HKUST SPD - INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY

Title

Authors

Source

Version

DOI

Publisher

Copyright

This version is available at HKUST SPD - Institutional Repository (<https://repository.ust.hk/ir>)

If it is the author's pre-published version, changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published version.

Bicultural Identity Negotiation

Sun No,¹ Ching Wan,² Melody M. Chao,¹ Jennifer L. Rosner,¹ & Ying-yi Hong¹

¹University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

²Nanyang Technological University

Note. This is the authors' final copy before publication but may not exactly replicate the final published version. It is not the copy of record.

In A. K-y. Leung, C-y. Chiu, & Y. Hong (Eds.), *Cultural processes: A social psychological perspective* (pp. 213-241). Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511779374>

Bicultural Identity Negotiation

Increased intercultural contacts within and across national boundaries have raised pressing questions for individuals and societies such as: How do individuals make sense of themselves as multicultural beings? How can societies cultivate the benefits of increased heterogeneity within its populace (e.g., creativity and productivity) and simultaneously resolve possible intergroup tensions? How can social policies be formulated to foster an overarching inclusive identity for all members from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds? Consider the fact that the 2005 riots in France (along with a shorter-lived repeat in 2007), and some of the recent terrorist attacks in Britain can be partially attributed to the perceived exclusion of ethnic minority youths from the mainstream society (*New York Times*, 2005; 2007). There is no doubt that high rates of unemployment due to racial and religious discrimination, along with perceptions of police insensitivity, combined to fuel weeks of violence and car burnings across France. However, the anger and frustration felt by French-born and France-identified youth and young adults of Arab and African ancestry regarding belonging and acceptance had long preceded these events. A *Time Europe* special report on the cause of the riots provided insight into the tensions behind identity and exclusion: "The young men behind the violence 'are rioting, not because they hate the Republic,' says Dounia Bouzar, an anthropologist who has worked extensively with [public housing project] delinquents, 'but because they want to be included in it.'" (*Time Europe*, 2005).

Incidents such as the French riots underscore the pressing need to understand identity negotiations within multicultural settings. Although there have been attempts to examine these processes from a psychological standpoint, these issues have yet to be adequately addressed, and the available research is widely scattered within topics such as immigration, mixed-race peoples,

ethnic identity, and intercultural communication. In this chapter, we propose a framework for examining bicultural identity negotiation processes, which we consider to be a subset of multicultural identity negotiation. Our objective in introducing this framework is to stimulate further research on this timely topic in the current era of hyperconnectivity within and across national boundaries. Through our model, we also aim to direct attention to the view of bicultural identities as continuously unfolding co-constructions linked to personal resources, situation-embedded goals, and even specific interaction partners.

Importantly, in discussing the psychological trials and tribulations of individuals who must incorporate multiple social identities into their self-concept, the existing literature predominantly focuses on the *bicultural* experience and the negotiation of *two* cultural identities. While this literature is useful such that it applies to many individuals who find themselves “caught between two worlds”, we should not allow the terminology to limit our study to *only* biculturals. Indeed, although we use the terms “bicultural” and “dual identities” throughout the chapter, the “bicultural” framework presented below can most definitely be applied to triculturals (e.g., those who must somehow manage having a strong ethnic heritage identity, new national identity, and religious identity; see Rosner & Gardner, 2006) and even multiculturals.

Beyond the presentation of our framework, the chapter is organized into three main areas of concern with respect to processes surrounding bicultural identity negotiation. The first section deals with the precursors (past and ongoing) to bicultural identity construction: personal characteristics, social structure, and bicultural identity negotiation strategies that continuously update the current construction of the individual’s identity via situational salience of either the ethnic or mainstream identity or both. In the second section, we address possible identity negotiation outcomes, which can range from bicultural competence (acting appropriately and

effectively in differing cultural environments), to identity ambivalence (the anxious feelings and/or distancing associated with incompletely connected cultural identities). The last section includes a discussion of the changing dynamic of bicultural identity negotiation across the lifespan as well as cross-generationally. Implications for social policy are also highlighted.

A Framework for Understanding Bicultural Identity Negotiation

Figure 1 depicts our general model of bicultural identity negotiation processes.

Negotiation necessarily implies goals as well as a certain flexibility of options that can be chosen to meet those goals. Individuals negotiating bicultural identities may choose to emphasize aspects of the self that meet desired goals, whether through explicit, thoughtful decision making (i.e., enrolling in heritage language or history courses) or through implicit, automatic shifts in behavior (i.e., displaying appropriate behaviors in alignment with the cultural context at an all-White university).

The process of negotiating identities is undeniably impacted by the particulars of the situation, such as relevant goals or situational constraints (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002), yet there exists a great deal of choice and variation available to individuals (DiMaggio, 1997). The wide range of negotiation strategies available to individuals is a direct result of the variety of personal characteristics (such as beliefs, goals, socialization history), social structural variables (such as social norms and conventions, background context of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination) and the specific situations in which individuals find themselves (Deaux, 2000). We argue that personal characteristics, social structural variables, and the particular circumstances of the situation dynamically interact to direct the form that negotiation takes. Thus, bicultural identity negotiation processes vary according to the specific situation, the larger

societal context, and the personal resources the individual has at hand. Such a wide range of key variables attests to the fluid nature of bicultural identity negotiation.

As an example, a person living in the United States who is categorized as belonging to a minority culture is requested to educate others about her minority heritage culture. While this person may consider her ethnic heritage culture important, she may also lack relevant cultural knowledge about this heritage culture. Thus, she would negotiate a bicultural identity that emphasizes her belonging to the minority cultural group, and she would feel positively about the experience if she perceived the situation to be a validating one where all those involved affirmed her identity as a member of the minority culture. In a different situation, particularly one where the minority culture is viewed unfavorably, this same individual may choose to emphasize her mainstream American identity, and downplay her heritage culture. The following sections of the chapter detail what we mean by social structural variables, personal characteristics, and the situational requirements of the situation, as well as negotiation strategies and outcomes. However, before discussing our framework in more depth, it is necessary to address the assumptions of our model.

bicultural identity negotiation processes

Figure 1: Bicultural Identity Negotiation Processes

Assumption 1: Cultural self and cultural knowledge are distinct (see Chapter 6, this volume). Identity negotiation strategies depend upon cultural knowledge *or* identification with the cultural group as being a cultural member. Our framework purposefully does not specify the placement of the bicultural self (an internally coherent collection of cultural identities) because we see the bicultural self as being either an antecedent or a consequence (or at times both) of engaging in bicultural identity negotiation processes.

