

The Development of Ethnic Identity During Adolescence

Sabine Elizabeth French
University of Illinois at Chicago

Edward Seidman
William T. Grant Foundation

LaRue Allen and J. Lawrence Aber
New York University

The development of ethnic identity is a critical facet of adolescence, particularly for adolescents of color. In order to examine the developmental trajectory of ethnic identity, African American, Latino American, and European American early and middle adolescents ($N = 420$) were assessed over 3 years. Two components of ethnic identity were assessed—group-esteem was found to rise for both early and middle adolescents; exploration rose for middle adolescents. African Americans and Latino Americans were lower in group-esteem but have greater increases than European Americans, particularly across a school transition. The course of ethnic identity development during early and middle adolescence, the role of school context, and the variability in developmental trajectories among racial and ethnic groups are discussed.

Keywords: ethnic identity development, adolescents, longitudinal

With the rapid changes in the racial and ethnic composition of our nation, understanding ethnic identity development has gained increasing theoretical, empirical, and practical salience. With each passing year, the number of children of color grows, and they will eventually outnumber European American children, thus necessarily making issues relating to the development of children of color central themes in psychology. The social origins of the ethnic identity development literature date back to Clark and Clark's (1950) research examining racial preference with young African American children. Through judicial decision making, these classic studies had a far-reaching impact on society in terms of the desegregation of public schools. In part, this early empirical work on young children stimulated the development of theories of ethnic identity development.

Theoretically, many forms of identity, including ethnic identity, become especially salient during adolescence. Yet, surprisingly, the research examining these theories has been primarily cross-sectional and has only recently focused on early or middle adolescents. In addition, these theories of ethnic identity development have not been subject to rigorous empirical test. The present study

further researchers' understanding of ethnic identity development by examining the developmental trajectories of two major dimensions of ethnic identity: group-esteem (or regard) and exploration (or search). These two dimensions are examined over a 3-year period during early and middle adolescence for African Americans, Latino Americans, and European Americans. But first, theories of identity development and ethnic and racial identity development are reviewed and examined.

Theories of Identity Development

Theories of ethnic identity development are essentially at the intersection of developmental and social psychology. Developmental psychology's interest in identity development stems from Erikson's (1968) seminal work, *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, in which Erikson located the search for and development of one's identity as the critical psychosocial task of adolescence. The identity crisis of adolescence is resolved by reconciling the identities imposed upon oneself by one's family and society with one's need to assert control and seek out an identity that brings one satisfaction, feelings of industry, and competence. Forming a healthy, developed identity through the process of exploration and commitment was proposed as essential to the mental health of an individual.

However, social psychologists' interest in identity is centered around feelings of belonging to a group and the consequences of identification with one's social groups in society (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Rather than discuss social identity in developmental and teleological terms, where a young person moves through stages until he or she reaches an ideal state of social identity, social psychologists have focused on the negotiation of one's social identity in the broader context of the value society has placed on one's group membership. Individuals who belong to highly valued groups do not need to modify or enhance their social identity; however, when faced with a context that devalues one's group, the

Sabine Elizabeth French, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago; Edward Seidman, William T. Grant Foundation; LaRue Allen and J. Lawrence Aber, School of Education, New York University.

This research was supported in part by National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Grant MH43084 and Carnegie Corporation Grant B4850, awarded to Edward Seidman, J. Lawrence Aber, and LaRue Allen, and NIMH Training Grant T32-MH19890. We thank the children and schools whose cooperation made this study possible as well as Pat Shrout, Beth Shinn, and Diane Hughes for comments on earlier versions of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sabine Elizabeth French, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1007 West Harrison Street, MC 285, Chicago, IL 60607-7137. E-mail: sefrench@uic.edu

person may have to engage in a process to negotiate the meaning of his or her identity.

Tajfel and Turner (1986) outlined three strategies by which individuals can deal with being a member of a devalued group: (a) individual mobility—if possible, the individual chooses to physically leave the group and change group membership, or if group membership is not permeable (modifiable), such as gender, race, or ethnicity, then the individual chooses to psychologically leave his or her group by disidentifying with the group; (b) social creativity—the group as a whole chooses to redefine the meaning of their group membership by comparing themselves with the out-group on a dimension on which they are superior or by changing the values assigned to the attributes of the group from negative to positive; and (c) social competition—in which the group as a whole fights the current system to actually change the hierarchy of group membership in society. In the same way that we can feel good about ourselves and have a high level of self-esteem, we can also feel good about being a member of a group and have high collective self-esteem (what we call *group-esteem*) (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). In order to test Tajfel and Turner's theory, Crocker and Luhtanen (1990) used a measure of collective self-esteem that did not require participants to assess one particular aspect of their identity (e.g., ethnicity or gender); they found that people who were high in collective self-esteem were more likely to engage in strategies to restore a threatened social identity than were people low in collective self-esteem. Therefore, members of a devalued group who use individual mobility would have a low group-esteem, whereas members who used either social creativity or social competition would have a high group-esteem.

People of color in the United States are generally considered members of devalued groups (Jones, 1997). Tajfel (1978) predicted that groups held in low regard by society would internalize these negative attitudes and would be adversely affected. However, the research on African Americans has not borne out his prediction. In a meta-analysis of hundreds of studies of self-esteem, researchers found that African Americans have consistently reported self-esteem that is as high or higher than European Americans (Twenge & Crocker, 2002). Given consistent findings on the relationship between self-esteem and minority group membership, researchers began to explore ethnic identity as a mediating factor. Ethnic identity development may be a form of Tajfel's "social creativity" strategy because in the process of developing positive ethnic identity, individuals redefine what it means to be a member of their ethnic group and no longer allow society to define it for them. Thus, it is critical to focus on the development of ethnic identity, especially for people of color in the United States.

Theories of Ethnic Identity Development

Many developmental and social psychologists regard ethnic identity as one of many facets of an individual's social identity (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998). Living in the United States, where there are many different ethnic groups coexisting in society, makes one's ethnicity highly salient, especially as the numbers of ethnic "minorities" grow and move toward surpassing the European American "majority." Multiple models of ethnic identity development have been proposed for African Americans, Latino Americans, and European Americans (e.g., Arce, 1981; Cross, 1991; Helms, 1990, respectively).

