ETHNIC IDENTITY MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION*

Peter J. Burke
Department of Sociology
University of California, Riverside

Michael M. Harrod
Department of Sociology
Central Washington University

Abstract

We show how identity theory can provide a coherent theoretical framework for understanding people's ethnic identity meanings and behavior across an ethnically diverse sample. Using a mixed-methods approach, we developed measures of respondents' ethnic identity that reveal two separate though related dimensions of meaning that are relevant for all respondents. One of these is oriented toward ethnic group membership focused on the heritage and traditions of members. The other is oriented toward ethnic role behavior, more role focused on the performances that maintain and display one's ethnic identity. We examine how respondents' level of knowledge and certainty of their ethnicity, as well as generation in the U.S., influence the difficulty respondents report verifying their ethnic identity. Results show identity theory is well positioned to understand respondents' ethnic identity and the difficulties they experience. In addition, we provide a theoretical explanation for why respondents feel uneasy when their ethnic identity claims are not accepted by others.

Introduction

The social psychological components of actors' racial/ethnic[1] identity represent a fertile, but heretofore largely under theorized, component of both the race/ethnicity and social psychological literatures. Within this paper we move toward strengthening both traditions by highlighting what each offers the other. To date, a considerable amount of the race/ethnicity literature has focused on how large-scale factors such as immigration patterns, ethnic replenishment, discrimination and assimilation affect actors (Jimenez 2008; Lee and Bean 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Waters and Jimenez 2005). However, this literature has been remiss to fully address the internal aspects of one's ethnic identity and provide a coherent theoretical approach across studies.

The social psychological literature, on the other hand, has faced the opposite problem; considerable attention has been given to the internalized functioning of identities, but suffers from a paucity of effort to understand potential racial/ethnic differences. Hunt and colleagues (Hunt et al. 2000) argue that the dearth of social psychological theory and research investigating possible racial/ethnic differences implicitly assumes the theories are invariant to racial/ethnic differences. However, as scholars of race/ethnicity have clearly shown, the foundational place that racial/ethnic meaning holds within American society makes this an assumption in need of exploration (Harris and Sim 2002; Lee and Bean 2004; Waters 1990; Waters and Jimenez 2005).

This oversight is even more conspicuous when considering the overarching salience that race/ethnicity plays in society, where race/ethnicity is argued to represent a "master status" influencing most other identities an individual holds and it influences how others treat the

---

[1] The terms race, race/ethnicity, and ethnicity will be used interchangeably throughout this paper. Nevertheless we recognize that race and ethnicity are sometimes conceptualized as separate and/or overlapping concepts. We have chosen to follow recent scholarship arguing that distinguishing between these terms fails to account for respondents' lived experiences (Brown, Hitlin and Elder 2006; Cornell and Hartmann 2007; Hitlin, Brown and Elder 2007; Lee and Bean 2004; Wimmer 2008).

individual (Lacy 2007; Stryker 1980; Waters 1990). Moreover, it is argued that a decisive component of American culture includes a meaning system where race and ethnicity act as central organizing principles within American society (Omi and Winant 1994). These differences are associated with the stratification system, with those of European descent generally being favored. The effect is that some groups (e.g. Whites) have been afforded greater rights, better treatment and more privileges than other groups (e.g. African Americans or Latinos) (Bean and Stevens 2005; Bonilla-Silva 1997; Nagel 1994; Pager and Shepherd 2008).

The research reported here allows us to begin addressing both limitations. Viewing persons' ethnic identity from an identity theory perspective provides a theoretical explanation of the internal dynamics of how one's racial/ethnic identity enactment, maintenance and action unfolds, which informs the racial/ethnic identity literature. It also allows us to begin exploring how members of different racial/ethnic groups understand and enact their ethnic identity. As such, it is an opportunity to evaluate how well identity theory functions across different racial/ethnic groups. In this way, it allows us to examine the heretofore untested assumption that identity theory's theoretical predictions work equally well regardless of one's racial/ethnic background. A third goal of this research is to more deeply explore a social or group-based identity instead of a role or person-based identity, in this case one's racial/ethnic identity. To date, most of the empirical work of identity theory has focused on the role and person bases of identity. We seek to broaden this scope and application by empirically evaluating a social or group-based identity (Burke and Stets 1999; Stets and Burke 1994; Stryker and Serpe 1994). We begin with a brief review of the theoretical orientation employed.

<center>**THEORY**</center>

Identity Theory

Identity theory traces its roots to the structural symbolic interactionist framework emphasizing how people acquire and internalize self-meanings, in the form of identities, from their statuses, social groups and positions within the social structure (Burke and Stets 2009; Stryker 1980, 1982). According to identity theory, persons develop of a sense of self that is intricately tied to society. Holding a role or being in a social group leads one to internalize the meanings and expectations for oneself that, in turn, come to inform both the individual and others who the individual is. Following these roots, identity theory argues that actors derive self-relevant meanings by taking the self as an object as others would see him/her. Through this self-reflective process, an individual acquires definitions of the self by looking at oneself as a social object as others see the self (Cooley 1964 [1902]; Mead 1934).

Building on structural symbolic interaction theory, identity theory argues that people have internalized what it means to be a member of their ethnic/racial group. These identity meanings guide the type of behaviors one undertakes to be consistent with those self-meanings. Enacting identity behaviors consistent with the actor's identity comes to illustrate to self and others that these behaviors reflect what it means to hold the enacted identity. It is this process that encompasses one of identity theory's central tenets: meanings are manifest in behavior and practices (Burke and Stets 2009).

Identity Control Process

Identity theory provides an in-depth explanation of the multifaceted nature of an individual's identities ranging from how identities are organized, regulated and maintained to how they change and the subsequent implications for one's psychological well-being (Burke and Stets

<center>3</center>

2009). An identity is a set of meanings, held in the identity standard, that define the individual –
what it means to be, for example, a teacher (role identity) or a Latino (group or category
identity), or a person with integrity (person identity) (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum 1957). A
core aspect of identity theory is identity verification, the idea that people seek to have others
view them in terms of the same meanings as they see themselves (Burke 1991; Burke and Stets
2009). To achieve identity verification, people act to control their perception of identity relevant
meanings in the situation to match the meanings in their identity standard -- a perceptual control
system (Burke and Cast 1997b; Burke and Stets 2009; Powers 1973; Stets and Burke 2014b).

Self-meanings are held in an "identity standard" that serves as the referent for the individual
guiding her/his perceptions. When an identity is activated in a situation, the identity becomes
engaged in a feedback loop comprised of four main parts: 1) the *identity standard* (the meanings
one holds for an identity); 2) perceptual *input* of self-relevant meanings from the situation (i.e.
one's perceptions of the meaningful feedback that the self obtains from others in a situation); 3) a
comparator which compares a person's perceptions of meanings in a situation with one's
identity standard; and 4) the *output* (i.e. one's behavior) to the environment as a result of how
one thinks others see the him/herself in the situation (Burke 1991).

Once an identity is activated, people monitor perceived meanings in the situation (how things
are). The comparator receives these perceived meanings and compares them to the meanings in
the identity standard (how things are supposed to be). When the perceived meanings within in
the situation match one's identity standard, this is identity verification, which produces positive
emotions as well as increased feelings of self-worth and self-efficacy (Burke and Stets 1999;
Burke and Harrod 2005; Cast and Burke 2002; Stets and Burke 2014b). But when there is a
discrepancy between the perceived meanings from the situation and the meanings in the identity

standard, this is identity non-verification, which triggers negative emotions, distress and decreased self-esteem. As a consequence, people act to change meanings in the situation to reduce the discrepancy and make them match their identity standard.