Assumption 2: Aside from individual goals to assert, modify, or challenge particular identities, there exist shared goals with interaction partners to arrive at a similar understanding of the situation. We explore this assumption more fully in the sub-section of “Strategies of Bicultural Identity Negotiation” having to do with communicative goals.

Assumption 3: Individuals negotiate bicultural identities with background motives of maintaining or enhancing self-esteem, continuity, efficacy, and meaning as well as achieving an optimal balance between belongingness and distinctiveness (Brewer, 1991; Vignoles, Regalia, Manzi, Gollledge, & Scabini, 2006).

Assumption 4: Negotiation proceeds within a particular cultural context, therefore negotiation acts are interpreted within the meanings afforded by that particular setting, the situational norms, and the cultural valuation of specific behaviors.

Precursors to Bicultural Identity Construction

As research on bicultural identity construction is scattered across a variety of topic headings, the use of the term ‘bicultural’ is often left vague and undefined. From our perspective, there are multiple ways of being bicultural. The attributes that are typically used to characterize biculturality by researchers, such as being first or second generation immigrants, may not be the only modes of being bicultural. Instead, we posit that individuals are open to define themselves with as many knowledge traditions as deemed necessary to satisfy immediate needs and lifelong goals. Thus, bicultural identities are constructed by immigrants, the children of immigrants, biracial individuals, transracial or international adoptees, ethnic, racial, and linguistic minorities, and individuals navigating across socioeconomic class or age categories. In our framework, bicultural identity construction is fueled by the combination of personal characteristics, social structural variables, and ongoing bicultural identity negotiation strategies. By personal characteristics we mean elements such as physical appearance, beliefs (e.g., beliefs concerning the nature of race), and socialization history. By social structural variables we mean background context of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination, identity validation versus identity denial, and norms and social conventions. In this section, bicultural identity negotiation processes refer

to the variety of methods that bicultural individuals may either habitually or intermittently employ that continuously “update” the current state of bicultural identity construction.

I. Personal Characteristics

Physical Appearance

Outward features are important in the construction of bicultural identities, as ascribed identities are partially determined by how one looks. In contrast to individuals whose appearance is less like the dominant group, White Americans of various European ethnicities are likely to participate in symbolic ethnicity when it is convenient for them, such as during family celebrations and other leisure time activities (Waters, 1990). Therefore, White Americans, and individuals whose phenotypes more closely match that of White Americans, are less likely to develop a bicultural or multicultural orientation. Conversely, for individuals whose phenotype sets them apart from White Americans, there may be greater pressure both internally and externally (via discrimination and exclusion) to identify as bicultural and display more interest in the ethnic heritage community, despite being multiple generations removed from initial migration (AhnAllen, Suyemoto, & Carter, 2006). Indeed, Vazquez, Garcia-Vazquez, Bauman, and Sierra (1997) have shown that biculturally oriented, darker skinned Latino Americans from a majority fifth generation sample from the American Southwest were more likely to express interest in the Latino community than their counterparts who were lighter skinned. As such, appearances tend to constrain identity options for individuals who look less typical of mainstream members of the society and spur the development of bicultural or ethnic and racial identities (Brunsma & Rockquemore, 2001).

Racial Essentialism

For individuals who are phenotypically distinguishable from mainstream members of a society, race may be a salient feature of interactions with others. Race itself may take on different meanings, as some believe that race is biologically rooted, reflects abilities and traits, and is unchangeable, while others believe that race is socially constructed, arbitrary, and fluid across time and contexts (No et al., 2008). Belief in racial essentialism may impede the development of bicultural identities for racial minority individuals, in that what is perceived to be natural is that which is ethnic (Tsang, Irving, Alaggia, Chau, & Benjamin, 2003). For instance Chao, Chen, Roisman, and Hong (2007) showed that Chinese American biculturals who endorsed racial essentialism had more difficulty in cognitively shifting across American and Chinese cultures and responded with more emotional reactivity when describing experiences with both cultures. These results are thought to relate to perceiving more discreteness and less permeability in cultural boundaries. Belief in racial essentialism may also interact with other variables, such as generational status, to impact bicultural orientations (Hong & No, 2005).

Belongingness Motives

Identity construction is influenced by the fulfillment of multiple motives (Vignoles et al., 2006). Among these motives is the fundamental human need for belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). As identification with a group fulfills the need to belong, people should be more likely to identify with groups that can provide them with a sense of belonging. There is evidence suggesting that bicultural identification is related to a lower level of loneliness among bicultural individuals (Suarez, Fowers, Garwood, & Szapocznik, 1997), and ethnic identification is related to a sense of self-affirmation and belonging (Yuh, 2005). Also, feelings of exclusion from a cultural group predict lower identification with that group (AhnAllen et al., 2006). Thus, how bicultural individuals negotiate the existence of their two cultural identities could depend on their

perceived inclusion in the relevant cultural groups. When there is perceived acceptance by a valued cultural group, the person is more likely to identify with that group. It is also possible that bicultural individuals with a stronger need for belonging would seek to identify more strongly with the two cultural groups to which they belong.

