Marquette University
e-Publications@Marquette

Dissertations (1934 -)

Dissertations, Theses, and Professional Projects

Racial Identity Development and Psychological Adjustment in Biracial Individuals of Minority/Minority Racial Group Descent

Kizzie Paule Walker
Marquette University

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu

 Part of the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Walker, Kizzie Paule, "Racial Identity Development and Psychological Adjustment in Biracial Individuals of Minority/Minority Racial Group Descent" (2011). *Dissertations (1934 -)*. 118.
https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/118

RACIAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT IN BIRACIAL INDIVIDUALS OF MINORITY/MINORITY RACIAL GROUP DESCENT

by

Kizzie P. Walker, M.S.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 2011

ABSTRACT
RACIAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT IN BIRACIAL INDIVIDUALS OF MINORITY/MINORITY RACIAL GROUP DESCENT

Kizzie P. Walker, M.S.

Marquette University, 2011

Based on the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism and race as a social construct, individuals with biological parents racially distinct from each other have biracial identity options (i.e., Singular, Border, Protean, and Transcendent) (e.g., Rockquemore and Brunsma, 2002). The purpose of the current study was to examine factors that influenced biracial individuals' level of racial/ethnic identity development and the impact on biracial identity and psychological adjustment (i.e., self-esteem and psychological well-being). A total of 199 biracial individuals, who ranged in age from 18 to 55 years, completed an online survey that measured factors such as the rule of hypodescent (i.e., one-drop rule), physical appearance, self-monitoring, and exposure to multicultural experiences. Although the one-drop rule was not a significant predictor of biracial identity options, there were other significant findings within this population. Physical resemblance to two or more racial groups and exposure to multicultural experiences predicted biracial individuals' identification with a Border or Protean identity. Second, this study found that a high level of exposure to multicultural experiences best predicted a high level of ethnic identity development and positive interactions with other racial groups. Lastly, the current study found that the previously mentioned factors also contributed to biracial individuals' psychological adjustment (i.e., self-esteem and psychological well-being). Limitations of the current study and recommendations for future research with this population were also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Kizzie P. Walker, M.S.

I have much admiration for the people in my life who have encouraged me along this journey. I wish to thank those who have guided and supported me, knowing that words cannot fully express my appreciation. First, I would like to thank my dissertation committee, Drs. Stephen L. Franzoi, Stephen M. Saunders, and Debra L. Oswald, for their tremendous patience and words of wisdom. Second, I would like to thank Kenyatta Coleman for her assistance in the early stages of this process. Thank you to my cheerleaders, "The Fellows," especially Chanté Meadows and Shanti Pepper, during the most challenging time of this process. They encouraged me with their creativity, infectious laughter, and kept telling me to "just keep swimming, just keep swimming." I would also like to thank my friends, Kris Chapleau and Katie Dillenburger, who helped ground me during moments of irrational thought. Lastly, thank you to my family, who has been there from the very beginning. To my sisters Hattie and Leah, I have learned to appreciate our differences and similarities, which have been challenging, humorous, and inspirational. To my extended family, Auntie Margaret, Baby, Toning, Uncle Phillip and Junior, I have much respect and gratitude for their continued support. To my parents, Kenny and Leticia Walker, who have inspired me with their love and instilled in me the importance of education. I dedicate this dissertation to them, as it would not have been possible without them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS……i

LIST OF TABLES……...v

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION……...1

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW……3

THEORETICAL MODELS OF IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT……3
Psychosocial Model of Identity Development…….3
Model of Racial Identity Development……5
Model of Ethnic Identity Development……...8

THEORIES OF BIRACIAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT……10
The Life-Cycle of the Marginal Man…….13
Biracial Identity Development in Children……14
Developmental Models of Biracial Identity…….…..15
Resolution of a Marginal Identity……..17
A Biracial, Bicultural Identity……18
Cultural and Ethnic Identity of Mixed-Heritage Individuals…….20
A Bicultural Alternation Model…….…….20
A Life-Span Model of Biracial Identity Development……..21
The Black/White Biracial Identity Model…….…….25

A SOCIOLOGICAL BASED PERSPECTIVE ON BIRACIAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT……..28

FACTORS SALIENT TO BIRACIAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT……...36
Physical Appearance……..36
Cultural Exposure……..37
Social Networks……37

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT OF BIRACIAL INDIVIDUALS……..41
Effect of Race-Based Social Interactions……..41
Effect of Discrimination and Feelings of Oppression……42
Effect of Negative Stereotypes……..45
Impact of Negative Outcomes on Identity Development……..48
Positive Psychological Adjustment…...……50
Critique of Methodology Pertaining to Self-esteem Research……..52

SUMMARY AND CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE REVIEW…….53

CRITIQUE OF BIRACIAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY……59
Definitions of Race, Ethnicity, and Culture……...61
Measurements of Ethnic and Racial Identity Development……..62
Hypotheses of Current Study……66
Proposed Analyses……68

CHAPTER 3: METHOD……..69

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF RACE……..69

RECRUITMENT AND DATA COLLECTION……...70

PARTICIPANTS……...70

RACIAL IDENTIFICATION……73

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF PARTICIPANTS' PARENTS……..73

RULES OF HYPODESCENT……...73

MEASURES……..76
Biracial Identity Options……76
Physical Appearance……..77
Level of Racial Identity Development……...78
Multicultural Experience Inventory……...80
Self-Monitoring……..82
Self-Esteem……82
Psychological Well-Being……83

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS……..84

RULES OF HYPODESCENT ON BIRACIAL IDENTITY……84

RULES OF HYPODESCENT AND PHYSICAL RESEMBLANCE ON BIRACIAL IDENTITY……88

RULES OF HYPODESCENT AND SELF-MONITORING ON BIRACIAL IDENTITY……93

RULES OF HYPODESCENT AND MULTICULTURAL EXPERIENCES…..95

RULES OF HYPODESCENT, ETHNIC IDENTITY, AND OTHER GROUP ORIENTATION……..101

RULES OF HYPODESCENT AND MULTICULTURAL EXPERIENCES ON BIRACIAL IDENTITY……104

FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO SELF-ESTEEM……107

FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING……110

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION……..114

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS……..126

LIMITATIONS……....128

STRENGTHS……..131

FUTURE DIRECTIONS……132

REFERENCES……136

APPENDIX A: Questions and Hypotheses……151

APPENDIX B: Consent Form……152

APPENDIX C: Biracial Information……..154

APPENDIX D: Physical Appearance……156

APPENDIX E: Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure……157

APPENDIX F: Multicultural Experience Inventory……...159

APPENDIX G: Self-Monitoring Scale……...161

APPENDIX H: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale……...163

APPENDIX I: Psychological Well-Being Scale……164

APPENDIX J: Demographic and Racial Self-Identification and Information……...167

APPENDIX K: Debriefing Statement, Follow-up Questions, and Thank you……...169

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Demographic Information of Biracial Individuals (N = 199)…….72

TABLE 2: Two Methods of Biracial Individuals' Racial Categorization (N = 199)…...74

TABLE 3: Demographic Information of Participants' Parents (N = 199)……...75

TABLE 4: Level of Education Completed by Participants' Parents……76

TABLE 5: Participants' Biracial Identification (N = 199)……...86

TABLE 6: Chi-Square Test of Independence of the Rules of Hypodescent and the Four Biracial Identity Options (N = 199)……..87

TABLE 7: Biracial Individuals' Perception of Physical Resemblance to Racial Groups (N = 199)……...90

TABLE 8: Likelihood the Rules of Hypodescent and Physical Resemblance to 1 Racial Group Predicts a Singular Identity (n = 163)…….91

TABLE 9: Chi-Square Test of Independence of the Rules of Hypodescent and Physical Resemblance to 1 or more Racial Group(s) (N = 199)……...92

TABLE 10: Likelihood the Rules of Hypodescent and High Self-monitoring Predicts a Protean Identity (n = 122)…….94

TABLE 11: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Ethnic Identity……...97

TABLE 12: Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Ethnic Identity……98

TABLE 13: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Other Group Orientation…….100

TABLE 14: The Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Other Group Orientation……..101

TABLE 15: Likelihood of a High Level of Ethnic Identity and Other Group Orientation Predicting a Singular Identity (n = 139)……...103

TABLE 16: Likelihood of the Rules of Hypodescent and a High Level of Multicultural Experiences Predicting a Border or Protean Identity (n = 121)…….106

TABLE 17: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation Predicting Self-Esteem…109

TABLE 18: Multiple Regression Predicting Self-Esteem Based on the Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation (n = 80)……110

TABLE 19: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation Predicting Psychological Well-Being……...112

TABLE 20: Multiple Regression Predicting Psychological Well-Being Based on the Rules Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation (n = 122)……..113

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Over the past 4 decades, the United States has undergone significant demographic, cultural, and social changes. Due to various social movements (e.g., civil and women's rights) and their impact on social attitudes towards race relations, the number of interracial marriages and relationships have increased. In 1967 the U.S. Supreme Court removed antimiscegenation laws, which prohibited interracial marriages. The purpose of antimiscegenation laws was to regulate marriages between Whites and people of other races. The twenty years since this Supreme Court ruling has seen an increase in interracial relationships and marriages. In 1983, the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1985) reported over 719,000 interracial marriages with this number increasing to 2,094,000 by 2003. The significance of this increase in interracial marriages/unions was illustrated in the 2000 U.S. Census, when individuals were provided the opportunity to identify themselves as belonging to more than one race. As a result of these unions, 2.4 percent of the population (i.e., 6,826,228 people) reported belonging to more than one racial group. Consequently, the sudden increase of individuals with a multiracial background sparked an interest in understanding how to categorize these individuals and how these individuals come to self-identify within a preexisting racial classification system (Shih & Sanchez, 2005).

Although a significant proportion of United States' citizens have multigenerational multiracial roots, the topic of multiraciality had been silenced due to the history of antimiscegenation laws and attitudes combined with the rules of hypodescent (Root, 1992a). Also known as the "one-drop rule," hypodescent is society's influence on labeling an individual as Black if they have "one-drop of black blood" in

their ancestry. The function of hypodescent was to ensure that individuals could not identify with both the Black and White race (Bowles, 1993). This codified racial classification scheme resulted in individuals of a biracial background not having the opportunity to choose their own identities. It was not until the 1970s that individuals whose biological parents are racially different from one another began to claim more than one racial group or create a new identity like biracial (Root, 1992b). In spite of this trend, biracial individuals were likely to identify with only one racial and/or ethnic group. However, there was a growing need among biracial groups to self-name in order to validate their existence, thereby liberating themselves from an oppressive structure of the traditional racial classification system (Hall, 2001). Some biracial individuals have attempted to liberate themselves from traditional modes of racial classification, where identity is defined with respect to skin color, which is thought to be equated to race. For example, professional golfer, Tiger Woods ignored race as the primary factor of his identity. Instead, he defined himself as "Cablinasian" in order to acknowledge his Caucasian, Black, Indian and Asian ancestry that contributes to his racial heritage (Hall, 2001). As a nation becomes more racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse, identity development is being considered across one's life span and where identity models are based more on the individual rather than his or her race (Hall, 2001).

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Models of Identity Development

Psychosocial Model of Identity Development

Traditionally, the focus of psychological theory and research on identity development has centered on individuals from the dominant culture (Gibbs, 1987). As the pioneer of the concept of identity, Erikson (1959, 1963, 1968) has been influential in the work of psychosocial development. His 8-stage theory of psychosocial development consists of psychosocial crises that emerge at certain periods within the life cycle due to biological and social interactions. The psychosocial crisis of the fifth stage, *identity vs. identity confusion*, centers on establishing a coherent identity (Steinberg, 1996). Identity is characterized as the search for an integration of self-images necessary to attain social adulthood (Kamptner, 1988). It is at this stage that Erikson (1959) described the young person as developing a sense of ego identity as he or she receives confirmation of integrated self-images from society. He also emphasized how personal and group identity help shape a mature and healthy personality. Personal identity centers on the "Who am I?" question and relies upon family relationships to help answer the question. Built upon the family relationships in personal identity are the other relationships in the community (e.g., peers, colleagues) required to answer the "Who are we?"; "Who are they?" questions of group identity (Bowles, 1993). Erikson (1963) stressed how several important tasks were involved in establishing an independent identity during adolescence. As cited in Poston (1990), the most important tasks included: (1) establishing a personal identity, (2) autonomy and independence; (3) relating to members of the same and other

sex; and (4) committing to a career choice.

Marcia (1966, 1980, 1994) operationalized Erikson's views on identity formation and provided four identity statuses: *identity achievement*, *moratorium*, *identity foreclosure*, and *identity diffusion*. These four modes of resolution to the psychosocial crisis of identity are based upon the amount of crisis/exploration and commitment experienced by adolescents. *Crisis* is the period during identity development adolescents choose among meaningful alternatives. The term *exploration* is often used by most researchers, instead of crisis. *Commitment* is adolescents' demonstration of a personal investment in what they are going to do (Santrock, 1997). *Moratorium* occurs when an individual is in the midst of exploration. At this time, a person depicts his or her uncertainty about the present and future, which can lead to the onset of an "identity crisis." When an individual has made commitments without a period of exploration, he or she is categorized with the identity status of *identity foreclosure*. *Identity foreclosure* is a representation of the failure to meet the identity challenge in terms of exploration. At this developmental position, the adolescent has made commitments from the beliefs, expectations, and roles established in childhood. *Identity diffusion* occurs when an individual has either not made any commitments or is not in a period of exploration. This identity status often results in adolescents feeling socially isolated (Donovan, 1975). *Identity achievement* is the most mature of the identity statuses because it emphasizes that a person has made commitments after a period of crisis and exploration, thereby establishing a coherent sense of identity (McAdams, 1994; Steinberg, 1996). In order to reach the identity status of achievement, one must have passed through *moratorium* (Meeus, Iedema, Helsen, & Vollebergh, 1999). Identity achievers strive for internalized

goals, rely on their own skills and capacities in meeting daily challenges, and tend not to conform to peer pressure and social norms (Adams, Ryan, Hoffman, Dobson, & Nielson, 1984; Toder & Marcia, 1973).

Although each identity status is a representation of a person's current developmental position, it is believed that identity can be negotiated and reworked, making it possible to move from one status to another over time (Bourne, 1978; Waterman, 1982). Marcia (1983) believed interpersonal relations are important to the identity development process because identity is a psychosocial issue that develops in relation to others. Therefore, the resolution of the *identity* vs. *identity confusion* crisis lies within adolescents' interactions with others. The interactions and responses with significant people act as a mirror for adolescents to receive information about themselves. These interactions shape and influence their identity because adolescents reflect back on who they are and who they ought to be (Steinberg, 1996). This concept of how identity development is affected by interactions will be discussed in greater detail later on within this section. Despite the various components mentioned in Erikson (1963) and Marcia's (1983) theory of identity development, there is no mention of race as being an important factor in developing identity. There is an emphasis on relating to one's sex, but nothing about being able to relate to one's own race. What role does race play in the development of identity?

Model of Racial Identity Development

A model of racial identity development most often used is the adapted version of Cross's Negro-to-Black Conversion model (1971, 1978, 1991), also known as the

nigrescence model. *Nigrescence* is "…the developmental process by which a person 'becomes Black,' where *Black* is defined as a psychological connection with one's race rather than the mere identification of the color of one's skin" (Plummer, 1996, p. 169). According to this model there are 5 stages of Black racial identity development: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion/emersion, internalization, and internalization-commitment. At the beginning, individuals in the *pre-encounter* stage adopt the beliefs and values of the dominant culture, thereby actively or passively rejecting their minority group. An event or series of events that force acknowledging the impact of race (e.g., instances of social rejection by White friends or colleagues) prompts an individual to move into the *encounter* stage. At this stage, it is common for negative experiences and/or events to alter "…the person's current feeling about [self] and [his or her] interpretation of the condition of Blacks in America" (Cross, 1971, p. 17). It is during the encounter stage that Black individuals conclude that they cannot truly be White and therefore will not be viewed as equal to White. At this stage, Black individuals begin to ask themselves questions pertaining to what it means to be Black in addition to determining that their previous conceptions of what it means to be Black were misguided. At this point, feelings of anger, guilt and hostility emerge for having abandoned their race and demean their "Blackness" (Cross, 1971). These feelings lead to an interest in further exploration of their Black identity.

The next stage involves focusing one's identity on being a member of a racial group by actively avoiding symbols of Whiteness and being surrounded with visible symbols of their racial identity. This *immersion-emersion* stage is characterized by Black individuals seeking out opportunities to explore aspects of their racial history and culture,

while simultaneously experiencing negative feelings toward White people and their culture. Although feelings of hostility may still be present, feelings of guilt are replaced by feelings of pride because of the emersion of the Black experience. Black individuals reach the *internalization* stage after having resolved any conflict between their old identity and their new worldview. They become secure in their own sense of racial identity and experience an increase in self-confidence. Based upon the outcome of the previous stage (i.e., immersion-emersion), there are three possible outcomes of the internalization stage: Disappointment and Rejection, Continuation and Fixation at Stage Three, and Internalization. In the previous stage of immersion-emersion, individuals develop an idealistic view of what it means to be Black. Positive experiences at this stage can lead to continued involvement in the Black movement and exploration towards the internalization stage. However, negative experiences, like "prolonged or traumatic frustration (and contentment) of these high expectancy levels may direct [an individual] to be more deeply rooted in nihilistic expectancies…" (Cross, 1971, p. 21). The outcome of the internalization stage that finds these individuals with a nihilistic, hopeless, and possibly an anti-people worldview is labeled *Disappointment and Rejection*. The *Continuation and Fixation at Stage Three* is a result of individuals becoming overwhelmed with anger towards White people. It is possible for these individuals to reach a point of psychological Blackness and not progress any further. The last outcome, *Internalization*, is a result of "incorporate[d] aspects of the immersion-emersion experience into their self-concept. They achieve a feeling of inner security and are more satisfied with themselves" (Cross, 1971, p. 21). They are less inclined to assert the "Blacker than thou" attitude and more willing to establish meaningful relationships with

Whites who are respectful of their own self-definition. The final stage of *internalization-commitment* involves the ability to translate a personal sense of Blackness into a form of commitment (i.e., plan of action) concerning Black individuals as a group. Also, as the internalization of a Black identity increases, the negative attitudes towards White people declines. Specific to African Americans, Cross's (1991) model of racial identity development is viewed as a recurring process rather than a linear one. The objective is for the individual to revisit the stages after facing new encounters and experiences, which results in a continual transformation of the later stages.

Although Erikson (1959) depicts adolescence as the time people begin the process of searching for their identity, Cross (1991) implied that this process of racial identity development may have already occurred for Black individuals prior to their adolescent years. Racial socialization of Black children is thought to have begun early in childhood. This would allow Black children to grow up with the necessary skills needed to exist in a predominantly White European culture (Plummer, 1996). It is doubtful that adolescence is the first time a Black individual experiences a negative event (e.g., racial slur, racism). So, it would not be unusual, rather expected, for Black adolescents to have a grasp of their racial identity prior to adolescence.

Model of Ethnic Identity Development

Although racial group membership is considered central to self, it is the least studied aspect of identity development (Phinney, 1990). Ethnic identity development is thought to be similar to the process of psychosocial identity development (Erikson, 1959; Marcia, 1980), where individuals become displaced or upset by a crisis and seek out a

resolution (Steinberg, 1996). Some have suggested conceptual frameworks for the study of ethnic identity are acculturation and identity formation. *Acculturation* deals with "…the changes in cultural attitudes, values, and behaviors that result from contact between two distinct cultures (Berry, Trimble, & Olmedo, 1986)" (as cited in Phinney, 1990, p. 501). Based upon this concept of acculturation, there is a two-dimensional model of ethnic identification of the majority and minority group with four possible outcomes: assimilation, marginality, separation, and biculturalism. *Assimilation* is the adopting of the majority culture's norms and standards while rejecting those of the minority group. *Marginality* involves living within the majority culture but never feeling completely accepted. Associating only with members of one's minority culture and rejecting the majority culture is *separation*, while maintaining ties to both the majority and the minority cultures is considered *biculturalism*.

Assimilated minority youth are often scorned by their communities for trying to "act white." For instance, the pejorative term *oreo* is used to label African Americans who are perceived as trying too hard to assimilate. Similarly, the term *banana* is used to describe Asian Americans who are perceived as acting White (Spencer & Dornbusch, 1990). In response to the negative consequences of assimilation, many minority youth adopt the strategy of separation. This is especially common among minority groups who are survivors of intense discrimination, racism, and prejudice. Biculturalism is generally considered the more viable alternative to assimilation or separation because bicultural individuals are often more successful in "shuttling" between the dominant culture and that of their racial and ethnic group (Spencer & Dornbusch, 1990).

Another theoretical construct for studying ethnic identity is the developmental

framework of identity formation. Phinney (1989) outlined the stages of ethnic identity development as:

1. *Diffuse*: Little or no exploration of one's ethnicity and no clear understanding of the issues.
2. *Foreclosed*: Little or no exploration of ethnicity, but apparent clarity about one's own ethnicity. Feelings about one's ethnicity may be either positive or negative, depending on one's socialization experiences.
3. *Moratorium*: Evidence of exploration, accompanied by some confusion about the meaning of one's own ethnicity.
4. *Achieved*: Evidence of exploration, accompanied by a clear, secure understanding and acceptance of one's own ethnicity (p. 38).

Phinney (1990) reflected upon the similarities between the ego identity conceptualized by Erikson (1968) and operationalized by Marcia (1980) to conclude that the development of an ethnic identity occurs in three stages: unexamined ethnic identity, ethnic identity search (moratorium), and the achieved ethnic identity. The first stage of an *unexamined ethnic identity* is evident among individuals who have either identified with the dominant ethnic group or given very little consideration to their ethnicity. In the second stage, *ethnic identity search* (*moratorium*), individuals experience an "awakening" to their ethnic culture and seek out ways to participate in activities that provide the opportunity to learn about their culture. When individuals gain a better understanding and appreciation of their ethnicity, they have reached the last stage of *achieved ethnic identity*. This stage is distinguished by how individuals' persist with maintaining their understanding of their ethnic identity.

Theories of Biracial Identity Development

Although prior models of racial identity development support the significance of identity development for monoracial individuals, they lack the ability to recognize

biracial or multiracial identities (e.g., Miller, 1992; Phinney, 1990). According to Poston (1990), when traditional models of racial identity development are applied to biracial individuals, several limitations arise. First, at various stages of these models an individual must choose one group's culture or values over another at various stages. The second limitation made by these models is the rejection of their minority and then the dominant culture. This becomes problematic for the biracial individual who is a descendent of both a majority and minority racial group. The third limitation of these models is that they do not allow for the integration of several group identities. These models claim that biracial individuals can achieve self-fulfillment by integrating only one racial and/or ethnic group, while accepting the other groups. The fourth limitation is the requirement of acceptance into the minority culture of origin in order for there to be successful completion of the identity development process. However, not all biracial individuals experience acceptance by the minority or dominant cultures. Gibbs (1987) suggested that many biracial individuals experience higher rates of victimization by their parents' cultures and other groups than individuals of a single minority group.

Biracial identity development is an important aspect in the life of any individual whose parents are from different racial groups. Understanding the process of biracial identity development can be beneficial to those individuals who may experience difficulty negotiating societal and familial hurdles (Poston, 1990). Although the majority of the research in racial identity development has focused on Black racial identity development (e.g., Cross, 1971, 1991) and most recently White racial identity development (Helms, 1990), the literature on biracial identity development is growing. Theoretically, racial identity development for an individual with a multiracial background

would be more complex compared to an individual with a monoracial background (Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995). For instance, based upon messages from the dominant society (e.g., being a member of a disadvantaged and devalued minority group), Black individuals may find their identity formation to be more difficult (Erikson, 1959; Gibbs, 1985; Jenkins, 1982). Therefore, if Black individuals experienced problems with their identity development, then it would not be unusual for biracial individuals to experience difficulty with their identity formation (Gibbs, 1987; Lyles, Yancey, Grace, & Carter, 1985; Sebring, 1985; Sommers, 1964; Teicher, 1968). For instance, Katz (1983) stated that children develop their racial identity through the process of learning about the "group" to which they belong, with the assumption that the "other" group is different from their group. This process is only made more complicated due to the fact that biracial individuals are trying to identify with a "group" that is "biracial." It is very common for the biracial child to develop a dual identity, because some interracial parents are encouraging their biracial child to identify with both racial and/or ethnic groups (Barringer, 1989; Smolowe, 1993). So, it would seem that from the very beginning, biracial children are working on developing a dual identity.

Over the past 7 decades, various models or approaches to biracial identity development have emerged. The identity development models applied to biracial individuals were deficit models (e.g., Stonequist, 1937), general minority models of identity development (e.g., Morten & Atkinson, 1983), or African American models of identity development (e.g., Cross, 1971; Parham & Helms, 1985). Research has led to some preliminary findings in terms of the process involved in biracial identity development (e.g., Jacobs, 1992; Poston, 1990) and only recently has research been

directed towards examining specific variables involved in biracial identity development (e.g., Khanna, 2004).

The Life-Cycle of the Marginal Man

As the very first model of biracial identity development, The Life-Cycle of the Marginal Man (Stonequist, 1937) examined the effects of individuals actively participating in two different cultures. As a deficit model, Stonequist's (1937) model assumed that biracial identity development is "marginal," because although people who are of a "mixed race" have connections to both worlds (i.e., racial groups), they do not completely belong to either. According to Stonequist (1937), there are three phases to the marginal individuals' development. In the first phase, biracial individuals are not aware of the potential "conflict" associated with existing between two social worlds; they are not "race-conscious." When biracial individuals consciously experience this "conflict" internally, they have reached the second phase. During this time, marginal individuals become conscious of themselves and their ancestry. The final phase is an attempt to address anxiety associated with existing in two worlds, by taking an active role in defining and understanding the significance of their race. As a result, the life-cycle of the marginal individual ends in three options: "(1) assimilation into the dominant group; (2) assimilation into the subordinate group; or (3) some form of accommodation, perhaps temporary and incomplete, between the two groups" (p. 130). A limitation of The Life-Cycle of the Marginal Man is the emphasis on identity problems being solely placed within the individual. However, marginality can also be related to how individuals internalize the biased and prejudice beliefs that may exist within their parents' cultures.

This means that instead of the differences between the cultures, a lack of support from the parents' cultures may be responsible for the difficulties biracial individuals encounter (Poston, 1990).