On the basis of Marcia's (1980) conceptualization of Erikson's (1968) theory of identity development, Phinney (1989) proposed a model of ethnic identity development for members of all ethnic groups in which individuals progress through three stages: (a) *unexamined ethnic identity*—individuals have unexamined positive or negative views of their ethnic group; (b) *ethnic identity search (or exploration)*—individuals have begun a search into what it means to be a group member, and (c) *achieved ethnic identity*—individuals have explored their ethnic group membership and are clear as to the meaning of ethnicity in their life. Although a positive group-esteem is not part of the definition of the third stage, having a positive sense of ethnic group membership is often expected of individuals who have an achieved ethnic identity and is highly correlated with ethnic identity achievement (Phinney, 1992).

Cross's (1971) model of Nigrescence is a five-stage model for African Americans moving from self-hatred to self-love: (a) pre-encounter, (b) encounter, (c) immersion-emersion, (d) internalization, and (e) internalization-commitment (Cross, 1971, 1991). Cross (1991) suggests that individuals in the pre-encounter stage believe that race does not matter and never give their racial group membership much thought—their group-esteem could be positive or negative, but their exploration is very low. The encounter was originally conceived of as the occurrence of a traumatic, racially prejudiced event that shakes a person from their original view so that they are more receptive to new interpretations of their racial identity. More recently, Cross (1991, 1995) suggests that this critical encounter can be initiated from many small and negative eye-opening incidents too. After experiencing the encounter, the person now decides to be "Black," explores what it means to be "Black," and fully immerses himself or herself into everything that is "Black." Upon emerging from the immersion-emersion stage, individuals enter the internalization stage in which they are confident and proud of their identity as a Black person and have a positive group-esteem. Individuals in the internalization-commitment stage take their confidence in and commitment to their race one step further and work toward elevating the status of African Americans and eliminating racism in our society. It is possible for individuals to stagnate at the immersion-emersion stage and not move on (Cross, 1991) or to recycle back through the stages at later points in life after experiencing a new encounter (Parham, 1989).

Much less research has examined ethnic identity in children under the age of 10. Bernal, Knight, Garza, Ocampo, and Cota (1990) used a cognitive developmental framework to examine the steps in the process of the acquisition of ethnic identity in preschool and elementary school-age children. As their cognitive abilities develop, children are able to move from the correct acquisition of ethnic labels to ethnic constancy. These researchers defined ethnic identity in this age group more simply than did Phinney and Cross; they defined ethnic identity as knowledge about one's own ethnic group and the sense of self as a member of that group. This definition is more appropriate for elementary-age children who are not capable of the abstract thinking skills that are required for deeper thought about what it means to be a member of one's ethnic group.

Phinney (1989) suggested that ethnic identity development is a facet of adolescence, whereas Cross, Strauss, and Fhagen-Smith (1999) suggested that the Nigrescence process is for adults. Cross

(1995) also noted that there are some African Americans who have been socialized from childhood to have positive group-esteem and racial awareness and are not in need of Nigrescence. These models of ethnic identity have a great deal in common. They suggest that individuals begin in a state of unawareness or disinterest about what it means to be a member of their ethnic group. From this initial state, individuals move through a process of exploration into their ethnicity. Ideally, after this process, individuals are able to come to terms and are satisfied with their sense of self as a member of their ethnic group and have a positive group-esteem.

Testing Ethnic Identity Development Models

From the time Marcia (1966) set forth his four-status model of ego identity development on the basis of Erickson's theory, researchers have attempted to validate this theory. It is interesting to note that although Marcia did not propose this to be a stage model, many researchers have examined this model as such because of the identity achievement status being an ideal end state. Researchers have also tested ethnic identity development primarily in terms of the stage model. However, the stage model may not truly capture the dynamic nature of ethnic identity. Only recently have researchers examined identity development in terms of continuous growth as opposed to discrete changes in stage. The stage model may not capture subtle changes in ethnic identity over short periods of time, whereas a continuous growth approach will. One goal of the present study was to examine ethnic identity in terms of continuous growth rather than discrete stages.

Hundreds of studies have been conducted over the past 35 years in which the identity development stage model has been examined and has been reviewed in detail elsewhere (see Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1993; Meeus, Iedema, & Vollebergh, 1999; Waterman, 1982). Much of the research has been cross-sectional and generally has demonstrated that older adolescents were more likely to be at higher stages than younger adolescents, suggesting that individuals progressed linearly as they aged. However, the few longitudinal studies of identity development have found that although many individuals progress to higher stages of identity, individuals also regress to lower stages. Thus, this four-stage model of identity development has essentially been dropped in lieu of returning to the four-status model of identity development, acknowledging that there are multiple pathways among the four statuses (Waterman, 1999).

Similar to the research on ego identity development, most research on ethnic identity development has been cross-sectional. However, Phinney (1989; Phinney & Chavira, 1992) tested her model of ethnic identity development longitudinally. Adolescents were categorized into Phinney's three-stage model at two points. Some of the 18 adolescents who were followed-up progressed to a higher stage of ethnic identity development. Unfortunately, with only 18 of the original 60 adolescents successfully followed for 3 years, replication remains essential.

Without categorizing individuals into stages, three studies used Phinney's (1992) global measure of ethnic identity (a combination of ethnic identity achievement, sense of belonging, and exploration) to examine ethnic identity over time. The results were mixed in that neither the Clubb (1998) nor the Chatman (1999) studies found any evidence of change in reported ethnic identity, but Perron, Vondracek, Skorikov, Tremblay, and Corbière (1998) did

find evidence of an increase in ethnic identity over time for the minority students and no change in ethnic identity for the majority adolescents. However, these studies differ dramatically in terms of developmental level of the adolescents, ethnicity, frequency and number of assessments, and the ecological context in which they took place. Clubb (1998) assessed two cohorts of African American middle-school students (sixth–eighth and seventh–ninth grades) five times over 3 years. Three stable longitudinal profiles of ethnic identity were discovered—stable low levels, stable moderate levels, and stable high levels. Unfortunately, no description of the school environment was given, so one cannot ascertain whether these students attended racially homogeneous or diverse schools and what role the school context may have played. Chatman (1999) surveyed African American college students over a 15-week period—at the beginning, middle, and end of their fall semester. This is a short time to expect changes in ethnic identity. However, Perron et al. (1998) followed four cohorts (7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th graders) of multiethnic Canadian adolescents over 15 months. A further difficulty that complicates the interpretation of all three studies is that the global measure comprises three different dimensions of ethnic identity: belonging (group-esteem), ethnic identity achievement (a mixture of exploration and clarity of identity), and ethnic behaviors.

In a study to assess factors that predict change in ethnic identity over the transition to senior high school, French, Seidman, Allen, and Aber (2000) surveyed adolescents in their last year of junior high school and 1 year later at the end of their first year of senior high school. Given the dramatic role and structural changes that accompany the normative transition, French et al. (2000) predicted that the transition could serve as an "encounter," that is, an event to stimulate one to think about what it means to be a member of her or his racial or ethnic group. In examining ethnic identity, they used the Group-Esteem and Exploration subscales. The ethnicity of the adolescents, as well as the school environment, the perceived environment, and the ethnic composition of the school played a role in understanding the identity of both African American and European American students. These results indicated not only that changes in the school environment over the normative school transition could impact ethnic identity and serve as a possible "encounter" but also that the ethnic identity of African American and European American youths responded differently to similar experiences, suggesting that ethnic identity may mean very different things for these two groups.

The Present Investigation

Given that the major theories of ethnic identity are developmental in nature, it is surprising that so little research has been longitudinal. The major goal of this investigation was to examine longitudinally the developmental course of ethnic identity over two key transitional periods during adolescence. Additional questions examine whether (a) patterns of ethnic identity are similar across different ethnic groups (African American, Latino American, and European American), (b) there is evidence of increased group-esteem and exploration during early adolescence or middle adolescence, and (c) there are different patterns of change over the transition year to junior and senior high schools than over the first 2 years in each new school.

In this study, two critical dimensions of ethnic identity development are examined. The first dimension, *group-esteem*, is defined as how one feels about being a member of one's racial or ethnic group, and the second dimension, *exploration*, is defined as how much an individual tries to find out what it means to be a member of one's racial or ethnic group. Exploration is designed to tap Phinney's (1992) construct of ethnic search and may also represent some aspects of Cross's (1991) immersion-emersion stage. Although group-esteem is not exactly the same as commitment to one's group, it is strongly positively related to commitment to one's group (Phinney, 1992). In addition, having a positive sense of group-esteem is an important part of being committed to one's group.

The patterns of change for both group-esteem and exploration are examined. Given the ethnically diverse contexts in which our adolescents live, the first hypothesis is that both exploration and group-esteem will increase over time. Adolescence is the critical period during which to examine changes in identity because it is during this time that abstract reasoning abilities increase as well as the need to explore multiple aspects of one's identity. This increase in exploration possibly may lead to an increase in group-esteem; thus, it is important to examine both of these dimensions of ethnic identity. Rather than focus on stages of ethnic identity as some of the previous literature has done, we focused on the continuous change in the two dimensions of ethnic identity. An examination of stages would overlook smaller changes in group-esteem or exploration that could occur over a 1-year time period, whereas an examination of the variables continuously will allow us to see subtle changes that may occur.

In order to expand on researchers' knowledge of the variation in the course of ethnic identity, a cohort of early adolescents and middle adolescents are examined separately. Tatum (1997) would suggest that one should see greater increases among the early adolescents because it is during this time that they first begin to differentiate their friendships along ethnic lines. However, French et al. (2000) found that the increasing demographic diversity of the high school environment played a role in both group-esteem and exploration; thus, the second hypothesis is that greater increases in group-esteem and exploration will be seen for the middle adolescents than for the early adolescents. In a similar vein, more change in ethnic identity is expected over the transition year than over the first 2 years of school in the new school environment because of the disruptive nature of the school transition (French et al., 2000; Seidman, Aber, Allen, & French, 1996). Minimal research has revealed gender differences in terms of ethnic identity; therefore, gender differences are not expected. Thus, in order to maximize sample size in all analyses, gender differences are not examined.

Even though the majority of ethnic identity models were designed with people of color in mind, it is expected that ethnic identity will be meaningful for all students in our sample. Given the large immigrant population of the primary location of our sample, New York City, European American adolescents are likely to identify with various European ethnic groups, such as being Italian or Greek, rather than merely identifying with being White. Whereas European Americans generally have the choice to identify as "White" or as a member of a White ethnic group (Waters, 1990), ethnic group membership is particularly salient in a large immigrant city such as New York. However, previous research has demonstrated that ethnic identity is more salient for people of color

than for European Americans (Phinney & Alipuria, 1990; Smith, 1991); therefore, the third hypothesis is that African American and Latino American adolescents will report higher levels of exploration and group-esteem. Nonetheless, both similarities and differences in trajectories of ethnic identity will be examined for the three ethnic groups in this study. In addition, given the ethnic diversity within broad racial and ethnic labels such as *Black*, *Latino*, and *White*, subethnic groups within these broader groups will be compared to determine whether it is appropriate to collapse them into the broader categories.

Method

The data for this study were drawn from the Adolescent Pathways Project (APP), a longitudinal study of youth attending Eastern urban public schools with high concentrations of poor children in three major Eastern seaboard cities.

Sampling

School selection. Elementary and junior high/intermediate schools with high proportions of the student body eligible for reduced and/or free lunch were selected. Predominantly African American or Latino American schools with a minimum of 80% and predominantly European American schools with a minimum of 60% of the student body eligible for reduced and/or free lunch were targeted. (The poorest European American schools did not have as high concentrations of economically poor students as did the schools with predominantly minority enrollments.) Within these schools, all students in the grade prior to the transition to either junior or senior high school were recruited (i.e., fifth/sixth or eighth/ninth graders, respectively).

Recruitment. Study participants were recruited in each classroom of the highest grade of each targeted school. All students in attendance were introduced to the study by the teacher, a staff member, or both. Students were given a description of the study and a consent form and asked to have a parent (or guardian) read the description, sign the consent form, and return it to the school. (The study description and active consent forms were in both English and Spanish.) For students with signed parental consent forms, the study was again described to the youth, and they were asked to sign their own youth informed consent before participating in Wave 1.

Data collection. Data were collected in group settings at schools by APP staff of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Instructions and questions were read aloud to the group. Staff members circulated to answer students' questions and "spot-check" measures for which directions were more complicated.

Design and retention. Time 1 data (pretransition year) were collected between March and early June of 1988 or 1989. Between 10 and 12 months later, after the transition, a second wave of data was gathered from 70% of the students who participated in Wave 1 (Time 2—transition year, January–May of 1989 or 1990). Approximately 1 year later, a third wave of data was gathered from 85% of the students who participated in Waves 1 and 2 (Time 3—posttransition year).

In Time 1, ethnic identity was the final measure in a lengthy protocol, and unfortunately, when time fully elapsed, the ethnic identity measure was frequently not completed. Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were conducted to examine differences between youth who did not complete the ethnic identity measure in Time 1 and those who had completed it in Times 1, 2, and 3 with regard to ethnic identity at Time 2 and Time 3 as well as demographic variables at Time 1. The MANOVA for the early adolescents was significant, $F(4, 524) = 2.49, p < .05$, which was accounted for by a significant difference in group-esteem at Time 3, which was significantly higher for the early adolescents who were included in the

study, $F(1, 527) = 7.10, p < .01$ ($M_{\text{included}} = 3.51, SD = .64; M_{\text{excluded}} = 3.35, SD = .75$). It is important to note that although there is a significant difference, it only accounts for 1% of the variance. More important, students did not intentionally skip the ethnic identity measure; the survey was not completed because time elapsed. In addition, more early adolescent African Americans and European Americans were included, and more Latino Americans were excluded, $\chi^2(2, N = 258) = 60.55, p < .001$. There was no difference for the middle adolescents. There was no difference for gender for either the early or middle adolescents.

Sample description. The sample for this study consisted of African American, Latino American, and European American students for whom three waves of data were available. In all, 420 adolescents—258 early adolescents and 162 middle adolescents—were included. The mean age for the early adolescents is 11.28 years ($SD = 0.82$), and the mean age for the middle adolescents is 14.01 years ($SD = 1.05$) at the time of the pretransition year assessment. Of the sample, 30% of early adolescents began as fifth graders, and 70% began as sixth graders. Sixty-three percent of middle adolescents began as eighth graders, and 37% began as ninth graders.

Among the early adolescents, there were 154 girls and 104 boys. Subethnic group descriptions are based on youths' open-ended self-description. Thus, of the 102 Black students, 63 were African American, and 39 were Caribbean American; of the 81 European American students, 17 were nonethnic White, 39 Italian, 11 Greek, and 14 "other" European ethnic group; and of the 75 Latino Americans, 20 were Puerto Rican, 27 Dominican, and 28 "other" Latino. For the middle adolescent cohort, there were 115 girls and 47 boys, 45 Black¹ students (39 African American and 6 Caribbean American), 71 European Americans (14 nonethnic White, 26 Italian, 12 Greek, and 19 "other" European ethnic group), and 46 Latino Americans (12 Puerto Rican, 17 Dominican, and 17 "other" Latino).

Immigrant status was obtained by asking participants in which country they were born; 32.4% of African American, 10% of European American, and 34.7% of Latino American participants were born outside the United States. Immigrant status was not related to group-esteem or exploration at any time point; thus, immigrant status was not included in the analyses. Participants reported their ethnic label at all three time points; only 3.7% were inconsistent in their choice of an ethnic label over time; that is, they self-labeled as one ethnicity at one time point and a different ethnicity at another time point. Inconsistency did not differ by ethnicity and was not related to group-esteem or exploration at any time point. Thirty-four students reported biracial ancestry and were classified as being a member of their ethnic minority group if one parent was either African American or Latino American and the other parent was European American. Students who had one African American parent and one Latino American parent could not be classified as a member of one ethnic minority group, so they were not included in the analyses. The number of biracial students was too small to analyze separately; however, the results of the study are identical when they are excluded from analyses. Therefore, they are included in all analyses.

Although we chose schools with high levels of poverty, we did not directly measure socioeconomic status of the adolescents; instead, we measured underemployment—that is, whether parents have full-time or part-time jobs. The scale ranges from 0 (*two full-time jobs*) to 5 (*no jobs*). For early adolescents, the mean underemployment by ethnic group was as follows: African American = .95 ($SD = 1.29$) (approximately one parent with a full-time job and one parent with a part-time job); European American = 1.43 ($SD = 1.36$) (between one parent with a full-time job and one parent with a part-time job and one parent with a full-time job); Latino American = 2.21 ($SD = 1.57$) (one parent with a full-time job). There was a significant difference between the three ethnic groups such that Latino American early adolescents were significantly more underemployed than were African American and European American early adolescents, $F(2, 255) = 17.63, p < .001$. For the middle adolescents, the means were African American = .98 ($SD = 1.18$) (one parent with a full-time job and one parent with a part-time job); European American = 1.44 ($SD = 1.40$)

(between one parent with a full-time job and one parent with a part-time job and one parent with a full-time job); Latino American = 1.61 ($SD = 1.69$) (between one parent with a full-time job and one parent with a part-time job and one parent with a full-time job). No significant difference was found for underemployment for middle adolescents, $F(2, 159) = 2.388, ns$. Underemployment is not associated with group-esteem or exploration at any time point. Thus, underemployment was not included in the analyses.

At Time 1, the pretransition year, both early and middle adolescents attended predominantly homogeneous schools; that is, the African American students in our sample attended schools where the majority of students were African American, the Latino American students attended schools where the majority of the students were Latino American, and the European American students attended schools where the majority of the students were European American. At Time 2, the transition year, the early adolescents transitioned into similarly homogeneous junior high schools, whereas the middle adolescents generally transitioned into more diverse senior high schools.

Measures

Ethnic identity. The ethnic identity measure was adapted from Phinney's (1989) original structured interview on ethnic identity, prior to the development of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992). Students were first asked to list all the ethnic or racial labels they used to identify themselves; they were given several examples of racial and ethnic labels. Then, they were instructed to respond to the subsequent questions in terms of the labels they chose for themselves. Seven items were chosen to represent two dimensions of ethnic identity: group-esteem and exploration. These items were rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*very true*) to 4 (*not at all true*). These seven items were subjected to a factor analysis, which confirmed the two-factor structure of ethnic identity across all racial and ethnic groups, genders, and age groups. Group-esteem was based on three items ($\alpha = .71$): "I feel good about being in my racial/ethnic group"; "I want to raise my children to be aware of their own cultural or racial/ethnic background"; and "I feel comfortable among people of my own group and at least one other group". Exploration was based on four items ($\alpha = .76$): "I talk with my friends about our racial/ethnic group and how it affects our lives"; "I have talked with my parents or other adults about what it means to be a member of my racial/ethnic group"; "I have thought about whether being a member of my racial/ethnic group will affect my future goals"; and "My parents or other adults taught me about my racial/ethnic background".

Results

First we examined whether there were subethnic group differences in terms of their ethnic identity at Time 1 within each panethnic category. If the subethnic groups were similar, then we examined whether the three broad panethnic groups differed in terms of their ethnic identity at Time 1. Next, we examined the development of ethnic identity over 3 years. We first examined the development of ethnic identity over 3 years within the subethnic groups within the larger ethnic categories in order to see whether they were similar in their trajectories. If they were similar in trajectory, then we collapsed across the subethnic groups and compared the three broader ethnic groups in order to examine the interaction of ethnicity with change in time—more specifically, do

¹ For the remainder of this article, all Black students are referred to as *African American*, even though there are Caribbean American students among them.

the three ethnicities have different patterns of change over time? All analyses were conducted separately for the early and the middle adolescent cohorts.

Subethnic Group Time 1 Analyses

First, the African American and Caribbean American students were compared on group-esteem and exploration at Time 1. There were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of group-esteem or exploration for either the early or middle adolescents, early: $t_s(100) = 1.88, 1.07, ns$; middle: $t_s(43) = -1.03, -0.70, ns$, respectively. Next, the Puerto Rican, Dominican, and "other" Latinos were compared. Once again, there were no significant differences at Time 1 group-esteem or exploration for the early or middle adolescents; early: $F_s(2, 72) = 0.56, 0.14, ns$; middle: $F_s(2, 43) = 2.38, 0.26, ns$, respectively. Finally, the nonethnic White, Italian, Greek, and "other" European ethnic students were compared. And again, there were no significant differences in terms of group-esteem or exploration for the early or middle adolescents, early: $F_s(3, 77) = 0.82, 1.53, ns$; middle: $F_s(3, 67) = 1.04, 0.49, ns$, respectively. Thus, we felt confident collapsing the subethnic groups into the three categories of African American, Latino American, and European American.

Racial and Ethnic Group Time 1 Analyses

Using a MANOVA, we compared the three groups on group-esteem and exploration at Time 1 within the early adolescents and middle adolescents separately. The MANOVAs for group-esteem and exploration were conducted because group-esteem and exploration represent two dimensions of the construct of ethnic identity, and their correlations within time were moderate to large (see Table 1). We also conducted planned contrasts comparing (a) the African Americans and Latino Americans with the European Americans (minority vs. majority) as well as (b) the African Americans with the Latino Americans. The three ethnic group MANOVA was significant for both the early and middle adolescents, $F(4, 508) = 3.96, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$; and, $F(4, 316) = 4.67, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$, respectively. Univariate analyses illustrated that the significant difference was accounted for exclusively for group-esteem for both the early and middle adolescents, $F(2,$

$255) = 7.71, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$; and, $F(2, 159) = 9.07, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$, respectively.

Planned contrasts for the early adolescents illustrated that the European Americans reported higher group-esteem than the African Americans and Latino Americans ($C = -0.33, SE = .09, p < .001$), whereas there was no significant difference between the African Americans and Latino Americans ($C = 0.09, SE = .09, ns$). Planned contrasts for the middle adolescents also illustrated that the European Americans reported higher group-esteem than the African Americans and Latino Americans ($C = -0.22, SE = .09, p < .05$), but for this cohort, the African Americans reported lower group-esteem than the Latino Americans ($C = 0.35, SE = .10, p < .001$). Exploration was not significantly different for the early or middle adolescents, $F(2, 255) = 1.05, ns, \eta^2 = .01$; and, $F(2, 159) = 1.45, ns, \eta^2 = .02$, respectively. Thus, the three groups differed in terms of group-esteem for both early and middle adolescents, with European Americans reporting higher group-esteem than African Americans and Latino Americans and with middle adolescent Latino Americans reporting higher group-esteem than African Americans at Time 1—the last year of elementary school or junior high school, respectively.

Subethnic Group Analyses

Although we confirmed that the subethnic groups report similar levels of group-esteem and exploration at Time 1, we also examined whether the subethnic groups had similar trajectories of ethnic identity development over 3 years. To examine the longitudinal progression of ethnic identity within each racial/ethnic category, an Ethnicity \times Time (pretransition, transition, posttransition) repeated measures MANOVA for group-esteem and exploration was performed separately within each panethnic group and within each cohort. Because our interest was whether the developmental progression of the dimensions of ethnic identity were equivalent for the subgroups, only the within-subject interactions with ethnicity were examined. When the multivariate interaction effect with time was significant, the univariate interactions for group-esteem and exploration were examined.

For Black students, the Multivariate Time \times Subethnicity effect was not significant for either the early or middle adolescents, $F(4, 394) = 0.47, ns$; and, $F(4, 170) = 2.04, ns$. For Latino students, the Multivariate Time \times Subethnicity effect was not significant for either the early or middle adolescents, $F(8, 274) = 2.57, ns$; and, $F(8, 166) = 1.70, ns$, respectively. For White students, the Multivariate Time \times Subethnicity effect was not significant for either the early or middle adolescents, $F(12, 326) = 0.67, ns$; and, $F(12, 278) = 0.40, ns$, respectively. Given the consistent similarities within the subethnic groups, we used the broader racial and ethnic categories for the remaining analyses.

The Course of Ethnic Identity

The pretransition, transition, and posttransition year means and standard deviations for group-esteem and exploration are presented in Table 2. To examine the longitudinal progression of ethnic identity, an Ethnicity (African American, Latino American, European American) \times Time (pretransition, transition, posttransition) repeated measures MANOVA for group-esteem and exploration was performed separately for the early and middle adoles-

Table 1
Group-Esteem and Exploration Correlations Within Time
by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group

Age group and race/ethnicity	Pretransition year: Time 1	Transition year: Time 2	Posttransition year: Time 3
Early adolescents			
African American	.67	.47	.51
European American	.37	.16 ^a	.44
Latino American	.52	.45	.46
Middle adolescents			
African American	.57	.52	.52
European American	.45	.46	.48
Latino American	.24 ^a	.47	.53

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

^a Nonsignificant.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Group-Esteem and Exploration by Age Group and Race/Ethnicity

Age group and race/ethnicity	n	Group-esteem						Exploration					
		Time 1		Time 2		Time 3		Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Early adolescents	258	3.08	.83	3.46	.72	3.51	.64	2.55	.84	2.57	.91	2.65	.87
African American	102	2.89	.94	3.53	.66	3.59	.62	2.48	.88	2.64	.95	2.65	.86
European American	81	3.36	.65	3.50	.60	3.49	.63	2.66	.83	2.57	.84	2.59	.92
Latino American	75	3.03	.78	3.31	.87	3.42	.68	2.54	.80	2.48	.92	2.71	.86
Middle adolescents	162	3.25	.71	3.55	.60	3.57	.55	2.59	.72	2.63	.89	2.84	.82
African American	45	2.89	.86	3.48	.69	3.64	.52	2.46	.79	2.74	.86	2.99	.77
European American	71	3.40	.61	3.58	.54	3.62	.50	2.60	.64	2.57	.87	2.79	.80
Latino American	46	3.38	.58	3.57	.62	3.43	.62	2.71	.75	2.62	.97	2.77	.89

cent cohorts. When the multivariate main effects or interactions were significant, the univariate main effects or interactions for group-esteem and exploration were examined. When the univariate main effects or interactions were significant, polynomial contrasts were examined to test whether the progression was linear or curvilinear. A curvilinear pattern was indicated by a significant quadratic effect across the 3 years—a curvilinear pattern with an increase or decrease over the transition year may indicate an effect of the transition. Planned contrasts were conducted to test for differences by ethnicity. Average scores for both group-esteem and exploration (across the three time points) were compared for the three ethnic groups. The first contrast compared European Americans with African Americans and Latino Americans in order to see whether there was a majority versus minority group member difference, and the second contrast compared African Americans with Latino Americans to see whether there was a difference between the two ethnic minority groups.

Early Adolescents

Both the multivariate time effect, $F(4, 1018) = 15.05, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$, and the Multivariate Time \times Ethnicity effect, $F(8, 1018) = 2.64, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$, were significant such that there was a significant change in ethnic identity over time, and it changed differentially by ethnicity. In Table 2, one can see by the rising means at each time point that the univariate time effect was significant for group-esteem, $F(2, 510) = 26.39, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09$, but not for exploration, $F(2, 510) = 1.27, ns, \eta^2 = .01$. Group-esteem significantly increased over time for the early adolescents, but exploration did not change. Both the linear and quadratic contrasts for group-esteem were significant, $F(1, 255) = 44.92, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15$; and, $F(1, 255) = 8.25, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$, respectively. Thus, group-esteem rose over time, and it rose more over the transition from elementary to junior high school, but it did not rise as much over the first 2 years of junior high school, suggesting that the transition to junior high school may have an impact on the development of group-esteem.

Again, in Table 2, one can see that the Univariate Time \times Race/Ethnicity effect was also significant for group-esteem, $F(4, 510) = 4.81, p = .001, \eta^2 = .04$, but not for exploration, $F(4, 510) = 1.33, ns, \eta^2 = .01$, such that the change in group-esteem over time differed by ethnic group, but the three ethnic groups had

similar patterns of exploration over the 3 years. Only the linear contrast for group-esteem was significant, $F(2, 255) = 7.84, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$; quadratic: $F(2, 255) = 1.84, ns, \eta^2 = .01$. The ethnic groups differed in their linear pattern for group-esteem over the 3 years. African American and Latino American students were significantly different from the European American students in their group-esteem patterns ($C = -0.13, SE = .05, p < .05$); however, African American and Latino American students were not different from each other ($C = -0.06, SE = .05, ns$). Overall, a significant increase in group-esteem was evident over time, especially over the transition year, whereas change in exploration was not evident. African American and Latino American students have a greater increase in group-esteem over time than European American students.

Middle Adolescents

The multivariate time effect for the middle adolescents was also significant, $F(4, 634) = 12.23, p < .001, \eta^2 = .07$, as was the Multivariate Time \times Ethnicity effect, $F(8, 634) = 3.17, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$. There was a significant change in ethnic identity over time, and it changed differently by ethnicity. Examining Table 2, unlike the early adolescents, one can see that the univariate time effects were significant for both group-esteem, $F(2, 318) = 20.73, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$, and exploration, $F(2, 318) = 6.94, p < .001, \eta^2 = .04$, such that both group-esteem and exploration rose over time. Both the linear and quadratic contrasts for group-esteem were significant, $F(1, 159) = 28.41, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15$; and, $F(1, 159) = 10.33, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06$, respectively. However, only the linear contrast for exploration was significant, $F(1, 159) = 12.86, p < .001, \eta^2 = .08$; quadratic: $F(1, 159) = 1.35, ns, \eta^2 = .01$. Thus, group-esteem rose over time, but not as much over the first 2 years of senior high school as it did over the transition from junior to senior high school. Exploration rose steadily over time.

The Univariate Time \times Ethnicity effect was significant for group-esteem, $F(4, 318) = 6.20, p < .001, \eta^2 = .07$, but was not significant for exploration, $F(4, 318) = 1.87, ns, \eta^2 = .02$, such that the change in group-esteem over time differed by ethnicity group. The linear contrast for group-esteem was significant, $F(2, 159) = 10.07, p < .001, \eta^2 = .11$, but not the quadratic, $F(2, 160) = 0.96, ns, \eta^2 = .01$. Thus, the ethnic groups differed in their linear pattern for group-esteem over the 2 years. Despite the

significant Time \times Ethnicity interaction, there was only a marginally significant difference in the majority versus minority contrast for group-esteem ($C = -0.11$, $SE = .06$, $p < .10$), and the African American versus Latino American contrast was not significant ($C = 0.09$, $SE = .07$, ns). Thus, overall, there was a significant increase in group-esteem and exploration over time, and the African Americans and Latino Americans increased slightly more than the European Americans.

Discussion

The primary goal of this study was to add to the knowledge base concerning ethnic identity development. Few longitudinal studies of ethnic identity have been conducted. These longitudinal studies have been limited by small sample sizes, inadequate time frames, and/or lack of a multidimensional approach to ethnic identity. Although the most widely cited models of ethnic identity development are stage models, researchers need to move beyond merely assigning individuals to stages and instead try to grasp the processes underlying the development of ethnic identity. The findings are discussed in terms of the onset of ethnic identity development, the role of school context and the normative school transition as an encounter, and the variability in developmental trajectories among racial and ethnic groups.

The Course of Ethnic Identity Development

Although group-esteem and exploration are highly correlated, they follow different trajectories. As expected, group-esteem was found to rise for both the early and middle adolescent cohorts. However, exploration rose only for the middle adolescent cohort. A critical facet of identity development is the process of exploration. Ego and ethnic identity development models suggest that in order to have an achieved identity, one must go through a process of exploration. Thus, even though the younger adolescents reported positive levels of group-esteem that rose over the 3-year period, it is not clear that this rise represents movement toward the development of an achieved identity without a corresponding rise in exploration. Both Phinney's (1989) and Cross's (1991) models of racial and ethnic identity development suggest that individuals in the unexamined and preencounter stage, respectively, may have positive feelings toward one's group membership, but these are based solely on accepting what one is taught by one's family and not on the process of exploration.

The Role of School Context and School Transitions

A crucial difference between the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in our study is that the high schools were much more ethnically diverse than either the elementary or junior high schools. In fact, ethnically homogeneous elementary and junior high schools were targeted in order to maximize student representation in the three ethnic groups in the study. (They were also linked as feeder schools for ease of follow-up.) Thus, the early adolescents transitioned from relatively homogeneous elementary schools into relatively homogeneous junior high schools, whereas the middle adolescents transitioned from relatively homogeneous neighborhood junior high schools into a variety of senior high schools that ranged from homogeneous to extremely diverse.

Tatum (1997) suggested that junior high school is the time when adolescents begin to segregate themselves by ethnicity. However, she speaks of early adolescents in integrated schools. Because the early adolescents in this study were in homogeneous schools, they did not have the opportunity to choose to self-segregate. Moreover, these students were less likely to experience an encounter without a change in the ethnic composition of the school, nor did the new context heighten racial salience (Sellers, Chavous, & Cooke, 1998). Such a change in composition could have served as an encounter, thus stimulating students to begin to think about their ethnic identity. Thus, it is not surprising that students in this study did not manifest a rise in the exploration of their ethnic identity across the transition to junior high school. At the same time, the greatest increases in group-esteem were over the transition year. Therefore, it is quite possible that the early adolescents could and would begin the process of exploration of their ethnic identity if they were in a setting that was more heterogeneous, in which ethnicity may have been more salient.

However, many of the middle adolescents in this study experienced a change in the ethnic composition of the school when they made the normative school transition to senior high school. Thus, for these students, this transition may serve as an encounter and heighten racial salience (Sellers, Chavous, & Cooke, 1998). In a study by French et al. (2000), the authors found that the change in ethnic congruence over the transition to senior high school predicted increases in exploration. As expected, we confirmed the rise in exploration across the normative transition to more ethnically heterogeneous senior high schools. Group-esteem rises again in the subsequent year, perhaps as a result of the increased exploration.

It may be that although our society is quite diverse, early adolescents who live in racial and ethnic enclaves may not interpret race or ethnicity as salient in their everyday lives, thus not worthy of exploration. However, once adolescents leave the safety and security of their neighborhood and neighborhood school and are faced with many persons who look and act very different from persons in their own ethnic group, ethnicity becomes salient, and the process of exploration may begin. This is not to say that having positive group-esteem or pride in one's ethnic group without the process of exploration is dysfunctional or insufficient. Similarly, this is not to say that interactions with people of other ethnic groups are necessary to explore the meaning of one's ethnic group membership. However, negative interactions with members of other ethnic groups (an encounter) are more likely to push one toward exploring the meaning of being a member of one's ethnic group (Cross, 1995).

Is merely entering a diverse school environment enough to stimulate ethnic identity development? Or, are there extraindividual factors that go hand-in-hand with being in a more diverse setting? Verna and Runion (1985) found that African American students in dissonant school environments reported more negative personal attributes than those in consonant school environments. Rosenberg (1962) found that in more diverse settings, students reported more instances of prejudice. Personal experiences of prejudice in the new school may stimulate an encounter. It is also possible that institutional racism in the schools may become more evident with a more diverse student body (Fine, 1997). Cross (1971, 1991) proposed that it took a prejudicial event to stimulate the exploration process. The role of experiences of racism, both at the personal and institutional level, need to be further examined in

order to understand how the transition to high school may serve as an encounter.

Subethnic Group Differences

We first endeavored to confirm that subethnic groups within broader racial and ethnic group categories would report similar levels of ethnic identity and similar trajectories of ethnic identity development. Despite different cultures and histories in the United States, both “Black” groups—African Americans and Caribbean Americans—reported similar levels of ethnic identity and similar trajectories of ethnic identity development, thus suggesting that in the United States, because both groups are perceived as “Black,” they are both forced to accept their group membership under similar circumstances. We found the same results for the Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and “other” Latino groups in the study. Despite having different cultural backgrounds, these groups typically have Spanish language use in common as well as a perception of being “Latino” by mainstream Americans. In fact, most adolescents reported both a subethnic group label as well as the broader label of *Hispanic* when asked to self-identify ethnically. Finally, all four “White” categories—Italian, Greek, “other” European ethnic and nonethnic Whites—also reported similar levels of ethnic identity and trajectories of development. Despite the fact that some of these students identified with an ethnic group, they all shared the status of being White in the United States. This set of exploratory analyses must be replicated with larger subethnic groups in order to ensure that the subethnic groups are truly not different. The primary purpose of these analyses was to confirm that it was acceptable and appropriate to combine the subethnic groups into the broader ethnic group categories for the primary analyses in this study. We recommend that future research continue to examine subethnic groups as well as broader ethnic categories.

Racial and Ethnic Group Differences

The earliest theories of and research on ethnic identity focused on ethnic groups separately. In general, research has focused on people of color because as “devalued” groups in society, their ethnic identity was considered more vulnerable. Ethnic identity was found to be more salient for people of color (Phinney & Alipuria, 1990; Smith, 1991). Therefore, it was important to examine changes in ethnic identity both across and within the ethnic groups. As predicted, there were slightly different patterns for the three groups.

The African American and Latino American students exhibited the greatest amount of change in group-esteem over the 3 years. Although both the early and middle European American adolescents rose in group-esteem over the 3-year time period, they exhibited the most stable group-esteem over time. The European American students started off high and stayed high in terms of their group-esteem. Although it has been found in previous research that the ethnic identity of European Americans may be less salient (Smith, 1991), the adolescents in this study had high group-esteem. Given their place in society as members of the racial majority and living in cities where there are other ethnic group members with whom to compare themselves, these adolescents were expected to have high group-esteem.

As predicted by social identity theory, the African American middle adolescents reported low group-esteem at Time 1. It is possible that they have taken on a negative view of their group membership and are engaging in the social mobility strategy, that is, psychologically distancing themselves or disidentifying with their group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). However, over the next 2 years, group-esteem increases dramatically, indicating that they may be abandoning the social mobility strategy and engaging in a social creativity strategy in which they are reassessing the standards by which their group is judged and rejecting their validity. Therefore, these adolescents are able to have a high group-esteem over time.

However, it does not seem likely that the early adolescents are engaging in any strategic thinking regarding their racial group membership, given their lack of exploration. They may be developing more positive group-esteem on the basis of mere social influence from peers and popular media such as music and sports. It is also possible that parental messages of positive group-esteem may increase over time as well.

Cautions, Conclusions, and Future Directions

Our findings for the European Americans may be limited to European Americans in ethnically diverse cities or in the Northeast region of the United States. It is in the Northeast that one still finds a substantial influx of recent European immigrants living in ethnic enclaves; thus, the adolescents in this study are regularly exposed to members of their ethnic group in addition to White Americans who are not members of their ethnic group. Ethnic identity may be less salient for European Americans whose families have been in the United States for several generations, especially because these families are likely to have intermarried with other White ethnic groups over the many generations. Findings for the Latino Americans in this study may be limited to Latinos from the Caribbean because few Latinos of Mexican, Central American, or South American descent are included in the study. Latinos from Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, and Cuba have very different histories and cultures than Latinos of Mexican, Central, or South American descent. Finally, the findings for African Americans should be generalizable to other urban African American adolescents, although the experiences of rural African Americans may be different from those in this study simply because of different environments and different historical patterns of race relations. Given that different patterns of development on the basis of racial or ethnic group were found, it is important that we continue to examine ethnic identity both within and across racial and ethnic groups. Further studies need to better evaluate the processes that may explain why different ethnic groups have different developmental trajectories. Again, differential experiences of discrimination may play a role in patterns of ethnic identity as well as different styles of racial and ethnic socialization.

Group-esteem and exploration evidenced different trajectories over two different 3-year periods; group-esteem was more likely to rise than was exploration. Thus, researchers should continue to evaluate the dimensions of ethnic identity rather than focus on global measures. Researchers may want to expand to using 7-point scales when measuring ethnic identity dimensions because there may have been a ceiling effect for group-esteem because most scores were between 3 and 4 on the 4-point scale. Middle adoles-

cents were more likely to increase in exploration than were early adolescents, suggesting that ethnic identity exploration is more likely to be stimulated during the middle adolescent years. Although group-esteem rose for all racial and ethnic groups, it was more likely to rise for African American and Latino American youths. This supports prior notions and assumptions that ethnic identity will be more salient for people of color than for European Americans who are members of the majority group.

Future research must examine the impact of heterogeneous versus homogeneous neighborhood and school settings on the development of ethnic identity among early adolescents in order to better assess whether these young adolescents are cognitively able to explore the meaning of being a member of a racial or ethnic group. In addition, if one finds that being in a heterogeneous environment makes one more likely to engage in exploration, then researchers must determine what extraindividual factors stimulate exploration.

References

- Arce, C. H. (1981). Reconsideration of Chicano culture and identity. *Daedalus*, 110, 177–191.
- Bernal, M. E., Knight, G. P., Garza, C. A., Ocampo, K. A., & Cota, M. K. (1990). The development of ethnic identity in Mexican-American children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 3–24.
- Chatman, C. M. (1999). *The identity paradox model: Explaining school performance among African-American college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey–New Brunswick.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1950). Emotional factors in racial identification and preference in Negro children. *Journal of Negro Education*, 19, 341–350.
- Clubb, P. A. (1998). *Contexts for development and longitudinal patterns of violence among African-American adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 60–67.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). Negro to Black conversion experience. *Black World*, 20, 13–27.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1995). The psychology of nigrescence: Revising the Cross model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 93–122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cross, W. E., Jr., Strauss, L., & Fhagen-Smith, P. (1999). African American identity development across the life span: Educational implications. In R. H. Sheets & E. R. Hollins (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic identity in school practices: Aspects of human development* (pp. 29–47). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis* (1st ed.). New York: Norton.
- Fine, M. (1997). Witnessing whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power and society* (pp. 57–65). Florence, KY: Taylor & Francis/Routledge.
- French, S. E., Seidman, E., Allen, L., & Aber, J. L. (2000). Racial/ethnic identity, congruence with the social context, and the transition to high school. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15, 587–602.
- Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 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., Waterman, A. S., Matteson, D. R., Archer, S. L., & Orlofsky, J. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Meeus, W., Iedema, J., & Vollebergh, W. (1999). Identity formation re-revisited: A rejoinder to Waterman on developmental and cross-cultural issues. *Developmental Review*, 19, 480–496.
- Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological nigrescence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 17, 187–226.
- Perron, J., Vondracek, F. W., Skorikov, V. B., Tremblay, C., & Corbière, M. (1998). A longitudinal study of vocational maturity and ethnic identity development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52, 409–424.
- Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9, 34–49.
- 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, 171–183.
- Phinney, J. S., & Chavira, V. (1992). Ethnic identity and self-esteem: An exploratory longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 15, 271–281.
- Rosenberg, M. (1962). The dissonant religious context and emotional disturbance. *American Journal of Sociology*, 68, 1–10.
- Seidman, E., Aber, J. L., Allen, L., & French, S. E. (1996). The impact of the transition to high school on the self-esteem and perceived social context of poor urban youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 24, 489–515.
- Sellers, R. M., Chavous, T. M., & Cooke, D. Y. (1998). Racial ideology and racial centrality as predictors of African American college students' academic performance. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24, 8–27.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 18–39.
- Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 181–188.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *The social psychology of minorities*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup relations. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Twenge, J. M., & Crocker, J. (2002). Race and self-esteem: Meta-analyses comparing Whites, Blacks, Hispanics and American Indians. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 371–408.
- Verna, G. B., & Runion, K. B. (1985). The effects of contextual dissonance on the self-concept of youth from a high versus low socially valued group. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 449–458.
- Waterman, A. S. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 341–358.
- Waterman, A. S. (1999). Issues of identity formation revisited: United States and The Netherlands. *Developmental Review*, 19, 462–479.
- Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Received January 7, 2004

Revision received May 27, 2005

Accepted July 11, 2005 ■