Socialization History

How bicultural individuals negotiate two cultural identities is also affected by the individuals' experiences in environments within and outside of the family. Family environment plays an important role in the socialization of bicultural identity. Children's participation in ethnic cultural behaviors and social networks is influenced by the cultural behaviors and social networks of their parents (Killian & Hegtvedt, 2003). Also, when the family provides a strong ethnic socialization environment, adolescents of ethnic minorities are more likely to develop a stronger and more mature identification with their ethnic ingroup (McHale et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006). In studies of adoption, the adopted ethnic minority children's cultural identity is influenced by the adopted parents' ethnicity, attitudes and perceptions (Andujo, 1988; McRoy, Zurcher, Landerdale, & Anderson, 1982; McRoy, Zurcher, Lauderdale, & Anderson, 1984).

Outside of the family, the neighborhood climate affects the family's socialization process and the possibilities of bicultural identity development. On the one hand, a negative social climate toward minorities directs parents' socialization efforts toward the prejudice and discrimination faced by the group (Caughy, Nettles, O'Campo, & Lohrfink, 2006). On the other hand, a multicultural neighborhood promotes ethnic identification (Garcia & Lega, 1979; Verkuyten, 2004). In a larger societal context, the possibilities for bicultural identity negotiation are affected by the dominant group's view on intercultural contact. In societies where pluralism

is promoted, bicultural individuals would have more freedom to develop their two cultural identities and integrate them into one.

II. Social Structure

Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Discrimination

Stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination are category-based biases toward members of social groups. These biases are rooted in the assumption that members of a social group are homogenous with little within-group variation and, hence, can be treated interchangeably (Fiske, 2004). Briefly defined, stereotypes are cognitive representations of a particular social group. Prejudice refers to the affective components of the category-based responses towards the social group. Discrimination entails biased (and often harmful) actions and behaviors that are directed toward the social group (Fiske, 1998, 2004). Although these three components are closely related, they are not identical concepts. For example, one can endorse the stereotypes of a certain group, but not feel nor act positively or negatively towards members of the group. One can also feel negatively towards a group without linking that feeling to specific stereotypical representations. In general, however, these cognitive, affective, and behavioral biases go together. Specifically, prejudice correlates more highly with discriminative behaviors than do stereotypes (Dovidio et al., 1996).

Stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination do not only set up the environment in which bicultural individuals negotiate their cultural identities - they also help individuals to organize and to make sense of the world in which they live, and color the lens through which bicultural individuals look at the world, the others, and the self.

The stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination associated with certain ethno-cultural groups can be positive (e.g., Asian Americans as hardworking and a high achieving model

minority) or negative (e.g., Arab Americans as suspicious terrorists). Although these biases were not formed without any (historical or political) basis, treating any single individual member of a group as representative of the group and as highly interchangeable with other members of that group is prone to error, and could lead to negative social and psychological consequences, even if the biases are positive (Deaux, 2006). For example, in an ethnically diverse American school setting, teachers might show preferential treatment towards Asian students over other ethnic minority students (e.g., Latinos, African Americans) based on the model minority belief. As a result of this differential treatment, the inter-ethnic group boundary will become salient, resulting in discriminatory treatment not only from the teachers, but also among students from different ethnic groups (Rosenbloom & Way, 2004). Under this context, ingroup-outgroup boundaries become salient. Subsequently, polarization of attitudes and escalation of group conflicts are not uncommon consequences. Furthermore, on an individual level, when group boundaries are made chronically salient and when one's ethnicity becomes perceptually distinctive in the environment, the individual's ethnic identity becomes a central part of the self (McGuire, McGuire, Child, & Fujioka, 1978; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), and might lead the person to adopt different identity negotiation strategies.

Stereotype Threat

Category-based biases do not only influence individuals through intergroup perceptions and interethnic relations, they can also have direct and profound effects on an individual's behavior—from test performance (Aronson, Lustina, Good, Keough, Steele, & Brown, 1999; Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999; Steele & Aronson, 1999) to athletic performance (Stone, Lynch, Sjomeling, & Darley, 1999). Claude Steele and colleagues (Aronson, et al., 1999; Steele & Aronson, 1999) coined the term *stereotype threat* to describe this phenomenon. Stereotype threat

is a “threat in the air.” When the stereotypes of a group become personally relevant for members of that group in a specific situation, the individuals might become anxious about being judged in terms of these group stereotypes. Consequently, the threat of this lurking unearned judgment leads to a reduction in performance in domains with which an individual personally identifies. For example, an African American student in an elite school might show a decrement in test performance when the potential for him to be judged as academically inferior is made salient. This perceived threat would have implications for the individual’s personal as well as social identity.

Identity Threat and Identity Denial

Stereotypes can also propagate discriminative behaviors towards minority groups, with or without an individual’s conscious awareness, and threaten one’s social identity. For example, the stereotype of Asian Americans as model minorities might appear positive, and might seem to glorify Asian Americans’ success over other ethnic minority groups at first glance. Nonetheless, the label of “minority” inevitably implies that Asian Americans are considered “less American” than other Americans, as demonstrated across a series of studies (Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Devos & Banaji, 2005). A question as simple as, “Where are you *really* from?” and an apparently friendly remark such as, “Your English is really good!” from a fellow American student sends signals to individuals that their identity as American is not recognized by other group members. In response to this instance of denial, individuals should strategize to reaffirm their social identity (Cheryan & Monin, 2005).

Race-Based Rejection Sensitivity

Stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination exert their influence on an individual to the extent that the individual is aware of the stereotypes regarding their own group and is sensitive to

the potential negative consequences (Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrazk, 2002; Pinel, 1999). Research has shown that African American students who are sensitive to race-based rejection experienced greater discomfort around their professors, and demonstrated a lower feeling of belongingness towards the college. They also reported more distrust towards the institution administration (Mendoza-Denton et al., 2002). Although these particular studies were conducted within the university setting, when the findings were applied to the macro social institutional context, they suggested that rejection sensitivity might lead individuals to distrust the social institution constructed by the dominant groups and to decrease their sense of belongingness. These feelings of distrust and detachment often lead to marginalization or separation.