Biracial Identity Development in Children

Jacobs (1978, 1992) proposed three distinct stages of biracial identity development based upon the interviews generated by the doll-play instrument methodology with Black/White biracial children. The first two stages hypothesized were based upon the doll-play methodology and the third stage was projected to address children beyond 8 years of age. Stage 1, *Pre-Color Constancy: Play and Experimentation With Color,* is when children begin to understand that there are color differences. Although color is perceived to lack value, it was hypothesized that negative experiences prior to exploratory play with color can result in negative evaluations based on color. Stage 2, *Post-Color Constancy: Biracial Label and Racial Ambivalence,* involved the rejection of both racial groups. At this time biracial children are ambivalent about their color and the internalization of an interracial label emerges. Usually, the children's family provided and advocated the use of this label, thereby fostering a parenting style that facilitated a healthy self-concept. It is at this stage when biracial children become aware of social discrimination based on race. The final stage, *Biracial Identity,* is when biracial children understand that skin color does not determine racial group membership, but that they are correlated. The determining factor in the identity development of a biracial child is the racial, ethnic, and social group membership of their parents.

Developmental Models of Biracial Identity

Poston (1990) suggested a 5-stage, progressive and developmental model for biracial identity development that illustrated changes in what Cross (1987) referred to as Personal Identity (PI) and Reference Group Orientation (RGO). PI is considered independent of racial categorization and consists of the constructs self-esteem, self-worth, and interpersonal competence. RGO consists of the constructs that involve racial identity, racial esteem, and racial ideology. Although similar to other life-span focused models of identity development (Cross, 1971; Erikson, 1963; Morten & Atkinson, 1983), Poston's (1990) model differs because of the emphasis on the biracial individual's need to value and integrate multiple cultures. Poston's (1990) model addressed a limitation of The Life-Cycle of the Marginal Man (Stonequist, 1937) by allowing both cultures to coexist without conflict. These five stages are described as Personal Identity, Choice of Group Categorization, Enmeshment/Denial, Appreciation, and Integration.

Biracial individuals at the *personal identity* stage are just becoming aware of their ethnic heritage. Although it is possible that they are aware of their race and ethnicity, their sense of self is largely independent of their racial background. Since the RGOs are not developed at this stage, the biracial individual's personal identity is based on factors developed and learned in the family, such as self-esteem and feelings of self-worth. It would be uncommon for a biracial individual to choose a biracial identity at this time because this would require a level of cognitive development and knowledge of multiple cultures that is uncharacteristic of this age group at this stage (Poston, 1990).

Biracial individuals need to participate or belong to peer, family, and/or social groups (Hall, 1980). However, they often feel that they have been forced into choosing

the identity of one racial group in the *choice of group categorization* stage. Due to the forced nature of having to make a specific racial choice, this stage can be a time of crisis and alienation. According to Hall (1980), the biracial individual has two choices: choose a multicultural existence or choose one parent's culture or racial heritage as dominant over the other. Typically the outcome of this stage is the identification with one racial group. In order to assist biracial individuals in their choice of group categorization, Hall (1980) identified several salient factors that contributed to this decision-making process:

> (1) *status factors* – group status of parents' ethnic background, demographics of home neighborhood (i.e., the ethnicity of neighbors and parental peers), and ethnicity and influence of peer group; (2) *social support factors* – parental style and influence, acceptance and participation in cultures of various groups, and parental and familial acceptance; and (3) *personal factors* – physical appearance, knowledge of languages other than English (if any), cultural knowledge, age, political involvement, and individual personality differences (as cited in Poston, 1990, p. 153).

Feelings of confusion, guilt, and self-hatred associated with having chosen an identity that is not a full representation of one's background is characteristic of *enmeshment/denial*, the third stage of Poston's (1990) model of biracial identity development. Biracial individuals at this stage may feel ashamed of having a parent whose racial background is different from the norm within their neighborhood or school. These feelings of shame, guilt, and anger are due to the biracial individuals' apprehension about having friends meet this parent. Biracial individuals resolve these feelings by learning to appreciate both parents' racial backgrounds and cultures; otherwise, they will remain at this developmental stage. Sebring (1985) suggested parental and community support in resolving the problems of this stage. Otherwise, biracial individuals will experience guilt and feelings of disloyalty over rejecting one parent because they cannot identify with both parents. In the fourth stage of *appreciation,* biracial individuals are

influenced by the salient factors outlined in the choice of group characterization stage. It is at this stage that biracial individuals broaden their reference group orientation by learning about their racial and/or ethnic heritage and cultures. Although biracial individuals begin to appreciate their multiple identities, the tendency is to identify with only one racial and/or ethnic group. The final stage of *integration* is where biracial individuals recognize and value all of their ethnic identities, resulting in the development of a secure and integrated identity.

Resolution of a Marginal Identity

Root (1990) contends that biracial individuals are considered "marginal" due to the ambiguity of their racial and ethnic identities and society's difficulty in viewing the races as equal. To address marginality, Root (1990, 1998) initially proposed four healthy resolutions that are dependent upon a number of factors (e.g., age or generation, geographic location, coping strategies associated with racial identity conflicts). The first resolution is the multiracial individual's *acceptance of the identity society assigns*. This resolution provides a biracial individual with a fluid identity that radically changes depending upon the social situation. So, a biracial person from a Black-Japanese union may be perceived by family and peers as Black. However, if this same individual moves to another community or country, then their assigned racial identity may change. Another resolution of marginality is *identification with both racial groups*, which would allow the individual to shift from one identity to another depending upon the situational context. Unlike the prior resolution, it is the biracial individual that determines his or her identity, not society. The third option of the multiracial individual is to actively choose a

racial group identity that is less likely to shift when the situational context changes (*identification with a single racial group*). *Identification as a new racial group* (e.g., a new "mixed-race heritage") is the final healthy resolution of marginality. A characteristic of this resolution is that all aspects of one's racial and cultural heritage are valued equally. The multiracial individual feels well integrated and has the ability to relate to both groups (Sue & Sue, 2003). Biracial individuals will experience a smooth transition between racial groups but perceive themselves as separate from these reference groups, without feeling marginal because of the new reference group they created (Root, 1990). In addition to the four biracial identity resolutions to marginality, Root (2001) included two other ways in which biracial individuals could self-identify – "a *symbolic race or ethnicity*" (p. 161) and *racial identification based on different situations and circumstances*.

A Biracial, Bicultural Identity

Kich's (1992) model of biracial identity development emphasized three main stages that occur during a lifetime process of "transitions of questionable, sometimes devalued sense of self to one where an interracial self-conception is highly valued and secure" (p. 305). *Awareness of Differentness and Dissonance* is the first stage and occurs between the ages of 3 and 10 years. At this time biracial children recognize the differences among people, whether it is a positive difference from a secure family context or a negative difference from peers. Differences such as, physical appearance, discrepancy between name and physical appearance, or the birthplace of parents can increase biracial children's perception that they do not belong. Therefore, parental

involvement in developing a positive self-concept and interracial label is critical at this initial stage. Exposure to cultural experiences, like foods, languages, and social contexts are ways in which to foster open communication of discussing racial and ethnic differences.

From the age of 8 through late adolescence or young adulthood, biracial individuals go through the *Struggle for Acceptance*. At this second stage, biracial adolescents are more involved with friends, peers, and the community, thereby increasing their belief that these individuals perceive them and their family as different. Questions about the biracial individual's background begin at this time. When asked, "What are you?" the usual response is to list their parents' backgrounds (e.g., My father is White and my mother is Japanese). It is also characteristic for there to be a separation between family and social life in order to guard against fears of rejection. Biracial adolescents struggle with wanting to fit in or wanting to be accepted for their uniqueness. At a time when biracial adolescents are being questioned about their background, a reference group orientation that bypasses race and ethnicity emerges, and the focus of one's identity is placed on abilities. Unlike other adolescents, biracial individuals struggle with finding a level of acceptance, comfort, recognition, and membership with others like them. There is also a struggle with determining with which parent to identify. After high school, during the transition to and from college or work is when the final stage, *Self-Acceptance and Assertion of an Interracial Identity* occurs. During this time, biracial individuals learn about their cultural heritages and value this information while being aware of their status as an American. Also, there is more openness to the questions about their racial background, as it is explained by society's confusion over the concept race.

Cultural and Ethnic Identity of Mixed-Heritage Individuals

The empirical studies of Williams (1992) and Stephan (1992) have strong implications for biracial identity development. Williams' (1992) study consisted of 43 Amerasians between the ages of 16 and 35 yielded the following results:

1. Biracial Japanese/American individuals have a sense of holding something in common with other Amerasians as well as other racially mixed Americans
2. They have an early awareness of racial differences, often due to others bringing it to their attention
3. The variable of physical appearance plays a role, but with unknown impact due to many individual differences
4. Choice of a reference group is not always predicated on whether a particular community was accepting of the individual (as cited in Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995, p. 210).

Stephan (1992) implied that cultural exposure, a specific upbringing of interacting with a cultural group, is not necessary for ethnic identity development. The idea is that biracial individuals can obtain cultural exposure on their own. Stephan (1992) concluded that dual-heritage individuals experience difficulties with identity development, such as constructing a racial identity, coping with the long-term effects of rejection, and/or integrating the different cultural norms. However, there were also advantages of a biracial status, which include increased contact with the members of one's heritage groups, enjoyment of the cultures of one's heritage groups, facility in languages spoken by one's heritage groups, and intergroup tolerance" (p. 62).

A Bicultural Alternation Model

LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) introduced the *bicultural alternation model*, which stipulated that attaining competence among two cultures is possible without

having to lose one's original cultural identity or choose one culture over the other. This model rejected the belief that living in two cultures can have a negative impact (e.g., identity confusion, marginality) on an individual. LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) argued that it is more beneficial (i.e., key to psychological well-being) to have the ability of developing and maintaining a level of competence associated with being part of two cultures. Any negative psychological effects are addressed through the development of bicultural competence, which occurs in six dimensions:

1. Knowledge of cultural beliefs and values such as awareness of history, rituals, and everyday cultural practices
2. Positive attitudes toward the goal of bicultural competence and toward both groups with whom one has sufficient contact (but not necessarily equal regard)
3. The belief that one can live in an effective and satisfying way within more than one group
4. The ability to appropriately and effectively communicate verbally and nonverbally in each culture
5. Having a range of situationally appropriate behaviors and roles for each cultural group
6. Having a sufficient social support system providing a source of practical information (as cited in Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995, p. 209).

A Life-Span Model of Biracial Identity Development

Kerwin, Ponterotto, Jackson, and Harris (1993) determined critical identity issues relevant to the identity development of Black/White biracial individuals. Interviews with Black/White biracial children and their parents revealed a number of major themes – *racial awareness*, *self-description*, *labels*, *preparation for anticipated discrimination*, and *location*. The way in which the biracial children described their physical appearance was defined as the *self-description* theme. All of the biracial children described themselves in terms of skin color and other characteristics, such as the type of clothes worn. The first

time that the participants became aware of racial categories, racial differences or both, was considered the *racial awareness* theme. The younger children spoke of their racial awareness in terms of skin color or social groups. Overall, Kerwin et al. (1993) discovered that the biracial children did not experience marginality nor had they felt alienated from extended family members. They also did not struggle with the identification of one parent's racial group over the other. The parents did not experience any conflict with their children's racial label, which was probably due to the security of their (i.e., the parents) own racial identity.

The theme of *labels* was in reference to whether or not there was use of a racial and/or ethnic identification. The parents' view on the use or nonuse of such a label varied. Some were displeased by society's demand for individuals to have a racial and/or ethnic label, while others felt that labels were critical to the development of biracial identity. Families preferred the labels "*interracial, mixed, Black, Black and White, and bicultural*" (Kerwin et al., 1993, p. 225). The children of families that did not have a racial category created their own. Typically, the younger children referred to themselves in terms of their skin color or that of their parents (e.g., 'tan,' 'My Daddy is Black and my Mommy is White') (p. 226). The older children and adolescents, however, relied on societal groupings to label themselves and others (e.g., 'Black and White' or 'mixed') (p. 226). The *preparation for anticipated discrimination* theme referred to how parents dealt with the issue of racial discrimination. Although the parents varied in how they prepared their children, they were optimistic in their children's ability to deal with racial discrimination. Some parents took an active approach in preparing their children to handle prejudice, while others preferred to shelter their children from situations that may

be discriminatory or prejudicial. The theme of *location* was in reference to the environment/community parents decided to live and raise their children. For parents, the neighborhoods' racial demographic and its level of openness to interracial relations were important factors in deciding where to live.

By integrating similar empirical findings of various studies on biracial identity development (e.g., Kerwin, 1991; Kerwin et al., 1993; Stonequist, 1937; Poston, 1990; Jacobs, 1978; 1992; Kich, 1992; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Williams, 1992; Stephan, 1992), Kerwin and Ponterotto (1995) constructed their own model of biracial identity development. This six-stage model addressed the numerous personal, societal, and environmental factors that influence the formation of biracial identity. Although they identify various factors that contribute to this process of identity formation, Kerwin and Ponterotto (1995) argued that the ultimate decision is dependent upon the individual. For instance, a biracial individual of African American descent may have a multiracial self-concept, but identify his or her public self as African American. The six stages of the Kerwin-Ponterotto model are labeled *Preschool*, *Entry to School*, *Preadolescence*, *Adolescence*, *College/Young Adulthood*, and *Adulthood*.

The first stage of *Preschool* occurs up to 5 years of age and centers around the biracial child becoming aware of racial differences. At this early age, biracial children notice differences in hair texture and skin color, which may be attributed to parents' heightened sensitivity to their children's awareness, or the children's awareness of intrafamilial differences (Kerwin, 1991). *Entry to School* is the stage where biracial children are first questioned about their racial status. Katz (1983) stated that at an early age, there is a tendency to socially categorize others in order to simplify one's perceptual

world. So, even though some school-age children have a distinguishable sense of self and a clear understanding of social groups, there is a tendency for the peers of biracial children to ask, "What are you?" Biracial children respond with the descriptive terms and/or labels used to define themselves and/or their families. Some use descriptive terms for skin color (e.g., "coffee and cream"), while others use a label provided to them by their parents (e.g., interracial) (Kerwin et al, 1993).

Preadolescence, the third stage of Kerwin-Ponterotto's (1995) model of biracial identity development addressed how in addition to one's physical appearance (i.e., skin color, hair texture), other factors such as language and culture become representative of group membership. At this stage, labels representative of social groups by race, ethnicity, and/or religious background are used more than physical descriptors. At times, environmental situations can increase racial awareness for biracial children. These factors include a biracial individual's first incident with racism, or entry into a more integrated or segregated environment for the first time (Kerwin, 1991).

Due to developmental factors and societal pressures, *Adolescence* is the most challenging stage for biracial individuals. The search for a racial identity can be so intense that it often involves the denial of one parent, whether conscious or unconscious (Barringer, 1989). The perceived pressure from peers to choose one racial group over another may be related to Erikson's (1968) description of "in groupers" and "out groupers" and/or the difficulty of rejecting societal expectations to identify solely with one parent of color (Kerwin, 1991). At times the pressure to identify with a specific racial group is neutralized by other reference group orientation (RGO) factors not related to race, like academic abilities, team sports, and other interests. However, these "other

interests" can bring up other racial issues, like dating. Dating is likely to occur during adolescence and the reaction of the parents of potential dating partners may bring up the issues associated with interracial dating (e.g., Keerdoja, 1984; Shackford, 1984).

The fifth stage, *College/Young Adulthood*, is a continuation of how immersing in one culture leads to the rejection of the other. The rejection of others' expectations and an acceptance of a biracial and/or bicultural heritage are likely to occur at this stage, regardless of the secure personal identity that biracial young adults possess at this stage. A sign of successful progression through these stages involves a growing recognition of the advantages and disadvantages associated with a biracial heritage. Biracial individuals who are aware of the advantages of "bicultural vision" are provided with an understanding of situations in a more in-depth and multifaceted way. The final stage of Kerwin-Ponterotto's model of biracial identity development is *Adulthood*. Although considered the final stage, *Adulthood* is not the final process in the development of biracial identity; it is the beginning of one's continued exploration in one's own heritage and that of others. With the successful completion of earlier stages, biracial adults continue integrating the different facets that make up their racial identity. It is during this stage of *Adulthood* that an integrated biracial individual understands the significance of different communities and how to effectively function within various situations.

The Black/White Biracial Identity Model

The Black/White Biracial Identity Model (Henriksen, 1997, 2000; Henriksen & Trusty, 2004) consists of six periods or phases that illustrate movement towards the development of a racial identity. According to Henriksen (2000), biracial identity

develops after the individual has moved through these various periods or phases of racial identity. A biracial identification is the result of how individuals perceive the experiences associated with the interactions with other individuals or groups. So, to be biracial means to belong to a special group. The outcome of developing a healthy racial identity depends upon the types of relationships experienced and their reactions to external pressures encountered during the various phases of racial identity development.

The Black/White Biracial Identity Development model is a fluid process where biracial individuals can experience more than one stage simultaneously and life experiences can become catalysts to re-examining biracial individuals' racial identity. It is not a linear model where one must master a stage prior to continuing on to the next. Rather, the individual has the opportunity to revisit a phase of development or to be present in more than one period simultaneously. At the first stage of *Neutrality*, the biracial individual is not aware of racial differences and how these differences impact interactions in life. However, neutrality is not experienced by all biracial individuals because some were made aware of racial differences at a young age, usually by a parent. During the phase of *Acceptance*, biracial individuals are made aware of racial differences and that they possess a racial heritage. This task is usually carried out by family members and peers. Although aware of racial differences at this phase of development, biracial individuals may not completely grasp the significance of these differences and that they can become problematic. For the first time, biracial individuals will experience what it's like to be racially different and racially categorized by others. The period of acceptance also serves as an indicator of how biracial individuals move through the process of developing a racial identity. *Awareness* is the period of understanding the

significance of racial differences and depicts the onset of developing a racial identity. During this phase of development, family members and peers impact biracial individuals' ability to recognize and accept themselves. As biracial individuals begin to recognize their racial heritage, they also come to realize that they do not have a racial reference group. This is often a result of a negative interaction that leaves biracial individuals feeling isolated. As a nonlinear model, these stages of awareness and acceptance can be experienced separately or simultaneously.

It is at the phase of *Experimentation* when situational interactions impact how biracial individuals define themselves and with which racial heritages to identify. These situational influences are a result of the types of activities that biracial individuals participate in, which provides the opportunity to socialize with individuals who share similar interests. According to Root (1994), the most important outcome for biracial individuals in the experimentation phase is to acquire approval and acceptance from their peer groups. So, in an attempt to establish a connection with others, biracial individuals will try to identify with one part of their racial heritage. However, it is common for biracial individuals to oscillate between their racial groups or try to identify with one racial group. When trying to determine their racial identity, biracial individuals look for whether or not they "fit in" to a particular group and if there is a level of comfort in identifying with that group. Although individuals may acknowledge the label *biracial* (i.e., comprised of two racial groups), it does not mean that this identity is validated by others and that they won't struggle to identify with a group that suits them. Since the experimentation phase can be a time of confusion and internal conflict, there is a need for biracial individuals to evaluate how they understand their identity. The act of clarifying

how biracial individuals feel about themselves, specifically their racial identity, depicts the *Transition* phase of development. It is during this period that biracial individuals come to understand their preference for how they want to be racially identified. *Recognition* is the final phase during which biracial individuals accept their racial identity. Regardless of how the decision is made or which identity or label is maintained, this model proposes that there is a purpose behind the choice and it is a healthy one. For example, one biracial individual from the Henriksen and Trusty (2004) study stated, "I am African-American or Black. I usually say Black because it's easier than having to explain to everyone what your racial make-up is" (p. 75).

A Sociological Based Perspective on Biracial Identity Development

Early scholarship on ethnic and racial identity development has been rooted in psychologically oriented identity theories (e.g., Erikson, 1968, Helms, 1990; 1992; Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1989). Today, researchers are increasingly adopting perspectives on racial identity development that introduce additional theoretical frameworks, such as acculturation and culture conflict scholarship (e.g., Berry, Trimble, & Olmedo, 1986) and sociologically-oriented social identity theories (e.g., White & Burke, 1987). The complexity of racial identity development illustrates that the outcome of this process (e.g., a dichotomous commitment of one racial group over another or an integration of minority and majority groups) can affect the individual's level of adjustment and quality of social interactions (Helms, 1994; Steinberg, 1996).

Another contrast to the traditional models of racial identity development is the notion that identity is not fixed and final, but instead, racial identity is a fluid social

construct that extends across the life span of human development. Over the years, the definition of race has changed, so that most scholars now think of it as a social construct rather than a genetic construct (Hall, 2001; Harris & Sim, 2002). This shift in thinking is consistent with the reconceptualization of "race." Social meaning, sociocognition, and socialization are being considered critical parts to the identity development of biracial children because they experience "developmental markers, such as color differentiation, racial awareness, self- and race identification, and self-evaluation (both personal and group)" (Johnson, 1992, p. 37). The evidence of multiracial individuals challenging the social construction of race is found in terms like *mixed race*, *biracial*, and *multiracial*, which demonstrates the efforts at self-defining and dismantling socially accepted definitions of what it means to have parents whose origins are of more than one racial and/or ethnic group.

Multidimensional identity models have recently allowed for the possibility that individuals can simultaneously be a member of multiple, fluid identities with different groups (Henriksen & Trusty, 2004; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). Researchers are increasingly adopting perspectives on racial identity development that introduce sociologically-oriented social identity theories as a theoretical framework (e.g., Khanna, 2004; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; White & Burke, 1987). For that reason, a contrast to the traditional models of racial identity development is that identity is not fixed and final. Rather, racial identity is a fluid social construct that extends across the life span of human development.

Blumer (1969) emphasized three core principles regarding symbolic interactionism – meaning, language, and thought. *Meaning* is assigned to objects (e.g.,

people, things) that impact human behavior. *Language* is the method used to negotiate meaning through symbols, and *thought* is the ability to modify the interpretation of symbols. Symbols are categorized as a class of social objects, which is any object that an individual uses within a particular situation. Social objects are defined according to their use and are of a physical (e.g., a tree) or nonphysical (e.g., the self) form. It is through social interactions that social objects constantly change as they are being defined and redefined, or as people change their meaning of these objects (Charon, 2001).

As a nonphysical social object, identity is thought of as a symbol whose meaning changes across individuals and situations (Howard, 2000). From a symbolic interactionist perspective, the individual recognizes himself or herself as a social object in the environment through social interactions. As a constant exchange of symbols and shared meanings occur within social interactions, the individual's self (i.e., identity) is shaped through the behavior of others within the social interactions (Charon, 2001). The assumption is that individuals learn about themselves through the perception of others, how others perceive them, or how they believe that others perceive them. This principle of *reflected appraisals* or *the looking glass self* (Cooley, 1902) illustrates how the perceived perception of others influence individuals' self-concept or identity (Stryker, 1968; 1980). The Cooley-Mead (Kinch, 1968) formulations regarding self-concept argue that an individual's identity formation is a result of the way he/she perceived the responses of others toward him/her or as Mead (1934) considered to be *taking-the-role-of-the-other*.

Cooley (1902) believed that self-concept is developed as individuals reflect upon the responses and evaluations of others in the environment. According to his theory of

reflected appraisals, individuals imagine how they are perceived by others and how these perceptions are judged. Based upon these perceptions, individuals form a self-feeling, or self-concept. Additional theorists and researchers confirmed and expanded on Cooley's theory of reflected appraisals (e.g., Kinch, 1963; Mead, 1934; Schlenker, 1980; Sullivan, 1947, 1953). Wicklund and Gollwitzer (1982) further illustrated the significance of individuals receiving validation from others on their identity. Felson (1981) stated that reflected appraisals play a critical role in the development of self-attributions, especially when there is a lack of objective feedback or a sense of uncertainty and ambiguity. In the present analysis of racial identity, the social and psychological process described by Cooley's "looking-glass" self concept could benefit multiracial individuals' attempt to determine where they belong by relying upon the opinions of others in order to emphasize one racial identity over the other (Festinger, 1954).

White and Burke (1987) introduced a symbolic interactionist approach to define and explain the nature of racial and ethnic identity. The emphasis was on the importance of shared meanings or symbols acquired through social interactions that are later attributed to a particular racial and/or ethnic role or position, and finally incorporated into the self. These symbols are often a reflection of stereotypes, other perceived trait differences, or social conventions within members of racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, racial and ethnic identity is based upon the symbolic meaning and shared perceptions of what it means to be part of a particular racial or ethnic group. There are four perceptions associated with how specific aspects of identity are defined in terms of their association with a particular role or group: (1) ideal qualities (i.e., how one would like to be); (2) a societal based influence of external attributions of stereotypes; (3) normative (i.e., what

people ought to be like); and (4) actual characteristics of people (i.e., in their own eyes) (Burke, 1980).

A symbolic interactionist framework addressed the questions about choices, preferences, and social distances when studying racial identity development. The assumption of interactionist thought is that during social interactions, individuals use symbols and their shared meanings to understand their surroundings in order to predict and understand the behavior of others, and identify themselves (White & Burke, 1987). Racial and ethnic identity development is considered an ongoing process where individuals or groups perceive and define themselves with respect to other significant individuals (Lal, 1995).

Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) examined biracial identity development using the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism. They sought to determine important factors that influence racial identities along with an exploratory model of the relationship between these factors and the factors that impact biracial individuals' understanding of their racial identity. The study's conceptual framework was based upon Blumer's (1969) three assumptions of symbolic interactionism: "(a) that people know things by their meanings, (b) that meanings are created through social interaction, and (c) that meanings change through interaction" (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002, p. 40). So, *identity* was defined as the individual's self-understanding of what and where he or she is socially (Stone, 1990). Identity viewed in this manner relied upon the perceptions of others, in that an individual's self-understanding (i.e., identity) must be validated by others in order for it to function effectively. So, there cannot be a discrepancy between a

biracial individual's identity and the identity others have assigned this individual as an object within society.

Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) revealed that biracial individuals understood their identity in four descriptive identity categories – Singular, Border, Protean, and Transcendent. Racial identity that is exclusively one racial group is defined as a *Singular* identity. Historically, a singular Black identity was the norm for biracial individuals of European American and African American heritage. Although the Singular identity is only one racial group, Root (1990) stressed how identity options are affected by "the sociocultural context and racial composition of biracial individual's social context" (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002, p. 47). So, if you lived in the South, regardless of the era, a singular White option would not be available because of the deep historical context of race and hypodescent. Typically, a singular Black identity is synonymous to the identity that is assigned by society. Biracial individuals with a *Border* identity view themselves as existing between two socially distinct races and incorporating both races into a unique hybrid category (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002).

Biracial individuals with a *Protean* identity described themselves as "changing and shifting according to the group of people that [they] are with and the social context" (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002, p. 47). In order to have their self-understanding validated, biracial individuals with a protean identity feel the need to alter their identity (i.e., demonstrate different social behaviors) according to their social environment. Social situations are examined to determine the best identity fit. Biracial individuals with a Protean identity believe that their multiple racial backgrounds provide them with the ability to shift identities within any situation because their identities are thought of as

separate cultural entities. Several researchers (e.g., Miller, 1992; Stephan, 1991, 1992; Tizard & Phoenix, 1995) have considered a biracial identity as the ability to have various identities within different contexts. This ability of shifting identities is a way of exercising "situational race." With this ability, individuals with a Protean identity have an "integrative identity" because they can simultaneously reference themselves in both of the different racial communities (Daniel, 1996). An integrative identity can be synthesized or functional, where individuals with this type of identity are equally comfortable in either cultural setting. Although an individual with a functional integrative identity can identify and function in both racial group communities, they generally feel acceptance, comfort and a stronger point of reference with only one of the racial groups.

A *Transcendent* identity is thought of as a nonracial self-understanding. Participants who chose a transcendent identity described race as, "a false categorization of humanity" and do not consider themselves as a member of any racial category (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002, p. 50). These individuals viewed race as something that interfered with others being able to see their authentic self. Therefore, individuals with a Transcendent identity have the ability to equally identify with and reference themselves in both racial group communities (Daniel, 1996). According to Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002), the difficulty with Transcendent identity is that it needs to be validated. However, is it possible to obtain validation for a nonracial identity in a racially stratified society? For these individuals, racial validation is meaningless because they "consciously view the existing system of racial classification as biologically baseless, yet symbolically meaningful to other members of society, [therefore] their participation in

that system is equally meaningless to their individual self-understanding" (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002, pp. 51-52).

Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) examined how biracial individuals understood their identity and investigated the influence of social and interactional factors that surround racial identity formation. They uncovered individual (e.g., physical appearance) and structural (e.g., socioeconomic status, composition of social networks, racial socialization) factors that influenced the diverse choices biracial individuals made regarding their racial identity. Aside from providing a means to express self-identification, appearance is information that assists in the development of one's identity. Appearance also informs others in society of who they are and whether this identity is either disputed or validated (Stone, 1990). Physical cues play a role in racial categorization because phenotypic characteristics (e.g., skin color, hair texture, and facial features) can reveal individuals' identity to others. Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) found biracial individuals viewed their appearance as a reflection of personal and social characteristics. A phenotypic description of self (e.g., skin color) was considered a personal characteristic while the social characteristic was the way in which society classified the participants "(i.e., people always assume I'm black)" (p. 56).

With a dichotomous Black/non-Black schema of a racial identification system within American society, the identity options for biracial individuals can become restrictive. Their identity options are restricted by their appearance, as one's appearance and identity may be incompatible, which can affect how identity is validated by society. Since racial categories are defined by appearance, the judgment and endorsement of racial categorization becomes questionable if individuals cannot be easily identified by

their physical appearance. There is some difficulty when studying the relationship between appearance and the racial identity of biracial individuals, due to the problem with achieving enough variation in physical characteristics to make any substantial conclusions (e.g., Phinney, 1990).

Despite some of the literature on biracial identity (e.g., Bowles, 1993; Herring, 1995; Gibbs, 1973; Poussaint, 1984), there is the expectation that "those who have dark skin are more likely to choose an exclusively Black identity, those who have light skin will be more likely to choose a biracial identity, and those who appear White will identify as White (Rockquemore and Brunsma, 2002, p. 57). However, according to Root (1992a), there was no significant correlation between phenotype and identity, nor did phenotype predict identity. According to Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002), the most common response for the biracial individuals was that even though their physical appearance was ambiguous, society assumed that they were Black. Skin color did not predict identity choice; rather socially perceived appearance emerged as an important and influential factor in determining racial identity.

Factors Salient to Biracial Identity Development

Physical Appearance

Physical appearance is the most commonly researched variable within this population because an individual's physical appearance is the primary criterion used by society to identify and categorize individuals. Physical attributes contribute to the formation of identity because physical traits, such as hair texture, skin tone, shape of facial features, are commonly perceived as representative of certain racial and ethnic

groups (e.g., Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). So, an individual with a dark complexion and coarse hair texture is more readily identified as African American or Black compared to an individual with straight hair and a fair complexion. Consequently, skin color has been an integral component to understanding identity development of biracial individuals, where it is understood that a biracial individual with a darker skin complexion is more likely to take on a singular Black identity and be categorized by others as Black (Brown, 1990; Field, 1996; Tizard & Phoenix, 1995).

Cultural Exposure

Another influential factor thought to play a role in the identity development of biracial individuals is cultural exposure. The assumption is that an increase in cultural exposure impacts how a biracial individual selects a racial group with which to identify (Khanna, 2004; Stephan, 1991, 1992). Cultural exposure impacts racial identity formation because it influences feelings of belonging (Stephan, 1991, 1992). Examples of material and nonmaterial components of cultural exposure include cultural values, dance, household furnishing, primary language spoken in the home, music, and the racial population of the neighborhood (e.g., Hall, 1980; Saenz, Hwang, Anderson, 1995; Uyeki, 1960; Williams, 1992). Due to the importance of cultural exposure, biracial individuals' socialization history and networks would be significant.

Social Networks

Despite the influence of cultural aspects (e.g., language, behavior, and knowledge of ethnic group history) on the identity development of minority groups, complications

occur because of the profound influence of social context (Spencer & Dornbusch, 1990). Identity development of minority groups that live within a majority society are often impacted by racial stereotypes, limited role models, and mixed messages of identifying too closely with the majority culture (Steinberg, 1996). Consequently, minority groups have struggled to maintain their cultural identities (Santrock, 1997). Social context within the identity development of minority groups is also evident in biracial individuals.

Social networks are another influence of biracial identity development (Hall, 1980; Porter, 1991; Rockquemore, 1998; Root, 1990). These social networks consist of individuals, such as family members, communities/neighborhoods, and peers, who play a significant role in influencing identity. Even within the social networks, factors like a racially homogeneous neighborhood can impact the identity options of biracial individuals (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). For instance, hypodescent is deeply internalized in the Black community (e.g., Davis, 1991; Spencer, 1997) and it is common for these communities to classify biracial individuals as Black. For biracial individuals, the decision to identify as Black is a method of feeling complete (Rockquemore, 1998). At one time, communities that were predominately one race were not able to provide biracial individuals with experiences similar to their biracial background. Teicher (1968) hypothesized that biracial Black and White children who live in a predominately White or Black community would identify with the parent who is perceived as less socially devalued and have problems with their racial identity. However, further research found that biracial individuals raised in predominately White social networks tend to develop a border identity because it is more socially acceptable. For such persons, there tends to be other resources available to them within their social network, like cultural translators,

mediators, and role models to help them manage their border identity (e.g., Rockquemore, 1998; Miller & Miller, 1990; Brown, 1990).

Although mixed-heritage individuals have ancestral ties to particular groups, they do not always identify with this group. Stephan and Stephan (2000) argue that this is due to the instability of racial and/or ethnic identity over time and across situations as a result of how one's identity must be validated by others in society. In order for individuals to maintain their ethnic and racial identity, this identity must be accepted by society. It is through social interactions that identities are validated, hence the reason why identities are at times unstable across situations. However, the movement towards viewing the racial and ethnic classification system as a social construct would involve a classification system that is based on self-identification. This argument stems from the difficulties associated with categorizing people by their race and/or ethnicity. A single individual could be categorized very differently depending upon a country's classification system. For example, an individual of African heritage could be considered African American in the United States, but Mixed (Coloured) in South Africa. Superficial biological characteristics have been a strong influence on the classification system, where skin tone, facial structure, and hair texture were used to define race. Unfortunately, these superficial biologically based systems of ethnic and racial identification have overlooked the subjective and social aspects of racial and ethnic identities (Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

Racial identity options are affected by what Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) described as *push and pull factors* found in the social networks. When interacting within their social networks, biracial individuals either felt *pull*ed toward or *push*ed away from a

particular racial group. However, negative experiences from this social network can result in being pushed away from a Singular Black identity (Miller & Miller, 1990; Rockquemore, 1998). Field (1996) found that when biracial individuals experience positive feelings about their social networks, they are likely to feel close enough to that group, thereby influencing their identity. For example, biracial individuals who had a positive experience with their predominantly Black social network may be pulled toward a Singular identity.

In regards to social structure and personality, there is an indirect relationship with the impact of social class on racial identity (Demo & Hughes, 1990). For instance, Demo, Small, and Williams (1987) found that racial self-esteem and feelings of closeness to other Black individuals is positively influenced by the quality of interpersonal relations with family and friends. Religious participation, especially among Black churches, is another socializing factor thought to "increase self-respect, positive group evaluation, and enhance psychological well-being" (as cited in Ortega, Crutchfield, & Rushing, 1983; Hughes & Demo, 1989).

Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) viewed identity development to be affected by factors like appearance, social network structure, and other socialization factors. They demonstrated that biracial identity is conceptually complex and varies among biracial individuals. It seemed that there was no singular understanding among Black/White biracial people as to the meaning of biracial identity or how it translates into a racial self-understanding and/or group affiliation.

Psychological Adjustment of Biracial Individuals

A significant part of understanding the total person is to identify the process by which an individual develops his or her racial and ethnic identities (Miller, 1992). According to Rotheram and Phinney (1987), these racial and ethnic identities are fundamental to an individual's psychological profile. However, as previously discussed, American society's racial classification system has resulted in biracial individuals having either a singular racial identity imposed upon them or being forced into choosing one racial identity over another. Therefore, it is not uncommon for multiracial individuals to experience psychological problems in a society that categorizes individuals into single groups (Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995).

Effect of Race-Based Social Interactions

As previously discussed, racial and ethnic ambiguity plays a role in how biracial individuals are perceived by others. Biracial individuals tend to have indistinguishable phenotypic characteristics that make it difficult for other people to place them in a racial category. It is very common for biracial individuals to be asked "What are you?" by complete strangers. However, not every biracial individual is prepared to answer such a question because this type of question requires a biracial individual to justify his or her existence. When attempting to answer such a question, the biracial individual may begin to wonder: "Why is the person asking? Does it really matter? Are they really interested in the answer or am I going to violate their expectations? Do they see me as an oddity?" (Sue & Sue, 2003, p. 368). According to Ramirez (1996), if the biracial person provides the answer "American" or even "mixed," this may lead to the stranger asking more

questions: “What ethnicity are you?” If the answer is ‘part White and Black,’ other questions follow: “Who are your parents? Which is Black? Why did they marry?” This line of questioning could result in biracial individuals feeling scrutinized about their racial and ethnic makeup and bring about an internal trauma, feelings of invalidation, and confused identity development (Sue & Sue, 2003).

Effect of Discrimination and Feelings of Oppression

Ethnic and racial minorities are reminded by society that they are viewed as different, even inferior, due to prejudice, discrimination, and/or racism. For instance, social identities are based on the experiences associated with belonging to a group (e.g., ethnic, racial, gender) (Franzoi, 2000). If social interactions become negatively affected by prejudice, discrimination, and/or racism, the outcome of these experiences can become incorporated into one’s self-perception. Consequently, the attitudes and behaviors of minority group members are affected, not to mention the way in which the ethnic and/or racial group members respond to the negative social interactions. Negative events experienced as a result of being a member of a particular group can produce a significant amount of psychological and interpersonal distress, thereby impairing one’s ability to lead a productive life (Ramirez, 1999). Due to their multiple racial backgrounds, biracial individuals are thought to have similar, if not more complex race-related experiences (Helms, 1995).

Oppression and pressures to conform are additional issues for people who do not fit the preferred or idealized images of society. A lack of fit may be due to external features, (e.g., skin color, accent, physical appearance, or impairments) or “invisible”

characteristics (e.g., values, thinking, emotional or expressive style, philosophy of life, or sexual orientation). As a result of not fitting in, there are feelings of being different and misunderstood. This feeling of being different is common among members of minority groups. Unfortunately, the differences that make the group unique are also responsible for making the group feel "mismatched" within society. Individuals who experience *mismatch* can feel alienated, lonely, depressed, and even anxious. Common traits associated with the mismatch syndrome include self-rejection, a negative outlook on life, and rigid thinking and problem solving (Ramirez, 1999).

Society often imposes on its members the pressure to conform and abandon their individuality, thereby forcing people into ideal, but fictional molds and patterns. Those who do not fit these patterns are made to feel inferior. In order to "fit in" and appear less different, the outcome is to reject a part of their true selves. The pressure to assimilate and conform affects anyone whose personality, lifestyle, or physical characteristics make them different from the majority (Ramirez, 1999). Similar to what Spencer and Dornbusch (1990) described as "shuttling," *flex* is the ability to switch styles to conform to environmental demands. This behavior is often found in biracial individuals, where attempts to switch membership from one racial and/or ethnic group to another depends upon the social circumstances (Gibbs & Moskowitz-Sweet, 1991). When biracial individuals feel the need to flex, it is often a result of society's reaction to them and/or how they interpret the environment's perception of them.

Biracial individuals are perceived as marginalized individuals (Stonequist, 1937) and therefore characterized as developing certain personality characteristics, such as uncertainty, restlessness, and insecurity (Chang, 1974). Aside from experiencing

prejudice and discrimination, biracial individuals are also thought to experience negative stereotypes. Stereotypes associated with biracial individuals are based upon the notion that they are marginalized individuals who are forced to choose between their racial groups. For example, the sexuality of biracial women is often regarded as "exotic" or as encompassing "an unusually sexual being" (Root, 1994, p. 469). Negative stereotypes (i.e., *stereotype threat*) are oppressive and detrimental to one's development (Steele, 1997). This can have an impact on biracial individuals, especially those who identify with the racial group linked to the stereotype threat (Edwards & Pedrotti, 2004). When biracial individuals experience stereotype threat, they may experience anxiety and pressure to not confirm the negative stereotype associated with their identified racial group. In an attempt to negate stereotypes associated with their racial group, a negative reaction could still occur. For example, there is the stereotype that African Americans are not high academic achievers. So, if a biracial individual of African America descent is achieving academic success, then the biracial individual is often perceived as "acting white" (Wolfe & Spencer, 1996, p. 182).

According to Gibbs (1987, 1990), when biracial individuals experience problems with their overall psychological adjustment, they engage in defense mechanisms and coping strategies. When dealing with conflicts of racial identity and social marginality, Gibbs (1987) found that biracial adolescents engaged in "denial (e.g., 'I'm not black, I'm mixed'), reaction formation (e.g., 'I don't like to hang around with the black kids at school because they always segregated themselves'), and overidentification with the idealized racial group (e.g., 'I prefer to go to white parties')" (pp. 272-273). Although these responses seem like defense mechanisms, Gibbs (1987) stated they are mostly due

to the ambiguous or difficult social situation biracial adolescents find themselves. For instance, despite the racial division of their school or neighborhood, biracial adolescents felt more comfortable with individuals with whom they share similar backgrounds and interests, even if they are not of the same racial background. Although biracial adolescents engage in various coping strategies and defense mechanisms to address conflicts associated with their dual racial heritage, these difficulties can severely affect identity development to the point where clinical treatment becomes necessary (Lyles et al., 1985; Sebring, 1985; Gibbs, 1989).

Effect of Negative Stereotypes

Although biracial individuals have legitimate claims to a majority and minority racial and/or ethnic group, previous discussion of the literature highlights the fact that the development of such an identity can become problematic (Gibbs & Moskowitz-Sweet, 1991). An individual who exists between two or more cultures could experience major psychological and social stressors (Root, 2001; Sue & Sue, 2003). Benson's (1981) ethnographic study of mixed-race families revealed that a majority of the participants rejected their Black identity verbally, behaviorally, or by socially identifying with white peers. The belief is that the development of racial attitudes and self-concepts of biracial children differs from that of monoracial children (Gunthrope, 1998). Benson (1981) also argued that biracial offspring experience feeling marginal, low self-esteem, self-hatred, difficulties with meeting two cultural demands, and societal discrimination (e.g., Stonequist, 1937; Lyles et al., 1985). Typically, the societal discrimination experienced is similar to that of monoracial minority individuals (Brandell, 1988; Katz, 1983;

Shackford, 1984).

Poussaint (1984) conducted informal interviews in an attempt to gather retrospective information on what it was like to grow up biracial and whether or not there had been any advantages or disadvantages. According to the biracial individuals interviewed, there were disadvantages to growing up biracial. Some biracial individuals felt paranoid because they had the feeling that they were being scrutinized for being biracial. Other participants experienced feelings of insecurity because they felt like they could not identify with a racial group. Gibbs (1987, 1989, 2003) provided some insight into aspects of biracial identity development and identified five core conflicts experienced by biracial individuals: racial and/or ethnic identity, social marginality, sexuality, autonomy, and educational and occupational aspirations. The focus of this review, however, will only cover the first two conflicts. The first core conflict of *racial and/or ethnic identity* centers on the individual's inability to integrate both racial and/or ethnic heritages into a unified sense of identity. This conflict has four outcomes and its basic question of "Who am I?" is associated with self-descriptive and derogatory terms like, "half and half," "Heinz 57 varieties," and "Oreos" (Spencer & Dornbusch, 1990).

Some biracial adolescents tend to overidentify with the parent with whom they physically resemble, especially in regards to skin color. The preference is to incorporate the perceived attributes of the racial group of the parent with whom the biracial adolescent most identifies. This decision may cause the biracial individual to incorporate negative attitudes and stereotypes associated with the minority culture resulting in a negative identity formation. However, there are times when biracial adolescents reject the parent with whom they share the most physical features. For instance, biracial girls

may feel ashamed of their Black physical features (e.g., curly hair, dark skin) and reject their identification with the Black culture. Another outcome of the *racial and/or ethnic identity* conflict is the ambivalence biracial adolescents experience about their parents' racial backgrounds, which often leads to alternating positive and negative feelings towards the attributes of both racial and/or ethnic heritages. This outcome brings about feelings of being forced to choose one racial and/or ethnic group over another, which contributes to the development of a negative identity. The final outcome relies upon the environment and the situational demands being placed upon the biracial individual. Biracial individuals expressed being divided between their racial and/or ethnic groups and would alternate from one group to another depending upon the social situation (Gibbs & Hines, 1992).

The core conflict *social marginality* usually appears during adolescence, when conformity is highly valued due to the significance of participation in social activities. The basic question associated with this conflict is, "Where do I fit?" Upon entering junior high or high school, biracial adolescents are influenced by the attitudes and behaviors of their peer groups and experience problems associated with the fear of social rejection. As a result of this fear, biracial adolescents feel that they must redefine their social status and relationships. This feeling is based upon the belief that they are not able to fit in either majority or minority groups because they do not share similar qualities (e.g., physical traits or family background) with their peer group. Gibbs (2003) suggested that in order to address the social problem of not fitting in, biracial individuals would need to develop a social network comprised of individuals who are not mesmerized by what it means to be biracial. Individuals from this social network would

value the biracial individual as unique and provide support under negative circumstances.

Gibbs and Hines (1992) found that a small percentage of the biracial adolescents in their study demonstrated problems with their psychosocial adjustment. These adolescents were more likely to come from single-parent homes where the family structure was less inclined to engage in open dialogue regarding racial and/or ethnic issues. Additional indicators of poor psychosocial adjustment included low level of self-esteem, uncertainty with regard to identifying as Black, low levels of social and sexual maturity, and uncertainty about educational and occupational aspirations. Consequently, the poor levels of psychosocial adjustment were thought to be attributed to biracial individuals' difficulty with developing a racial and/or ethnic identity.

Impact of Negative Outcomes on Identity Development

When biracial adolescents experience identity problems, it is not necessarily the sole cause of their identity problems. According to Gibbs (1987), it is important to determine how other factors (i.e., developmental, environmental, and social) contribute to the etiology of behavioral problems. Biracial adolescents develop their identity as they integrate their two racial and/or ethnic backgrounds while simultaneously negotiating their social status. Difficulties experienced in negotiating this identity process can lead to psychological and behavioral problems associated with severe identity crises, such as higher rates of victimization, identity conflicts with parents, and an increase of referrals for psychological evaluation and treatment (Faulkner, 1985; Faulkner & Kich, 1983; Lyles et al., 1985; McRoy, Zurcher, Lauderdale & Anderson, 1982).

It is believed that the "normal" process of identity development for biracial individuals is intensified due to the ambiguity and uncertainty with identifying their parents, peers, and social group specific to individuals of other ethnic and/or racial groups (Gibbs, 1987). There are a number of community network organizations created to address the various needs of biracial individuals and their families. As the oldest interracial support network, I-Pride was established to educate the community about the racial classification of multiracial/multiethnic individuals and how being forced to identify with one racial and/or ethnic group or the term *Other* is not desirable. In 1988, I-Pride along with 13 other charter member organizations (e.g., Biracial Family Network of Chicago, Interracial Family Circle in Washington, DC) created the Association of MultiEthnic Americans (AMEA), a nonprofit organization that collaborates with its charter members to provide opportunities that will educate and advocate for multiracial/multiethnic individuals and their families (Brown & Douglass, 1996).

Root (1996) created the "Bill of Rights for Racially Mixed People." This tool is an illustration of the fluidity of identity and how the multiracial client has the freedom to choose his or her own identity. These rights reflect three affirmations for the *resistance*, *revolution*, and *change* of American society's current racial classification system. Within each affirmation are four reflective statements. In refusing to believe in a system that violates civil rights, *resistance* becomes a nonviolent strategy for changing the status quo that enables racial conflict and a violation of civil rights. *Revolution* is the affirmation that pertains to individuals who make voluntary choices of crossing racial boundaries (e.g., multiracial individuals, or anyone, who engages in interracial relationships) that may identify them as "race traitors" by others. The last affirmation of *change* addresses

ways of building connections with others and experiencing a sense of belonging to one another (Sue & Sue, 2003). The statements (i.e., rights) that embody the three affirmations are:

I have the right… (resistance)
- not to justify my existence in this world
- not to keep the races separate within me
- not be responsible for people's discomfort with my physical ambiguity
- not to justify my ethnic legitimacy

I have the right… (revolution)
- to identify myself differently than strangers expect me to identify
- to identify myself differently than how my parents identify me
- to identify myself differently than my brothers and sisters
- to identify myself differently in different situations

I have the right… (change)
- to create a vocabulary to communicate about being multiracial
- to change my identity over my lifetime – and more than once.
- to have loyalties and identify with more than one group of people
- to freely choose whom I befriend and love (Root, 1996, p. 7).

Positive Psychological Adjustment

There is some evidence that biracial individuals exhibit a positive psychological profile (e.g., adaptability, high self-esteem, resiliency, and competence) when reared in supportive family systems (e.g., Gay, 1987; Johnson & Nagoshi, 1986; Poussaint, 1984). According to Edwards and Pedrotti (2004), biracial individuals draw strength from their diverse backgrounds and histories. For example, resiliency is a strength commonly associated with biracial individuals. The belief is that biracial individuals persevere despite the problems experienced as a result of their race and/or ethnicity. Other attributes include being open-minded, tolerant of others, and more accepting of other cultural groups (Poussaint, 1984; Root, 1994).

Poussaint (1984) interviewed biracial individuals and discovered that they identified advantages to being biracial. These participants acknowledged how they felt special and that the exposure to two cultures resulted in the development of tolerance, objectivity, and nonjudgmental behaviors. A biracial identity allowed these individuals to move between both cultures without any difficulty. Another advantage to having a biracial identity was related to one's physical appearance. Biracial individuals who identified as having a fair complexion considered this to be valuable in that "…people responded to them better because they were closer to white looking…" (Poussaint, 1984, p. 10).

According to LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993), competency in more than one culture leads to social support that is multicultural, a reflection of positive attitudes regarding both cultures, and a strong sense of personal identity. Several factors contributed to a positive mental health, such as family relations, community environment (e.g., school and neighborhood), and social support networks. It was important that biracial individuals had an intact family (i.e., both parents) that was open and warm, so that any problems associated with a biracial identity were confronted. These families also participated in a multicultural lifestyle, where parents encouraged their biracial adolescents to explore both sides of their racial and/or ethnic heritage through the exposure of a range of activities, institutions, and role models that had a racial and/or ethnic theme. It was also necessary that these intact families live in a diverse neighborhood where the biracial youth could attend a diverse school, which would result in social interactions with racially and ethnically diverse individuals.

Critique of Methodology Pertaining to Self-esteem Research

Research pertaining to biracial individuals and the psychosocial construct self-esteem has revealed contradictory findings. The inconsistent findings may be due to the variety of research methodologies. For instance, some studies (e.g., Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Chang, 1974; Phinney & Alipuria, 1996) utilize a comparison group of monoracial and/or ethnic participants, while other studies (e.g., Gibbs & Hines, 1992; Henriksen & Trusty, 2004) do not make comparisons across racial and/or ethnic groups. The outcome of different research designs is evident within the varied interpretations of the findings. When Gibbs and Hines (1992) examined the relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem among biracial individuals without a comparison group, these individuals exhibited a high level of psychological well-being. However, Phinney and Alipuria (1996) found no significant differences between multiethnic and monoethnic high school students on self-esteem. Overall, research findings regarding psychological factors (e.g., identity, self-esteem) of biracial individuals have been inconsistent. When compared to monoracial and/or ethnic groups, biracial individuals either have different levels of self-esteem or lack any difference (Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor, 2004).

Biracial individuals encounter a number of issues as a result of their dual heritage. They can feel like they don't belong to a particular group or they can feel out of place in both groups. Biracial individuals also differ in the way they define themselves. They can opt to identify with one, both, or none of their heritage groups (Edwards & Pedrotti, 2004). These findings, however, are based on a clinical sample. If the clinical sample was not taken into account, then these statements could be descriptive of someone at a

certain stage of their biracial identity. For instance, the "I'm not black, I'm mixed" statement could be someone with a border identity (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002) or "I don't like to hang around with the black kids at school because they always segregated themselves" could depict a Black adolescent from the pre-encounter stage (Cross, 1971).

Gibbs and Hines (1992) suggested that family members, educators, and mental health providers could assist biracial individuals in achieving optimal developmental growth by supporting the integration of a dual racial and/or ethnic heritage, encouraging participation in multicultural learning opportunities and the development of prevention programs and early interventions in order to minimize potential social problems and identity conflicts.

Summary and Critique of Literature Review

After antimiscegenation laws were rescinded in 1967, there was an increase in interracial marriages/unions which led to the biracial baby boom (Sue & Sue, 2003). Consequently, the sudden increase of individuals with a multiracial background sparked the interest of many groups in understanding how to categorize these individuals within a preexisting racial classification system (Shih & Sanchez, 2005). It has been ten years since the addition of a category in the U.S. Census Bureau (2000) and multiracial individuals could choose one or more races to indicate what they consider themselves to be. Although this option addressed the issue of being forced to choose one racial identity, not everyone agreed with the creation of a separate multiracial category. Some organizations, like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), believed that the multiracial category would dilute census numbers of racial

and ethnic individuals, thereby affecting the calculations involved in determining government funds disbursed to minority programs (Sue & Sue, 2003). So, for political reasons, it would seem that the NAACP would prefer multiracial individuals to choose one racial identity.

As a result of the census allowing individuals to identify with more than one race, there has been much interest in determining how an individual determines that he or she is multiracial. The complexity behind studying multiracial identity is that there are many options and no one standard. This is clearly evident in the various theories of biracial identity discussed earlier. At first, biracial identity was viewed as a problem (e.g., Stonequist, 1937) and a majority of biracial research was conducted with small samples (e.g., Kerwin et al., 1993). The shift in racial politics (e.g., civil rights movement) brought about an increase in understanding racial and ethnic identity. At this time, monoracial and biracial individuals were considered equivalent and thought to experience the same process of racial identity development. So, general models of ethnic and racial identity development (e.g., Cross, 1987; Phinney, 1990) were used to describe and understand the process of biracial identity development. For that reason, monoracial theories of development were utilized. Historically, the majority of biracial identity research has focused on individuals of European American and African American descent. Consequently, biracial individuals have been classified with African Americans and a majority of the research on racial identity has focused on the African American population (e.g., Cross, 1971).

The assumption made was that biracial individuals could not be categorized as White. Unfortunately, these models do not take into account that biracial individuals are

able to identify with multiple racial and/or ethnic groups. After recognizing the limitations of general models of ethnic and racial identity development on individuals with biracial backgrounds, researchers constructed several models of identity development specific to biracial individuals (e.g., Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Poston, 1990; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). However, these models of biracial identity development are based on monoracial models of identity along with their corresponding assumptions.

A common theme for the models of bi- or multiracial identity development is that the individuals move through various stages until they determine what aspects of their ethnic and/or racial components they plan to incorporate into their identity. There were a number of factors that play a role in determining which stage of development biracial individuals reach, such as cultural exposure, physical characteristics, and social environment. The identity of biracial individuals was affected by their physical appearance, even though the appearance for many biracial individuals is ambiguous. Physical attributes contribute to formation of identity because physical traits, such as hair texture, skin tone, shape of facial features, are commonly perceived as indicative of racial and/or ethnic groups. For instance, African Americans often describe the texture and appearance of Caucasian hair as "good hair." If a biracial individual of African American descent is told that she has "good hair," she is inadvertently being told what physical characteristics are considered beautiful and desirable (Edwards & Pedrotti, 2004), which happen to be traits that are not of African American descent.

Despite the numerous theories that exist in explaining biracial identity development, very little empirical research has been conducted to test these theories.

Typically, the empirical research that does exist (e.g., Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002) utilizes different methodologies (e.g., case studies, interviews, surveys, questionnaires) to capture biracial identity development. It is also rare to find a particular methodology replicated. For example, two research studies (e.g., Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002) may attempt to measure biracial identity development, but two distinct questionnaires were used (e.g., The Survey of Black Experiences, Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure). This has a lot to do with which theoretical framework of biracial identity development is used, which affects how biracial identity is operationally defined and measured. For instance, many researchers have used the majority/minority group combination (i.e., Black/White) to examine theories on biracial identity development. However, by only focusing on the offspring of Black/White interracial unions, the stereotype that "biracial" is equivalent to Black/White is further perpetuated. Also, any potential differences present within dual minority combinations may be captured if a majority/minority model is used to assess the process of identity development.

There is very little in the literature that addresses the identity development of individuals with a racial heritage from two minority groups (e.g., Hall, 1980; Khanna, 2004). Is it because the minority/minority group combination is not as culturally and socially distant as that of a majority/minority group? Interestingly, of the interracial marriages documented by the U.S. Census Bureau (2000), the largest number was between White men and Asian women and the lowest was between White men and Black women (Sue & Sue, 2003). So, why are the majority of the biracial research studies with offspring of Black/White unions instead of individuals with Asian/White parentage?

Could one speculate that the reason is that Black/White interracial couples have more children than Asian/White interracial couples? Why is research of Black/White biracial identity so prevalent? Does it have anything to do with the highly researched models of ethnic and racial identity development, which focus mainly on the Black minority group and how these models (e.g., Cross, 1991) were the foundation for the biracial identity models?

Prior biracial identity research has raised additional questions regarding society's views on monoracial and multiracial individuals. For example, why are the offspring of a Black/White union considered Black by our society? Why not White? Why is it easier to accept the notion that children of certain interracial unions (e.g., Asian/White, Native American/White) have the option of classifying themselves as multiracial or White, unlike other combinations that involve African Americans? Is this all because of the rules of hypodescent? Are certain interracial relationships more acceptable than others? According to Jackson et al. (1996), African Americans are viewed as less socially desirable than other ethnic and racial groups (e.g., Asian Americans). Therefore, the rule of hypodescent has a greater impact on Black interracial unions and their interracial offspring compared to other racial combinations (e.g., Asian and White). This may be a reason as to why the offspring of Black/White unions are less likely to be considered biracial or White by society, compared to offspring of Asian/White unions. Based upon the rules of hypodescent, would this be true of offspring from Black/minority group unions? Would an individual of say Black/Asian descent be considered Black instead of Asian? Also, would the current theories of biracial identity development apply?

Multidimensional identity models have recently demonstrated the possibility that individuals can simultaneously be a member of multiple, fluid identities with different groups (e.g., Henriksen & Trusty, 2004; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Root, 1999). These models do not support the dichotomous or bipolar schemes that marginalize the status of racially or ethnically mixed persons. According to these models, the theory that phenotype, genotype, and ethnicity coincide to reliably predict identity is not supported. For example, a person of Black and Asian heritage may share physical features similar to someone of African American descent, but self-identify as biracial. However, even if this person identifies as biracial, the attempts to move back and forth between color lines are viewed as creative rather than negative (Bradshaw, 1992; Nakashima, 1992). Although quickly growing, research on the identity development and psychological adjustment of multiracial individuals is still fairly new. Additional research is needed in order to test the various models of multiracial identity development.

Another concern when conducting research with racial and ethnic minorities is to determine whether data collection is focused on one specific racial or ethnic group, a combination of racial and ethnic groups, and/or to compare this group with a control (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). When individuals of the same racial or ethnic background are grouped together in order to conduct assessment research with ethnicity as an independent or predictor variable, assumptions are made that racial and/or ethnic groups share psychological characteristics and that these characteristics are linked to pathology (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). However, when ethnicity is defined as a demographic variable, it becomes distinct from psychological variables (e.g., cultural values, self-concept, and minority status). Consequently, the research findings reported are based upon

assumptions made about the psychological characteristics of the sample, not to mention the possibility of the incorrect categorization of race and ethnicity perpetuating unnecessary stereotypes.

Self-esteem is regarded and frequently used as an indicator of psychological well-being (Phinney, 1991). Despite the fact that self-esteem is frequently studied in conjunction with racial and/or ethnic identity development, researchers are conflicted as to the direction of the relationship. That is, it is not clear whether positive self-esteem derives from group membership or whether being a member of a socially stigmatized group results in low self-esteem (Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). Several research studies (e.g., Cauce et al., 1992; Phinney & Alipuria, 1996) portray biracial individuals with a positive well-being, while others (e.g., Gibbs, 1989; Milan & Keiley, 2000) depict this population as being at risk. The limitations surrounding clinical research of biracial individuals are very similar to that of studies investigating this population's process of identity development. One issue pertains to how race and racial and/or ethnic identity is operationally defined. Some studies have considered race as a psychological construct, whereas others have used the term as a demographic label. As this diverse population grows, mental health providers need to fine-tune a theoretical orientation that will address how factors, like physical appearance and social network, impact well-being and treatment outcomes.

Critique of Biracial Research Methodology

Since the early 1980s, the main focus of research with the biracial population has only addressed the Black/White biracial combination (Hall & Turner, 2001). The

prevalence of biracial research studies with a Black/White biracial population is due to the fact that these racial groups have been identified as being more culturally and socially distinct from one another. However, despite additional research with other biracial combinations, such as Asian/White (Grove, 1991; Kich, 1982; Murphy-Shigematsu, 1987), Latino/White (Salgado de Snyder, Lopez, & Padilla, 1982), and Native-American/White (Wilson, 1992), little is known about biracial individuals of minority/minority descent. There is a need for research regarding the identity development of minority/minority biracial individuals in order to determine if there are any differences surrounding the racial background of biracial individuals.

Based upon the rules of hypodescent, one could speculate that a minority/minority biracial individual would identify with one racial group, but the question is which minority group. The current study examined the impact of the rules of hypodescent on the identity development of biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent. The goal was to determine whether certain factors of biracial identity development, which have been recognized as salient to Black/White biracial individuals, were also relevant for biracial individuals of minority/minority descent. The current study sought to investigate the identity development of biracial individuals of minority/minority group descent. The objective was to determine similarities or differences among factors that influence the identity development of biracial individuals of minority/minority or minority/majority descent.

Definitions of Race, Ethnicity, and Culture

When conducting research with variables related to race and ethnicity, the terms *race*, *ethnicity*, and *culture* need to be explicitly stated. Usually, the term *race* implies biological factors, because it is characterized by physical features (e.g., skin color, hair type, and facial features), meaning that certain physiognomic features are associated with certain racial groups (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). *Ethnicity* focuses on the group mores and practices of a particular culture of origin and the degree to which individuals feel that they identify with their group mores and practices (APA, 2003). *Culture* pertains more to individuals' customs, norms, and practices that influence their belief systems and value orientations (APA, 2003). Based upon these definitions of the terms alone, it is unclear as to why these terms are used synonymously and interchangeably in research with minority groups. A consequence of using these terms interchangeably affects the framing of self-identification questions, where the manner in which the terms *race* and *ethnicity* are used can reflect different concepts (Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

The most common methodological problem found in biracial research pertains to the racial classification and/or identification of participants (Root, 2002). The definition of race has evolved over the years where in 1870 the U.S. Census Bureau divided the American population into five races. By 1980, the census reflected 13 additional categories. Twenty years later, census surveys provided the option of indicating a multiracial status, where individuals could identify with more than one race (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). The rationale for providing an accurate definition and classification system for biracial individuals is due to the fact that every individual can be

categorized into an ethnic and racial group. The question is whether or not the individual identifies more with their ethnic or racial group status.

Racial groups are set apart from one another due to physical differences, while the distinction of ethnic groups is due to the national origin or distinctive cultural patterns of the individual (Schaefer, 2002). So, in a society that readily classifies individuals according to physical differences, it is more common for individuals to identify with and be identified by their racial group than their ethnic group. It would also appear common for some individuals to not be familiar with the culture associated with their ethnic group and therefore, identify more with their racial group status. For instance an individual of German heritage may identify as Caucasian because he or she did not grow up with the knowledge or active practice of German customs or traditions. In this study, *biracial* is defined as an individual whose biological parents are from two different racial groups; while *multiracial*, reflects an individual who is a descendant of three or more racial groups. However, even though an individual may meet the criteria of biracial or multiracial, he or she may not identify as such.

Measurements of Ethnic and Racial Identity Development

The development of racial and ethnic identity measures is contingent upon the terminology used to construct these measures (Johnson et al., 1997). However, there is much variation in how researchers define racial and ethnic identity (e.g., Shih & Sanchez, 2005); hence the variety of measures designed to assess racial and/or ethnic identity development. Then there's the Ethnic Identity Inventory (Rosenthal & Cichello, 1986) that measures an individual's strength in his or her acceptance of, and commitment to

his/her ethnicity. For example, Parham and Helm's (1981) Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) measures the attitudes of African Americans toward their own group and the dominant culture. Regardless of the fact that there are a number of ways to assess racial or ethnic identity, these measures are usually specific to one ethnic or racial group. When measuring constructs (e.g., identity, self-esteem, personality) in a biracial population, it is important to determine if these methods of assessment assume a monoracial or monocultural bias. According to Root (1992a), an identity measure based upon a theoretical framework that views situational or simultaneous racial and/or ethnic identities as a form of pathology would not be a reliable and valid measure for multiracial individuals.

Unfortunately, there is no standardized measure of identity development for biracial individuals. Despite the variety of theories of biracial identity development, a majority of the biracial research has either used measures developed by doctoral candidates or measures based on monoracial theories of identity development (e.g., Cross, 1971). However, there is a common theme for the models of biracial identity development in that they move through various stages until they reach an endpoint. There is a period of unexamined identity followed by a period of time when biracial individuals work on determining and incorporating various aspects that make up their ethnic and/or racial identity until finally, they have come to some form of an identity that they accept.

Phinney's (1989, 1990) theory of ethnic identity development is a good illustration of these three themes. Based on Erikson's (1968) ego identity formation operationalized by Marcia (1980), Phinney's theory of ethnic identity development

occurs in three stages: unexamined ethnic identity, ethnic identity search (moratorium), and achieved ethnic identity. The first stage of an *unexamined ethnic identity* is evident among individuals who have either identified with the dominant ethnic group or given very little consideration to their ethnicity. During the second stage of *ethnic identity search* (*moratorium*), individuals experience an "awakening" to their ethnic culture and seek out ways to participate in activities that provide the opportunity to learn about their culture. When individuals gain a better understanding and appreciation of their ethnicity, they have reached the last stage of *achieved ethnic identity*. This stage is highlighted by how individuals' persist with maintaining their understanding of their ethnic identity.

In an attempt to address the lack of a measure of biracial identity development, Phinney (1992) constructed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) to simultaneously assess the ethnic identity of a diverse group of individuals (e.g., African Americans, Mexican Americans, Japanese, European Americans, and biracial individuals). The MEIM is comprised of three subscales: "… (a) affirmation and belonging (e.g., pride and attachment to group), (b) ethnic identity achievement (e.g., search and commitment), and (c) ethnic behavior and practices (e.g., participates in activities)" (as cited in Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalano, & Oxford, 2000, p. 372). The items are scored on a 4-point Likert scale, (i.e., (1) s*trongly disagree* to (4) *strongly agree*) where higher values illustrate exploration and commitment towards ethnic group, participation in ethnic behaviors or activities, and positive feelings and preferences toward ethnic group. Examples of MEIM items include, "In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group and I feel strong attachment toward my own ethnic group" (Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor,

2004, p. 127). At this point in time, the MEIM is the most frequently used measure to assess the identity of biracial individuals.

Due to the movement towards understanding identity development and race as a fluid and social construct rather than fixed, an element of self-awareness is to be expected. To be self-aware means that when individuals reflect or make decisions that involve themselves, they engage in a process focusing their attention on their thoughts, feelings, behaviors or appearance (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975). As individuals engage in the process of being self-aware, they may also exhibit self-monitoring. Self-monitoring is a state of mind in which people shape their publicly presented selves so that they more closely match current situational expectations. Not only is self-monitoring a psychological state, but according to Snyder (1979) it is also a personality trait, as individuals differ in their habitual tendencies to self-monitor.

For instance, several researchers (e.g., Miller, 1992; Stephan, 1991, 1992; Tizard & Phoenix, 1995) have regarded the biracial individual with the ability to adopt various identities within different contexts. This ability of shifting identities is a way of exercising "situational race." As demonstrated with biracial individuals with a Protean identity, they change or shift their identity according to their social environment. In order for this to occur biracial individuals monitor their presentation of self (i.e., self-monitor) in order to fit in their social context (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). In the current study, the significance of determining whether or not individuals self-monitor can provide additional evidence for the theory that race and identity development is a fluid and social construct whereby individuals have the ability to change their perception of self in order to accommodate their needs.

Hypotheses of Current Study

The current study's first question addressed how the rules of hypodescent (i.e., one-drop rule) impact the way in which biracial individuals identify. Due to the longstanding practice of a Black/non-Black schema regarding the racial classification system in the United States (i.e., the one-drop rule) and based upon the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism and race as a social construct, this study hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent are more likely to identify as Singular than as Border, Protean, or Transcendent (H_{o1}).

The second question pertains to how one's physical resemblance to a racial group relates to the way in which biracial individuals identify. This study hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent are more likely to identify as Singular the more they perceive themselves to physically resemble one racial group (H_{o2}).

A factor that has not been examined with this population, but thought to impact how individuals of minority/minority descent identify is the personality trait self-monitoring. The current study examined how self-monitoring relates to the way in which individuals of non-White/non-White descent identify. It was hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify themselves as Protean will have higher self-monitoring scores than biracial individuals who identify as Singular, Border, or Transcendent (H_{o3}).

Another question surrounding multicultural experiences pertains to its potential relationship with racial identity development. Specifically, how does exposure to multicultural experiences impact the degree in which biracial individuals of non-

White/non-White descent achieve a certain level of racial identity development? It was hypothesized that a high degree of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences predicts a high level of racial identity development among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o4}). The exposure to multicultural experiences was also thought to impact the way in which individuals of minority/minority group descent identify. The current study hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify as Singular will have a higher level of racial identity development than those who identify as Border, Protean, or Transcendent (H_{o5}).

The sixth research question under investigation pertained to how cultural experiences (e.g., environment and social interaction) impact the way in which biracial individuals identify. It was hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify as Border or Protean will report a higher level of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences than those who identify as Singular or Transcendent (H_{o6}).

In addition to racial identity development, another area of interest surrounding individuals of biracial individuals is their level of psychological adjustment. The second to last question pertains to the relationship between racial identity development and self-esteem. It was hypothesized that a high level of racial identity development best predicts a high level of self-esteem among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o7}). For the first time, biracial individuals' level of psychological adjustment will be examined using the measure Psychological Well-being (Ryff, 1989a, 1989b). The current study assessed the relationship between racial identity development and psychological well-being among biracial individuals. It was hypothesized that a high

level of racial identity development best predicts a high level of psychological well-being among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o8}). Refer to Appendix A for a list of the current study's questions and hypotheses.

Proposed Analyses

The current study conducted descriptive and inferential statistics to determine the relationship of biracial identification, self-monitoring, perception of physical appearance and exposure of multicultural experiences on the level of identity achievement of biracial individuals. Logistic and multiple regressions were conducted to determine which factors (i.e., rules of hypodescent, perception of physical appearance, level of self-monitoring) were the best predictors of biracial individuals' identity status and level of identity achievement. Multiple regressions were also performed to determine the relationship surrounding biracial individuals' level of identity achievement and degree of psychological adjustment (i.e., self-esteem and psychological well-being). Lastly, analysis of variance with planned comparisons was conducted to determine differences between majority/minority and minority/minority biracial individuals regarding factors that contribute to biracial identity options.

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Operational Definition of Race

In order to prevent any confusion about participants' racial or ethnic background, the current study classified individuals based upon how they categorized themselves racially. Participants self-identified via an open-ended format using five recognized racial groups and two other options. The five recognized racial groups were (1) American Indian/Alaskan Native; (2) Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander; (3) Black/African American, not Hispanic or Latino; (4) Latino/Hispanic, not White; and (5) White/Caucasian/European American. The other two categories were (6) Biracial (please specify racial groups) and (7) Other (please specify). Participants endorsed at least TWO of the first 5 racial categories or ONE of the remaining racial categories. In addition to obtaining participants' racial group status, the current study had participants specify both of their biological parents' racial group membership using the same criteria mentioned above (see Appendix J).

Participants' responses were coded according to the racial group they selected. However, if participants endorsed Biracial in addition to two or more racial groups, they were coded as "Dual" to denote that these participants considered themselves to have a dual identity. A dual identity reflected the possibility that participants perceive their racial categorization to shift (i.e., biracial and one or more racial groups). The above-mentioned coding criterion was also applied to participants' racial identification of their parents.

Recruitment and Data Collection

Participants were recruited via advertisements sent to the officers of campus-based cultural student organizations to ascertain the degree of interest in participation. From this initial contact, the officers of these organizations were asked to assist in the recruitment of biracial participants via their email listservs. Websites that serve biracial support organizations (e.g., Swirl, Inc.) was also contacted regarding the posting of information about the study. In addition to this procedure of recruitment, the method of snowball sampling was used, where individuals interested in participating were notified by word-of-mouth. Participants recruited other people they know to identify as biracial, such as family, friends, and co-workers. The current study used a nonclinical sample in order to provide an accurate depiction of what constitutes a well-adjusted level of racial identity development among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent. Participants included individuals over the age of 18 whose biological parents are racially different from one another. The primary method of data collection was quantitative and gathered via online survey that addressed questions pertaining to beliefs about their racial group status, self-esteem, psychological well-being, and demographic information. As compensation for taking part in the study, participants were entered in a random drawing for a cash prize and debriefed on the nature of the study (see Appendices B and K).

Participants

After applying exclusion criteria (i.e., under the age of 18, biological parents who were not racially different from one another), a total of 199 individuals participated in the current study. The sample of 128 participants, who provided their age, ranged from 18 to

55 years (M = 25.05, SD = 7.77). Participants' demographic information, such as age, gender, racial identification, level of education completed, and marital status, can be found in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Demographic Information of Biracial Individuals (N = 199)

Characteristics	*n*	*%*
Age (years old)		
18 – 24	76	59.4
25 – 34	36	28.1
35 – 44	10	7.8
45 – 55	6	4.7
No Response	71	----
Gender		
Male	31	23.7
Female	100	76.3
Racial Identification		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	1.6
Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander	2	1.6
Black/African American, not Hispanic	14	10.9
Latino/Hispanic, not White	6	4.7
White/Caucasian/European American	5	3.9
Biracial	48	37.2
Other	2	1.6
Dual	50	38.8
Level of Education Completed		
Graduate/Professional	28	23.1
Some Graduate/Professional School	11	9.1
4-yr College	16	13.2
2-yr College	7	5.8
Trade/Vocational School	2	1.7
Some College	44	36.4
H.S. or GED	11	9.1
7^{th} Grade	2	1.7
Marital Status		
Single	101	78.9
Married	17	13.3
Divorced	4	3.1
Other	6	4.7

Note. Other = Participants' write-in response, such as "Human" for Racial Identification or "Serious Relationship" for Marital Status.

Racial Identification

Participants' were asked to identify their racial identification group status on two different occasions. The first attempt was based on MEIM's open-ended question and three other options (i.e., Biracial, Dual, Other). Participants then categorized themselves based on how they identified according to five recognized racial groups and three other options (i.e., Biracial, Dual, Other). Table 2 depicts how participants demonstrated their racial identification.

Demographic Information of Participants' Parents

Participants were also asked to provide demographic information about their parents' racial identification, marital status, and level of education completed. This information can be found in Tables 3 and 4.

Rules of Hypodescent

The one-drop rule (i.e., hypodescent) was applied based on the following criteria: If participants identified their mother or father as White/Caucasian/European American, the participant was designated as majority/minority biracial group status. Participants who identified both their mother and father as non-White/Caucasian/European American were designated as minority/minority biracial group status. Based on this criterion, 74.3% of the participants (n = 124) were identified as majority/minority biracial group and 25.7% of participants (n = 43) were identified as minority/minority biracial group. The current study will factor the one-drop rule variable into all of the analyses.

TABLE 2

Two Methods of Biracial Individuals' Racial Categorization (N = 199)

Characteristics	*n*	*%*
MEIM Racial Identification (*n* = 191)		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	3	1.6
Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander	12	6.3
Black/African American, not Hispanic	26	13.6
Latino/Hispanic, not White	10	5.2
White/Caucasian/European American	11	5.8
Biracial	46	24.1
Other	4	2.1
Dual	79	41.4
Racial Identification (*n* = 129)		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	1.6
Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander	2	1.6
Black/African American, not Hispanic	14	10.9
Latino/Hispanic, not White	6	4.7
White/Caucasian/European American	5	3.9
Biracial	48	37.2
Other	2	1.6
Dual	50	38.8

Note. MEIM = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. Dual = The endorsement of Biracial and 1 or more racial group(s); Other = Participants' write-in response, such as "human" for MEIM Racial Identification or "Human" for Racial Identification.

TABLE 3

Demographic Information of Participants' Parents (N = 199)

Characteristics	*n*	%
Father's Racial Identification (*n* = 130)		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	0.8
Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander	5	3.8
Black/African American, not Hispanic	48	36.9
Latino/Hispanic, not White	16	12.3
White/Caucasian/European American	39	30.0
Biracial	2	1.6
Other	1	0.8
Dual	18	13.8
Mother's Racial Identification (*n* = 131)		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	3	2.3
Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander	24	18.3
Black/African American, not Hispanic	17	13.0
Latino/Hispanic, not White	17	13.0
White/Caucasian/European American	49	37.4
Biracial	4	3.0
Other	1	0.8
Dual	16	12.2
Parents' Marital Status (*n* = 132)		
Never Married	20	15.2
Married	60	45.4
Separated	8	6.1
Divorced	37	28.0
Other	7	5.3

Note. Dual = The endorsement of Biracial and 1 or more racial group(s); Other = Participants' write-in response, such as "Palestinian" for Father's Racial Identification or "Tartar" for Mother's Identification, and "widowed" for Marital Status.

TABLE 4

Level of Education Completed by Participants' Parents

Characteristics	*n*	*%*
Father's Level of Education (*n* = 115)		
Graduate/Professional	28	24.3
Some Graduate/Professional School	2	1.7
4-yr College	14	12.2
2-yr College	8	7.0
Trade/Vocational School	10	8.7
Some College	21	18.3
H.S. or GED	23	20.0
7th Grade	6	5.2
Less than 7th Grade	7	2.6
Mother's Level of Education (*n* = 122)		
Graduate/Professional	27	22.1
Some Graduate/Professional School	8	6.6
4-yr College	20	16.4
2-yr College	8	6.6
Trade/Vocational School	12	9.8
Some College	17	13.9
H.S. or GED	21	17.2
7th Grade	8	6.6
Less than 7th Grade	1	0.8

Measures

Biracial Identity Options

In addition to this method of categorizing participants, the current study also determined participants' biracial identity according to a symbolic interactionist framework. Similar to Hazan and Shaver's (1987) method of data collection, a single item measure to assess participant's biracial identity was designed by translating Rockquemore's (1998) description of biracial identity options (see Appendix C). The

first part of the measure involved reading statements the described biracial identity options. Participants then rated to what degree they believe the statements are reflective of them on a 5-point Likert scale: (1) *True of Myself*; (2) *Mostly True of Myself*; (3) *About Halfway True of Myself*; (4) *Slightly True of Myself*; and (5) *Not at All True of Myself*. In the second part of this measure, participants were instructed to read the statements again, but then forced to choose only 1 of the biracial identity options that best described them.

Physical Appearance

When studying the relationship between physical appearance and the racial identity of biracial individuals, it is difficult to provide enough variation in physical characteristics to make any substantial conclusions (e.g., Phinney, 1990). Also, societal assumptions are more prevalent when determining the racial classification of physically ambiguous biracial individuals. There is also a movement toward regarding a socially perceived appearance as the more influential and predictive factor in determining identity choice and not skin color (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). Accordingly, the current study measured physical appearance based upon participants' perception of their physical resemblance to their biological parents and how much they physically resemble a racial group. In place of measuring phenotypes or physical characteristics, participants will rate to what degree they physically resemble their biological parents. Participants also endorsed which of their parents they physically resembled, by selecting their Biological Mother, Biological Father, both parents, or Other. Participants' physical resemblance response was coded as "unique combination" if they selected more than one criteria in addition to "Other." Participants also endorsed, on a 4-point Likert scale [(1) *Not At All* to

(4) *To a Great Extent*], each of the following racial groups: (1) American Indian/Alaskan Native; (2) Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander; (3) Black/African American, not Hispanic or Latino; (4) Latino/Hispanic, not White; and (5) White/Caucasian/European American (see Appendix D). Participants' resemblance to racial groups was coded to capture the number of racial groups they perceived themselves to resemble (i.e., one or two or more racial groups), along with the status of these groups.

Level of Racial Identity Development

Based upon Phinney's (1989, 1990) theory of ethnic identity development, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) was developed and a commonly used measure of capturing aspects of ethnic identity development common in individuals of all ethnic minority groups, regardless of their group differences (e.g., Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzzi, & Saya, 2003; Roberts et al., 1999). The MEIM is a 23-item scale consisting of three components. The first component refers to an individual's *Self-Identification* and *Ethnicity*, which is measured by an open- and close-ended question. The open-ended question (*Self-Identification*) elicits a spontaneous response to write an ethnic label that an individual uses for oneself. However, the close-ended question (*Ethnicity*) requires individuals to choose an ethnic group for themselves and that of their parents. The second component of the MEIM is comprised of three subscales that measures *Ethnic Identity* (EI): "positive ethnic attitudes and sense of belonging [Items 6, 11, 14, 18, and 20]; ethnic identity achievement, including both exploration and resolutions of identity issues [Items 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, and 13]; and ethnic behaviors or practices [Items 2 and 16]" (p. 164). The last component of the MEIM examines the

attitudes and interactions with other ethnic groups than their own [i.e., Other-Group Orientation (OGO; Items 4, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19)] (p. 161).

Excluding the *Self-Identification* and *Ethnicity* questions, responses on the MEIM are based on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) s*trongly disagree* to (4) *strongly agree*. As mentioned earlier, the MEIM generates two scores, Ethnic Identity (EI) and Other Group Orientation (OGO). An EI score is obtained by reversing the responses on Items 8 and 10, so that responses 1 = 4 and 2 = 3, prior to summing across the items, and obtaining a mean. EI scores range from 4 (ethnic identity achievement) to 1 (ethnic identity diffusion). An OGO score is obtained in the same manner, except the reversed items for this score are 7 and 15. The OGO score will range from 1 (negative other-group attitudes) to 4 (positive other-group attitudes). Several studies have demonstrated the MEIM to be a reliable measure of ethnic identity with Cronbach's alphas for EI ranging as high as .84, .81, and .90 for adolescent, high school, and college samples, respectively (e.g., Phinney, 1992; Ponterotto et al., 2003; Roberts et al. 1999). The OGO showed a reliability of .74 for biracial and monoracial college students (Lee & Davis, 2000; Phinney, 1992).

As previously discussed, when the terms *race* and *ethnicity* are not clearly differentiated, the scores and the interpretation of the results may be impacted (Kohatsu & Richardson, 1996). The original directions for the MEIM do not make a distinction between racial and ethnic groups. Examples of ethnic groups were depicted to include, Black, Hispanic, Anglo-American, and White, which was also portrayed in the close-ended question of *Ethnicity*. Examples of the ethnic groups in the close-ended question included Asian and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. In the current study,

changes were made to the MEIM in order to reflect race instead of ethnicity. A sample EI item that was altered read: "I have a clear sense of my racial background and what it means for me" (Item 3). An altered OGO item (reverse-scored) reads: "I sometimes feel it would be better if different racial groups didn't try to mix together" (Item 7). This distinction was made based upon the notion that an individual's race is readily identified in comparison to one's ethnicity. Another modification to the MEIM was the removal of the *Self-Identification* and *Ethnicity* questions. These open- and close-ended questions elicit two self-identification responses, one that is voluntary and another that is forced choice. These questions were captured in the current study's racial self-identification and categorization questions (i.e., "I racially classify myself as…") (see Appendix E).

Multicultural Experiences Inventory

Ramirez's (1999) Multicultural Experience Inventory (MEI) was used to assess other factors salient to biracial identity development (i.e., level of cultural exposure and socialization history),. MEI provides information on participants' personal history and behavior in the areas of demographic and linguistic information, socialization history, and multicultural participation. Part I of the MEI consists of 22 items inquiring about demographic and linguistic information. Part II is comprised of an individual's Historical Development Pattern (HDP, Items 1-8) and Contemporary Multicultural Identity (CMI, Items 9-26). These 26 items provide information on socialization history and degree of multicultural participation in the past as well as in the present. The HDP items are based on a 5-point Likert-type scale where individuals respond to the following statements: "(1) almost entirely my ethnic group; (2) mostly my ethnic group with a few people of color

from other groups; (3) mixed (my ethnic groups, whites, and other minorities, about equally; (4) mostly whites with a few people of color; and (5) almost entirely whites" (Ramirez, 1999, p. 171).

The HDP score (maximum of 33) is obtained by assigning a point value to each item response and then summing across the items. The point value is based on the following criteria: a response 1 or 5 will receive 1 point; 2 points are given to responses that endorse a 2 or 4, and 3 points are given for selecting response 3. Higher HDP scores reflect a high level of multiculturalism. The CMI items are also based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) *Extensively* to (5) *Never*. A CMI score (maximum of 54) is obtained by assigning a point value to each item response and then summing across the items. Items that endorse the response, *Extensively* or *Frequently* (response 1 or 2) are assigned 2 points and all of the other responses are assigned 1 point. The total Multicultural Experiences Inventory score (MEI; maximum of 87) is obtained by summing the total scores of the HDP and CMI (Ramirez, 1999). The MEI exhibits a split-half reliability of .87 for Items 1-17 and correlation coefficients ranged from .65 to .71 for Items 1-17 and from .69 to .73 for Items 18-26 (Ramirez, 1999). The MEI is estimated to have an internal reliability of .86 (Lee & Davis, 2000).

Some modifications were made to the MEI in the current study. Several items from Part I were excluded from the study. These items were not pertinent to the proposed study as they pertained to identifying information (i.e., name and address), religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, and level of active participation in their religious background. Another item excluded pertained to participants' ethnic background, which was obtained through the current study's items on racial classification

and biracial identity options. The removal of these items will not affect the MEI score as this score is based upon items from Part II. In maintaining the distinction made between racial and ethnic groups, changes were also made to the MEI in order to reflect race instead of ethnicity. An altered MEI sample item read: "The racial composition of the neighborhoods in which I lived" (Item 1). The 5-point Likert responses were also changed to depict *racial* groups instead of *ethnic* groups (see Appendix F).

Self-Monitoring

In 1974, Snyder developed the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS, Appendix G) to assess one's level of self-monitoring. The SMS consists of 25 True-False self-descriptive statements depicting: (a) concern with social appropriateness (e.g., Item 3); (b) attendance to social cues in order to exhibit appropriate self-expression (e.g., Item 7); control and modification abilities regarding self-presentation and expressive behavior (e.g., Item 24); (d) the use of self-monitoring ability in specific situations (e.g., Item 25); and (e) "…the extent to which the respondent's expressive behavior and self-presentation is cross-situationally consistent or variable [e.g., Item 13]" (p. 529). SMS items were scored in the direction of high self-monitoring. The total SMS score is the sum of all endorsed true statements. The SMS was deemed a reliable measure with a reliability of .70 and a test-retest reliability of .83 (Snyder, 1974).

Self-Esteem

A common method of assessing the psychological adjustment of biracial individuals is to determine their level of self-esteem. Self-esteem is a frequently

measured indicator of psychological well-being with the biracial population (Phinney, 1991). To obtain a measurement of global personal self-esteem, Rosenberg's (1965, 1979) Self-Esteem Scale (RSE, see Appendix H) was used in the current study. Participants completed the RSE by indicating how much they agree to 10 statements using a 5-point Likert scale. The Likert responses range from (0) *extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me*) to (4) *extremely characteristic (very much like me*). Participants' RSE score is obtained by first reverse-scoring the responses on Items 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9 so that 0 = 4, 1 = 3, 3 = 1, and 4 = 0, and summing the responses. A RSE total can range from 0 to 40, where "scores greater than 20 indicate generally positive attitudes toward the self; those below 20 indicate generally negative self-attitudes" (Franzoi, 2000, p. 43). Biracial identity research using the RSE has demonstrated alphas of .86 for Black/White biracial individuals and .92 for Asian/White biracial individuals (Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004).

Psychological Well-Being

In addition to Rosenberg's (1965) measure of self-esteem, another measure of psychological well-being was used in the current study. Ryff (1989a, 1989b) developed an 18-item questionnaire that reflects six dimensions of psychological well-being. The Psychological Well-Being (PWB, Appendix I) questionnaire consists of items that inquire about an individual's attitude toward the self, relations with others, level of self-determination and independence, sense of mastery and competence in one's environment, life goals and directions, and sense of developmental growth. Equally divided between positive and negative items, respondents are required to indicate which statement they

agree is a self-description. As a 6-point Likert scale, the PWB response options range from (1) *strongly disagree* to (6) *strongly agree*.

The PWB measure is comprised of six subscales: Self-Acceptance (SA); Personal Growth (PG); Purpose in Life (PL); Environmental Mastery (EM); Autonomy (A); and Positive relations with others (PR). Each subscale is derived by summing the responses to three items (SA: 1, 7, 13; PG: 2, 8, 14; PL: 3, 9, 15; EM: 4, 10, 16; A: 5, 11, 17; and PR: 6, 12, 18). The total PWB score (PWB) is obtained by first reverse-scoring Items 4, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 15, and 18 so that 1 = 6; 2 = 5; and 3 = 4 and then summing the six subscales. The PWB is a successful measure of psychological well-being and has demonstrated the following levels of internal consistency coefficients: Self-Acceptance (α = .93); Autonomy (α = .86); Environmental Mastery (α = .90); Positive Relations with others (α = .91); Purpose in Life (α = .90); Personal Growth (α = .87); and overall Psychological Well-Being (α = .80) (Keyes & Ryff, 1998; Ryff, 1989a; 1989b).

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Rules of Hypodescent on Biracial Identity

Do the rules of hypodescent (i.e., one-drop rule) apply to biracial individuals' biracial identification? The present study hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent are more likely to identify as Singular than as Border, Protean, or Transcendent (H_{o1}). Participants rated the degree to which they felt each of the four biracial identities best described them on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = True of Myself to 5 = Not at All True of Myself). Participants were then asked to choose only one of the biracial identity options that best described him/her. Of the 199 participants surveyed,

one participant did not provide a rating for the biracial identity Transcendent. Information on the frequency in which participants rated the biracial identity options and their preferred biracial identity can be found in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Participants' Biracial Identification (N = 199)

Characteristics	*n*	*%*
Singular		
extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)	40	20.1
uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)	40	20.1
neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic	20	10.1
characteristic (somewhat like me)	62	31.2
extremely characteristic (very much like me)	37	18.6
Border		
extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)	11	5.5
uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)	25	12.6
neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic	17	8.5
characteristic (somewhat like me)	69	34.7
extremely characteristic (very much like me)	77	38.7
Protean		
extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)	21	10.6
uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)	33	16.6
neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic	22	11.1
characteristic (somewhat like me)	78	39.2
extremely characteristic (very much like me)	45	22.6
Transcendent		
extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)	45	22.7
uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)	45	22.7
neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic	33	16.7
characteristic (somewhat like me)	39	19.7
extremely characteristic (very much like me)	36	18.2
Forced Choice		
Singular	38	19.2
Border	84	42.4
Protean	49	24.7
Transcendent	27	13.6

Assumptions of the Chi-Square test were met: each participant only contributed to one cell of the contingency table and the expected frequencies were greater than five. According to the Chi-Square test of independence analysis, there does not appear to be a

significant association between the rules of hypodescent (i.e., majority/minority group and minority/minority group) and participants' biracial identification χ^2 (3, n = 166) = 1.81, p > .05 (see Table 6). Although not statistically significant, it appears that biracial individuals, whether of majority/minority or minority/minority group status, preferred to identify as Border. The hypothesis that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent were more likely to identify as Singular compared to the other biracial identities of Border, Protean or Transcendent, was not supported (H_{o1}).

TABLE 6

Chi-Square Test of Independence of the Rules of Hypodescent and the Four Biracial Identity Options (N = 199)

	Rules of Hypodescent			
	Majority/Minority *n* (%)	Minority/Minority *n* (%)		
Biracial Identity Options	124 (74.7)	42 (25.3)	χ^2 (3)	*p*
Singular	25 (20.2)	6 (14.3)	1.81	0.61
Border	51 (41.1)	21 (50)		
Protean	31 (25)	8 (19)		
Transcendent	17 (13.7)	7 (16.7)		

Note. Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1.
* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Rules of Hypodescent and Physical Resemblance on Biracial Identity

The next research question pertained to how participants' physical resemblance to a racial group relates to the way in which biracial individuals identify. This study hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent are more likely to identify as Singular the more they perceive themselves to physically resemble one racial group (H_{o2}). Participants were asked to rate the degree to which they perceived their physical resemblance to a racial group. Based on participants' responses on their resemblance to a racial group, ratings that were endorsed "Somewhat" or "To a Great Extent" were coded to reflect that participants' perception of physical resemblance to 1 or more racial groups. Of this sample, 50 (25.1%) participants identified a physical resemblance to one racial group, while 143 (71.9%) participants identified a physical resemblance to two or more racial groups. Six participants (3%) had low or nonexistent (i.e., Not at All) ratings and therefore excluded from the analysis. Participants' rating of their physical resemblance can be found in Table 7.

Direct logistic regression was conducted to determine if the one-drop rule and physical resemblance to one or more racial groups predicated a Singular identity. As seen in Table 8, the model containing two independent variables (i.e., one-drop rule, physical resemblance) was statistically significant, χ^2 (2, N = 163) = 6.52, p = .04. The model as a whole explained between 4% (Cox and Snell R square) and 6.3% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in Singular identity classified 81% of cases. Although there was no distinction between majority/minority and minority/minority biracial individuals, the hypothesis that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who perceive

themselves to physically resemble one racial group were likely to identify as Singular was partially supported.

TABLE 7

Biracial Individuals' Perception of Physical Resemblance to Racial Groups (N = 199)

Characteristics	*n*	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native (*n* = 152)		
Not At All	67	44.1
Very Little	36	23.7
Somewhat	41	27.0
To a Great Extent	8	5.3
Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander (*n* = 154)		
Not At All	86	55.8
Very Little	25	16.2
Somewhat	28	18.2
To a Great Extent	15	9.7
Black/African American, not Hispanic (*n* = 170)		
Not At All	48	28.2
Very Little	26	15.3
Somewhat	49	28.8
To a Great Extent	47	27.6
Latino/Hispanic, not White (*n* = 157)		
Not At All	38	24.2
Very Little	25	15.9
Somewhat	54	34.4
To a Great Extent	40	25.5
White/Caucasian/European American (*n* = 167)		
Not At All	33	19.8
Very Little	27	16.2
Somewhat	74	44.3
To a Great Extent	33	19.8
Other (*n* = 66)		
Not At All	35	53.0
Very Little	8	12.1
Somewhat	11	16.7
To a Great Extent	12	18.2

Note. Other = "middle eastern;" "Indian (India);" "Maori, Mestiza/Portuguese, Egyptian"

TABLE 8

Likelihood the Rules of Hypodescent and Physical Resemblance to 1 Racial Group Predicts a Singular Identity (n = 163)

			Singular Identity			
Predictors	β	SE	Wald's χ^2 (1)	*p*	Odds ratio	95% CI
Constant	-1.98	0.47	18.03	.000	0.14	----
OneDrop	0.27	0.51	0.29	0.59	1.32	[0.49, 3.55]
Physical resemblance	1.06	0.43	6.17	0.01**	2.88	[1.25, 6.65]
	χ^2	6.52				
	df	2				
	p	.04*				

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1). Physical resemblance = 1 racial group coded as 1 and 2 or more racial groups coded as 0. Singular coded as 1 and Border, Protean, and Transcendent coded as 1.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A Chi-square test of independence was conducted to determine the relationship between physical resemblance to one or more racial groups and biracial identification. Assumptions of the Chi-Square test were met: each participant only contributed to one cell of the contingency table and the expected frequencies were greater than five. There was a significant association between the number of racial groups individuals perceived to resemble and their biracial identification χ^2 (3, N = 192) = 16.36, $p = .001$. Biracial individuals who perceived themselves to physically resemble 1 racial group identified as

Singular (*n* = 19) followed by Border (*n* = 15) and an equal number (*n* = 8) having identified as Protean or Transcendent. When biracial individuals perceived themselves to resemble 2 or more racial groups, they identified as Border (*n* = 66) followed by Protean (*n* = 40), Singular (*n* = 19), and then Transcendent (*n* = 17) (see Table 9).

TABLE 9

Chi-Square Test of Independence of the Rules of Hypodescent and Physical Resemblance to 1 or more Racial Group(s) (N =199)

	Physical Resemblance			
	1 racial group	2 or more racial groups		
	n (%)	*n* (%)		
Variables			χ^2 (3)	*p*
Biracial Identity Options	50 (26)	143 (74)		
Singular	19 (38)	19 (13.4)	16.36	.001***
Border	15 (30)	66 (46.5)		
Protean	8 (16)	40 (28.2)		
Transcendent	8 (6)	17 (12)		

Note. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1). Physical resemblance=1 racial group and 2 or more racial groups.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Rules of Hypodescent and Self-monitoring on Biracial Identity

The third research question pertained to how the rules of hypodescent and the personality trait self-monitoring influenced the way in which biracial individuals identify. It was hypothesized that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify themselves as Protean will have higher self-monitoring scores than biracial individuals who identify as Singular, Border, or Transcendent (H_{o3}). According to Snyder (1974), the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) has acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient reported of .70. In this current study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .70. Of the 131 participants who completed the SMS, the average score was 11.69 (*SD* = 4.20).

Direct logistic regression was performed to assess the impact of the one-drop rule and self-monitoring (SMS) on the likelihood that biracial individuals would identify as Protean. The model containing two independent variables (i.e., one-drop rule, SMS) was not statistically significant, χ^2 (2, N = 122) = 3.68, $p > .05$, indicating that the model was not a significant fit of the data. The model as a whole explained between 3% (Cox and Snell R square) and 4.5% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in Protean identity, classified 77.9% of cases. The hypothesis that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify as Protean will have higher self-monitoring scores than biracial individuals who identify as Singular, Border, or Transcendent was not statistically supported. However, SMS appeared close to statistical significance and the potential to predict that biracial individuals identify as Protean (see Table 10).

TABLE 10

Likelihood the Rules of Hypodescent and High Self-monitoring Predicts a Protean Identity (n = 122)

			Protean Identity			
Predictors	*B*	SE	Wald's χ^2	*p*	Odds ratio	95% CI
Constant	-2.25	0.68	11.00	.001***	0.11	----
OneDrop	-0.45	0.53	0.73	.39	0.64	[0.22, 1.80]
SMS	0.10	0.05	3.29	.07	1.10	[0.99, 1.22]

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. SMS = Self-Monitoring Scale. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1). Singular, Border, and Transcendent coded as 0 and Protean coded as 1.
$p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A one-way between-groups ANOVA with planned comparisons was conducted to determine the existence of a difference in self-monitoring scores among the four biracial identity options. Participants were divided into four groups according to their biracial identity (i.e., Group 1: Singular; Group 2: Border; Group 3: Protean; Group 4: Transcendent). There was a significant difference among the mean SMS scores for the four biracial identity groups: F (1, 27) = 5.52, $p < .05$. Biracial individuals who identify as Protean reported a higher mean score on self-monitoring (M = 13.31) compared to a Singular (M = 10.88), Border (M = 10.87) or Transcendent (M = 12.18) identity. The SMS mean scores between the groups was a medium effect size of .06, which was calculated using eta squared. Although the ability to self-monitor did not significantly

predict a Protean identity, there was a difference with regard to how biracial individuals identified and rated their level of self-monitoring abilities.

Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences

The fourth research question pertained to the relationship of how the rules of hypodescent and exposure to multicultural experiences impact the degree in which biracial individuals achieve a certain level of racial identity development. The current study hypothesized that hypodescent (one-drop rule) and a high degree of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences (MEI) would predict a high level of racial identity development (EI and OGO) among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o4}).

The Multicultural Experience Inventory (MEI) is estimated to have an internal reliability of .86 (Lee & Davis, 2000). The MEI is comprised of Historical Development Pattern (HDP) and Contemporary Multicultural Inventory (CMI) scores. The current study's Cronbach alphas for MEI's HDP and CMI were .83 and .79, respectively. Participants who completed the MEI, obtained an average HDP score of 23.20 (*SD* = 5.41, *n* = 162) and an average CMI score of 34.11 (*SD* = 5.42, *n* = 148). The current study's average MEI score was 57.64 (*SD* = 9.47, *n* = 140) with a Cronbach alpha of .86.

According to Phinney (1992), the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) was found to be a reliable measure of ethnic identity (i.e., EI α = .90 and OGO α = .74). In the current study, the MEIM's four subscales (i.e., MEIMachv, MEIMbhvr, MEIMattblng, and MEIMOGO) obtained the following Cronbach alphas, respectively: .70, .54, .75, and .81. MEIM's Ethnic Identity (EI) score received a Cronbach alpha of

.86 and MEIM's Other Group Orientation (OGO) obtained an alpha of .78. Participants received an average EI score of 3.07 (*SD* = .50, *n* = 175) and an OGO average of 3.55 (*SD* = .48, *n* = 186).

Two simultaneous multiple regressions were conducted to assess the ability of hypodescent and exposure to multicultural experiences (i.e., MEI) would predict racial identity development (i.e., EI and OGO). Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. Results of the first simultaneous multiple regression indicated that the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 8.4%, F (2, 118) = 5.44, p = .01. Multicultural experiences made a statistically significant unique contribution in predicting ethnic identity development (standardized beta = .29, t = 3.24, p = .002) in a model that also included hypodescent. Not only was MEI significantly correlated with EI (r = .29, n = 130, p = .001), it also explained 8% of the variance in EI. If MEI were to increase by one standard deviation (SD = 9.47), EI would increase by .29 SD units. Hypodescent was not a statistically significantly contribution in predicting EI (see Tables 11 and 12).

TABLE 11

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Ethnic Identity

Variable	*n*	*M* (*SD*)	1	2
EI	175	3.07 (0.50)	-0.05	0.29***
Predictor Variables				
1. OneDrop	149	0.74 (0.44)	---	0.02
2. MEI	130	57.64 (9.47)	0.02	----

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. EI = Ethnic Identity. MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 12

The Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Ethnic Identity

			Ethnic Identity			
Predictors	*B*	SE	β	*p*	Δ*F*	95% CI
Constant	2.25	0.28	----	.000***	7.98	[1.69, 2.81]
OneDrop	-0.07	0.10	-0.06	0.51	-0.66	[-0.27, 0.13]
MEI	0.02	0.01	0.29	.002**	3.24	[0.01, 0.02]
R^2	.08					
F	5.44*					
ΔR^2	.07					

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. EI = Ethnic Identity. MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A second simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to determine the ability of hypodescent (one-drop rule) and a high level of multicultural experiences (MEI) to predict a high level of Other Group Orientation (OGO). Preliminary analyses were again conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. There was only one outlier found amongst the participants, who obtained an OGO score of 2, but the model predicted a value of 3. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, p. 75), a value larger than 1 for Cook's Distance can be problematic. However, since there was only one outlier and the model's

maximum Cook's Distance is .329 and the maximum Mahalanobis distance value did not exceed the critical chi-square value of 13.82, the case with the potential outlier was left in the analysis.

Results revealed that the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 17%, F (2, 118) = 12.24, $p < .001$. Multicultural experiences made a statistically significant unique contribution in predicting Other Group Orientation (OGO) (standardized beta = .41, t = 4.94, $p < .001$) in a model that also included hypodescent. If MEI were to increase by 1 standard deviation (SD = 9.47), OGO would increase by .41 standard deviation units. Not only was MEI significantly correlated with OGO (r = .41, n = 130, $p < .001$), it also explained 17% of the variance in OGO (see Table 13 and 14). Hypodescent was not a statistically significantly contribution in predicting Other Group Orientation. According to the multiple regression analysis, the hypothesis that the rules of hypodescent and multicultural experiences predicted racial identity development was partially supported (H_{o4}). Although the rules of hypodescent did not make a significant contribution in predicting EI or OGO among biracial individuals, the most significant contribution made was MEI.

TABLE 13

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Other Group Orientation

Variable	*n*	*M* (*SD*)	1	2
OGO	186	3.55 (0.48)	-0.02	0.41***
Predictor Variables				
1. OneDrop	155	0.74 (0.44)	----	0.02
2. MEI	130	57.64 (9.47)	0.02	----

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. OGO = Other Group Orientation. MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 14

The Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences Predicting Other Group Orientation

			Other Group Orientation			
Predictors	*B*	SE	β	*p*	Δ*F*	95% CI
Constant	2.36	0.26	----	.000***	9.21	[1.85, 2.87]
OneDrop	-0.03	0.09	-0.02	0.51	-0.29	[-0.21, 0.16]
MEI	0.02	0.004	0.41	.000***	4.94	[0.01, 0.03]
R^2		.17				
F		12.24***				
ΔR^2		.16				

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. OGO = Other Group Orientation. MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation

The fifth question was designed to determine the relationship between racial identity development and how biracial individuals categorize their biracial identity. It was hypothesized that a high level of racial identity development among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent would best predict a Singular identity over a Border, Protean, or Transcendent identity (H_{o5}). Direct logistic regression was performed to assess the impact of the one-drop rule and racial identity development (i.e., EI and

OGO) on the likelihood that biracial individuals would identify as Singular. As shown in Tables 15, the full model containing all predictors (i.e., one-drop rule, EI, and OGO) was not statistically significant, χ^2 (3, N = 139) = 5.40, $p > .05$. The model as a whole explained between 3.8% (Cox and Snell R square) and 6% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in Singular identity. Compared to the constant, the model did not change the classification of cases, which was 79.9%. The hypothesis biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who report a higher level of racial identity development will identify as Singular compared to those who identify as Border, Protean, or Transcendent, was not statistically supported. However, predictors EI and OGO appeared to approach statistical significance and had the potential to predict biracial individuals identifying as Singular.

TABLE 15

Likelihood of a High Level of Ethnic Identity and Other Group Orientation Predicting a Singular Identity (n = 139)

			Singular Identity			
Predictors	β	SE	Wald's χ^2 (1)	*p*	Odds ratio	95% CI
Constant	-1.73	1.86	0.86	0.35	0.18	----
OneDrop	0.39	0.55	0.50	0.48	1.47	[0.50, 4.34]
EI	0.88	0.48	3.37	0.07	2.42	[0.94, 6.20]
OGO	-0.76	0.46	2.82	0.09	0.47	[0.19, 1.14]
	χ^2	5.40				
	df	3				
	p	.15				

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. EI = Ethnic Identity. OGO = Other Group Orientation. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1). Border, Protean and Transcendent coded as 0 and Singular coded as 1.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A one-way between-groups ANOVA with planned comparisons was conducted to determine the existence of a difference in racial identity development among the four biracial identities. Participants were divided into four groups according to their biracial identity (i.e., Group 1: Singular; Group 2: Border; Group 3: Protean; Group 4: Transcendent). With planned comparisons, participants who identified as Singular (Group 1) were compared to participants who identified as Border, Protean, and Transcendent (i.e., Groups 2, 3 and 4). Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was

not significant; therefore the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated. With equal variances assumed, there was a significant difference among the four biracial identity groups with regard to their mean EI scores: F (1, 170) = 3.77, p = .05.

Biracial individuals who identified as Singular obtained a slightly higher EI (M = 3.18) compared to a Border (M = 3.13), Protean (M = 2.98), or Transcendent (M = 2.86) identity. Another one-way between-groups ANOVA using the same planned comparisons, was conducted to determine which biracial identity reported a higher level of Other Group Orientation (i.e., OGO). The Levene's test of homogeneity of variances was found to be significant. Therefore the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated. Equal variances not assumed, there was no statistically significant difference among the four biracial identity groups with regard to their mean OGO scores: F (1, 34) = 2.02, p = .09. According to the ANOVAs, there was a slight significant difference on EI for biracial individuals who identified as Singular compared to biracial individuals who identify as Border, Protean, or Transcendent.

Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences on Biracial Identity

The current study hypothesized biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent with a higher level of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences would predict a Border or Protean identity over a Singular or Transcendent identity (H_{o6}). Direct logistic regression was performed to determine the impact of the one-drop rule and cultural exposure and multicultural experiences (i.e., MEI) on the likelihood that biracial individuals would identify as Border or Protean vs. Singular or Transcendent. The full model containing all predictors variables (i.e., One-drop rule and MEI) was statistically

significant, χ^2 (2, N = 121) = 6.04, $p < .05$, indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who identified as Border or Protean vs. Singular or Transcendent. The model as a whole explained between 4.9% (Cox and Snell R square) and 6.7% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in Border or Protean identity, and correctly classified 68.6% of cases. As shown in Table 17, the strongest predictor of reporting a Border or Protean identity was cultural exposure and multicultural experiences, recording an odds ratio of 1.05. This indicated that for every increase in the score of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences, the odds of a biracial individual identifying as Border or Protean increase by 1.05. The hypothesis that a higher level of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences best predicts a biracial identification of Border or Protean vs. Singular or Transcendent among biracial individuals was partially supported.

A one-way between groups ANOVA with planned comparisons was conducted to determine whether cultural exposure and multicultural experiences of participants who identified as Border (Group 2) or Protean (Group 3) differed from participants who identified as Singular (Group 1) or Transcendent (Groups 4). The assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated, as Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was not significant. With equal variances assumed, there was a statistically significant difference between the biracial identities with regard to their mean scores on MEI: F (1, 136) = 4.36, $p = .04$. It appears that the MEI mean score for participants who identified as Singular ($M = 52.46$, $SD = 10.14$) was significantly different from those who identified as Border ($M = 58.14$, $SD = 8.59$), Protean ($M = 60.06$, $SD = 7.07$) and even Transcendent ($M = 58.77$, $SD = 12.10$). The hypothesis that biracial individuals who

identify as Border or Protean are more likely to report a higher degree of multicultural experiences compared to biracial individuals who identify as Singular or Transcendent (H_{o6}) was partially supported.

TABLE 16

Likelihood of the Rules of Hypodescent and a High Level of Multicultural Experiences Predicting a Border or Protean Identity (n = 121)

			Border or Protean Identity			
Predictors	β	SE	Wald's χ^2 (1)	*p*	Odds ratio	95% CI
Constant	-1.80	1.22	2.18	0.14	0.17	----
OneDrop	-0.37	0.45	0.69	0.41	0.69	[0.29, 1.66]
MEI	0.05	0.02	5.22	0.02	1.05	[1.01, 1.09]
	χ^2	6.04				
	df	2				
	p	.05*				

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. MEI = Multicultural Experiences Inventory. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1). Singular or Transcendent coded as 0 and Border or Protean coded as 1.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Factors that Contribute to Self-Esteem

The current study examined the relationship between racial identity development and self-esteem among biracial individuals. It was hypothesized that a high level of racial identity development best predicted a high level of self-esteem among of biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o7}). Biracial identity research using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale (RSE) has demonstrated alphas of .86 for Black/White biracial individuals and .92 for Asian/White biracial individuals (Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). The current study's RSE obtained a Cronbach alpha of .91. Eighty participants completed the RSE and obtained a mean score of 29.81 with a *SD* of 8.83.

A simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to determine the ability of hypodescent and a high level of racial identity development (i.e., EI and OGO) to predict a high level of self-esteem (RSE). Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. Based on Mahalanobis distance value exceeding the critical chi-square value of 16.27, there were two cases identified as outliers. In order to determine whether these outliers had any influence on the regression model as a whole, the values for Cook's Distance was examined. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, p. 75), a value larger than 1 for Cook's Distance can be problematic. Since there were only two outliers and the model's maximum Cook's Distance was .369, these cases were left in the analysis. Results revealed that the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 14%, F (3, 70) = 3.81, p = .014. Ethnic identity development (EI) made a statistically significant unique contribution in predicting self-esteem (RSE) (standardized beta = .25, t = 2.14, $p < .05$) in a model that also included hypodescent and Other Group Orientation.

If EI were to increase by one standard deviation (*SD* = .50), RSE would increase by .25 standard deviation units. EI was also significantly correlated with RSE (r = .31, n = 74, p = .004), it also explained 5.6% of the variance in RSE (see Tables 17 and 18).

Although Other Group Orientation did not make a statistically significant contribution in predicting self-esteem, it was significantly correlated to RSE (r = .29, n = 76, p = .006). Hypodescent was not a statistically significantly contribution in predicting self-esteem. According to the simultaneous multiple regression, the hypothesis that hypodescent and ethnic identity would predict self-esteem was partially supported (H_{o7}). Although the rules of hypodescent and other group orientation did not make a significant contribution in predicting self-esteem among biracial individuals, the most significant contribution made was ethnic identity.

TABLE 17

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation Predicting Self-Esteem

Variable	*n*	*M* (*SD*)	1	2	3
RSE	80	29.81 (8.83)	0.04	0.31**	0.29**
Predictors					
1. OneDrop	77	0.74 (0.44)	----	-0.05	-0.02
2. EI	74	3.07 (0.50)	-0.05	----	0.29***
3. OGO	76	3.55 (0.48)	-0.02	0.29***	----

Note. RSE = Rosenberg Self-esteem. EI = Ethnic Identity. OGO = Other Group Orientation. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 18

Multiple Regression Predicting Self-Esteem Based on the Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity and Other Group Orientation (n = 80)

		Self-Esteem			
Variables	*B*	SE *B*	β	Δ*F*	95% CI
OneDrop	1.23	2.23	0.06	0.55	[-3.23, 5.68]
EI	4.37	2.04	0.25	2.14*	[0.30, 8.44]
OGO	3.94	2.13	0.21	1.85	[-0.31, 8.19]
	R^2	0.14			
	F	3.81**			
	ΔR^2	0.10			

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. EI = Ethnic Identity. OGO = Other Group Orientation. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Factors that Contribute to Psychological Well-Being

The current study examined the relationship between racial identity development and psychological well-being among biracial individuals. It was hypothesized that the rules of hypodescent and a high level of racial identity development best predicts a high level of psychological well-being among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o8}).

According to Keyes and Ryff (1998), the Psychological Well-Being (PWB) scale has good internal consistency with Cronbach alpha coefficients for all six subscales: Self-

Acceptance, .93; Autonomy, .86; Environmental Mastery, .90; Positive Relations with others, .91; Purpose in Life, .90; Personal Growth, .87; and overall Psychological Well-Being, .80. In the current study, the PWB received the following Cronbach alpha coefficients: self-acceptance (α = .66); autonomy (α = .63); environmental mastery (α = .69); positive relations with others (α = .68); purpose in life (α = .42); personal growth (α = .70). The Cronbach alpha for overall PWB was .87 and participants averaged a score of 82.86 (*SD* = 12.80, *n* = 122).

A simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to determine the ability of hypodescent, EI, and OGO to predict a high level of PWB. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. Based on Mahalanobis distance value exceeding the critical chi-square value of 16.27, there were two cases identified as outliers. In order to determine whether these outliers had any influence on the regression model as a whole, the values for Cook's Distance was examined. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, p. 75), a value larger than 1 for Cook's Distance can be problematic. Since there were only two outliers and the model's maximum Cook's Distance was .182, these cases were left in the analysis. Refer to Table 19 for descriptive statistics pertaining to the simultaneous multiple regression where the one-drop rule, EI and OGO predicted PWB. PWB was significantly correlated to EI ($r = .26$, $n = 112$, $p = .003$) and OGO ($r = .35$, $n = 114$, $p < .001$). EI explained 3% of the variance, while OGO explained 8% of the variance in PWB.

TABLE 19

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for the Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation Predicting Psychological Well-Being

Variable	*n*	*M* (*SD*)	1	2	3
PWB	122	82.86 (12.80)	0.12	0.26**	0.35***
Predictors					
1. OneDrop	119	0.74 (0.44)	----	-0.05	-0.02
2. EI	112	3.07 (0.50)	-0.05	----	0.29***
3. OGO	114	3.55 (0.48)	-0.02	0.29***	----

Note. PWB = Psychological Well-Being. EI = Ethnic Identity. OGO = Other Group Orientation. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Results revealed that the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 16%, F (3, 108) = 7.07, $p < .000$. In the final model, EI and OGO made a statistically significant unique contribution in predicting PWB, with OGO (standardized beta = .30, t = 3.23, $p < .05$) recording a higher beta value than EI (standardized beta = .18, t = 1.95, p = .05). An increase by one standard deviation of OGO (*SD* = .48) would increase PWB by .08 *SD* units. If EI were to increase by one standard deviation (*SD* = .50) PWB would increase by .03 *SD* units (see Table 20). Hypodescent was not a statistically significant contribution in predicting PWB. According to the simultaneous multiple regression, the hypothesis that a high level of racial identity development best predicts a high level of psychological well being among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent

was partially supported. Although the rules of hypodescent did not make a significant contribution in predicting psychological well-being among biracial individuals, the most significant contribution made was OGO followed by EI.

TABLE 20

Multiple Regression Predicting Psychological Well-Being Based on the Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity and Other Group Orientation (n = 122)

		Psychological Well-Being			
Variables	*B*	SE *B*	β	Δ*F*	95% CI
OneDrop	3.78	2.57	0.13	1.47	[-1.32, 8.88]
EI	4.58	2.35	0.18	1.95*	[-0.08, 9.24]
OGO	7.92	2.45	0.30	3.23**	[3.05, 12.78]
	R^2	0.16			
	F	7.07***			
	ΔR^2	0.14			

Note. CI = Confidence Interval. EI = Ethnic Identity. OGO = Other Group Orientation. OneDrop = Rules of Hypodescent (Majority/Minority coded as 0 and Minority/Minority coded as 1).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Prior research on biracial identity development has highlighted individuals of African American and European American descent. The present study was designed to determine the factors that contribute to the identity formation of biracial individuals who are descendants of two minority groups (i.e., non-White/non-White). Due to the growing nature of this population, it would be beneficial to determine whether factors salient to the identity development of African American and European American individuals are similar to or different from biracial individuals who identify with two minority groups. The following section will review the key findings, implications, and limitations of the current study, as well as offer recommendations for future research.

For bi- and multiracial individuals, the path of racial identification is often not linear and can be ambiguous. The assumption often made regarding multiracial individuals of African American heritage is that they have few identity options (Roth, 2005). This assumption is held because for many years in this country race was defined as an exclusive construct, meaning that a person could only have one race. For instance, the one-drop rule is a well-recognized designation of Blackness in American Society. However, with the increase of interracial unions and therefore a multiracial population, the view of race as exclusive has increasingly been challenged (Roth, 2005). So, now the racial reality in this country has become that many Americans are challenging racial exclusivity by exploring racial identity options.

The main purpose of this study was to determine factors (e.g., one-drop rule, physical appearance, ability to self-monitor) that predict how biracial individuals identify (i.e., Singular, Border, Protean, and Transcendent) and if exposure to multicultural

experiences can predict their level of ethnic identity development. The current study also sought to determine if some of the previously mentioned factors predicted psychological adjustment (i.e., self-esteem and psychological well-being).

Rules of Hypodescent on Biracial Identity

The first question examined how the rules of hypodescent (i.e., one-drop rule) influenced the way in which biracial individuals of minority/minority group status identified themselves. The hypothesis that biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent are more likely to identify as Singular, compared to the other biracial identity options, was not supported. In fact, despite their racial group combination (i.e., minority/minority or majority/minority), biracial individuals were more like to identify as Border. Biracial individuals who endorsed a Border identity perceived that the following statement best described him/her: "Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I consider myself to be a combination of my parents' racial groups and identify as biracial, I can't pick one over the other group because I'm part of both." These individuals incorporated both racial categories rather than considering themselves to be one race over the other. So, the longstanding practice of a Black/non-Black schema regarding the racial classification system in the United States (i.e., if you have 1 drop of Black blood in your ancestry, you must identify as Black), was not evident in this study; rather a Border identity, which is "…grounded in 'inbetweenness'" was found (Roth, 2005, p. 39). This shift may be due to the growing multiracial population. As this population increases, so does the interest in their identification. According to Roth (2005), education influences how one comes to understand race. So, a high level of

education for the parent(s) of the biracial child might expose him/her to challenge America's norms of racial classification, thereby fostering a supportive environment for alternative ways to racially identify.

Roth (2005) found that high parental education led to the rejection of norms of racial classification (i.e., one-drop rule) and movement towards more acceptance of interracial identity options. So, highly educated parents of bi- and multiracial are more likely to foster an environment that would emphasize that their sons/daughters are not limited by one racial group identification. For a biracial individual to select an identity other than a Black Singular identity demonstrates movement from the one-drop rule. According to Roth (2005), this would not be a consciously deliberate rejection, but rather a "…positive assertion of other identities" (p. 63). In the current study, about a third of the participants' parents completed some college, followed by the completion of graduate/professional school, and the next largest group having completed a 4-year college degree. The smallest percentage of education completed by participants' parents was trade/vocational school and the 7th grade.

Also, consistent with prior research (e.g. Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002), biracial individuals tended to identify as Border. However, in the current study, there's a noticeable difference with the increase in biracial individuals identifying as Protean. With the nation's recognition and movement toward acceptance of more than one racial identity, there's a shift in the understanding of race so that bi- or multiracial individuals may experience less pressure to identify as one identity (Lusk, Taylor, Nanney, & Austin, 2010). Another explanation for biracial individuals identifying as Border may stem from the relationship with their parent(s) and/or other family members. Home (i.e., parents,

extended family) is the first place that biracial individuals become socialized to race. In the current study, over half of the participants identified both parents as their primary caregivers. Rockquemore and Laszloffy (2005) emphasized the importance of parents teaching their biracial children how to love and value their race. If parents were able to provide a loving and supportive environment and model a positive identity with regard to their own race, a demonstration of this love and affection would result in biracial individuals being able to incorporate all aspects of their parents' heritages. Lastly, the current study's lack of support for the hypothesis of the one-drop rule may be attributed to the study's sample size of minority/minority biracial individuals. The small sample size may not have been large enough to capture that the influence of the one-drop rule.

Rules of Hypodescent and Physical Resemblance on Biracial Identity

The second question pertained to how physical resemblance to one or more racial group(s) would influence how biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent identified. Again, the one-drop rule did not appear to impact biracial group membership. However, there was a significant association between the number of racial groups biracial individuals perceived themselves to resemble and the biracial identity in which they aligned. First, a majority of the biracial individuals perceived themselves to resemble two or more racial groups. These biracial individuals identified as Border, followed by Protean, Singular and then Transcendent. As expected, biracial individuals who physically resembled one racial group identified with a Singular identity. The next commonly selected biracial identity option was a Border identity followed by an equal number of biracial individuals identifying as Protean and Transcendent.

Research (e.g., Phinney, 1990; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002) has attempted to capture how physical appearance influences racial identification among biracial individuals. Various methodological approaches have been utilized to capture physical appearance of biracial individuals, such as measuring individuals' ratings of perceived skin color (e.g., black, light brown, yellow, white). However, this study preferred not to focus on skin color, rather biracial individuals' perception of their appearance. As supported in other research (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002), a distinction was made between skin color and appearance because skin color tends to focus more on one's self-perception, while appearance is more socially mediated and evidence for the relationship between appearance and how biracial individuals racially understood themselves.

As expected, biracial individuals who perceived themselves to physically resemble two or more racial groups, associated with an identity option that captured two unique aspects of self, regardless of whether or not that self was constant (i.e., Border) or flexible (i.e., Protean). Consistent with prior research (e.g., Ahnallen, Suyemoto, & Carter, 2006), physical appearance made an independent contribution to racial identity. However, other factors, like the experience of belonging or exclusion (i.e., how biracial individuals are treated by others based on their physical appearance) may play a more significant role (Stephan & Stephan, 1989). Something that was not examined in the current study, but worthy of exploration, would be to determine other factors that might influence biracial individuals' perception of their physical appearance, such as, socioeconomic status, social network, and/or the diversity of one's neighborhood/community.

However, in spite of the significant findings of the current study, a possible limitation was the measurement of physical appearance. Biracial individuals measured their physical appearance according to their interpretation of "To what degree do you physically resemble the racial groups listed below…." Participants may have had a different interpretation of what it meant to "physically resemble" a racial group. Physical resemblance could have pertained to facial features, resemblance to a racial group based on stereotypical features, familial similarities, or a combination of the above.

Rules of Hypodescent and Self-monitoring on Biracial Identity

Although the personality trait self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974) has not been examined with this population, it was thought to influence how biracial individuals of minority/minority descent identify. However, the current study found that high self-monitoring did not predict a Protean identity for biracial individuals. The lack of a significant finding may be due to sample size and that the difference in self-monitoring between a Protean and a Transcendent identity was not large enough to denote significance.

However, biracial individuals who identified as Protean reported being slightly higher in self-monitoring than biracial individuals who identified as Transcendent, Singular, and or a Border identity. An interesting finding was that the next biracial identity option to report a comparatively higher self-monitoring score was Transcendent. It was unexpected to discover that biracial individuals with a Transcendent identity would endorse a state of mind in which they would alter their publicly presented selves to match current situational experiences. However, this may not be such an unexpected finding for

biracial individuals who perceive themselves as Transcendent (i.e., …I identify as a human being without thought to my parent's racial group(s). I do not place a lot of emphasis on my racial background). Since this identity option looks beyond one's race, it would be beneficial for these individuals to be receptive to other aspects of self. The Self-Monitoring Scale may have captured aspects of identity not specific to ethnicity or race. For instance, the formation of a stable identity is evident with being autonomous from parents, having relations with same- and other-sex peers, and developing a unique sense of self through comparisons with others (Erikson, 1968). This would provide an explanation for why biracial individuals identify more as Transcendent rather than the other biracial identity options with regard to self-monitoring. It is possible that those biracial individuals valued other aspects (i.e., autonomy, relationship with peers) of their identity development not specific to ethnicity or race.

Although self-monitoring did not predict a Protean identity, it would still benefit researchers to consider the role/impact of shifting racial identities. For example, Sanchez, Shih, and Garcia (2009) have examined the concept of *malleable racial identification*, which they defined as the "…tendency to identify with different racial identities depending on the social context" (p. 243) and the belief that there are benefits to shifting a racial identity or the opportunity to have more than one (e.g., buffer harmful effects of stereotypes). According to Hitlin, Brown, and Elder (2006), multiracial adolescents were likely to change their racial categorization over 5 years. Also in support of flexible racial identities, Harris and Sim (2002) found that rather than keeping their racial categorization constant, multiracial adolescents changed it between the contexts of

home and school. This ability to prioritize social identities within certain contexts over others has been thought of as "compartmentalization" (Sanchez, Shih, & Garcia, 2009).

Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences

The current study sought to determine the influence of exposure to multicultural experiences as a predictor of racial identity development for biracial individuals. Specifically, a high degree of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences would predict a high level Ethnic Identity and Other Group Orientation among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent. Although the rules of hypodescent did not predict Ethnic Identity or Other Group Orientation, a high degree of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences was a better predictor. So, it would seem that biracial individuals who are exposed to situations/experiences of racial diversity (e.g., "I often spend time with people from racial groups other than my own. I am happy that I am a member of the group(s) I belong to. I have a clear sense of my racial background(s) and what it means to me") develop a high level of ethnic identity and other group orientation. This finding further supports the belief that cultural practices play a role in ethnic identity, as defined by Phinney (1992). Phinney (1992) developed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, which examined ethnic identity achievement: ethnic behaviors/practices and positive affirmations and feelings of belonging. It is through this process of ethnic identity formation that the exploration and engagement of one's racial/ethnic history and culture becomes essential. As a result, the involvement in social activities, the practice of cultural traditions, and the experience of pride and positive feelings toward one's group becomes significant (Phinney, 1989; Phinney & Alipuria,

1990). In this study, the Multicultural Experiences Inventory (Ramirez, 1999) was able to capture the level of identity exploration for biracial individuals via their level of exposure multicultural experiences.

Although considered a separate construct from ethnic identity, Other Group Orientation was thought to interact with ethnic identity as an aspect of social identity (Phinney, 1992). Therefore, as individuals change their attitudes towards other racial/ethnic groups, a change in one's self-awareness regarding his/her ethnicity occurs (Phinney, Jacoby, & Silva, 2007). As expected, this study found that exposure to multicultural experiences predicted "…openness toward other ethnic groups and willingness to interact with members of these groups" (Phinney, Jacoby & Silva, 2007, p. 481). A mature level of ethnic identity is associated with positive intergroup attitudes and therefore reflected in positive attitudes toward other groups (Phinney, Jacoby, & Silva, 2007. Another factor not taken into account is the quality rather than the quantity of multicultural exposure. According to Rockquemore (1998), socio-demographic factors (i.e., socioeconomic status, religion) may help facilitate a positive experience and feelings of validation for biracial individuals within diverse social networks.

Rules of Hypodescent, Ethnic Identity, and Other Group Orientation

The current study then examined how ethnic identity and other group orientation and the rules of hypodescent would predict a biracial identity option among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent. First, this study revealed that hypodescent and a high level of ethnic identity and other group orientation did not significantly predict a Singular identity, as hypothesized. However, biracial individuals who identified as

Singular demonstrated a slightly higher ethnic identity compared to biracial individuals who identified as Border, Protean, or Transcendent. Interestingly, biracial individuals who identified as Singular, Border, Protean, or Transcendent did not differ with regard to Other Group Orientation. Positive attitudes toward and interactions with other racial groups did not appear to play a significant role in biracial identity options.

The lack of significance may be due to sample size, as biracial individuals with a Singular identity was the second smallest sample despite obtaining the largest average with regard to ethnic identity. Second, since the study hypothesized a Singular identity for biracial individuals with a high level of ethnic identity and other group orientation, this may have not been reflected in the findings, as a majority of biracial individuals identified with Border identity. For instance, in comparison to the other biracial identity options, biracial individuals with a Border identity reported a higher level of Other Group Orientation. This finding is to be expected considering that one who identifies as Border takes in account both of their racial groups.

Rules of Hypodescent and Multicultural Experiences on Biracial Identity

Since there was a relationship between the exposure of multicultural experiences, ethnic identity and other group orientation, the current study also sought to determine whether multicultural cultural experiences (e.g., diverse environment and social interactions) would predict a Border or Protean identity over a Singular or Transcendent identity among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White heritage. Although rules of hypodescent did not contribute to the way in which biracial individuals identified, exposure to multicultural experiences made a significant, but unexpected contribution.

As expected, biracial individuals of a Singular identity reported, on average, less experiences of multicultural exposure compared to the other biracial identities. Biracial individuals who identified as Protean demonstrated, on average, higher levels of exposure to multicultural experiences followed by Transcendent and then Border identity. Surprisingly, biracial individuals of a Transcendent identity reported a higher level of multicultural experiences than other biracial identities (i.e., Border or Singular) that emphasize the importance of ethnicity and race. However, as previously mentioned biracial individuals who identity as Transcendent may stress other aspects of their life, such as relations with others (Erikson, 1968). Although the Multicultural Experiences Inventory highlights the diversity of one's environment and interactions (i.e., minority, mixed, predominately white racial group), the most prevalent theme is the relationship with others and therefore an explanation of the current study's finding.

Factors that Contribute to Self-Esteem

Another important area of interest for the biracial population, in addition to their racial/ethnic identity development, is their level of self-esteem. Although the rules of hypodescent did not contribute to biracial individuals' self-esteem, ethnic identity was a significant predictor of self-esteem. This finding further supports research evidence of the positive relationship between one's commitment to racial/ethnic identity development and self-esteem (e.g., Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Lusk et al., 2010; Phinney & Alipuria, 1996). Prior research found that the commitment to an ethnic identity was more related to self-esteem than what the rules of hypodescent implied about which ethnic/racial group biracial individuals were more likely to select (e.g., Suzuki-

Crumly & Hyers, 2004). The contributing factor may be the connection felt to a particular group of reference, rather than the group itself. According to Lusk et al. (2010), it is the development of a positive self-concept and confidence from in-group interactions comprised of cultural traditions and customs that carries the most significance.

Although not able to predict self-esteem, Other Group Orientation was positively correlated with self-esteem. These unexpected findings may be due to a couple of things. Despite the evidence of a positive relationship between self-esteem and other group orientation, there may not have been enough power to capture the predictive relationship due to the small sample size. Second, as mentioned earlier, Other Group Orientation is a separate construct from Ethnic Identity (Phinney, 1992). Therefore, the commitment to one's ethnic identity may just be a stronger connection than positive attitudes towards other racial groups.

Factors that Contribute to Psychological Well-Being

For the first time, biracial individuals' level of psychological adjustment was examined using the measure Psychological Well-Being (Ryff, 1995). The current study found that ethnic identity and other group orientation predicted psychological well-being among biracial individuals, unlike the rules of hypodescent. The connection between individuals' level of ethnic identity achievement and psychological well-being could be due to the six dimensions that make up this construct: Self-acceptance, Positive relations with other people, Autonomy, Environmental mastery, Purpose in life, and Personal growth. Each dimension reflects a sense of self that seem parallel to ethnic identity

development. In this study, biracial individuals experienced an improvement in self and were open to new experiences that would result in more self-knowledge (i.e., Personal Growth). They also felt that their lives had goals, direction (i.e., Purpose in life), and a level of independence (i.e., Autonomy) separate from societal pressures. Biracial individuals also experienced positive feelings about one's past life (i.e., Self-acceptance). Lastly, biracial individuals felt they had satisfying and trusting relationships with others (i.e., Positive relations with other people) and reported they were aware of their surroundings for personal needs/values (i.e., Environmental mastery) (Ryff, 1995). Based on the theoretical underpinnings of the measure of Psychological Well-Being, it was not a surprise to find that other group orientation made more of a significant contribution than ethnic identity with regard to predicting psychological well-being among biracial individuals. This finding could be due to how the measure Psychological Well-Being emphasize "others orientation," and well-being is comprised of having good relationships with others (Ryff, 1989).

Clinical Implications

Compared to monoracial individuals, research has shown that bi- and multiracial individuals experience unique challenges that can affect their identity development (Root, 1996; Gillem, Cohn, & Throne, 2001). According to Milville (2005), monoracial identities "do not recognize the social complexity of adopting a biracial identity in a monoracially defined social world" (p. 303). Multiracial individuals described feelings of alienation, uncertainty about their identification, and frustration felt when others assign an identity to them (Root, 1996). Although it is important to understand how the

multiracial population describe themselves, it is just as imperative to respect a multiracial individual's decision to label him- or herself in his/her own way.

Lusk et al. (2010) suggested some areas of importance for mental health practitioners who work with a multiracial population. Clinicians should first recognize that due to socialization experiences, there are multiple ways in which multiracial individuals identify. Therefore, it would behoove clinicians to learn about the racial heritage of the multiracial individual's family. Second, the racial identification status of multiracial individuals should not be deemed as linear or fixed. Clinicians should attend to the process in which a multiracial individual comes to understand and racially define him- or herself, which would influence his/her psychological functioning. In conceptualizing a multiracial individual's racial identity, the real or perceived ability to adapt one's identity (e.g., shifting, protean, malleable) within various situations should also be taken into account. Some suggest this chameleon-like ability should not automatically be considered healthy, as it can increase psychological stress and produce negative mental health outcomes for some multiracial individuals (e.g., Coleman & Carter, 2007; Sanchez, Shih, & Garcia, 2009).

Pedrotti, Edwards, and Lopez (2008) identified four themes thought to influence the identity development of multiracial individuals: (a) environment and context, (b) the nonlinear process of multiracial identity development, (c) ascribed identity versus self-definition, and (d) "the richness of multiple heritages" (p. 194). The first theme pertains to the multiracial individuals' environmental resources and deficits. An individual's multiple contextual influences are an important aspect of a person's identity. In order to determine factors that influenced identity development, it would benefit the clinician to

obtain information on a multiracial individual's "…psychological assets (e.g., self-efficacy, persistence, internal motivation), psychological weakness (e.g., lack of insight, problems with frustration tolerance), environmental resources (e.g., social support, positive communities and schools), and environmental stressors (e.g., prejudice, poverty, family dysfunction" (Pedrotti, Edwards, & Lopez, 2008, p. 195). As suggested in Lusk et al. (2010), the second theme reflects the perception that multiracial identity development should be deemed as a cyclical process with changing identities and where clinicians conceptualize multiracial individuals' ability to function in a healthy way without having to integrate their identities.

The theme of ascribed identity vs. self-defined identity is significant in the lives of multiracial individuals who identify in different ways depending upon the situation and time in their life (Root, 1990). The last theme reflects the richness associated with multiple racial heritages. It would behoove clinicians to avoid the perception of multiracial individuals as marginalized and focus on the following culturally relevant strengths: bicultural competence and the ability to navigate cultural contexts (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993), an attitude of openness toward others (Phinney & Alipuria, 1996), and the function of belonging to a part of different individual cultures (Pedrotti, Edwards, & Lopez, 2008). Focusing on one's strengths would assist multiracial individuals in the development of a healthy identity outcome.

Limitations

Although an addition to the growing literature regarding the biracial population, the current study contained limitations that may have impacted the findings.

Participant recruitment. Methods of recruiting a nonrandom multiracial population have relied upon advertisements and snowball sampling. However, advertisements in college, city, and/or newspapers that serve an ethnic population provide a limited sample (Root, 2002). Snowball sampling is a method most often used to address difficulties in participant recruitment, such as the nonrandom distribution of a multiracial population or uncertainty about participation. Typically, the snowball method involves the recruitment of participants by word-of-mouth. Another means of snowballing was to recruit a sample from ethnic/racial groups or organizations (e.g., churches, temples, professional associations, political organizations, and social clubs) (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). The end result is a large, but selective sample of multiracial participants. Participants of the current study were recruited through such methods (i.e., nonrandom, snowball). Participants were asked to recruit other people they knew to identify as multiracial, such as family, friends, and co-workers. They were also recruited from online organizations that specifically target a multiracial population (i.e., AMEA, Swirl, Inc.). Unfortunately, it is likely that this form of participant recruitment does not lead to a diverse sample (e.g., age, experiences, racial identities) (e.g., Hall, 1980; Stephan, 1991; Stephan & Stephan, 1989; Thornton, 1983; Williams, 1992).

Heterogeneous vs. homogeneous samples. According to Root (2002), the racial and ethnic combination of a sample can also be an important factor in multiracial research. For instance, if the ethnicity of a particular racial group is kept the same, then researchers can determine if identity development has been influenced by factors (i.e., cultural attitudes, beliefs, values) specific to the ethnic group. However, when researchers reduce ethnicity to race, groups of different racial heritages are combined and

the lack of differences between groups, such as cultural attitudes, beliefs, values, are implied. Due to the current study's heterogeneous sample, the decision to reduce ethnicity to race in order to address small subsamples and low statistical or conceptual power, can affect the generalizability and confidence of the current findings.

Data collection. Although internet data collection increases the opportunity for a large and diverse sample of biracial individuals, it may not be representative of the population. Similar to previous research (e.g., Lusk et al., 2010; Sanchez, Shih, & Garcia, 2009), this sample was highly self-selective in that populations that emphasized a biracial identity was targeted for recruitment. Although the use of the internet as a means of data collection increased the opportunity to reach a larger population, it was also a limitation. Certain populations (e.g., age, higher level of education, socioeconomic status) are more likely to have access to and familiarity with the internet, thereby influencing the generalizability of the results.

In an attempt to not influence how biracial individuals rated their biracial identity options (i.e., Singular, Border, Protean, Transcendent), more traditional methods of racial categorization (e.g., American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander), along with additional demographic information (e.g., age, gender, level of education), was left at the end of the study. However, due to participant drop-out rate, there was a loss of information that may have had a significant impact on the findings (i.e., power to detect statistical significance) and generalizability. This may serve as one explanation for the small sample of biracial individuals of minority/minority group descent.

In order to remain consistent with the current study's preference to utilize the term race, instead of the term ethnicity, items on the Multicultural Experiences Inventory (MEI) and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) were reworded in order to reflect this. Although the MEI and MEIM in this study was found to be reliable, it is unclear as to how these measures would affect the findings had the items been left to reflect ethnicity.

Strengths of the Current Study

Restricting a sample is another issue relevant in multiracial research. Since obtaining large samples of ethnic minority groups can be difficult; sampling from college populations becomes an ideal solution. However, Sears (1985) raised the concern that sampling from a college pool, does not reflect the foundation of human processes. Differences exist between American college undergraduates and the general population, such a "…a less than fully formulated sense of self, less crystallized social and political attitudes, highly unstable peer relationship" (as cited in Okazaki & Sue, 1995, p. 370). Another limitation of college samples is that they are not always able to capture the life events and developmental milestones (e.g., marriage, birth of a children, and death of a parent) thought to impact the process of identity development (Root, 1998). There is also the possibility that the identity of a college-age student may not be the same 10 years later. Based on these limitations, a college sample of racial and ethnic minorities may not be representative of a racial and ethnic minority population. Okazaki and Sue (1995) argue that differences exist in the variables associated with race and ethnicity (e.g., socioeconomic status, educational attainment of the participants in relation to their age

cohorts who do not attend college, values and attitudes). Consequently, college samples of ethnic and racial minorities may be an underestimation of the demographic and psychosocial diversity of the larger population. A strength of the current study is that it is not solely made up of a sample from a college population. Therefore, there is a chance that this sample captured more life experiences of biracial individuals. A second strength is large sample size and quantitative methodology of the current study, as research surrounding biracial individuals has primarily consisted of small sample sizes and qualitative methodology. Lastly, the current study's attempt to examine ethnic and racial identity development of biracial individuals of minority/minority descent is a significant step toward expanding the research in this population.

Future Directions

In addition to addressing limitations of the current study, there are a number of suggestions for future research. Since there is much significance with clarifying the definitions of race and ethnicity; it would be just as important to provide an accurate definition and classification system for biracial individuals. According to Costello (1993), establishing a category involves categorical members having similar traits. However, one immediate difficulty is that biracial individuals do not have their own racial category, which is evident in their lack of ethnic artifacts (e.g., beliefs, food, history, music) that are unique to their group (Root, 1992a). Multiracial individuals also do not share physical features, unlike monoracial groups, which have often been used to classify race. It would be noteworthy to conduct a study that determines how biracial

individuals define ethnicity and race and the reasons behind which term they prefer and the factors that contribute to the process of making this decision.

Although the current study involved biracial individuals of racial majority/minority and minority/minority descent, there was not a large enough sample of minority/minority biracial individuals in order to conduct a sufficient comparison. Further investigation of a comparison between these groups would deconstruct the effects of race and ethnicity and determine the significance on identifying with a majority or minority group.

A longitudinal study would highlight the process of biracial identity development, as it would capture other areas in the life of biracial individuals that would significantly impact their identity [e.g., developmental milestones, relations with others (e.g., siblings, parents, and peers)]. It would also allow for the possibility to track the progression of identity development. Also, the ability to ascertain the involvement of significant individuals, such as family or friends, may help to determine how these individuals impact the identity development and psychological adjustment of biracial individuals.

Although the current study simplified certain factors, like physical appearance or exposure to multicultural experiences, a recommendation would be to pursue how more specific aspects of these factors (e.g., racial composition of the household, cultural traditions practiced in/out of the home; relationships with others) mediate or moderate biracial identity development or psychological well-being.

Conclusions

The current study conceptualized biracial identity development based upon a theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism and race as a social construct (e.g., Rockquemore and Brunsma, 2002). Based on the rules of hypodescent, the more traditional identity of biracial individuals of African American descent is that of a Singular identity where there is only one racial identity option. An individual who preferred a Protean identity simultaneously made reference to self in both racial group communities where his/her identity changed according to the social and cultural context of the community (Roth, 2005). However, individuals with a Border identity perceived their identity to exist between predefined social categories and there was a blending of the races of their heritage for a unique hybrid (i.e., biracial, multiracial, mixed). Biracial individuals with a Transcendent identity recognized themselves as members of the human race. They preferred to be understood as individuals, as race was viewed as a 'false categorization of humanity' (Roth, 2005, p. 39).

The current study examined three main areas pertaining to biracial individuals of majority/minority and minority/minority group descent. Although the one-drop rule was not a significant factor with regard to group membership, there were a number of significant findings. The current study first sought to determine the factors that contribute to the membership of a biracial identity. Physical resemblance to two or more racial groups and exposure to multicultural experiences appeared to predict biracial individuals' identification with a Border or Protean identity. Second, this study found that high exposure to multicultural experiences best predicted a high level of ethnic identity development and other group orientation. Lastly, the current study found that a

high level of ethnic identity development and other group orientation contributed to a positive psychological adjustment (i.e., self-esteem and psychological well-being) of biracial individuals. The lack of influence of the rules of hypodescent may be due to the increased awareness regarding the opportunity and acceptance for biracial individuals to identify with more than one racial group. In addition to the growing research, there are various literature (e.g., Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2005; Root & Kelly, 2003) and support groups/organizations (e.g., AMEA, I-Pride, Swirl, Inc.) created to foster further understanding of this population.

Due to the complexity of the issues surrounding race and biracial identity, scholars have difficulty formulating a clear understanding of biracial identity and its impact on psychological adjustment. Consequently, biracial identity research has branched out into diverse fields (e.g., public health, sociology, political science) to further explore the experiences of this population. For biracial individuals, the path of racial identification is not a clear or single one. However, the assumption always made is that there are few identity options for biracial individuals of African American heritage due to the one-drop rule, a well-recognized designation of Blackness in American Society (Roth, 2005). For the longest time a person could only have one race and race, as defined in America, is exclusive. However, with the increase of interracial unions and therefore a multiracial population, the view of race as exclusive is being challenged along with a movement toward an exploration of racial identity options. This current study contributes to providing additional knowledge regarding the role of race on biracial identity and its influence on psychological experiences.

REFERENCES

Adams, G. R., Ryan, J. H., Hoffman, J. J., Dobson, W. R., & Nielson, E. C. (1984). Ego identity status, conformity behavior, and personality in late adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 1091-1104.

Ahnallen, J. A., Suyemoto, K. L., & Carter, A. S. (2006). Relationship between physical appearance, sense of belonging and exclusion, and racial/ethnic self-identification among multiracial Japanese European Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *12* (4), 673-686.

Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1989). *Counseling American minorities*: *A cross-cultural perspective*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Barringer, F. (1989, September 24). Mixed-race generation emerges but is not sure where it fits. *New York Times*, p. 22.

Benson, S. (1981). *Ambiguous ethnicity*: *Interracial families in London today*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Berry, J., Trimble, J., & Olmedo, E. (1986). Assessment of acculturation. In W. Lonner & J. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (pp. 291-324). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism*: *Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bourne, E. (1978). The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal (Part I). *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *7*, 223-255.

Bowles, D. D. (1993). Bi-racial identity: Children born to African-American and White couples. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *21*, 417-428.

Bracey, J. R., Bámaca, M. Y., & Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2004). Examining ethnic identity and self-esteem among biracial and monoracial adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *33*, 123-132.

Bradshaw, C. K. (1992). Beauty and the beast: On racial ambiguity. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 77-88). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Brandell, J. R. (1988). Treatment of the biracial child: Theoretical and clinical issues. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *16*, 176-187.

Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1988). On the nature of self-monitoring: Problems with

assessment, problems with validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 663-678.

Brody, H. (1984). Growing up in interracial families: Suggestions for single parents. *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin*, *15*(6), 12-15.

Brown, P. M. (1990). Biracial identity and social marginality. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *7*, 319-337.

Brown, N. G., & Douglass, R. E. (1996). Making the invisible visible: The growth of community network organizations. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial experience*: *Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 323-340). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Burke, P. J. (1980). The self: Measurement requirements from an interactionist perspective. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *43*, 18-29.

Cauce, A. M., Hiraga, Y., Mason, C., Aquilar, T., Ordonez, N., & Gonzales, N. (1992). *Between a rock and a hard place*: *Social adjustment of biracial youth*. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 207-222). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Charon, J. M. (2001). *Symbolic interactionism: An introduction, an interpretation, an integration* (7th ed.). Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chang, T. S. (1974). The self-concept of children of ethnically different marriages. *California Journal of Educational Research*, *25*, 245-252.

Coleman, V. H., & Carter, M. M. (2007). Biracial self-identification: Impact on trait anxiety, social anxiety, and depression. *Identity*, *7*, 103-114.

Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Costello, R. B. (Ed.). (1993). *The American Heritage College Dictionary* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World*, *20*, 13-27.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1978). The Cross and Thomas models of psychological nigrescence. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *5*, 13-19.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1987). A two-factory theory of Black identity: Implications for the study of identity development in minority children. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotherham (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp.

117-133). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of black*: *Diversity in African America identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Daniel, R. G. (1996). Black and White identity in the new millennium: Unsevering the ties that bind. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial experience*: *Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 121-139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Davis, F. J. (1991). *Who is Black? One nation's definition*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Demo, D, & Hughes, M. (1990). Socialization and racial identity among Black Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 53*, 364-374.

Demo, D., Small, S., & Savin-Williams, R. (1987). Family relations and the self-esteem of adolescents and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49*, 705-715.

Donovan, J. M. (1975). Identity status and interpersonal style. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4*, 37-55.

Edwards, L. M., & Pedrotti, J. T. (2004). Utilizing the strengths of our cultures: Therapy with biracial women and girls. *Women & Therapy, 27*, 33-43.

Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. *Psychological Issues, 1*, 1-171.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Faulkner, J. (1985). Women in interracial relationships. *Women & Therapy, 2*, 191-203.

Faulkner, J., & Kich, G. (1983). Assessment and engagement stages in therapy with the interracial family. *Family Therapy Collections, 6*, 78-90.

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 522-527.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison process. *Human Relations, 7*, 117-140.

Field, L. (1996). Piecing together the puzzle: Self-concept and group identity in biracial people in America Black/White youth. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial*

experience: *Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 211-226). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Franzoi, S. L. (2000). *Social Psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Gay, K. (1987). *The rainbow effect*: *Interracial families*. New York, NY: Franklin Watts.

Gibbs, J. T. (1973). Black students/White universities: Different expectations. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51*, 463-469.

Gibbs, J. T. (1985). City girls: Psychosocial adjustment of urban black adolescent females. *Scholastic Journal of Black Women, 2*, 28-36.

Gibbs, J. T. (1987). Identity and marginality: Issues in the treatment of biracial adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *57*, 265-278.

Gibbs, J. T. (1989). Biracial adolescents. In J. T. Gibbs & L. N. Huang (Eds.), *Children of color*: *Psychological interventions with minority youth* (pp. 322-350). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gibbs, J. T. (1990). Mental health issues of black adolescents: Implications for policy and practice. In A. R. Stiffman, & L. E. Davis (Eds.), *Ethnic issues in adolescent mental health* (pp. 21-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gibbs, J. T. (2003). Biracial and bicultural children and adolescents. In J. T. Gibbs, L. N. Huang, and Associates (Eds.), *Children of color*: *Psychological interventions with culturally diverse youth* (pp. 145-182). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gibbs, J. T., & Hines, A. M. (1992). Negotiating ethnic identity: Issues for Black-White adolescents. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 223-238). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gibbs, J. T., & Moskowitz-Sweet, G. (1991). Clinical and cultural issues in the treatment of biracial and bicultural adolescents. *Families in Society*: *The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 72*, 579-592.

Gillem, A. R., Cohn, L. R., & Throne, C. (2001). Black identity in biracial black/white people: A comparison of Jacqueline who refuses to be exclusive black and Adolphus who wishes he were. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *7*, 182-196.

Grove, K. J. (1991). Identity development in interracial Asian/White late adolescents: Must it be so problematic? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *20*, 617-628.

Gunthrope, W. W. (1998). *Skin color recognition, preference and identification in interracial children*: *A comparative study*. Lanham, MD: University Press of

America.

Hall, C. C. I. (1980). *The ethnic identity of racially mixed people*: *A study of Black-Japanese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hall, C. C. I. (1992). Please choose one: Ethnic identity choices for biracial individuals. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 250-264). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hall, C. C. I. & Turner, T. I. C. (2001). The diversity of biracial individuals: Asian-White and Asian-Minority biracial identity. In T. Williams-León & C. L. Nakashima (Eds.), *The sum of our parts*: *Mixed-heritage Asian Americans* (pp. 81-91). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hall, R. E. (2001). The Tiger Woods phenomenon: A note on biracial identity. *The Social Science Journal*, *38*, 333-336.

Harris, D. R., & Sim, J. J. (2002). Who is multiracial? Assessing the complexity of lived race. *American Sociological Review*, *67*, 614-627.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 511-524.

Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1992). *A race is a nice thing to have*: *A guide to being a white person or understanding the white persons in your life*. Topeka, KS: Content Communications.

Helms, J. E. (1994). The conceptualization of racial identity and other "racial" constructs. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity*: *Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 285-311). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helm'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* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Henriksen, R. C. Jr. (1997). Counseling mixed parentage individuals: A dilemma. *TCA Journal*, *25*, 68-74.

Henriksen, R. C. Jr. (2000). Black/White biracial identity development: A grounded theory study. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*: *Humanities and Social Sciences*, *61* (7A), 2605.

Henriksen, R. C. Jr., & Trusty, J. (2004). Understanding and assisting Black/White biracial women in their identity development. *Women & Therapy, 27*, 65-83.

Herring, R. D. (1995). Developing biracial ethnic identity: A review of the increasing dilemma. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 23*, 29-38.

Hitlin, S., Brown, J. S., Elder, G. H. Jr. (2006). Racial self-categorization in adolescence: Multiracial development and social pathways. *Child Development, 77*, 1298-1308.

Howard, J. A. (2000). Social psychology identities. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 367-393.

Hughes, M., & Demo, D. (1989). Self-perceptions of Black Americans: Self-esteem and personal efficacy. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*, 132-159.

Jackson, L. A., Hodge, C. N., Gerard, D. A., Ingram, J. M., Ervin, K. S., & Sheppard, L. A. (1996). Cognition, affect and behavior in the prediction of group attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 306-316.

Jacobs, J. H. (1978). Black/White interracial families: Marital process and identity development in young children. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 38*, 10-B. (University Microfilms No. 78-3173).

Jacobs, J. H. (1992). Identity development in biracial children. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 190-206). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Jenkins, A. H. (1982). *The psychology of the Afro-American*: *A humanistic approach*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Johnson, D. J. (1992). Developmental pathways: Toward an ecological theoretical formulation of race identity in Black-White biracial children. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 37-49). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Johnson, R. C., & Nagoshi, C. J. (1986). The adjustment of off-spring with group and interracial/intercultural marriages: A comparison of personality factor scores. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48*, 279-284.

Johnson, T. P., Jobe, J. B., O'Rourke, D., Sudman, S., Warnecke, R. B., Chavez, N., Chapa-Resendez, G., & Golden, P. (1997). Dimensions of self identification among multiracial and multiethnic respondents in survey interviews. *Evaluation Review, 21*, 671-687.

Kamptner, N. L. (1988). Identity development in late adolescence: Causal modeling of social and familial influences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 17*, 493-514.

Katz, P. A. (1983). Developmental foundations of gender and racial attitudes. In R. L. Leahy (Ed.), *The child's construction of social inequality* (pp. 41-78). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Keerdoja, E. (1984, November 19). Children of the rainbow: New parent support groups help interracial kids cope. *Newsweek*, pp. 120-122.

Kerwin, C. (1991). Racial identity development in biracial children of Black/White racial heritage. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*, 2469-A.

Kerwin, C., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1995). Biracial identity development: Theory and research. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (pp. 199-217). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Kerwin, C., Ponterotto, J. G., Jackson, B. L., & Harris, A. (1993). Racial identity in biracial children: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *40*, 221-231.

Keyes, C. L. M., & Ryff, C. D. (1998). Generativity in adult lives: Social structural contours and quality of life consequences. In D. P. McAdams & E. de St. Aubin (Eds.), *Generativity and adult development*: *How and why we care for the next generation* (pp. 227-263). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Khanna, N. (2004). The role of reflected appraisals in racial identity: The case of multiracial Asians. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *67*, 115-131.

Kich, G. K. (1982). *Eurasians*: *Ethnic/racial identity development of biracial Japanese/White adults*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wright Institute of Professional Psychology, Berkley, CA.

Kich, G. K. (1992). The developmental process of asserting a biracial, bicultural identity. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 304-317). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kinch, J. W. (1963). A formalized theory of the self-concept. *American Journal of Sociology*, *68*, 481-486.

Kinch, J. W. (1968). Experiments on factors related to self-concept change. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *74*, 251-258.

Kohatsu, E. L., & Richardson, T. Q. (1996). Racial and ethnic identity assessment. In L. A. Suzuki, P. J. Meller, & J. G. Ponterotto (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural assessment*: *Clinical, psychological, and educational applications* (pp. 611-650). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 395-412.

Lal, B. B. (1995). Symbolic interaction theories. *American Behavioral Scientist, 38*, 421-441.

Lee, R. M., & Davis, C. III. (2000). Cultural orientation, past multicultural experience, and a sense of belonging on campus for Asian American college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 110-115.

Lusk, E. M., Taylor, M. J., Nanney, J. T., & Austin, C. C. (2010). Biracial identity and its relation to self-esteem and depression in mixed black/white biracial individuals. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 19*, 109-126.

Lyles, M. R., Yancey, A., Grace, C. & Carter, J. H. (1985). Racial identity and self-esteem: Problems peculiar to bi-racial children. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24*, 150-153.

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3*, 551-558.

Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.

Marcia, J. E. (1983). Some directions for the investigation of ego development in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 3*, 215-223.

McAdams, D. P. (1994). *The Person: An Introduction to Personality Psychology*. (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.

McRoy, R. G., Zurcher, L. A., Landerdale, M. L. & Anderson, R. N. (1982). Self-esteem and racial identity in transracial and inracial adoptees. *Social Work, 27*, 522-526.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Meeus, W., Iedema, J., Helsen, M., & Vollebergh, W. (1999). Patterns of adolescent identity development: Review of literature and longitudinal analysis. *Developmental Review, 19*, 419-461.

Milan, S., & Keiley, M. K. (2000). Biracial youth and families in therapy: Issues and interventions. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 26*, 305-315.

Miller, R. L. (1992). The human ecology of multiracial identity. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 24-36). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miller, R., & Miller, B. (1990). Mothering the biracial child: Bridging the gaps between African-American and White parenting styles. *Women and Therapy, 10,* 169-180.

Milville, M. L. (2005). Psychological functioning and identity development of biracial people: A review of current theory and research. In R. T. Carter (Ed.), *Handbook of racial-cultural psychology and counseling* (pp. 295-319). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Morten, G., & Atkinson, D. R. (1983). Minority identity development and preference for counselor race. *Journal of Negro Education*, *52*, 156-161.

Murphy-Shigematsu, S. (1987). *The voices of amerasians*: *Ethnicity, identity, and empowerment in interracial Japanese Americans*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge.

Nakashima, C. L. (1992). An invisible monster: The creation and denial of mixed-race people in America. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 162-178). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Okazaki, S., & Sue, S. (1995). Methodological issues in assessment research with ethnic minorities. *Psychological Assessment, 7,* 367-375.

Ortega, S., Crutchfield, R., & Rushing, W. (1983). Race differences in elderly personal well-being. *Research on Aging, 5,* 101-118.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1981). The influence of Black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences for counselor's race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 250-257.

Pedrotti, J. T., Edwards, L. M., & Lopez, S. J. (2008). Working with multiracial clients in therapy: Building theory, research, and practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39* (2), 192-201.

Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *9*, 34-49.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 3*, 499-514.

Phinney, J. S. (1991). Ethnic identity and self-esteem: A review and integration. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science, 13*, 193-208.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.

Phinney, J. S. & Alipuria, L. L. (1990). Ethnic identity in college students from four ethnic groups. *Journal of Adolescence, 13* (2), 171-183.

Phinney, J. S., & Alipuria, L. L. (1996). At the interface of cultures: Multiethnic/multiracial high school and college students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136*, 139-158.

Phinney, J. S., Jacoby, B., & Silva, C. (2007). Positive intergroup attitudes: The role of ethnic identity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31* (5), 478-490.

Plummer, D. L. (1996). Black racial identity attitudes and stages of the life span: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Black Psychology, 22*, 169-181.

Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Stracuzzi, T., & Saya, R., Jr. (2003). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM): Psychometric review and further validity testing. *Educational Psychological Measurement, 63*(3), 502-515.

Poston, W. S. C. (1990). The biracial identity development model: A needed addition. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 152-155.

Porter, C. P. (1991). Social reasons for skin tone preferences of Black school-aged children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 61*, 149-154.

Poussaint, A. (1984). Study of interracial children presents positive picture. *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin, 15*, 9-10.

Ramirez, D. A. (1996). *Multiracial identity in a color-conscious world*. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial experience*: *Racial boarders as the new frontier* (pp. 499-562). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ramirez, M. (1999). *Multicultural psychotherapy: An approach to individual and cultural differences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*(3), 301-322.

Rockquemore, K. A. (1998). Between Black and White: Exploring the biracial experience. *Race and Society, 1*, 197-212.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2002). *Beyond black: Biracial identity in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Laszloffy, T. (2005). *Raising Biracial Children*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Root, M. P. P. (1990). Resolving "other" status: Identity development of biracial individuals. In L. S. Brown & M. P. P. Root (Eds.), *Diversity and complexity in feminist therapy* (pp. 185-205). Binghamton, NY: Haworth.

Root, M. P. P. (1992a). Back to the drawing board: Methodological issues in research on multiracial people. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 181-189). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Root, M. P. P. (1992b). Within, between, and beyond race. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 3-11). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Root, M. P. P. (1994). Mixed-race women. In L. Comas-Diaz and B. Greene (Eds.), *Women of color*: *Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy* (pp. 455-478). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Root, M. P. P. (1996). A bill of rights for racially mixed people. In M. P. P. (Ed.), *The multiracial experience*: *Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 3-14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Root, M. P. P. (1998). Experiences and processes affecting racial identity development: Preliminary results from the Biracial Sibling Project. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 4,* 237-247.

Root, M. P. P. (1999). The biracial baby boom: Understanding ecological constructions of racial identity in the 21st century. In R. H. Sheets & E. R. Hollins (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic identity in school practices*: *Aspects of Human Development* (pp. 67-89). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Root, M. P. P. (2001). *Love's revolution*: *Interracial marriage*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Root, M. P. P. (2002). Methodological issues in multiracial research. In G. C. Nagayama Hall & S. Okazaki (Eds.), *Asian American Psychology*: *The science of lives in context* (pp. 171-193). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Root, M. P. P., & Kelley, M. (Eds.). (2003). *The multiracial child resource book*. Seattle, WA: Mavin Foundation.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescents' self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Rosenthal, D., & Cichello, A. (1986). The meeting of two cultures: Ethnic identity and psychosocial adjustment of Italian-Australian adolescents. *International Journal of Psychology, 21,* 487-507.

Roth, W. D. (2005). The end of the one-drop rule? Labeling of multiracial children in black intermarriages. *Sociological Forum, 20,* 35-67.

Rotheram, M. J., & Phinney, J. S. (1987). Introduction: Definitions and perspectives in the study of children's ethnic socialization. In J. S. Phinney, & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 10-31). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ryff, C. D. (1989a). In the eye of the beholder: Views of psychological well-being among middle-aged and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *4*, 195-210.

Ryff, C. D. (1989b). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 1069-1081.

Ryff, C. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *4*, 99-104.

Saenz, R., Hwang, S., & Anderson, R. (1995). Persistence and change in Asian identity among children of intermarried couples. *Sociological Perspectives*, *38*, 175-194.

Salgado de Snyder, N., Lopez, C. M., & Padilla, A. M. (1982). Ethnic identity and cultural awareness among offspring of mixed interethnic marriages. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *2*, 277-282.

Sanchez, D. T., Shih, M., & Garcia, J. A. (2009). Juggling multiple racial identities: Malleable racial identification and psychological well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *15* (3), 243-254.

Santrock, J. W. (1997). *Life-span development*. (6th ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

Schaefer, R. T. (2002). *Racial and ethnic groups*: *Census 2000 Update* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relationships*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Sears, D. O. (1985). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 515-530.

Sebring, D. L. (1985). Considerations in counseling interracial children. *Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel Guidance, 13*, 3-9.

Shackford, K. (1984). Interracial children: Growing up healthy in an unhealthy society. *Interracial Books for Children*, *15*(6), 4-6.

Shih, M., & Sanchez, D. T. (2005). Perspectives and research on the positive and

negative implications of having multiple racial identities. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 569-591.

Smolowe, J. (1993). Intermarried. . . with children. *Time*, *142* (21), 64-65.

Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.

Snyder, M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 86-131). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities*: *The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York, NY: Freeman.

Snyder, M., & Simpson, J. A. (1984). Self-monitoring and dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 1281-1291.

Sommers, V. (1964). The impact of dual cultural membership on identity. *Psychiatry, 27*, 332-344.

Spencer, J. M. (1997). *The new colored people*: *The mixed-race movement in America*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Spencer, M. B., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1990). Challenges in studying minority youth. In S. S. Feldman & G. R. Elliott (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spencer, M. S., Icard, L. D., Harachi, T. W., Catalano, R. F., & Oxford, M. (2000). Ethnic identity among monoracial and multiracial early adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *20*, 365-387.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 613-629.

Steinberg, L. (1996). *Adolescence* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Stephan, C. W. (1991). Ethnic identity among mixed-heritage people in Hawaii. *Symbolic Interaction, 14*, 261-277.

Stephan, C. W. (1992). Mixed-heritage individuals: Ethnic identity and trait characteristics. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 50-63). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (1989). After intermarriage: Ethnic identity among mixed heritage Japanese-Americans and Hispanics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*, 507-519.

Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2000). The measurement of racial and ethnic identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *24*, 541-552.

Stone, G. (1990). Appearance and the self: A slightly revised version. In D. Brissett & C. Edgley (Ed.), *Life as theatre*: *A dramaturgical sourcebook* (2nd ed.) (pp. 141-162). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Stonequist, E. (1937). *The marginal man*: *A study in personality and cultural conflict*. New York: Russell & Russell.

Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *30*, 558-564.

Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic Interactionism*. Reading, MA: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sullivan, H. S. (1947). *Conceptions of modern psychiatry*. Washington, DC: W. H. White Psychiatric Foundation.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Suzuki-Crumly, J., & Hyers, L. L. (2004). The relationship among ethnic identity, psychological well-being, and intergroup competence: An investigation of two biracial groups. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *10(2)*, 137-150.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Teicher, J. (1968). Some observations on identity problems in children of Negro-white marriages. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *146*, 249-256.

Thornton, M. C. (1983). A social history of a multiethnic identity: The case of Black Japanese Americans (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan) UMI No. 8402386.

Tizard, B., & Phoenix, A. (1995). The identity of mixed parentage adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *36*, 1399-1410.

Toder, N., & Marcia, J. E. (1973). Ego identity status and response to conformity pressure in college women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *26*, 287-294.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1985). *Statistical abstract of the United States*: 1985 (105th ed.). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2000). *Statistical abstract of the United States*: 2000 (108th ed.). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Uyeki, E. S. (1960). Correlates of ethnic identification. *American Journal of Sociology, 65*, 468-474.

Waterman, A. S. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. *Developmental Psychology, 18*, 341-358.

White, C. L., & Burke, P. J. (1987). Ethnic role identity among black and white college students: An interactionist approach. *Sociological Perspectives, 30*, 310-331.

Wicklund, R. A., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1982). *Symbolic self-completion*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Williams, T. K. (1992). Prism lives: Identity of binational Amerasians. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 280-303). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wilson, T. (1992). Blood quantum: Native American mixed-bloods. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 108-125). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wolfe, C. T., & Spencer, S. J. (1996). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their overt and subtle influence in the classroom. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 176-185.

APPENDIX A

Questions and Hypotheses

Question 1: How do the rules of hypodescent (i.e., one-drop rule) impact the way in which biracial individuals identify? *Biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent are more likely to identify as Singular than as Border, Protean, or Transcendent (H_{o1}).*

Question 2: How does one's physical resemblance to a racial group relate to the way in which biracial individuals identify? *Biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent are more likely to identify as Singular the more they perceive themselves to physically resemble one racial group (H_{o2}).*

Question 3: How does the personality trait self-monitoring predict the way in which biracial individuals identify? *Biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify themselves as Protean will have higher self-monitoring scores than biracial individuals who identify as Singular, Border, or Transcendent (H_{o3}).*

Question 4: How does exposure to cultural experiences (e.g., environment and social interactions) impact the racial identity development of biracial individuals? *A high degree of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences predicts a high level of racial identity development among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o4}).*

Question 5: What is the relationship between one's level of racial identity development and how biracial individuals identify? *Biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify as Singular will have a higher level of racial identity development than those who identify as Border, Protean, or Transcendent (H_{o5}).*

Question 6: How does exposure to cultural experiences (e.g., environment and social interactions) impact the way in which biracial individuals identify? *Biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent who identify as Border or Protean will report a higher level of cultural exposure and multicultural experiences than those who identify as Singular or Transcendent (H_{o6}).*

Question 7: What is the relationship between racial identity development and self-esteem among biracial individuals? *A high level of racial identity development best predicts a high level of self-esteem among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o7}).*

Question 8: What is the relationship between racial identity development and psychological well-being among biracial individuals? *A high level of racial identity development best predicts a high level of psychological well-being among biracial individuals of non-White/non-White descent (H_{o8}).*

APPENDIX B

Marquette University Agreement of Consent for Research Participants

I have been invited to participate in this research study. Before I agree to participate, it is important that I read and understand the following information:

I understand that the purpose of this research study is to examine various factors (e.g., physical appearance, racial identification, cultural experiences, personal reactions, psychological adjustment, experiences with racism) thought to influence the identity development and well-being of biracial individuals who are of different racial group combinations (e.g., African American/Caucasian, African American/Asian, Latino/Asian, etc.).

I understand that my participation will consist of answering questions on a web-based survey that will take approximately 30 – 35 minutes to complete in one session. After reading this online consent form in its entirety, I will be directed to the survey questions.

I understand that there are minimal risks associated with participating in this study. A majority of the questions pertain to experiences associated with my race and may be considered personal and/or sensitive in nature. I may experience some temporary emotional discomfort; however, I understand that participating in this study is completely voluntary and that I may skip any questions I do not feel comfortable answering and/or exit the survey's website at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

Although there are no direct benefits to me, I understand that a possible benefit of my participation in the study is my contribution in advancing the scientific literature and understanding of biracial identity development.

I understand that my responses to the survey will be kept confidential. My email address will be stored separately from my responses in order to register my completion of the survey and be used in the lottery. The results of this study may be published and/or presented at conferences; however, my name or any other identifying information will not be included in any written materials because all of the results will be presented as group summaries. I understand I will be one of approximately 350 participants in this research study.

I understand that after exiting the survey, I may chose to have my email address entered in a lottery in order to receive one of four monetary awards (one $125, one $100 prize, one $75 and one $50 prize).

All of my questions about this study have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that if I later have additional questions or concerns regarding this project, I can post them in the comments section at the end of the survey, contact Kizzie P. Walker at

(414) 288-0619 or kizzie.walker@mu.edu or Dr. Stephen Franzoi, Professor of Psychology at Marquette University at stephen.franzoi@mu.edu If I have questions or concerns about my rights as a research participant, I can contact Marquette University's Office of Research Compliance at (414) 288-1479.

I am at least 18 years old.

- YES
- NO

I acknowledge that I have read the information above and understand the nature of this study.

- Yes, I agree with the above consent form and will participate in the study.
- No, I do not agree with the above consent form and will not participate in the study.

APPENDIX C

Biracial Identification

Part I – To what degree do each of the following statements best describe you?

Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I only identify with one of these racial groups. I identify with one of my parent's racial groups over the other.

[ ] extremely characteristic (very much like me)
[ ] characteristic (somewhat like me)
[ ] neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic
[ ] uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)
[ ] extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)

Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I consider myself to be a combination of my parents' racial groups and identify as biracial. I can't pick one over the other group because I'm part of both.

[ ] extremely characteristic (very much like me)
[ ] characteristic (somewhat like me)
[ ] neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic
[ ] uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)
[ ] extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)

Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I sometimes identify with my mother's racial group, sometimes my father's racial group, and sometimes biracial because it depends upon my current surroundings, who I am with and what I am doing.

[ ] extremely characteristic (very much like me)
[ ] characteristic (somewhat like me)
[ ] neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic
[ ] uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)
[ ] extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)

Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I identify as a human being without thought to my parent's racial group(s). I do not place a lot of emphasis on my racial background.

[ ] extremely characteristic (very much like me)
[ ] characteristic (somewhat like me)
[ ] neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic
[ ] uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)
[ ] extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)

Part II – If you only could only choose one, which of the following statements best describes you?

[ ] Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I only identify with one of these racial groups. I identify with one of my parent's racial groups over the other.

[ ] Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I consider myself to be a combination of my parents' racial groups and identify as biracial. I can't pick one or the other group because I'm part of both.

[ ] Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I sometimes identify with my mother's racial group, sometimes my father's racial group, and sometimes biracial because it depends upon my current surroundings, who I am with and what I am doing.

[ ] Even though my parents belong to two different racial groups, I identify as a human being without thought to my parent's racial group(s). I do not place a lot of emphasis on my racial background.

APPENDIX D

Physical Appearance

I physically resemble my…

[ ] Biological Mother
[ ] Biological Father
[ ] Biological Mother and Biological Father
[ ] Other (please specify)_____

To what degree do you physically resemble the racial groups listed below…

American Indian/Alaskan Native

[ ] Not At All
[ ] Very Little
[ ] Somewhat
[ ] To A Great Extent

Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander

[ ] Not At All
[ ] Very Little
[ ] Somewhat
[ ] To A Great Extent

Black/African American, not Hispanic or Latino

[ ] Not At All
[ ] Very Little
[ ] Somewhat
[ ] To A Great Extent

Latino/Hispanic, not White

[ ] Not At All
[ ] Very Little
[ ] Somewhat
[ ] To A Great Extent

White/Caucasian/European American

[ ] Not At All
[ ] Very Little
[ ] Somewhat
[ ] To A Great Extent

Other (please specify)_____

[ ] Not At All
[ ] Very Little
[ ] Somewhat
[ ] To A Great Extent

APPENDIX E

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or *racial groups* that people come from. Some examples of the names of the racial groups are Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, American Indian, and White. Every person is born into a racial group, or sometimes two groups, but people differ on how important their *race* is to them, how they feel about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your racial group and how you feel about it and react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of racial group(s), I consider myself to be _____

Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

4: Strongly agree 3: Somewhat agree 2: Somewhat disagree 1: Strongly disagree

	4	**3**	**2**	**1**
1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own racial group(s), such as its history, traditions, and customs.	❑	❑	❑	❑
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own racial group(s).	❑	❑	❑	❑
3. I have a clear sense of my racial background(s) and what it means for me.	❑	❑	❑	❑
4. I like meeting and getting to know people from racial groups other than my own.	❑	❑	❑	❑
5. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my racial group membership(s).	❑	❑	❑	❑
6. I am happy that I am a member of the group(s) I belong to.	❑	❑	❑	❑
7. I sometimes feel it would be better if different racial groups didn't try to mix together.	❑	❑	❑	❑
8. I am not very clear about the role of my race in my life.	❑	❑	❑	❑
9. I often spend time with people from racial groups other than my own.	❑	❑	❑	❑
10. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my racial group(s).	❑	❑	❑	❑

11. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own racial group(s). ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

12. I understand pretty well what my racial group membership(s) means to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group(s) and other groups. ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

13. In order to learn more about my racial background(s), I have often talked to other people about my racial group(s). ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

14. I have a lot of pride in my racial group(s) and its accomplishments. ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

15. I don't try to become friends with people from other racial groups. ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

16. I participate in cultural practices of my own group(s), such as special food, music, or customs. ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

17. I am involved in activities with people from other racial groups. ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

18. I feel a strong attachment towards my own racial group(s). ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

19. I enjoy being around people from racial groups other than my own. ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

20. I feel good about my cultural or racial backgrounds(s). ❑ ❑ ❑ ❑

APPENDIX F

Multicultural Experience Inventory

Next to each item, circle the number of the response that best describes your past and present behavior.

1 = almost entirely my racial group
2 = mostly my racial group with a few people of color from other groups
3 = mixed (my racial group, whites, and other minorities, about equally)
4 = mostly whites with a few people of color
5 = almost entirely whites

1. The racial composition of the neighborhoods in which I lived

1	2	3	4	5	(a) before I started attending school
1	2	3	4	5	(b) while I attended elementary school
1	2	3	4	5	(c) while I attended middle school
1	2	3	4	5	(d) while I attended high school
1	2	3	4	5	2. My childhood friends who visited my home and related well to my parents were of…
1	2	3	4	5	3. The teachers and counselors with whom I have had the closest relationships have been of…
1	2	3	4	5	4. The people who have most influenced me in my education have been of…
1	2	3	4	5	5. In high school, my close friends were of…
1	2	3	4	5	6. The racial backgrounds of the people I have dated have been of…
1	2	3	4	5	7. In the job(s) I have had, my close friends have been of…
1	2	3	4	5	8. The people with whom I have established close, meaningful relationships have been of…
1	2	3	4	5	9. At present, my close friends are of…
1	2	3	4	5	10. My close friends at work were (are) of…
1	2	3	4	5	11. I enjoy going to gatherings at which the people are of…
1	2	3	4	5	12. When I study or work on a project with others, I am usually with persons of…

1 2 3 4 5 13. When I am involved in group discussions where I am expected to participate, I prefer a group of people of…

1 2 3 4 5 14. I am active in organizations or social groups in which the majority of the members are of…

1 2 3 4 5 15. When I am with my friends, I usually attend functions where people are of…

1 2 3 4 5 16. When I discuss personal problems or issues, I discuss them with people of…

1 2 3 4 5 17. I most often spend time with people who are of…

Next to each item below, circle the number that bests describes you.

1 = Extensively
2 = Frequently
3 = Occasionally
4 = Seldom
5 = Never

1 2 3 4 5 18. I attend functions which are predominantly white in nature.

1 2 3 4 5 19. I attend functions which are predominantly of minority groups other than my own.

1 2 3 4 5 20. I attend functions which are predominantly of my own racial group in nature.

1 2 3 4 5 21. I visit the homes of whites.

1 2 3 4 5 22. I invite whites to my home.

1 2 3 4 5 23. I visit the homes of persons of my racial group (other than relatives).

1 2 3 4 5 24. I invite persons of my racial group (other than relatives) to my home.

1 2 3 4 5 25. I visit the homes of minorities other than my own racial group.

1 2 3 4 5 26. I invite persons of minorities other than those of my own racial group to my home.

APPENDIX G

Self-Monitoring Scale

The statements below concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before indicating how each statement applies to you using the following response scale:

1 = not usually true
2 = false
3 = true
4 = mostly true

_____ 1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.

_____ 2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.

_____ 3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.

_____ 4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.

_____ 5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.

_____ 6. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.

_____ 7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.

_____ 8. I would probably make a good actor.

_____ 9. I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.

_____ 10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.

_____ 11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.

_____ 12. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.

_____ 13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.

_____ 14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.

_____ 15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.

_____ 17. I'm not always the person I appear to be.

_____ 18. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

_____ 19. I have considered being an entertainer.

_____ 20. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

_____ 21. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.

_____ 22. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

_____ 23. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

_____ 24. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite so well as I should.

_____ 25. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

_____ 26. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

APPENDIX H

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Read each item below and then indicate how well each statement describes you using the following response scale:

0 = extremely uncharacteristic (not at all like me)
1 = uncharacteristic (somewhat unlike me)
2 = neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic
3 = characteristic (somewhat like me)
4 = extremely characteristic (very much like me)

_____ 1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

_____ 2. At times I think I am no good at all.

_____ 3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

_____ 4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

_____ 5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

_____ 6. I certainly feel useless at times.

_____ 7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

_____ 8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

_____ 9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

_____ 10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

APPENDIX I

Psychological Well-Being Scale

Please read each statement below and circle the number that best corresponds to the degree to which you agree with the statement as self-descriptive for you.

1. I like most parts of my personality.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

2. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Some people wander aimlessly through life, I am not one of them.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

4. The demands of life often get me down.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

7. When I look at my life story, I am pleased with how things have turned out so far.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how I think about myself and the world.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I live one day at a time and don't really think about the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

10. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

11. I have confidence in my own opinions, even if they are different from the way most people think.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

12. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

13. In many ways I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

14. I gave up trying to make big improvements in my life a long time ago.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

15. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in my life.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

16. I am good at managing the responsibilities of daily life.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

17. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

18. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

APPENDIX J

Demographic and Racial Self-Identification Information

Gender Age _____

[ ] Male [ ] Female

I racially classify myself as…

[ ] American Indian/Alaskan Native
[ ] Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander
[ ] Black/African American, not Hispanic or Latino
[ ] Latino/Hispanic, not White
[ ] White/Caucasian/European American
[ ] Biracial (please specify)_____
[ ] Other (please specify)_____

My biological Father's race is…

[ ] American Indian/Alaskan Native
[ ] Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander
[ ] Black/African American, not Hispanic or Latino
[ ] Latino/Hispanic, not White
[ ] White/Caucasian/European American
[ ] Biracial (please specify)_____
[ ] Other (please specify)_____

Father's Place of Birth (State/Country) _____

My biological Mother's race is…

[ ] American Indian/Alaskan Native
[ ] Asian/Asian American or Pacific Islander
[ ] Black/African American, not Hispanic or Latino
[ ] Latino/Hispanic, not White
[ ] White/Caucasian/European American
[ ] Biracial (please specify)_____
[ ] Other (please specify)_____

Mother's Place of Birth (State/Country) _____

Marital status of biological parents:

[ ] Never married
[ ] Married
[ ] Separated when I was _____ years old
[ ] Divorced when I was _____ years old

I was raised by my…

[ ] Biological Mother and Biological Father
[ ] Biological Mother and Step-Father
[ ] Biological Father and Step-Mother
[ ] Single Parent a. [ ] Mother b. [ ] Father
[ ] Adopted
[ ] Other (please specify relationship & the race (s) of the persons who raised you)

Please indicate the highest levels of education for the following:

	You	Mother	Father
Completed Graduate/Professional school	❑	❑	❑
Some Graduate/Professional school	❑	❑	❑
Completed 4-yr college	❑	❑	❑
Completed 2-yr college	❑	❑	❑
Trade/Vocational school	❑	❑	❑
Some college	❑	❑	❑
Completed high school or GED	❑	❑	❑
Some high school	❑	❑	❑
Completed 7^{th} grade	❑	❑	❑
Less than 7^{th} grade	❑	❑	❑

What is your place of birth? (State/Country) _____

How many years have you lived in the United States? _____

Have you lived in a country other than the United States?

[ ] Yes. Which country(ies)? _____For how many years? _____
[ ] No

Have you lived in a state other than the one in which you attend school?

[ ] Yes. Which state(s)? _____For how many years? _____
[ ] No

What language(s) does (did) your father speak?_____

What language(s) does (did) your mother speak?_____

What language(s) does (did) your parents speak at home?_____

What language(s) does (did) you speak?_____

What is your marital status?

[ ] Single
[ ] Married
[ ] Separated
[ ] Divorced

APPENDIX K

Debriefing Statement / Follow-up questions / Thank you

You have reached the end of the survey. Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study!

The main purpose of the current study was to look at how biracial individuals, from various racial group combinations, racially identify and whether certain factors (e.g., physical appearance, cultural experiences, personal reactions) play a role in this process. We were also interested in the psychological adjustment of biracial individuals and whether or not experiences with racism played a role.

If you have any questions and/or comments regarding this study, please feel free to write them in the comments box below. Now that you have reached the end of the survey, click on the DONE below in order to be redirected to another survey to answer follow-up questions and provide information for the lottery.

This survey is completely separate from your previous responses. There is no way to connect your responses to your email address.

How did you hear about this study? (Check all that apply)

a. Family member(s)
b. Friend(s)
c. College/University student cultural organization
d. Biracial/Multiracial website(s)
e. Email listserv
f. Other_____

Would you like to receive a summary of the study's findings?

a. Yes
b. No

Would you like to have your email address entered in a lottery in order to receive one of four monetary awards (one $125, one $100 prize, one $75 and one $50 prize)?

a. Yes, I would like to be entered in the lottery
b. No, I would not like to be entered in the lottery.

Please provide your email address _____

Again, your responses will remain anonymous and your email address will be used for the lottery and if you want a summary of the study's findings. Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. Once you exit the survey, you will be redirected to SurveyMonkey's homepage.

If you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact Kizzie P. Walker at (414) 288-0619 or kizzie.walker@mu.edu or Dr. Stephen Franzoi, Professor of Psychology at Marquette University at stephen.franzoi@mu.edu If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you can contact Marquette University's Office of Research Compliance at (414) 288-1479.