Ethnic Identity

People come to define themselves or derive self-meanings from the positions and groups they identify with (Deaux and Martin 2003; Rosenberg 1979; Stets and Burke 2000; Stryker 1980). The culturally shared meanings held within an actor's identity standard for a social or group-based identity is expressed by one's actions and interpreted by others who react towards the person's actions (Alba 1990; Brown and Lesane-Brown 2006; Hitlin, Brown, and Elder 2007; Hogg 2018; Jimenez 2004, 2008; Lee and Bean 2007). The internalized amalgam of a group's cultural meanings and one's own idiosyncratic meanings composes one's ethnic identity standard. Social categories define group members' group-based identity by 1) defining group boundaries where some are categorized as "in-group" members while others are defined as "out-group" members and 2) constructing group norms for appropriate expressions of social group meanings that are internalized as part of an individual's identity standard (Brown, Hitlin, and Elder 2006; Brown and Lesane-Brown 2006; Hitlin, Brown, and Elder 2007; Hogg 2018; Jimenez 2004; Lee and Bean 2007).

Seeing oneself and being seen by others as a group member is especially important for social or group-based identities because the behaviors and rituals related to membership in an ethnic group distinguish group members from non-members and "define an ethnic uniqueness worth maintaining" for the individual (Alba 1990:84; Jimenez 2008; Stets and Burke 2000). Therefore, these actions, practices, and behaviors are understood from an identity theory perspective as the *observable manifestations* of the self-meanings people continually regulate as part of their

5

racial/ethnic identity. This is where the race/ethnicity and social psychological literatures intersect. One learns, understands, and hones their ethnic identity from interacting with other in-group and out-group members and these meanings become internalized as part of the actor's ethnic identity.

While one's group identification is critical, it is not the only way someone is identified as part of a group. Another important aspect of one's ethnic identity development is how someone is viewed and treated by others as belonging or not belonging to a group (Frank, Redstone, and Lu 2010; Jimenez 2004, 2008; Khanna 2004, 2010; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Waters 1999). For example, Waters (1999) discusses how West Indian immigrants and their children actively resist efforts by others to see and treat them as African Americans. Waters' respondents highlighted that being seen and treated as an African American is tied to negative stereotypes and leads to poor treatment from others; identification as a West Indian, on the other hand, is linked to positive stereotypes (e.g., being hard working) and results in better treatment from others. Membership or identification with a particular group, however, does not mean that there is only *one* ethnic experience. Based on an individual's own experience and position within the group, s/he may choose to emphasize certain aspects of the group's general meanings and/or other members of the group may impose boundaries on the actor shaping the final composition of his/her unique ethnic identity standard (Deaux and Martin 2003; Jimenez 2004, 2008).

An important manner by which people come to develop their racial/ethnic identity is by determining the symbolic boundaries of how their group is similar to, and different from, other racial/ethnic groups (Howard 2000; Jimenez 2008; Phinney 2006; Reid and Hogg 2005). Group norms define the group's essential meanings, which, in turn, inform group members of what characteristics, feelings, and behaviors are appropriate to exhibit as a member of an ethnic group.

6

Individual group members then adopt these norms and meanings to fit in as part of their ethnic identity. Opportunities to enact and perform one's ethnic identity are important dimension of having the identity (Burke and Stets 2009; Deaux and Martin 2003). However, as Jimenez (2008) illustrates, with an influx of first generation immigrants, termed ethnic replenishment, second and later generation persons occasionally struggle to enact their ethnic identity in ways considered authentic by more recent immigrants. For example, Jimenez (2008) notes for Mexican-Americans that authentic identity performances are characterized by things such as: knowledge of Mexican history and the ability to speak Spanish. Poor performance on these tasks is taken as "evidence" that someone is not truly Mexican American. Jimenez discusses that some respondents avoid certain locations to prevent having their authenticity as a Mexican American challenged.

The race/ethnicity literature interestingly shows that when one's racial/ethnic membership is challenged, people's actions and feelings mirror the predictions of identity theory concerning people's feelings and action when they experience identity non-verification (Burke 1991; Burke and Cast 1997a; Burke and Harrod 2005). Several studies within the racial/ethnic literature highlight the negative feelings and actions people experience when their ethnic identity is not accepted by others (Jimenez 2004; Khanna 2004, 2010; Waters 1999). Waters (1999) example of the various activities in which West Indian immigrants engage to not be identified as African Americans illustrates this point well. These examples are consistent with identity theory's prediction that actors want others to see them as they see themselves (i.e. identity verification). And when perceptions during interaction fail to match their self-view, the actor takes actions such as avoiding locations where his/her identity is questioned. Linkages such as this between the race/ethnicity and social psychological literatures bolster our attempt to illuminate identity

theory's applicability for understanding people's racial/ethnic identity enactment as well as augmenting identity theory's broader applicability.

Despite the extensive and insightful research tradition of race/ethnicity, there have been few efforts to quantitatively measure ethnic identity. The few attempts to do so come largely from psychology, rather than sociology. Moreover, the disparate definitions and measures of ethnic identity in the literature have complicated efforts to draw general conclusions (Phinney 1990). Ethnic identity has been conceptualized in a myriad of ways such as: feelings of belonging and commitment (Singh 1977; Ting-Toomey 1981), a sense of shared values and attitudes (White and Burke 1987), cultural knowledge (Alba 1990), and language and behaviors (Alba 1990; Jimenez 2008; Khanna 2004; Rogler, Cooney, and Ortiz 1980; Waters 1990). In an effort to move toward some level of agreement among researchers studying ethnic identity, Phinney emphasized that there needs to be more "focus on the *common elements* that apply to groups" (Phinney 1990:499, emphasis added). Phinney developed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) scale to assess the common dimensions of meaning shared across different groups (Phinney 1992). However, it is unclear that there is a theoretical underpinning for the development of the 20 items comprising the MEIM scale. The MEIM uses a mixture of one's feelings for one's own group and other ethnic groups, the degree of clarity in one's ethnic background, and the respondent's ethnic practices and behaviors.

More recently, the MEIM scale was revised drawing on Erikson's (1968) work on identity development and achievement. The revision focuses on the respondents' sense of ethnic identity exploration (e.g. reading or learning cultural practices) and commitment—factors believed to be germane to the development of one's ethnic identity (Phinney and Ong 2007). This recent revision emphasizes a perspective in which ethnic identity begins in childhood and is refined

through early adulthood until becoming fairly stable. However, the revision has focused its attention on development in the beginning stages of one's life-course and has foregone the more holistic conceptualization of ethnic identity found in the original MEIM scale.

Following the principles of identity theory, we developed measures of respondents' ethnic identity taking into consideration the recent revisions of the current MEIM. Our questions focus on examining the meanings, expectations, and behaviors one has regarding his/her ethnic identity. These measures also represent a complement to the more recent MEIM scale in that the resulting scale focuses our understanding of ethnic identity in those areas that Phinney and colleagues suggest should be stable.

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

We explore two aspects of ethnic identity informed by identity theory. First, we explore the meanings of one's ethnic identity as manifest in various practices and behaviors to construct measures of ethnic identity useful for different race/ethnic groups across several immigrant generations. We also explore variations in ethnic identity across ethnic groups and generations in the U.S. Additionally, we examine how the identity verification process operates for a social or group-based identity like one's ethnic identity rather than a role or person identity as most prior work as explored; and we examine the negative impact of nonverification on the three components of self-esteem and whether that varies across ethnic groups and generation (Stets and Burke 2014a). We discuss each question in turn below.

Race/ethnicity, in part, defines one's position within the social matrices of American society, where one is afforded differential resources, status and prestige (Bonilla-Silva 1997, 2003; Hill Collins 2000; Krysan and Bader 2009; Pager and Shepherd 2008). This is consistent with prior identity theory research finding one's ability to access resources and status affects one's ability

9

to achieve identity verification (Burke 2008; Cast, Stets, and Burke 1999; Stets and Harrod 2004; Stets and Cast 2007). For example, researchers have begun explicating how amount of skin color pigmentation differentially affects how people of color are treated in the U.S. (Bean and Stevens 2005; Frank, Redstone, and Lu 2010). For example, Bean and Stevens (2005) find that light skinned immigrants have an easier time incorporating into American society than immigrants with darker skin. Because racial/ethnic minority groups have historically been accorded fewer resources, and are viewed as having fewer resources, we expect minority members will experience greater difficulty verifying their identities.

Thus, we argue that being a member of a racial/ethnic minority group generally results in having fewer resources, and because of this, racial/ethnic minorities should experience greater difficulty verifying their ethnic identity. Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

H1: Members of racial/ethnic minority groups will experience greater difficulty verifying their ethnic identity than Whites.

We also expect generational status to affect the ability of individuals to verify their ethnic identity (Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, and Waters 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006). Researchers argue that the straight-line assimilation of the pre-1965 immigrants, who were largely European, does not reflect the experiences of these more recent, largely non-European, immigrants. Instead, as Portes and Rumbaut (2006) point out, the children of racial/ethnic minority immigrants tend to selectively choose from mainstream society making past approaches less applicable to current conditions. Generational status has been related to one's immersion in American culture which has been linked with one's self-esteem (Harker 2001) and educational achievement (Mouw and Xie 1999). Second generation individuals should have greater exposure to mainstream culture than first generation individuals do, but less exposure than third generation respondents.

10

Accordingly, we argue that the degree of immersion and/or experience one has within American society should affect both the nature of one's ethnic identity and the difficulty one experiences verifying their ethnic identity. Second generation respondents can be caught between cultures; they experience life in fundamentally different ways than their immigrant parents and more recent arrivals as well as third generation respondents (Gans 1992; Jimenez 2004; Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, and Waters 2004; Waters and Jimenez 2005). Thus, second generation individuals are caught in a cultural crossfire trying to simultaneously satisfy the expectations of both cultures and this can lead to greater difficulties achieving identity verification. Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

H2: Individuals from the second generations will experience greater difficulty verifying their ethnic identities as compared to the other generations.

Researchers have defined both the level of knowledge about one's ethnicity and the certainty about the meanings of one's ethnic identity as important components of an ethnic identity (Phinney 1992). Knowledge can be thought of as the familiarity one has with his/her racial/ethnic background, history, and traditions. The greater a person's knowledge of their racial/ethnic background the more coherent should be their understanding and presentation of their ethnic identity. They should also have a better sense of the appropriate meanings one is seeking to verify through his/her actions. Khanna (2004) finds that respondents' level of ethnically shared cultural knowledge affects how group members react and treat claims of belonging to a given group. Those who can demonstrate greater cultural knowledge are treated as belonging to the group, and this positive treatment from other group members, increases the actor's sense of legitimacy as a group member. On the other hand, Khanna finds that when

people are unable to demonstrate their cultural knowledge, they are treated as an inauthentic member of the racial/ethnic group. This leads us to propose the following hypothesis:

> *H3: The more knowledge an individual has about his/her ethnicity, the less difficulty one will experience in verifying one's ethnic identity.*

Uncertainty about one's ethnic identity makes it more difficult to achieve identity verification. Uncertainty refers to the degree to which people hold a fixed set of ethnic meanings for themselves. Uncertainty negatively impacts the verification process because it is difficult for the actor to discern what feedback from others is relevant for their identity. For example, Backman, Secord and Peirce (1963) asked subjects to report aspects of themselves that five others would attribute to them as well as aspects few other people would attribute to them. They hypothesized, and found, that people were more likely to change their initial self-assessments after receiving contradictory information for aspects of the self that were not shared by others than for aspects of the self that were shared by several others. This is relevant here because people hone their social or group-based identities by interacting within social contexts with others that share the same group-based identity. However, those uncertain of their ethnic identity will have more difficulty locating the appropriate contexts and social networks within which to practice and perfect the boundaries of their ethnic identity as well as knowing what feedback to attend to. This leads us to presenting the following hypothesis:

> *H4: The more uncertain an individual is of their ethnic identity, the more difficulty the individual will experience verifying his/her ethnic identity.*

PROCEDURES

Sample

The data used for this study were obtained from a survey administered to student volunteers in several upper and lower division undergraduate sociology courses offered at a large, ethnically diverse Southwestern university.[2] Students were offered extra course credit in exchange for their participation. We utilized the categories of the U.S. Census for identifying race/ethnicity. Respondents were asked to classify themselves in one of the following seven categories: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White (non-Hispanic), Multiracial, or Hispanic or Latino. Because there were too few respondents for meaningful analysis, those who classified themselves as American Indian or Native Hawaiian were omitted from the analysis. This left 775 respondents with 283 Asians (37%), 250 Latinos (32%), 120 Whites (15%), 65 African Americans (8%), and 57 classifying themselves as Multiracial (7%).

While our sample is a convenience sample, we are not trying to generalize our findings to some population. Rather we focus on the development of measures of ethnic identity and the testing of theoretical processes concerning those identities and their verification. Our goal is to determine how well identity theory and the race/ethnicity literature can be linked and utilized to strengthen one another.

Measures

Ethnic identity. Items were developed from two sources: an initial and separate sample of 90 students' written descriptions of what it meant for them to be part of their racial/ethnic group,

---

[2] The racial/ethnic background of the undergraduate population was approximately: eight percent Black, 40% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 31% Hispanic and 16% white and about 5% others, including Native American.

and the published works of Phinney (1992) and Alba (1990) on ethnic identity. In keeping with the symbolic interactionist underpinnings of identity theory (Burke and Tully 1977), we were interested in developing a grounded approach to measuring the ethnic identity meanings held by our student sample. Ninety students enrolled in an introductory social psychology course wrote an essay reflecting what their race/ethnicity meant to them. Students wrote about how they viewed themselves in terms of their racial/ethnic background; what sorts of activities they were involved with based on their race/ethnicity; what their race/ethnicity meant to them; and when they were most aware of their race/ethnicity. Papers were then analyzed for common themes.

Several recurring themes surfaced in students' construal of their racial/ethnic identity. Most of the themes discussed mirrored the extant research. They included eating/preparing ethnic foods; looking like and being correctly identified as a member of one's self-identified ethnicity; listening to certain types of music; being around ethnically similar others; participating in traditions, holidays and festivals; speaking a relevant language/dialect; wearing certain clothing; and participating in religious traditions—all of which have been identified elsewhere as ways that people enact their ethnic identities (Alba 1990; Gans 1979; Jimenez 2004, 2008; Umana-Taylor et al. 2009; Wimmer 2008).

Eating and preparing food was one of the most frequent themes in the students' essays. For example, one indicative quote illustrates the importance of preparing and eating specific foods for ethnic identity: "Another way that I take pride in identifying my ethnic identity as Mexican-American is [by] knowing how to prepare signature meals that are recognized in our culture." Ethnic traditions were also a frequently cited aspect of one's ethnic identity. One student stated, "Personally, I think it is through the observation of our traditions I can feel that I belong to [my] Asian ethnic group…" and, "There are just so many things to say with each other since we know

14

and share a lot of the same traditions." Participating in ethnic traditions (e.g. festivals and eating certain foods), for these respondents, signified an important sense of belonging and kindred understanding among members of the same ethnic group.

Finally, looking like and being recognized as a member of one's racial/ethnic group was frequently discussed. For example, "My general appearance suggests German/English Caucasian blood, which I do identify with, and represents the majority of my ancestry." Overall, these recurring themes highlight how the actions and behaviors of the respondents based on their ethnicity help to define one as a member of an ethnic group, the boundaries of that group, and increase solidarity with the group. The more frequently encountered descriptions of ethnic practices gleaned from the students' essays were utilized in this study's measurement of ethnic identity.

In addition to the themes of the essays, we consulted the work on the measurement of ethnic identity conducted by Alba (1990) and Phinney (1992) to construct the ethnic identity measures. Many of the items in Alba and Phinney's measures of ethnic identity overlapped with the themes of the initial students' essays. Drawing on these sources, we utilized identity theory to guide the construction of the scale. Explicitly, we focused on identity theory's emphasis that meaning is manifest in behavior leading us to use those items pertaining to action and behavior implemented by the person him/herself to exemplify ethnic group membership.

For example, a desire to be around ethnically similar others that frequently surfaced in our participants written descriptions and the item "feeling a special sense of relationship to someone else because of your ethnic background" in Alba's (1990) "ethnic experiences" scale were used to inform the construction of the following three items: 1) "having friends with the same ethnic background," 2) "dating within my ethnic community" and 3) "being in my ethnic community."

15

These latter three items were included in this study's measure. From these sources, a scale of ethnic/racial identity meanings resulted in a list of 14 items shown in Table 1.

For each item, respondents were asked the degree of importance they placed on each feature as an expression of their identity. The response categories included "not important, a little important, somewhat important, very important, and extremely important" and were coded 1-5 where a higher score indicates a greater degree of importance placed on a given ethnic identity meaning.

Ethnic Identity was measured using these 14 items. To determine the dimensionality of these items measuring ethnic identity, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted using a principle component factor solution with promax rotation to preserve the correlation between the factors. This resulted in two factors, each with seven items. These are also indicated in Table 1. An examination of the loadings on the two factors suggests that the meanings highlighted in the first factor center on the group defining traditions, sharing, collective culture, and heritage. Engaging in these practices reaffirms the collective group and its traditions. The first item, "eating foods associated with my ethnicity," which might seem more like the role items of factor two, is most highly correlated with the second item, "engaging in ethnic traditions" suggesting that the meaning of the foods item is more aligned with traditions than just personal behaviors. We label this first factor the *heritage* dimension of ethnic identity as it is based on the group defining meanings of the ethnic category—the being ethnic dimension.

The second factor seems more personal, individual, and oriented toward ethnic role performance: acting to keep ties through friends, neighbors, dating, and looks. The item "being in my ethnic community" on the surface might seem more like the communal items of factor one, but it is most highly correlated with "having friends with the same ethnic background"

suggesting more of an individual acting to keep ties rather than maintaining the cultural

traditions associated with the first factor. The last item, "maintaining ethnic gender roles" might

be seen as aligning with traditions, but it is most highly correlated with "wearing clothing styles

associated with my ethnicity" suggesting it is more of maintaining appearances rather than

upholding traditions. We label this second factor the *personal* dimension of ethnic identity based

on the individual's way of playing out the role of ethnic group member—the doing ethnicity

dimension.

As the results show, these two dimensions are not completely independent. Across this sample

of different ethnicities, the correlation between the two dimensions is .65 indicating that they

share about 42% of variance in common—the being and doing of ethnicity go together. From the

results of the factor analysis, we then created two separate scales by standardizing each item,

making sure they were oriented in the proper direction, and then summing the items for each

factor. The *heritage* dimension of ethnic identity yielded a scale with an omega reliability of .92

and the *personal* dimension of ethnic identity yielded a scale with an omega reliability of .91.

[Table 1 about here]

The measure of *difficulty in verifying one's ethnic identity* was also created using the 14 items

indicating ethnic identity meanings/practices. Respondents were asked to identify the degree of

difficulty they had in carrying out specific practices indicated in each item. The response

categories included "no difficulty at all, not much difficulty, some difficulty, quite a bit of

difficulty, and a great deal of difficulty" and were coded 1-5 with a higher number indicating

greatest difficulty enacting ethnic/racial meanings—and thus greater identity non-verification. These items were standardized and summed to form a scale with an omega reliability of .95.[3]

The measure of ethnic/racial identity *knowledge* was comprised of four items in which respondents were asked to indicate the degree of knowledge they have of their race/ethnicity. Example items included "I know I great deal about my ethnic background" and "In general, I have a clear sense of my ethnicity" and the response categories were "strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree." These items were coded 1-4, standardized and summed to form a scale with an omega reliability of .88.

The measure of ethnic/racial identity *uncertainty* is comprised of four items indicating the degree of uncertainty an individual has about her/his race/ethnicity. Respondents indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with statements such as "one day I might have one opinion about my ethnicity and on another, I might have a different opinion," "I spend a lot of time wondering about my ethnicity," and "my beliefs about my ethnicity seem to change frequently." These items were coded 1-4, standardized and summed to form a scale with an omega reliability of .83.

The measure of *generational status* follows the generational classification utilized by Portes and Rumbaut (2001). We classify a respondent as first generation if the respondent and his or her parents were born *outside* of the U.S. [4] Respondents reporting that they were born in the U.S. but one or both of their parents were born outside of the U.S. were coded as second generation.

---

[3] Note that this measure of verification difficulty does not compare a measure of the respondent's identity standard with a measure of their reflected appraisals, but, instead, taps directly the respondent's feeling of discrepancy—that is, of not being able to have perceptions from the environment match one's identity standard.

[4] We do not have the data to determine when these respondents immigrated to the U.S. Thus, we are unable to determine if any of these individuals should be labeled as the 1.5 generation.

Lastly, we coded those respondents reporting that they and both parents were born within the U.S. as third generation.

Finally, we measured the three components of self-esteem identified by Stets and Burke (Stets and Burke 2014a): self-worth, self-efficacy, and authenticity. Self-worth was measured with 10 items and an omega reliability of .93, the efficacy scale had 12 items and an omega reliability of .93, and the authenticity scale had 13 items with an omega reliability of .94. The items and loadings for the items on these scales are presented in Appendix 1. High scores on the scales represent high levels of the esteem component. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for all the variables included in the analyses, while Table 3 presents the zero-order correlations among the variables used in the analyses.

(Tables 2 and 3 about here)

RESULTS

Before looking at the results of the measures of ethnic identity, we address the first question of the validity of these measures. Within identity theory, difficulty verifying a social or group-based identity is posited to lead to lower feelings of self-esteem (Burke and Harrod 2002; Burke and Stets 2009; Stets and Burke 2000, 2014a). We thus want to check that the ethnic identity meanings here are perceptually controlled meanings as predicted by identity theory (Powers 1973). To do this, we look at the consequences for all three components of self-esteem when individuals have difficulty in verifying their ethnic identity. We use structural equation modeling to estimate the effects of difficulty in verifying ethnic identity on the three components of self-esteem, allowing the error residuals to correlate. We also included ethnicity and difficulty by ethnicity interactions and other controls presented in Table 4. There, we see that difficulty in verifying the meanings associated with one's ethnic identity does significantly reduce an

19

individual's reported level of all three components of self-esteem. Further, testing for variation

of this effect by ethnic group and generation shows no significant interaction by either ethnic

group ($\chi^2_{(12)}$ = 9.32, p = .68) or generation ($\chi^2_{(6)}$ = 8.51, p = .20). These results demonstrate that

the meanings being measured with the ethnic identity scale presented here are valid indicators of

ethnic identity for all ethnic groups and that failure to verify the identity reduces self-esterm

equally for all groups. We also see in these results that ethnic identity uncertainty and knowledge

influence the esteem components. Table 4 shows that being more certain about one's ethnic

identity increases all three esteem components, though lacking ethnic identity knowledge only

hurts the self-worth component of self-esteem having to do with feelings of belonging and

acceptance.

(Table 4 about here)

Each of the ethnic identity scales (heritage and personal) were examined across ethnic groups

and generations using an analysis of covariance with ethnic group and generation as factors and

knowledge and uncertainty as covariates to gain a better understanding of how ethnic identity

varies across racial/ethnic groups and generations. Table 5a presents the means of the heritage,

group, or being dimension of respondents' ethnic identity by ethnicity and generation and Table

6a presents results for the personal, role, or doing dimension by ethnicity and generation as well.

Looking first at Table 5a we see that the degree to which individuals endorse the importance

of the heritage or group dimension of ethnic identity meanings does indeed vary by ethnicity and

generation. Not surprisingly, we see that the lowest reported heritage scores are for Whites and

the highest scores are reported by Latinos, with the other groups falling somewhere in-between.

Table 5b shows that there are no race/ethnicity-by-generation interaction effects for the

heritage dimension of ethnic identity. Looking at the tables for generational differences, we see a

decline in the importance of the ethnic heritage dimension from the first to the third generations, with the largest shift occurring between the second and third generation respondents. Finally, we see that the more respondents know about their ethnicity, the more important is the heritage component of their ethnic identity. Ethnic identity uncertainty, on the other hand, reduces the importance of the heritage dimension.

(Table 5a and 5b about here)

Turning next to the personal dimension or role aspect of ethnic identity, Table 6a shows significant variation in the importance of this dimension by ethnicity but not by generation on the average. There are, however, significant interaction effects of ethnicity and generation as seen in Table 6b. On the average, Whites and Multiracial groups report the lowest importance of personal ethnic meanings, while Asian and African Americans report the highest, although this varies by generation. Looking next at generational status, we see declines from the first to the second to the third generation for Asians, Blacks, and Whites. There are no declines for Multiracial individuals by generation, while for Latinos there is a slight increase from generation 1 to 2, and a decline from generation 2 to 3. Also, within Table 6b we see the strong effects that ethnic identity knowledge has on the personal, role, or doing dimension of ethnic identity measured here. Respondents with the greatest knowledge about their ethnicity held personal meanings most strongly. Ethnic identity uncertainty, on the other hand, has no significant effect on the strength to which respondents endorsed the personal (role) meanings of their ethnic identity.

In sum, the degree to which respondents see the heritage dimension or the personal dimension of ethnic identity meanings as important varies by ethnicity and generation, though not in a simple way.

21

We test hypotheses concerning difficulty of ethnic identity verification in Table 7a. Here we see that Whites have the least difficulty verifying their ethnic identity while Multiracial individuals have the most difficulty, thus supporting Hypothesis 1. Recall that Hypothesis 1 argues that members of minority groups will experience greater difficulty verifying their ethnic identity than Whites, likely because they have, on the average, fewer resources. We also see that there is a significant effect of generation on the verification of respondent's ethnic identity with both first- and second-generation respondents having more difficulty than third generation on the average.

However, a closer examination of these results reveals a more complex picture as there is a significant interaction between race/ethnicity and generation with respect to the difficulty verifying one's ethnic identity. We see increasing difficulty for Asians when moving from the first to the third generation with the biggest jump in difficulty occurring between generations two and three. African Americans, on the other hand, have decreasing difficulty when moving across the generations as do Multiracial individuals. Latinos, as a group, have fewer ethnic identity verification problems, but these difficulties increase slightly from generation one to generation three. Multiracial individuals have the most difficulty verifying their ethnic identity in the first generation. And, while this difficulty drops off over generations, it still averages highest of all ethnic groups. Multiracial individuals have few shared traditions that can be affirmed.

Overall, the results show that Whites and Latinos experience the least difficulty in verifying their ethnic identities whereas Multiracial and Asian respondents have the greatest reported difficulty. With respect to hypothesis two, only Whites conform to the hypothesized pattern of most difficulty verifying ethnic identity in generation two. Instead, each ethnic group seems to

have its own level and pattern of identity verification difficulty. These results demonstrate the varied nature of ethnic identity verification when examined by one's race/ethnicity and generational status.

Finally, we see support for both hypotheses three and four concerning the effect of knowledge and uncertainty on ethnic identity verification. Increasing knowledge about one's race/ethnic identity facilitates the verification of that identity, while uncertainty about one's identity makes verification more difficult as hypothesized.

(Tables7a and 7b about here)

We now turn to examine variations in both ethnic identity knowledge and uncertainty across ethnic groups and generations. Recall that knowledge refers to an understanding of the history and traditions of the group, while uncertainty refers to the stability and consistency of the ethnic identity meanings for the individual. Interestingly, as shown in Table 3, there is little relationship between identity uncertainty and knowledge.

Table 8a shows the results for the level of knowledge one has of his/her ethnicity. Knowledge about one's ethnic identity does vary by ethnicity, with Whites displaying the lowest level of knowledge and African Americans displaying the highest. By generation, the level of knowledge about one's ethnic identity decreases when moving from generation one to three. Finally, looking at Table 8b, we see that there are no significant interaction effects of ethnic identity knowledge and generation.

(Tables 8a and 8b about here)

Finally, Table 9a shows the results for ethnic identity uncertainty. Again, there are differences by ethnicity with Asian respondents reporting the greatest level of uncertainty and White and Latino respondents reporting the least. The high level of uncertainty for Asians may well be

23

because this category is not endemic to their origin—being from many different countries with their own character and traditions. Only in the U.S. are they lumped together ethnically. Looking at Table 9b we can see there are no effects for generation and no significant interaction effect of ethnicity-by-generation.

(Tables 9a and 9b about here)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study began as an effort to explicate how the race/ethnicity and social psychological literatures can inform each other. Our goal in this study was three-fold. First, we wanted to present a coherent social psychological framework (identity theory) to help inform existing findings within the race/ethnicity literature, while also extending identity theory's range through the examination of a social identity, which is perhaps the least explored of the identity bases (social, role, and person) within sociology (Burke and Stets 2009). Previous studies in the race/ethnicity literature have found that people desire to have others confirm their racial/ethnic identity and when this does not occur, people report feeling frustrated and uneasy (Jimenez 2004; Khanna 2004, 2010; Waters 1999). However, these studies do not discuss why people should experience such negative feelings and outcomes. Identity theory, on the other hand, has a well-developed theoretical and empirical program addressing precisely why and how people seek identity verification and report unease when that identity verification fails to happen.

Following a mixed methods approach, we drew on identity theory to create a measure of racial/ethnic identity, based on ethnic meanings as expressed through behavior. From both a grounded approach and review of the relevant race/ethnicity literature (e.g. Alba 1990; Phinney 1992) we were able to develop items to measure what it means to the respondents to hold the ethnic identity they have. In doing this, we find, for our ethnically diverse sample, that there are

24

two related dimensions to ethnic identity, one based on common heritage and the other on the individual role performances that attach one to the ethnic community. These scales build on the original MEIM scale but extend its scope to understand how ethnic identity is regulated and maintained after it is formed.

Both the group membership ethnic meanings (heritage) and the role performance ethnic meanings (personal) were held in varying degrees by respondents. The full meaning of ethnicity thus appears spread across both the being and doing of ethnicity. Our use of identity theory as a guiding theoretical framework in this study led us to emphasize the *meanings* of one's ethnic identity, as understood by the respondents themselves and expressed though *behaviors*—factors not always emphasized in the race/ethnicity literature. We suggest that the personal or role dimension of ethnic identity is comprised of meanings expressed through behaviors that serve to *sustain the self* in interaction as an ethnic (doing ethnicity), while the heritage or group dimension is composed of meanings expressed through behaviors that serve to *sustain and maintain the group or collectivity* (being ethnic).

With respect to the personal or role dimension, the actions of presenting oneself as a member of a specific racial/ethnic group (e.g. wearing ethnically appropriate clothing styles) and interacting with ethnically similar others (being/dating within my ethnic community) embody the individual as a distinct member of a group. These actions enable the individual to be identified with their ethnic group and not another and they enable the individual to maintain their group membership through interaction with those who are ethnically similar. Because self-presentation (Goffman 1959) and interaction (Mead 1934) are fundamental ways in which individuals develop and sustain their self-understandings, it is important to recognize that it is through these

actions that an individual *meaningfully defines* who he or she is as a member of the group and, thus, *sustains the self* as a member of one group rather than another.

The heritage dimension of ethnic identity, on the other hand, relates to the broader social group and is generally composed of behaviors/meanings that serve to sustain the group and culture. Engaging in ethnic traditions: participating in ethnic holidays/festivals and holding on to one's ethnic beliefs and attitudes are actions that serve to maintain a group's culture, norms, and meanings. A social group depends on group members' enactment of these activities without which it would become destabilized and likely dissipate. Conversely, if the group no longer existed, neither would one's ethnic identity.

For our third goal, we explored how well the predictions of identity theory hold for a currently unexamined group-based identity by testing the effects of difficulty in identity verification on feelings of self-esteem. Using the three components of self-esteem proposed by Stets and Burke (Stets and Burke 2014a), we confirmed identity theory's expectation that respondents who reported difficulty confirming their ethnic identity also reported lower levels of self-worth, efficacy, and authenticity even when controlling for knowledge and uncertainty about their ethnic identity. We also found that the effect of non-verification was the same for all ethnic groups studied, including Whites, as well as for all three generations, which results are consistent with prior research on the effects of identity non-verification, giving us confidence in our measure of ethnic identity. Additionally, we find that having high levels of uncertainty about one's ethnic identity leads to a decrease in all components of self-esteem. Lack of knowledge about one's ethnic identity, however, reduces only self-worth but not efficacy or authenticity.

When we examined variations in the degree to which individuals from different ethnic groups and generations endorsed the common meanings of ethnic identity indicating the different views

about ethnicity that are held across groups and generations that were consistent with prior research (Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, and Waters 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006). For example, results show that third generation respondents report a significantly lower sense of ethnic identity (both personal and heritage dimensions) than either first- or second-generation respondents.

The Multiracial group had consistently low personal ethnic identity meanings across all three generations, and were among the lowest heritage ethnic identity meanings, likely because there is not a single group around which these meanings may develop. Whites were similarly low, especially after the first generation though the reasons are likely different. As part of the dominant culture in which the blending of different white ethnicities has occurred, Whites may find less that bring them together as a group. Interestingly, even among groups which had lower levels of group and role meanings of ethnic identity, members still sought to control those levels of meaning and they experienced lower self-esteem when they had difficulty doing so.

With respect to the verification of ethnic identities, the results present mixed support of hypothesis two that second-generation respondents would experience greater difficulties. This was only true of Whites. Other ethnic groups had their own pattern. Latinos and Asians had increasing difficulty over the three generations, while Multiracial and black respondents found verification easier over the generations. And, while Whites had fewer verification difficulties than other groups in accordance with hypothesis one, this was primarily true in the third generation. Thus, we see that generational experiences matter, but depend upon the racial/ethnic group with which one identifies.

Our findings suggest that the level of knowledge of one's ethnic identity varies across the various racial/ethnic groups and generational status. Whites, as the dominant group within U.S.

society, know the least about their ethnic background and African Americans, as the historically most oppressed group, reports the greatest ethnic identity knowledge. This finding is not too surprising considering that researchers have found that Whites typically report difficulties identifying unique aspects of "white culture" because it is taken as normative (Bonilla-Silva 2003; Gallagher 2003; Lopez 1997; Perry 2007). Knowledge is also influenced by generational status, with first generation respondents reporting the greatest knowledge of their ethnic identity and third generation respondents reporting the least. Uncertainty about one's ethnic identity varies by racial/ethnic group, with Asian respondents reporting the most uncertainty and Whites and Latinos reporting the least. The level of uncertainty for Asian respondents may be partly attributed to the fact that many different Asian cultures and ethnicities are aggregated into the umbrella term "Asian" in the U.S. The meaning of "Asian" is thus inconsistent and confusing with no common history or community.

While these findings come from an exploratory study, they provide some interesting prospects for future research and efforts to better understanding of people's actions and reactions to events. We know that the drive for identity verification leads people to choose social situations where others see and react to them as they see themselves and avoid other environments that lead to identity non-verification. How this plays out to create different groupings and patterns of interaction and even residence would be a topic for future research to explore.

It is the personal or role dimension of ethnic identity whereby persons try to control meanings related to how they portray themselves and be seen by others. As suggested by this study, that this occurs through trying to engage and maintain social relationships linked to their ethnicity. Our subjects reported that they choose to spend time within their ethnic community and dress in ways that confirms for the individual how sees the self. Appreciation of the personal dimension

of one's ethnic identity should be increasingly relevant as immigration patterns and ethnic replenishment continue to change, leading to the sorts of identity issues highlighted by Jimenez (2008) or the importance within the race/ethnicity literature about understanding a Multiracial identity (Brunsma 2005; Campbell and Troyer 2007; Khanna 2004, 2010). A greater appreciation of how individuals construct their ethnic identity will help researchers understand people's actions, even when they may not be recognized, ethnically, by others in the same way.

Understanding the heritage dimension also has implications for the race/ethnicity literature because it provides a mechanism for someone to belong in their ethnic community and be part of the community and the traditions that bind them. While it is important that someone has an internalized sense of belonging to a group, it is equally important that they find situations and others with whom to enact their identity (Burke and Stets 1999; Deaux and Martin 2003; Stryker 1980). Enacting one's ethnic identity with others strengthens and reinforces existing understandings of the identity and allows for a sense of commonality.

Ultimately, this exploratory study suggests that identity theory has a great deal to offer researchers working within the race/ethnicity literature. It also shows that an appreciation of the race/ethnicity literature has a lot to offer social psychological research generally, and identity theory researchers, specifically. We can see that there are important differences in how members from different racial/ethnic groups conceptualize and express their ethnic identity. But despite these important differences, we found that our measure is applicable for a wide range of different racial/ethnic groups. This research helps us understand why people choose to associate with certain people and certain locations and avoid others depending on whether others verify their ethnic identity.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard D. 1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Backman, Carl W., Paul F. Secord, and Jerry R. Peirce. 1963. "Resistance to Change in the Self-Concept as a Function of Consensus among Significant Others." *Sociometry* 26:102-11.

Bean, Frank D. and Gillian Stevens. 2005. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Towards a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62:465-80.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2003. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racsim and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Brown, J. Scott, Steven Hitlin, and Glen H. Elder, Jr. 2006. "The Greater Complexity of Lived Race: An Extension of Harris and Sim." *Social Science Quarterly* 87:411-31.

Brown, Tony N. and Chase L. Lesane-Brown. 2006. "Race Socialization Messages across Historical Time." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69:201-13.

Brunsma, David L. 2005. "Interracial Families and the Racial Identification of Mixed-Race Children: Evidence from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study." *Social Forces* 84:1131-57.

Burke, Peter J. and Judy C. Tully. 1977. "The Measurement of Role Identity." *Social Forces* 55:881-97.

Burke, Peter J. 1991. "Identity Processes and Social Stress." *American Sociological Review* 56:836-49.

Burke, Peter J. and Alicia D. Cast. 1997a. "Stability and Change in the Gender Identities of Newly Married Couples." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60:277-90.

Burke, Peter J. and Alicia D. Cast. 1997b. "Stability and Change in the Gender Identities of Newly Married Couples." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60:277-90.

Burke, Peter J. and Jan E. Stets. 1999. "Trust and Commitment through Self-Verification." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62:347-66.

Burke, Peter J. and Michael M. Harrod. 2002. "Too Good to Be Believed?" Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Il.

Burke, Peter J. and Michael M. Harrod. 2005. "Too Good to Be Believed?". *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68:359-74.

Burke, Peter J. 2008. "Identity, Social Status, and Emotion." Pp. 75-93 in *Social Structure and Emotion*, edited by D. T. Robinson and J. Clay-Warner. Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Burke, Peter J. and Jan E. Stets. 2009. *Identity Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, Mary E. and Lisa Troyer. 2007. "The Implications of Racial Misclassification by Observers." *American Sociological Review* 72:750-65.

Cast, Alicia D., Jan E. Stets, and Peter J. Burke. 1999. "Does the Self Conform to the Views of Others?". *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62:68-82.

Cast, Alicia D. and Peter J. Burke. 2002. "A Theory of Self-Esteem." *Social Forces* 80:1041-68.

Cooley, Charles Horton. 1964 [1902]. "The Social Self - the Meaning of the "I"." Pp. 168-210 in *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Schocken Books.

Deaux, Kay and Daniela Martin. 2003. "Interpersonal Networks and Social Categories: Specifying Levels of Context in Identity Processes." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66:101-17.

Erikson, Erik. 1968. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.

Frank, Reanne, Ilana Redstone, and Bo Lu. 2010. "Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order: How and Where Do They Fit In?". *American Sociological Review* 75:378-401.

Gallagher, Charles A. 2003. "Playing the White Ethnic Card: Using Ethnic Identity to Deny Contemporary Racism." Pp. 145-58 in *White Out: The Continuing Significant of Racism*, edited by A. W. Doane and E. Bonilla-Silva. New York: Routledge.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:1-20.

Gans, Herbert J. 1992. "Second-Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15:173-92.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Harker, Kathryn. 2001. "Immigrant Generation, Assimilation, and Adolescent Psychological Well-Being." *Social Forces* 79:969-1004.

Harris, David R. and Jeremiah Joseph Sim. 2002. "Who Is Multiracial? Assessing the Complexity of Lived Race." *American Sociological Review* 67:614-27.

Hill Collins, Patricia. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Hitlin, Steven, J. Scott Brown, and Glen H. Elder, Jr. 2007. "Measuring Latinos: Racial and Ethnic Classification and Self-Understanding." *Social Forces* 86:587-611.

Hogg, Michael A. 2018. "Social Identity Theory." Pp. 112-38 in *Contemporary Social Psychological Theories*, edited by P. J. Burke. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Howard, Judith A. 2000. "Social Psychology of Identities." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:367-93.

Hunt, Matthew O., Pamela Braboy Jackson, Brian Powell, and Lala Carr Steelman. 2000. "Color-Blind: The Treatment of Race and Ethnicity in Social Psychology." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63:352-64.

Jimenez, Tomas R. 2004. "Negotiating Ethnic Boundaries: Multiethnic Mexican Americans and Ethnic Identity in the United States." *Ethnicities* 4:75-97.

Jimenez, Tomas R. 2008. "Mexican American Replenishment and the Continuing Significance of Ethnicity and Race." *American Journal of Sociology* 113:1527-67.

Kasinitz, Philip, John H. Mollenkopf, and Mary C. Waters. 2004. *Becoming New Yorkers: Ethnographies of the New Second Generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Khanna, Nikki. 2004. "The Role of Reflected Appraisals in Racial Identity: The Case of Multiracial Asians." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67:115-31.

Khanna, Nikki. 2010. ""If You're Half Black, You're Just Black": Reflected Appraisals and the Persistence of the One-Drop Rule." *the Sociological Quarterly* 51:96-121.

Krysan, Maria and Michael D. M. Bader. 2009. "Racial Blind Spots: Black-White-Latino Differences in Community Knowledge." *Social Problems* 56:677-701.

Lacy, Karyn R. 2007. *Blue-Chip Black: Race, Class, and Status in the United States in the New Black Middle Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2004. "America's Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:221-42.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2007. "Reinventing the Color Line: Immigration and America's New Racial/Ethnic Divide." *Social Forces* 86:561-86.

Lopez, Ian Haney. 1997. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: New York University Press.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mouw, Ted and Yu Xie. 1999. "Bilingualism and the Academic Achievement of First- and Second-Generation Asian Americans: Accommodation with or without Assimilation?". *American Sociological Review* 64:232-52.

Nagel, Joane. 1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41:152-76.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum. 1957. *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Pager, Devah and Hana Shepherd. 2008. "The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:181-209.

Pearlin, Leonard I. and Carmi Schooler. 1978. "The Structure of Coping." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 19:2-21.

Perry, Pamela. 2007. "White Universal Identity as a "Sense of Group Position"." *Symbolic Interactionism* 30:375-93.

Phinney, Jean S. 1990. "Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research." *Psychological Bulletin* 108:499-514.

Phinney, Jean S. 1992. "The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A New Scale for Use with Diverse Groups." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 7:156-76.

Phinney, Jean S. 2006. "Ethnic Identity Exploration in Emerging Adulthood." Pp. 117-34 in *Coming of Age in the 21st Century: The Lives and Contexts of Emerging Adults*, edited by J. Arnett and J. L. Tanner. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Phinney, Jean S. and Anthony D. Ong. 2007. "Conceptualization and Measurement of Ethnic Identity: Current Status and Future Directions." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 54:271-81.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben G. Rumbaut, eds. 2001. *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Powers, William T. 1973. *Behavior: The Control of Perception*. Chicago: Aldine.

Reid, Scott A. and Michael A. Hogg. 2005. "Uncertainty Reduction, Self-Enhancement, and Ingroup Identification." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 31:804-17.

Rogler, Lloyd H., Rosemary Santana Cooney, and Vilma Ortiz. 1980. "Intergenerational Change in Ethnic Identity in the Puerto Rican Family." *International Migration Review* 14:193-214.

Rosenberg, Morris. 1965. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, Morris. 1979. *Conceiving the Self*. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Singh, Vijai P. . 1977. "Some Theoretical and Methodological Problems in the Study of Ethnic Identity: A Cross-Cultural Perspective." *New York Academy of Sciences: Annals* 285:32-42.

Stets, Jan E. and Peter J. Burke. 1994. "Inconsistent Self-Views in the Control Identity Model." *Social Science Research* 23:236-62.

Stets, Jan E. and Peter J. Burke. 2000. "Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63:224-37.

Stets, Jan E. and Michael M. Harrod. 2004. "Verification across Multiple Identities: The Role of Status." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67:155-71.

Stets, Jan E. and Alicia D. Cast. 2007. "Resources and Identity Verification from an Identity Theory Perspective." *Sociological Perspectives* 50:517-43.

Stets, Jan E. and Peter J. Burke. 2014a. "Self-Esteem and Identities." *Sociological Perspectives* 57:1-25.

Stets, Jan E. and Peter J. Burke. 2014b. "Emotions and Identity Nonverification." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 77:387-410.

Stryker, Sheldon. 1980. *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin Cummings.

Stryker, Sheldon. 1982. "Symbolic Interactionism: Themes and Variations." Pp. 3-29 in *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, edited by M. Rosenberg and R. H. Turner. New York: Basic Books.

Stryker, Sheldon and Richard T. Serpe. 1994. "Identity Salience and Psychological Centrality: Equivalent, Overlapping, or Complementary Concepts?". *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57:16-35.

Ting-Toomey, Stella. 1981. "Ethnic Identity and Close Friendship in Chinese-American College Students." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 5:383-406.

Umana-Taylor, Adriana J., Edna C. Alfaro, Mayra Y. Bamaca, and Amy B. Guimond. 2009. "The Central Role of Familial Ethnic Socialization in Latino Adolescents' Cultural Orientation." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71:46-60.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Waters, Mary C. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Boston Harvard University Press.

Waters, Mary C. and Tomas R Jimenez. 2005. "Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:105.25.

White, Clovis L. and Peter J. Burke. 1987. "Ethnic Role Identity among Black and White College Students: An Interactionist Approach." *Sociological Perspectives* 30:310-31.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2008. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 113:970-1022.

TABLES

Table 1. Factor Loadings on Principle Component Factor Analysis of 14 Ethnic
Identity Meaning Items with Promax Rotation (N=775)

Items	Heritage	Personal
Eating foods associated with my ethnicity	**0.72**	-0.01
Engaging in ethnic traditions	**0.90**	-0.04
Speaking the language associated with my ethnicity	**0.71**	0.05
Sharing my ethnic heritage with my family	**0.89**	-0.11
Holding on to my ethnic beliefs and attitudes	**0.78**	0.08
Observing the religious traditions associated with my ethnicity	**0.58**	0.24
Participating in ethnic holidays/festivals	**0.76**	0.09
Having friends with the same ethnic background	0.28	**0.60**
Looking like my ethnicity	0.04	**0.75**
Listening to music associated with my ethnicity	0.24	**0.62**
Being in my ethnic community	0.29	**0.62**
Dating within my ethnic community	0.09	**0.81**
Wearing clothing styles associated with my ethnicity	0.13	**0.89**
Maintaining ethnic gender roles	0.05	**0.79**
Eigenvalues	6.19	5.83
Omega reliability	.93	.92

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for all Variables (N = 775)

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
Ethnicity		
Asian	.37	.48
Black	.08	.28
Latino	.32	.47
Multiracial	.07	.25
White	.15	.36
Knowledge	.02	.83
Uncertainty	-.02	.78
Generation 1	.19	.39
Generation 2	.55	.50
Generation 3	.26	.44
Ethnic Identity		
Heritage	.05	.77
Personal	-.10	.72
Verification Difficulty	-.02	.73
Self-worth	.00	.70
Self-efficacy	-.01	.67
Authenticity	.02	.68

Table 3. Zero-Order Correlations Among Variables. (n=775)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Asian	1.00														
2 Black	-.23*	1.00													
3 Latino	-.52*	-.21*	1.00												
4 Multiracial	-.21*	-.09*	-.19*	1.00											
5 White	-.32*	-.13*	-.29*	-.12*	1.00										
6 Knowledge	.06	.11*	.00	.05	-.20*	1.00									
7 Uncertainty	.22*	.02	-.11*	.00	-.17*	.05	1.00								
8 Generation 1	.29*	-.11*	-.10*	-.04	-.14*	.10*	.05	1.00							
9 Generation 2	.10*	-.18*	.28*	.00	-.35*	.11*	.03	-.53*	1.00						
10 Generation 3	-.36*	.30*	-.22*	.04	.52*	-.22*	-.08*	-.28*	-.67*	1.00					
11 Heritage	.07	.00	.23*	-.05	-.36*	.45*	-.02	.16*	.18*	-.35*	1.00				
12 Personal	.18*	.07*	.00	-.08*	-.23*	.34*	.09*	.21*	.00	-.19*	.67*	1.00			
13 Ver Difficulty	.13*	.01	-.10*	.13*	-.14*	-.07	.21*	.03	.08*	-.12*	-.04	-.05	1.00		
14 Self-worth	-.27*	.10*	.15*	-.01	.09*	.11*	-.22*	-.08*	-.06	.14*	.08*	-.03	-.21*	1.00	
15 Efficacy	-.26*	.06	.13*	.02	.11*	.02	-.32*	-.10*	-.04	.14*	.02	-.10*	-.25*	.76*	1.00
16 Authenticity	-.20*	-.02	.15*	.01	.09*	.00	.31*	-.10	-.01	.10*	-.02	-.12*	-.20*	.62*	.66*

Note: * $p \leq .05$

Table 4. Standardized Coefficients for the Regression of Self-Esteem on Ethnic
Identity Nonverification, Knowledge, and Uncertainty (N=775)

Variables	Self-Esteem Components		
	Worth	Efficacy	Authenticity
Difficulty Verifying Ethnic Identity	-.13*	-.17*	-.13*
Ethnic Group (Reference Group White)			
Asian	-.22*	-.18*	-.12*
Black	.03	.02	-.03
Multiracial	-.05	.01	.00
Latino	.01	.00	.03
Ethnic identity knowledge	.12*	.03	.01
Ethnic identity uncertainty	-.15*	-.24*	-.26*
R^2	.14	.17	.14

* $p <= .05$

Table 5a. Mean Heritage (Group) Ethnic Identity Scores by
Ethnic Group and Generation (N=775)

	Generation			
Ethnic Group	1	2	3	Total
Asian	.40	-.03	-.48	.09
Black	.05	.46	-.18	.00
Multiracial	.03	-.08	-.43	-.18
Latino	.32	.40	-.02	.34
White	-.05	-.33	-1.00	-.84
Total	.34	.16	-.58	.00

Table 5b. Tests of Effects from an Analysis of Covariance

	β	p
Knowledge	.38	.01
Uncertainty	-.06	.03
Ethnic Group Differences		.01
Generation Differences		.01
Ethnic Group X Generation		.60

Table 6a. Mean Personal (Role) Ethnic Identity Scores by
Ethnic Group and Generation (N=775)

Ethnic Group	Generation			Total
	1	2	3	
Asian	.69	.03	-.17	.24
Black	.56	.23	.21	.23
Multiracial	-.29	-.29	-.30	-.30
Latino	-.07	.05	-.25	.00
White	.23	-.44	-.62	-.55
Total	.45	.00	-.32	.00

Table 6b. Tests of Effects from an Analysis of Covariance

	β	p
Knowledge	.30	.01
Uncertainty	.04	.29
Ethnic Group Differences		.01
Generation Differences		.13
Ethnic Group X Generation		.04

Table 7a. Mean Ethnic Identity Verification Difficulty Scores
by Ethnic Group and Generation (N=775)

Ethnic Group	Generation			Total
	1	2	3	
Asian	.13	.15	.77	.18
Black	.59	.34	-.12	.03
Multiracial	1.17	.55	.01	.46
Latino	-.39	-.14	.03	-.15
White	-.12	.33	-.50	-.34
Total	.07	.07	-.20	.00

Table 7b. Tests of Effects from an Analysis of Covariance

	β	p
Knowledge	-.13	.01
Uncertainty	.18	.01
Ethnic Group Differences		.01
Generation Differences		.02
Ethnic Group X Generation		.01

Table 8a. Mean Ethnic Identity Knowledge Scores by Ethnic Group and Generation (N=775)

Ethnic Group	Generation			Total
	1	2	3	
Asian	.25	.02	-.45	.07
Black	.26	1.06	.10	.36
Multiracial	.03	.39	-.13	.18
Latino	.13	.03	-.23	.01
White	.52	.14	-.67	-.47
Total	.23	.10	-.38	.00

Table 8b. Tests of Effects from an Analysis of Covariance

	p
Ethnic Group Differences	.01
Generation Differences	.01
Ethnic Group X Generation	.21

Table 9a. Mean Ethnic Identity Uncertainty Scores by Ethnic Group and Generation

| | Generation | | | |
Ethnic Group	1	2	3	Total
Asian	.24	.30	.44	.29
Black	.19	-.09	.11	.06
Multiracial	.08	.11	-.25	-.01
Latino	-.26	-.18	.15	-.16
White	.12	-.51	-.38	-.38
Total	.11	.02	-.13	.00

Table 9b. Tests of Effects from an Analysis of Covariance

	p
Ethnic Group Differences	.01
Generation Differences	.63
Ethnic Group X Generation	.52

APPENDIX 1

Appendix 1a. Factor Analysis of Self-Worth Scale Items

Items	Loadings
1. I feel I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others. [r]	.65
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities. [r]	.73
3. I often feel I do not have much to be proud of. [r]	-.56
4. I take a positive attitude toward myself. [r]	.77
5. I often don't like myself.	-.72
6. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. [r]	.72
7. At times, I think I am no good at all. [r]	-.71
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. [r]	-.67
9. I usually feel good about myself.	.80
10. I feel I have much to offer as a person.	.74

Omega Reliability: .93

[r] Item from Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg 1965)

Appendix 1b. Factor Analysis of Self-Efficacy Scale Items

Items	Loadings
1. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. [r]	-.70
2. I am able to achieve things as well as most people. [r]	.62
3. I feel as if what happens to me is mostly determined by other people.	-.65
4. I certainly feel helpless at times. [r]	-.71
5. There is no way I can solve some of the problems I have. [p]	-.68
6. Sometimes I feel that I'm not able to accomplish what I want.	-.71
7. I have little control over the things that happen to me. [p]	-.76
8. I can do just about anything I really set my mind to. [p]	.67
9. I often feel unable to deal with the problems of life. [p]	-.73
10. What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me. [p]	.51
11. There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life. [p]	-.68
12. I have a lot of confidence in the actions I undertake in my life.	.65

Omega Reliability: .93

[r] Item from Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg 1965)

[p] Item from Pearlin Mastery Scale (Pearlin and Schooler 1978)

Appendix 1c. Factor Analysis of Authenticity Scale Items

Items	Loadings
1. I feel most people don't know the "real" me.	-.67
2. I find I can almost always be myself.	.71
3. I feel people expect me to be different than I really am.	-.57
4. I feel even my closest friends do not understand me.	-.68
5. I think most people accept who I really am.	.65
6. I just wish I were more able to be myself.	-.78
7. I feel the way in which I generally act reflects the "real" me.	.65
8. I can't always be the way I want to be.	-.55
9. I often do not feel I am myself.	-.80
10. I often feel that I am not being true to myself.	-.77
11. I feel I can be myself virtually anywhere I go.	.68
12. I often feel that what I do does not really reflect who I am.	-.70
13. I sometimes feel I need to be someone else to get through the day.	-.72

Omega Reliability: .94