III. Strategies of Bicultural Identity Negotiation

Cultural identity for bicultural individuals is a complex construct as they experience two cultural identities at the same time. Each cultural identity is associated with a set of shared cultural knowledge and norms, behavioral expectations, social relationships, and emotional ties. When two cultural identities coexist, the associations of the identities might be overlapping and compatible, or separate and conflicting. Bicultural individuals often find themselves trying to reconcile the presence of the two cultural identities, and individuals vary in how they negotiate the existence of the two cultural identities. In this section, we discuss the strategies that bicultural individuals might adopt when engaging in bicultural identity negotiation. The three strategies are alternation, integration, and synergy (Hong, Wan, No, & Chiu, 2007). The focus of this discussion is on the possible ways that people might handle two cultural identities at the same time. In doing so, we are aware that some individuals with extensive experience in two cultures only identify with one culture (e.g., Berry's (2001) assimilation and separation strategies) or do

not identify with either at all (e.g., Berry's (2001) marginalization strategy). However, our interest is in the complexity that is a result of dealing with two cultural identities within the same person. To this end, Berry's model may not be useful as it is more relevant for static, end result strategies, than for dynamic processes involving situation-to-situation negotiation between personal goals and social interaction demands. To fill this void, we elaborate on the aforementioned three modes of bicultural identity negotiation and explain that each represents a different level of overlap between a bicultural individual's heritage and mainstream identities. However, these modes are not mutually exclusive. A bicultural individual most likely engages in all three at different points in time depending upon the situation. These modes complement each other in describing the complex experience of the life of a bicultural individual.

Alternation

With alternation, the bicultural individual switches back-and-forth between two cultural identities without seeing much overlap between the two cultures (LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1993; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). Bicultural individuals are able to, and often do, switch between two modes of behavior depending upon situational demands. They adopt the language, problem-solving strategy, social behavior, response style, and self-description that are characteristic of one of the two cultures so as to create a context-dependent cultural identity (e.g., Gardner, Gabriel, & Dean, 2004; LaFromboise & Rowe, 1983; Ross, Xun, & Wilson, 2002; Verkuyten & Pouliasi, 2002). For example, immigrants often find themselves speaking the language and participating in rituals of their heritage culture while at home, and speaking the language and adopting the practices of the host culture while at school or work. Behavioral alternation is possible because bicultural individuals possess knowledge about the two cultures, and can switch between the two cultural frames depending upon the situational salience of the

two cultures (Hong, Morris, Chiu & Benet-Martínez, 2000). Once activated, a cultural frame would guide a person's behavior whenever applicable (Hong, Benet-Martínez, Chiu, & Morris, 2003).

Cultural frame switching is only part of cultural identity switching. Alternation when applied to cultural identity has the bicultural individual keep the two cultural identities separate. Instead of a hyphenated identity, the person often compartmentalizes the two cultural identities and sees the self as exclusively of one culture or the other depending upon situation (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Alternation of cultural identities is also situational in that bicultural individuals would feel one identity strongly in one situation and the other more strongly in another situation. For example, Chinese American adolescents feel more Chinese on days when they engage in behaviors that remind them of their ethnic culture, such as speaking Chinese or eating Chinese food (Yip & Fuligni, 2002). In another study, Greek- and Italian-Australian adolescents report feeling strong Greek/Italian identity when they are with their family and participating in social activities with others from their ethnic ingroup, and feeling strong Australian identification when they are with their Australian friends (Rosenthal & Hrynevich, 1985). Alternation occurs when the two cultures are seen as different from each other and difficult to combine as one. They do not necessarily entail perceived conflict between the two cultural identities. Nonetheless, the bicultural individual would be sensitive to the differences between the two cultures and feel the need to choose one of the two in particular situations.

Integration

When bicultural individuals see similarity and overlap between the two cultures, they can integrate the two identities into their bicultural self. The resulting identity is a hyphenated one in which the two cultural identities are blended and combined so that the person is equally both

(Birman, 1994; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). Integration has received much attention in the literature on intercultural contact. In his framework of intercultural contact, Berry (2001) identified the two major concerns that individuals have during intercultural contact as maintaining the heritage culture and a good relationship with the host culture. Different levels of fulfillment of these two concerns give rise to four acculturative styles. Integration occurs when a person maintains the heritage culture and a good relationship with the host culture, identifying with both cultures at the same time. Integration as conceptualized in Berry's model has arguably received the most attention in the literature. However, his conceptualization is very much silent on the blending of two cultures into a cohesive one, which is an important element of an integrated bicultural identity. On a more relevant note, Benet-Martínez and colleagues developed the construct of bicultural identity integration (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005), which tackles directly the issue of compatibility and cohesion of bicultural identities. Bicultural individuals who are high on bicultural identity integration see the two cultural identities as similar and compatible, whereas those who are low on bicultural identity integration see the two identities as different and conflicting. Interestingly, the level of bicultural identity integration is not related to adoption of Berry's integration strategy (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). This is not surprising, as Berry's framework does not directly deal with the cohesion of two identities.

Integration is similar to alternation in that elements of both cultures are present in the individual, and situational cues can trigger elements of one of the two cultures. However, the two differ in how the cultural elements and the corresponding cultural identities are organized within the individual. With alternation, the two identities are kept separate without much overlapping, whereas with integration, the two identities are mixed into one unitary bicultural identity. A

Chinese-American bicultural who alternates would refer to the self as Chinese in some contexts and American in some other contexts. In contrast, the same bicultural when integrating would refer to the self as Chinese-American.

Synergy

Synergy takes the blending of two cultures to a new level. In addition to blending the elements of the two cultures into one, a new culture that is distinct from the two origin cultures is formed as a result. This is akin to the idea of fusion (LaFromboise et al., 1993; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997) and hybridity (Anthias, 2001) in the literature, as cultural elements are combined and synthesized to produce new forms. The process can best be exemplified in the process of Creolization. Creolization in language happens when groups speaking different languages have extended contact and develop a common language that has basis in the different languages spoken by the original groups but is distinct from both as an end product. Creolization also refers to the formation of a new culture with inputs from the contacting groups' various cultures of origin. A new common identity is often formed surrounding the Creole language and culture. Examples can be found on islands in the Caribbean and Indian Ocean (e.g., Medea, 2002), and in Louisiana in the United States (Dubois & Melançon, 2000).

Much research has been done on the linguistic characteristics of Creoles. However, not much empirical study in psychology has been conducted to examine the formation of a bicultural identity based on synergy. Along this line, we have started a line of research that examines cultural hybridization for Korean Americans and Chinese Americans (No, Wan, & Chiu, 2005). With continuous contact with mainstream American culture and the specific cultural experience of ethnic minorities, it is possible that the Korean or Chinese culture that early immigrants brought to the United States has been transformed beyond a mere addition of American cultural

elements. This transformation might create a Korean American or Chinese American culture that is more than the summation of the culture from Korea or China and the culture of the United States. If this is the case, then individuals who identify themselves as Korean American or Chinese American would endorse a knowledge tradition that is unique to Korean American or Chinese American culture.

What are the situational antecedents that would lead bicultural individuals to use the alternation, integration, or synergy mode of identity negotiation? Most research on bicultural identity negotiation has focused on the acculturative strategies that bicultural individuals adopt in general across situations. However, the question of how two cultural identities may be negotiated in specific situations has not been explored in the literature. Next, we provide some preliminary insights into this very issue.

An Example of What We Mean by "Situation": Communicative Goals and Identity Negotiation

Social interaction is an important channel for cultural knowledge exchange and negotiation. Communication requires the building of a shared reality and the use of such shared reality as common ground for fluent interaction between interlocutors (Clark & Brennan, 1991; Higgins, 1992). Information is successfully exchanged and relationships positively maintained if interlocutors accommodate to each other's linguistic and non-linguistic characteristics (Gallois, Ogay, & Giles, 2005). When people communicate with fellow members of their cultural group, the shared cultural knowledge that all parties understand and the shared norms by which the parties abide would be expended as the basis for successful communication. Arguably, bicultural individuals' social interaction platforms are often culturally more diverse and complex than those experienced by individuals whose cultural experience is predominantly reserved to one culture. Bicultural individuals often face situations that differ in the dominance of one of the two

cultures, or both at the same time. For example, a second-generation Chinese American teenager might face a predominantly American cultural environment while at school, but a predominantly Chinese environment while at home with parents and relatives. But when the Chinese American student socializes with fellow second-generation Chinese American teenagers, the cultural setting might become a mix of both Chinese and American cultures, instead of having one of the two cultures as dominant. These varied cultural platforms create different situational demands for particular identity negotiation strategies.

If successful communication requires interlocutors to accommodate to one another, then one might expect bicultural individuals to assimilate their identity negotiation strategy to the cultural perspective dominant within the particular social situation. Along this line, Tadmor and Tetlock (2006) have proposed a model that captures such assimilation in the exploration of the influence of accountability on the development of bicultural identity. According to the model, acculturating individuals experience accountability pressures as their daily social interactions require them to adhere to certain cultural knowledge that the interaction audience holds. In doing so, the chosen identity negotiation strategy would depend upon the cultural membership of that audience. On the one hand, when the bicultural individual is accountable to an audience holding only one of the two cultural perspectives, the individual would likely adopt the one culture that is shared with the audience, instead of integrating the two cultures into one. On the other hand, when the individual is accountable to a mixed audience holding at least two different cultural perspectives, the demands of the mixed audience requires the person to somehow integrate the two cultural perspectives into one, which would likely result in integration or synergy. Thus, if a bicultural individual is often exposed to monocultural audiences, then alternation might be more frequently observed. However, if the individual is often exposed to audiences who also hold an

integrated or synergistic bicultural perspective, the individual might follow suit in his or her identity negotiation.

The above propositions assume an assimilation motive where the individual's communication style accommodates the cultural perspective of the audience for successful communication and social approval. However, people do not always hold assimilation motives during communication; rather, communication can be used to accentuate the difference in social identities between interlocutors (Gallois et al., 2005). It is possible for bicultural individuals to actively choose to contrast themselves from the cultural perspective of the audience. Specifically, when faced with an audience from predominantly one cultural perspective, the individual might want to assert the existence of the other culture, and the possibility of integrating the two cultures, or even creating a new culture beyond the combination of the two. Similarly, when faced with an audience that presents a mix of the cultures, a desire to separate the self from the audience might result in the individual choosing between one of the two cultures instead of integrating the two.

In short, the choice of the three identity negotiation strategies - alternation, integration, and synergy - could be a function of the situational demands on communicators and the assimilation versus contrast social motives that the communicators hold. Extant research is lacking in this area. Further research that treats bicultural identity negotiation as a dynamic process that could change depending upon situational demands and the individual's current motivations would be needed to test the above ideas.

Possible Outcomes of Bicultural Identity Negotiation Strategies

A broad range of outcomes is possible through engagement in bicultural identity negotiation strategies. On the more positive end of the spectrum, intensive experiences with two

cultures may lead to bicultural competence, or the flexible display of culturally-appropriate behaviors. On the negative end, individuals may experience identity ambivalence, identity conflict, marginalization and alienation. Here we focus on outcomes to the individual, rather than to society, while the last section of the chapter includes a discussion of the societal-level ramifications and social policy implications of biculturalism.

Bicultural Competence

Through repeated practice in negotiation interactions across diverse settings, individuals may acquire effective language, social, and behavioral skills to adjust to different cultural contexts (LaFromboise, et al., 1993). Individuals may also integrate their different identity components (Amiot, de la Sablonnière, Terry, & Smith, 2007). According to Haritatos and Benet-Martinez (2002), being biculturally competent is much the same as having a biculturally integrated identity, such that individuals see both of their cultural identities as well-matched and non-antagonistic, and have little difficulty in integrating both cultures into everyday thought and behavior. Thus, individuals may become more adaptive and flexible as they engage in bicultural identity negotiation strategies, particularly alternation strategies (Bacallao & Smokowski, 2005) and integration strategies. For example, acting as language and cultural brokers for parents and other family members may allow for greater facility in dual languages as well as becoming more informed of subtle and nuanced knowledge of both cultures (Trickett & Jones, 2007).

Identity Ambivalence

Identity ambivalence may result from others' fluctuating responses to strategies employed by individuals negotiating bicultural identities. Depending upon the salient identity features of a context (Turner, 1982), individuals may be approached with intimacy and familiarity in one context and responded to with fear and distance by the same person in another

context (Zaharna, 1989). These inconsistencies in how others relate to the self may lead to further ambivalence, as one develops simultaneous approach-avoidance orientation towards one's dual cultural identities ("We got the best of both worlds, we got the worst of both worlds; nevertheless, we are stigmatized, rejected, and told that we don't belong to either world" in Vivero and Jenkins, 1999). In a similar vein, identity ambivalence may result from intragroup conflicts among newly arrived and established cultural groups who settle within the same geographical area. For the newly arrived immigrants, perceived exclusion by the more established group disrupts the "natural" sense of affiliation experienced when around similar others (Castillo, Conoley, Brossart, & Quiros, 2007).

Identity Confusion and Conflict

Identification with multiple cultural groups engenders psychological conflict when values and practices of heritage and mainstream cultural groups are perceived to be too distant or in opposition (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002). Confusion and conflict may also result from others' overt lack of affirmation of one's claim to a bicultural identity (Bryant & LaFromboise, 2005). As with identity ambivalence, identity conflict may arise from experiences of exclusion or rejection by desired cultural groups. Identity conflict may be a more salient experience for younger individuals due to adolescence being a crucial time period for identity exploration and for those who have not yet achieved an integrated bicultural identity (Shi & Lu, 2007). Biracial individuals may experience identity conflict when they realize that others' perceptions of them do not match their own internal sense of self (Buchanan & Acevedo, 2004).

Cultural Inauthenticity

In repeatedly engaging and participating in multiple cultural systems, individuals may acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to develop repertoires of behaviors, thoughts, and

feelings appropriate to each cultural context (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000; LaFromboise et al., 1993). However, attainment of cultural knowledge does not preclude the subjective experience of impostorism or inauthenticity, a concept LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) recognized in their widely cited review article on biculturalism: “Words... such as ‘apple,’ ‘banana,’ or ‘oreo’ reflect the negative stereotype often applied to people who have intimate relationships with two or more cultures” (p.395). Due to these commonly held images regarding individuals who reside in the juncture of two or more cultures, competence in one cultural system may be perceived as (cultural) betrayal by an alternative cultural group; “biculturals” or “multiculturals” may not always feel authentic or true when dealing simultaneously with several cultural groups. Their divided loyalties, whether real or imagined, may become internalized to characterize the self as being an inauthentic member of one or multiple cultural groups.

Marginalization and Alienation

In an early analysis of migration and identity, Park (1928) approached the internal conflict and ambivalence arising from identification with multiple cultural groups through the notion of the “marginal man,” a person who feels simultaneous detachment and involvement with multiple cultural groups. The “deficit” model of biculturalism, as Park’s (1928) notion of the marginal man has come to be referenced in the literature, has largely been disproved (Padilla, 2006). Yet there is ample qualitative and quantitative evidence that individuals do experience moments of “cultural homelessness” (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999), or profound alienation and social invalidation.

Lingering Questions: Developmental Perspectives and Social Policy Implications

While research in social psychology and related disciplines has provided a strong foundational literature in the area of bicultural identity construction and negotiation, we now turn to less developed perspectives and lingering questions. Here we focus on how bicultural identity negotiation processes may be examined through developmental perspectives and cross-generational shifts in preferred negotiation strategy. We also explore the policy implications of increasing populations of bicultural and multicultural groups within societies.

Developmental Perspectives

Locating bicultural identity construction within a developmental perspective, individuals may be prompted to rethink, reevaluate, and recreate their bicultural identities due to a number of important developmental transition periods, such as growing into young adulthood, choosing life partners, and having children. Although not all models of racial/ethnic identity development specify a strictly linear progression, bicultural identities may be constructed and understood differently according to the person's particular stage in life. Amiot, de la Sablonnière, Terry, and Smith (2007) recently proposed a model of identity development based upon neo-Piagetian ideas where individuals are thought to continuously integrate multiple identities as new cognitive resources emerge across the lifespan. They posit that at particular key moments of change in a person's life, certain inhibiting (e.g., threat and uncertainty or status and power) and facilitating (e.g., coping and adaptation) factors may hinder or enhance integration of multiple identities and hence affect motivation and commitment to identities.

Our own framework of bicultural identity negotiation places heavy emphasis on the dynamic interactions of multiple factors in the negotiation and construction of bicultural identities, such as the gender of the individual (Dion & Dion, 2004), birthplace and generational status (if immigrants or sojourners, the cultural and demographic features of the region of

settlement; Padilla, 2006), whether of mixed ethnicity or race (Oikawa & Yoshida, 2007), or transracial or international adoptee (Freidlander et al., 2000; Ward, 2006), the relative status of cultural groups within a society as well as the particular socioeconomic status of the individual or family, and the extent of transmission of cultural knowledge and language from the immediate family (Nauck, 2001). Particularly for immigrant groups that are distinguishable by phenotype as being different from the majority group, bicultural identity may initially be constructed on physical differences (Willgerodt, Miller, & McElmurry, 2002). As individuals grow older, experience with discrimination may increase motivation to learn about the ethnic heritage culture (Pahl & Way, 2006).

Despite the different factors implicated in the construction of bicultural identities, the literature is most fully developed with respect to how immigrants and ethnic/racial minorities negotiate bicultural identities over the life course. In one such example, Mahalingam's (2006) developmentally informed model of idealized cultural identities asserts that internalized representations of the ideal cultural being (e.g., woman, student, son) are employed by individuals to meet negotiation goals. As such, our outline below incorporates findings from the ethnic/racial identity literature in our attempt to elaborate on how individuals falling within rough age groups (childhood, adolescence, early adulthood, and late adulthood) negotiate bicultural identities. It is important to note that there is substantial variability throughout these periods of development, which is dependent upon the specific context in which individuals find themselves (i.e., at home versus at school; Bacallao & Smokowski, 2005), and that we only highlight main themes from each age group.

Children who construct dual cultural identities are socialized into two distinct modes of being. Regardless of whether these bicultural children receive cultural knowledge from parents

or from teachers and peers, they are taught two languages and aspects of two cultures ranging from the general (values and beliefs) to the particular (holidays and practices surrounding holidays, what being polite means and how to be polite; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). During childhood, immigrant children may be required to act as translators and cultural brokers (Weisskirch, 2007). Through repeated experiences of mediating between parents and the dominant culture, these children may develop bicultural knowledge and a bicultural identity. In addition, immigrant children may be exposed to prejudice and discrimination for the first time through participation in the public school system. Parents of second- and later generation immigrant children may also enroll their children in weekend language schools in an effort to have their children retain fluency in the ethnic language (Lu, 2001).

In adolescence, access to dual cultures may lead to greater conflict among bicultural youth in comparison to monocultural youth, as this period is characterized by attempts to resolve the question of “Who am I?” and a greater concern for appearance and interpersonal relationships with peers (Phinney, 1989). Adolescents may receive conflicting messages regarding their identification from parents and other family members, teachers and peers, and the media. Parents and grandparents may exert continued pressure on adolescents to further develop their ethnic language skills and adolescents may admit to benefits in being fluent in a second language (Shi & Lu, 2007). Adolescents may make use of their knowledge of ethnic heritage language to develop a wider social network, or they may ignore their ethnic culture by disassociating from more recently arrived immigrants (Pyke & Dang, 2003).

Later on, as second-generation individuals leave the home and enter higher education, bicultural identities are re-constructed as these individuals take formal courses in their heritage language and history or attempt to blend in with the majority group (Ethier & Deaux, 1994).

Young adults may develop a greater appreciation for their dual cultural orientations with the recognition that fluency in their ethnic language helps them connect with grandparents and extended family and gives them an advantage in their careers (Shi & Lu, 2007). As second-generation individuals transition into careers, choosing partners, and having children, bicultural identities may become more overtly recognized by individuals as being a matter of picking and choosing what is comfortable for them in the current situation (Willgerodt et al., 2002).

In older adulthood, immigrant adults may again have to transition to a life without (adult) children in the same household. As many immigrant parents rely on their children for language and cultural brokering, along with economic assistance as children grow into employable ages, older immigrants may face the challenge of developing bicultural skills and self-reliance at ages when their non-immigrant peers are enjoying comfortable retirements (Wong, Yoo, & Stewart, 2006).

The developmental trajectory of bicultural identity negotiation across childhood, adolescence, young adulthood, and older adulthood can be placed within the wider context of intergenerational development of cultural identities. As individuals negotiate bicultural identities in their own lifetimes, their choices may be transferred to their children's generation which in turn may also affect how their grandchildren negotiate cultural identities. Additionally, choices in negotiation strategies may be due to the juxtaposition of two or more distinct immigrant generations residing in the same location (Buriel, 1993). Rosner and Gardner (2006) explored this potential for a macro-level, cross-generational shift in bicultural identity by examining recent Russian-Jewish immigrants to the United States and third and later generation American Jews of Eastern European descent. Their results showed that recent Russian-Jewish immigrants who deemed their Jewish identity as central to their self-concept saw less distance between their

American and Russian identities. These individuals also used their Jewish identity as a bridge to bring their Russian and American identities together and to develop a more cohesive *tricultural* identity. In contrast, for established American Jews, a moderate (and marginal) negative relationship was found between Jewish identity centrality and perceived distance between the two national identities, suggesting that over time, the Jewish identity may either prohibit enhanced assimilation into the American culture or, more favorably, serve to make the American Jew positively distinct from the mainstream American identity.

In total, the above findings support the claim that differences across the lifespan and across generations may yield differential reliance on particular negotiation strategies. The first round of results exploring cross-generational comparisons suggests that choice of bicultural identity negotiation strategy may be dependent on current motives to either ease the assimilation process or stand out as distinct from the mainstream. Future research employing developmental perspectives, rather than focusing exclusively on momentary choices, is essential for determining what type of negotiation strategy is employed as well as the reasons for those choices.

Implications for Social Policies

As we saw earlier, several beneficial and detrimental outcomes of bicultural identity negotiation are possible for any given individual. The pressing concern for societies more generally is to identify potential outcomes of biculturalism that are beneficial to all members and then to direct and implement necessary policies to ensure those outcomes. As we have witnessed increases in worldwide flow of transmigrations, outmarriage rates, and cultural hybridization, there have also been associated rises in the voicing of fears that increased biculturalism and multiculturalism may destroy loyalty to the nation and have detrimental effects on the unity of the country. In multicultural countries, it is becoming commonplace to hear disparaging remarks

about immigrant *cultural practices* that are perceived as too bizarre in comparison to the dominant group (Ben-Eliezer, 2004). This new brand of modern racism targets cultural elements of difference and argues that they are irreconcilable with the mainstream as to be un-American (or un-Israeli, etc.). These often embittered sentiments highlight the crucial need for society-wide policies to contain and reduce negative consequences of intergroup contact and increase respect and tolerance towards difference.

As such, research suggests that individuals' racial attitudes are malleable, depending upon the social contexts in which they are situated (Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). In addition, the promotion of multicultural ideology does not only help reduce racial bias (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004), but it also fosters trust towards the community (Purdie, Steele, Davies, & Crosby, 2001; cited in Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002). Therefore, advocating multicultural policies that encourage different ethnic groups to maintain their own identity while respecting other groups can help reduce intergroup conflict and foster a harmonious society, which in turn provides the context under which individuals negotiate their bicultural identities.

The promotion of biculturalism itself has been argued to allow members of society to more effectively cope with the existence of discrimination, as biculturality encourages flexibility, creativity, and adaptability (Padilla, 2006). Perhaps what is needed are educational interventions directed at *all* children and adolescents to promote multiple social identity exploration and experimentation (Quintana, 2007). We may also encourage superordinate categorization with the nation, with the caveat that all subgroup identities are actively valued and kept distinct (Amiot et al., 2007). Such a nation-wide policy of embracing biculturalism may minimize both explicit and implicit bias against minority groups, as has been documented with New Zealand Maori and Pakeha (Sibley & Liu, 2007).

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, we have proposed a framework to understand how bicultural individuals construct and negotiate their cultural identities. Specifically, we examine the roles individual characteristics (such as belief about race and their motivation to belong) and social structural factors (such as discrimination and rejection) play in the identity negotiation process. We recognize that individuals are active participants of this dynamic process; at the same time, social forces help to shape individuals' bicultural experiences.

In sum, bicultural identity negotiation process is complex. We introduced a framework for understanding how bicultural identities are constructed, co-constructed, negotiated, and renegotiated in ongoing interactions with socially relevant others. We recognize that our framework is rather preliminary in that it does not draw out all causal pathways. Part of the reason for this is due to the highly individualized and situation-dependent nature of bicultural identity negotiation processes; another part being the lack of systematic research into which personal, social, and situational variables produce which bicultural identity strategies and outcomes. Our hope is that this framework will inspire further research into bicultural identity negotiation processes, such that soon there will be a pressing need to modify and refine the framework. Individuals' personal characteristics and socio-cultural contexts interplay in shaping bicultural experiences. The model introduced in this chapter represents an initial attempt to integrate research from different areas to better understand this dynamic cultural process.

References

- AhnAllen, J. M., Suyemoto, K. L., & Carter, A. S. (2006). Relationship between physical appearance, sense of belonging and exclusion, and Racial/Ethnic self-identification among multiracial japanese european americans. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 673-686.
- Amiot, C. E., de la Sablonnière, R., Terry, D. J., & Smith, J. R. (2007). Integration of social identities in the self: Toward a cognitive-developmental model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 364-388.
- Andujo, E. (1988). Ethnic identity of transethnically adopted Hispanic adolescents. *Social Work, 33*, 531-535.
- Anthias, F. (2001). New hybridities, old concepts: The limits of "culture." *Ethnic & Racial Studies, 619-641*.
- Aronson, J., Lustina, M.J., Good, C., Keough, K., Steele, C.M., & Brown, J. (1999). When White men can't do math: Necessary and sufficient factors in stereotype threat. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*, 29-46.
- Bacallao, M. L., & Smokowski, P. R. (2005). "Entre dos mundos" (between two worlds): Bicultural skills training with latino immigrant families. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 26*, 485-509.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497-529.
- Ben-Eliezer, U. (2004). Becoming a black jew: Cultural racism and anti-racism in contemporary israel. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture.Special Focus on Racism in Israeli Society, 10*, 245-266.

- Benet-Martinez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural Identity Integration (BII): Components and Psychosocial Antecedents. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1015-1050.
- Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, 492-516.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 615-631.
- Birman, D. (1998). Biculturalism and perceived competence of Latino immigrant adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 335-354.
- Bryant, A. J., & LaFromboise, T. D. (2005). The racial identity and cultural orientation of lumbee american indian high school students. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 11, 82-89.
- Buchanan, N. T., & Acevedo, C. A. (2004). When face and soul collide: Therapeutic concerns with racially ambiguous and nonvisible minority women. *Women & Therapy*, 27, 119-131.
- Buriel, R. (1993). Acculturation, respect for cultural differences, and biculturalism among three generations of Mexican American and Euro American school children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 154, 531-143.
- Castillo, L. G., Conoley, C. W., Brossart, D. F., & Quiros, A. E. (2007). Construction and validation of the intragroup marginalization inventory. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13, 232-240.
- Caughy, M. O., Nettles, S. M., O'Campo, P. J., & Lohrfink, K. F. (2006). Neighborhood matters: Racial socialization of African American children. *Child Development*, 77, 1220-1236.

- Chao, M. M., Chen, J., Roisman, G. I., & Hong, Y. (2007). Essentializing race: Implications for bicultural individuals' cognition and physiological reactivity. *Psychological Science, 18*, 341-348.
- Cheryan, S., & Monin, B. (2005). "Where are you really from?": Asian Americans and identity denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 717-730.
- Clark, H. H., & Brennan, S. E. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L. B. Resnick & J. M. Levine (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 127-149). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Deaux, K. (2000). Surveying the landscape of immigration: Social psychological perspectives. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology. Special Issue: Social Changes in Globalised Societies and the Redefinition of Identities: Social Psychological Perspectives, 10*, 421-431.
- Deaux, K. (2006). *To be an immigrant*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Devos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = white? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 447-466.
- DiMaggio, P. (1997). Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 263-287.
- Dion, K. K., & Dion, K. L. (2004). Gender, immigrant generation, and ethnocultural identity. *Sex Roles, 50*, 347-355.
- Dovidio, J.F., Brigham, J.C., Johnson, B.T., & Gaertner, S.L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, Y M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping*. New York: Guilford.
- Dubois, S., & Melançon, M. (2000). Creole is, Creole ain't: Diachronic and synchronic attitudes toward Creole identity in southern Louisiana. *Language in Society, 29*, 237-258.

- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 161-186.
- Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 243-251.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 357-411).
- Fiske, S. T. (2004). *Social beings: A core motives approach to social psychology* (1st ed.). US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Freidlander, M. L., Larney, L. C., Skau, M., Hotaling, M., Cutting, M. L., & Schwam, M. (2000). Bicultural identification: Experiences of internationally adopted children and their parents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 187-198.
- Garcia, M., & Lega, L. I. (1979). Development of a Cuban ethnic identity questionnaire. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 247-261.
- