), a 47-item bi-dimensional scale that measures three categories of acculturation in terms of cultural traditions, values, beliefs, assumptions, and practices of the immigrant and the Acculturation Scale (AfAAS) by Snowden and Hines (1999).

The MASPAD incorporates both bi-dimensional and multi-dimensional approaches to acculturation, and it is culture-specific to people of African descent, both as Afro-Americans and as African immigrants.The development of acculturation measures beyond the unidimensional approach, that is, bidimensional and multidimensional scales, enables researchers to examine the independent contributions of each cultural orientation/domain to important acculturation outcomes, such as health and well-being and especially, the psychological and sociocultural adjustment facing immigrants (Huynh et al., 2009). Furthermore, the multidimensional aspect offers the added advantage of an inclusive scale incorporating the multi-cultural realities inherent in African traditional and religious worldviews relevant to the research population. By this, it is possible to measure all four acculturation strategies identified by research (Berry et al., 2006). Therefore, the present study explored the utility of an existing scale - the MASPAD - in measuring African immigrants’ acculturation patterns within the unique religio-cultural and immigration contexts of Nigerians in the UK.

The MASPAD was originally validated as a reliable, self-reported bidimensional acculturation scale widely used among people of African descent in America with scores on the two dimensions showing acceptable Cronbach: α = .87 on relative preference for cultural maintenance (D1) and α = .75 on relative preference for making contact/participation with the other cultures (D2) (Obasi & Leong, 2010). These two dimensions were aimed at assessing four possible acculturation orientations: Traditionalist (moderate to high scores on D1 and low scores on D2), Integrationist (moderate to high scores on both D1 and D2), Assimilationist (low scores on D1 and moderate to high scores on D2), and Marginalist (low scores on both D1 and D2). The MASPAD was also chosen as it is most recent, and more culture-specific, with items on traditional culture from “various dimensions of African worldview, philosophy, traditions, and cultural practices” (Obasi & Leong, 2010, p. 527). Therefore, it was more appropriate than other scales meant for generic ethno-cultural groups such as the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA) by Ryder et al. (2000). Moreover, the MASPAD is more inclusive of multiculturalism with more items that are representative of acculturation for African immigrants, by incorporating some additional subscales that measure African religious/cultural beliefs and behaviours relevant to illness perceptions and causal attributions among this research population. This aspect characterises the MASPAD as a multidimensional scale as well, without too many items that could affect the response rate. Hence, by incorporating acculturation and religion into one scale in the MASPAD, it was possible to reduce the number of response items and enhance participant interest and response rates (Worthington et al., 2003). Therefore, this study aimed to determine its reliability for use among people of African descent outside the USA.

**Method**

This report is part of a larger study by the same authors (2017, “Manuscript in preparation”) on the role that acculturation, religion and coping methods play in medical help-seeking among Nigerians in the UK. The study was approved by the ethical committee of a North London University.

***Participants***

Participants were 297 adult male and female Nigerian immigrants in the UK, of different religious and tribal affiliations, irrespective of the inter-cultural differences among Nigerian peoples. All participants were first generation Nigerian immigrants, as previous research shows that adult immigrants are more influenced by their pre-migration cultural values and life experiences (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006), and thereby experience more challenges with the host culture (Schwartz, Pantin, Sullivan, Prado, & Szapocznik, 2006). Slightly more women (53.9%) than men were involved in the study; and more middle-aged persons (48%) participated in the survey, with age categories ranging from: the young (18-40), the middle-aged (41-60) and the old (61 and over). Participants lived in the country between 1-53 years (M = 13.49, SD = 10.13), while their religious backgrounds were spread across Christianity (88%), Islam (3.2%) and those with no religion (8.8%).

***Materials***

The MASPAD is a forty-five-item measure used for surveying all four acculturation categories (traditionalist, integrationist, assimilationist, and marginalist), and was designed for people of African descent (Obasi & Leong 2010). As standardised methods do not exist for adapting a scale validated for other cultures, the author of the MASPAD gave permission for this scale to be adapted to the Nigerian British population. The adaptation resulted in a 30-item MASPAD from the original scale (see Table 1). Fifteen items were chosen from each of the two sub-scales of the original MASPAD (Table 1, N = 30), to obtain information on participants’ acculturation orientations and acculturation conditions, as well as domain-specificity aspects of acculturation orientations. Items for the religious/cultural beliefs and behaviours aspects of acculturation conditions were also included from the original scale.

(Table 1)

As the adapted scale was meant to understand the relative preference of maintaining African religious and cultural values among Nigerians living in the UK, the original items using the word “American” was changed to “British” (eg., ‘If I have children, I will raise them to be British first and a person of African ancestry second’). The questionnaire was scored on a six-point Likert scale; (1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 6 = ‘strongly agree’), with possible total scores ranging between 0 – 180; where scores of 1-3 were regarded as low and 4 to 6 as medium to high scores.

***Procedure***

Participants were recruited through the snowball process and were provided with adequate information about the purpose of the research, confidentiality. Self-addressed and stamped envelopes in which to seal and return their questionnaires were provided to each participant. The process of identification and recruitment of participants took place between August and September 2015. For the analyses, the 30 items of the MASPAD were subjected to principal component analyses (PCA). Prior to running the PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was considered and the correlation matrix showed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. Cronbach alpha was also conducted to check for acceptable reliability.

**Results**

***Descriptive***

A total of 560 questionnaires were distributed and 311 were returned (a 55.5% overall response rate); out of which 14 were rejected for missing data (more than 4 items), leaving a total of 297 completed questionnaires (53% complete response rate). The 297 participants were Nigerians resident in the UK for an average of 13 years (M = 13.29, SD = 10.13). More women (53.9%) than men (46.1%) participated and most (87.8%) were aged between 18 and 60 years old.

***Principal Components Analysis on the Adapted MASPAD***

A principal components analysis was conducted on the items with oblique rotation. The Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, KMO = .77, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance (*p* <.001), indicating that correlations between the items were sufficiently large for PCA. Principal component analysis revealed the presence of six factors with eigenvalues exceeding one, and explaining 19%, 11%, 10%, 7%, 5.4%, and 4.6% of the variance respectively. Further analysis was conducted based on the Monte Carlo approach (Choi, Fuqua & Griffin, 2001), with results from the Parallel Analysis (PA) showing that the first six components with eigenvalues exceeded the corresponding criterion values for a randomly generated data matrix of the same size (30 x 297 respondents).

An inspection of the scree plots also showed a clear break after the sixth component (Figure 1); and using Catell’s (1966) Scree test approach, six components were retained. The six-factor solution therefore, explained a total of 56% of the variance, with Component one contributing 18.8%, Component two contributing 10.8%, Component three contributing 6.7%, Component four contributing 5.4, Component five contributing 4.6%, and Component six contributing 9.4%.

(Figure 1)

***Item Analysis and Internal Consistency***

As shown in the pattern matrix (Table 2) the items that cluster on each of these components suggest that component (1) represents ‘traditionalist behaviours’, component (2) ‘traditionalist beliefs’, component (3) ‘assimilationist behaviours’, component (4) ‘integrationist behaviours’, component (5) ‘religious beliefs’, and component (6) ‘religious behaviours’.

The six-factor MASPAD subscales were further checked for acceptable reliability which yielded the following results: traditionalist behaviours with Cronbach’s alpha = .60, traditionalist beliefs - Cronbach’s alpha = .63, assimilationist behaviours Cronbach’s alpha = .67, integrationist behaviours Cronbach’s alpha = .59, religious beliefs Cronbach’s alpha = .78, and religious behaviours Cronbach’s alpha = .78; which were considered adequate. High scores on any of the items was indicative of expressing positive attitudes regarding traditionalist, assimilationist, integrationist, and religious behaviours or beliefs while low scores indicated the contrary. This 6-factor modified MASPAD supports a multidimensional explanation of acculturation and represents a possible scale for the measurement of acculturation patterns and religious beliefs/behaviours among Nigerian immigrants in the UK.

(Table 2)

**Discussion**

The original MASPAD was developed to measure four acculturation orientations and administered among people of African descent in the US (Obasi & Leong, 2010). However, when adapted to investigate acculturation among Nigerian immigrants in the UK, it yielded six distinct subscales to assess both acculturation orientations and religious beliefs/behaviours. The result of the rotated solution structure showing several strong loadings across six components is consistent with the multidimensional definition of acculturation. Therefore, a bidimensional MASPAD needs to be adapted for studies of acculturation among Africans in different countries outside the US, and especially adapted as a multidimensional measure when the focus is on acculturation among Nigerians living in the UK.

The bi-dimensional model of measuring acculturation deals with the ‘dimensionality’ perspective of acculturation orientation, by considering the relations between cultural adoption and cultural maintenance as two distinct dimensions not mutually exclusive (Huynh et al., 2009). It shows its greatest strength as being flexible enough to accommodate people of bicultural identities as well as those not attached to either of the cultures (Kang, 2006). However, the multidimensional models of acculturation measure go beyond the dimensions of acculturation to assess the perspective of ‘domain-specificity’. Multidimensional measures also, involve the multiple and inclusive identities of acculturation, as well as religion and culture (Van de Vijver, 2015). While the bidimensional measures espouse the conceptual perspective of ‘dimensionality’, so that it is possible to assess all four acculturation orientations, the multidimensional measures incorporate the ‘domain-specificity’ perspective of acculturation orientation (Van de Vijver, 2015). Hence, the conceptual independence of different dimension of acculturation orientation enunciated by the bidimensional models and the multi-faceted aspect of acculturation are guaranteed through multidimensional acculturation measures.

A multidimensional MASPAD therefore, with appropriate items regarding African religion and culture, which are relevant to understanding Africans and their immigration and acculturation experiences, is a useful development in acculturation studies. Overall, the development of bidimensional and multidimensional scales has provided opportunities for researchers to examine the independent contributions of each aspect of cultural orientations to such important issues as health and well-being as well as other psychological and sociocultural aspects of acculturation outcome (Huynh et al., 2009). The present study has established the utility of an adapted MASPAD in measuring African immigrants’ acculturation patterns within the unique religio-cultural and immigration context of Nigerians living in the UK. This is because, its multidimensional aspect incorporates the multi-cultural realities inherent in African traditional and religious worldviews relevant to the research population.

The two new religious subscales emerging from the present study (‘Religious Beliefs’ and ‘Religious Behaviours’) are relevant to the religious and cultural dimensions of acculturation, with special reference to the ethnicity of the study sample. This is consistent with previous studies showing that the reliability of dominant and non-dominant cultures of acculturation domain was related to ethnicity composition of the sample (Huynh et al., 2009). These two new subscales have therefore, highlighted the necessity for recognising the multi-faceted nature of migration and acculturation, with strong impetus for future developments towards multidimensional acculturation measures that will incorporate multi-culturalism, cosmopolitanism, as well as other global, multiple, and inclusive identities such as religion. This is especially vital for measures used among Africans, as relevant studies have identified religion as an important factor in the overall life and health outcome of Africans (Onyigbuo, Alexis-Garsee, & van den Akker, 2016). This finding is relevant for further validation of the MASPAD as a multidimensional acculturation measure. Moreover, the experiences of immigration or acculturation process within a unique dominant culture (as in the UK) distinct from the USA for Afro-Americans or other people of African descent makes it imperative to validate acculturation measures and ensure their reliability across cultures and contexts. Furthermore, there is an observable difference between the four types of acculturation styles developed by Berry and colleagues (1987), and those found among the newly distinct subscales of the adapted MASPAD: Traditionalist Behaviour (separation), Traditionalist Beliefs (separation), Assimilationist Behaviours, and Integrationist Behaviours. In the present study, Berry’s ‘marginalisation’ style was absent, with a second ‘separation’ style (traditionalist belief) emerging in its place. This is consistent with suggestions that Berry’s modes of acculturation styles are not true ‘types’ (Kang, 2006), but an arbitrary dichotomisation of the two basic dimensions relevant to maintenance of ethnic identities and attitudes towards mainstream cultures. This assertion has more specific implications for the concept of ‘marginalisation’ as a non-realistic acculturation styles.

***Limitations***

These results are a first step and replication with larger samples is needed. Also, with respect to the Nigerian population recruited in the UK, the data did not represent all religious groups nor show adequate reflection of intra-cultural differences among the Nigerian peoples, which are important factors unaccounted for. So, future studies could account for these factors by focusing on specific religious or ethnic groups from Nigeria. Also, though there was variability in participants’ years of residence in the UK, the UK’s current immigration policy grants legal permit/permanent residence after five years (Home Office [HO], 2013) so it was difficult to recruit participants who were resident in the UK for less than this period.

The authors acknowledge that the scale reliability of the ‘Integrationist Behaviours’ subscale was slightly low, but it was retained because the adapted measure was shorter than the original measure as research shows that length of scale is one of the factors that can affect scale reliability and consequently the validity (Huynh et al., 2009). Moreover, the descriptive statistics showing that more women participated in the study in conjunction with low reliability score on ‘Integrationist Behaviours’ is consistent with findings, that samples with more women tend to yield less reliable dominant culture scores (Huynh et al. 2009). Therefore, future research should exercise caution while including this item, particularly among immigrants where the relationship between cultural adaptation and health and wellbeing have been inconsistent. For instance, a clinical study with Hispanic Americans (Thomas & Suris, 2004), reported a positive link between cultural adaptation and quality of life, whereas a negative association in Vietnamese women in Taiwan (Yang & Wang, 2011), and no association among Chinese Americans was found by others (Lieber, Chan, Nihira, & Mink, 2001). Such inconsistencies could be explained by differences in the process of acculturation across migrant groups due to ethnicity, and across host countries in relation to migration history - reasons for migration, host-countries’ migration policy, variations in length of stay, perceived discrimination, employment issues, religion, and health conditions among migrants (Nap et al., 2015). Similar factors are noted as potential limitations to the present study as findings may have been influenced by different acculturation conditions, such as immigration policies in the UK, personal experiences of prejudice and discrimination specific to Nigerian immigrants, as well as their unique type of religion and culture (Prokopiou et al., 2012).

Also, data for this study were obtained through self-reporting questionnaires following a snowballing method of recruitment; hence, the participants were self-selected. This aspect could have introduced both sampling and response biases. Finally, the MASPAD scale was designed to measure intentions rather than actual behaviours. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that this study only measured intentions to act and not actual behaviours; an aspect that provides the scope for future improvements in research.

This study has provided useful information on acculturation orientations and religious beliefs/behaviours as important aspects of any acculturation measure, especially among Africans. The findings have implications for researchers in acculturation and immigration, as well as for cross-cultural studies to incorporate immigrants’ diverse religious and cultural values in their measuring tools.

**Conclusion**

The present study reported on the reliability and validity of the MASPAD scale adapted specifically to Nigerian immigrants living in the UK. The results showed good reliability for the MASPAD. The adaptation of existing scales provided new information from the multidimensional application of the MASPAD measure. The findings have important implication for adapting psychometric instruments to specific immigrant populations, as there could be distinct factors relevant to the religious beliefs and behaviours of the ethnic group. Hence, there could be a relationship between cultural adaptation and health behaviours based on religio-cultural indices; especially where immigrants’ health outcome could be influenced by the consequence of adjusting to the challenges from the new culture with a socio-cultural and religious background different from theirs.
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Table 1: The adapted MASPAD

Instructions: This section tries to understand the relative preference of you maintaining your African religious and cultural values as a Nigerian compared to your preference for participating and adopting the British way of life. Please answer each question as honestly as you possibly can by identifying the responses that best reflects your agreement/disagreement to each item: *Strongly* ***disagree (1) disagree (2) slightly disagree (3) slightly agree, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree (6)*.** There are no right or wrong answers. Provide only one response to each item by choosing the number that represent each statement (1 to 6) in the bracket provided:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. I take a great deal of pride in being a person of African ancestry (African, African American, Black Cuban, Black Brazilian, Trinidadian, Jamaican, etc.) ( ) |
| 2. If I have children, I will give them an African naming ceremony. ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. I do not feel connected to my African heritage ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. If I have children, I will raise them to be American first and a person of African ancestry Second ( )5. I was raised to maintain cultural practices that are consistent with people of African descent ( )6. I have difficulty accepting ideas held by the Black community ( )7. I tend to generate friendships with people from different racial and cultural backgrounds ( )8. I was socialized to treat my elders with respect ( ) 9. 10. I am comfortable putting on the mask in order to fit in ( )10. Despite facing potential discrimination, it is important for me to maintain my cultural beliefs ( )11. I behave in ways that are consistent with people of African ancestry even if other cultural groups do not accept it ( )12. The way that I behave in public (work, school, etc.) is different than how I behave at home ( )13. I consider myself to be a spiritual person ( )14. I consider myself to be a religious (Christian, Catholic, Muslim, etc.) person ( )15. I prefer to be around people that are not Black ( )16. I actively support Black owned businesses ( )17. People should modify many of their values to fit those of their surroundings ( )18. I express different cultural values in order to fit in ( )19. My beliefs are largely shaped by my religion (Christianity, Catholicism, Islam, etc.) ( )20. I do not purchase products from Black owned businesses ( )21. I believe festivals maintain spiritual and physical balance in my community ( )22. I perform various rituals for my departed ancestors ( )23. I see no problem assimilating into other cultural values in order to be financially successful ( )24. People of African descent should know about their rich history that began with the birth of humanity ( )25. I am actively involved in an African spiritual system ( )26. I use words from an African language when participating in my spiritual practices ( )27. I will probably marry someone that is not Black ( )28. Members of my culture should have an appreciation for African art and music ( )29. I expose myself to various forms of media (television, magazines, newspapers, internet, etc.) in order to keep up with current events that impact my community ( )30. I choose not to speak out against injustices that impact people of African descent ( )**Note: Thirty items selected for the adapted MASPAD**. |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 2: The Matrix Pattern for PCA – MASPAD |
| MASPAD Items  | Components  |
| 1 Traditionalist behaviours | 2 Traditionalist beliefs | 3 Assimilationist behaviours | 4 Integrationist behaviours | 5 Religious beliefs | 6 Religious behaviours |
| 2. African naming ceremony  | **.698** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. African ancestry | **.549** |  |  |  |  | -.307 |
| 25. Black businesses | **-.510** | .310 |  | .389 |  |  |
| 5. African cultural practices | **.475** |  |  | .307 |  |  |
| 3. African heritage | **-.455** |  | .381 | -.345 |  |  |
| 10. I maintain my cultural beliefs | **.376** |  |  | .358 |  | -.345 |
| 26. marrying someone non-Black |  | **.753** |  |  |  |  |
| 29. injustices on Africans |  | **.727** |  |  |  |  |
| 30. different cultural values to fit in | .559 | **.569** |  |  |  |  |
| 17. Modify values to fit in... |  | **.510** |  |  |  |  |
| 22. African rich history |  | **-.429** |  | .350 |  |  |
| 4. British first… |  | **.417** |  |  |  |  |
| 9. putting on the *mask* to fit in |  |  | **.671** |  |  |  |
| 21. assimilating into other cultures |  |  | **.549** |  | .316 |  |
| 7. People from different races… |  |  | **.542** |  |  |  |
| 15. people that are not black |  |  | **.518** | -.450 |  |  |
| 16. Black owned businesses |  |  | **.465** |  | .301 |  |
| 6. Ideas held by Blacks… |  |  | **.452** |  |  | .353 |
| 19. Festivals  |  |  |  | **.742** |  |  |
| 13. spiritual person |  |  |  | **.699** |  |  |
| 18. My religious beliefs  |  |  |  | **.698** |  |  |
| 14. religious person |  |  |  | **.599** | **-.409** |  |
| 23. African spiritual system |  |  |  |  | **.834** |  |
| 20. rituals and departed ancestors |  |  |  |  | **.781** |  |
| 24. I use African language  |  |  |  |  | **.711** |  |
| 27. African art |  |  |  |  |  | **-.761** |
| 8. Treating elders with respect |  |  |  |  |  | **-.579** |
| 1. pride in being an African |  |  |  |  |  | **-.571** |
| 28. events that impact my people |  |  |  |  |  | **-.570** |
| 12. the way I behave at home | -.368 |  | .418 |  | .301 | **-.467** |
|  |
| **Note:** Six major loadings for each item are bolded  |



Figure 1. A scree plot showing 6 factors, for oblimin rotated component factor analysis.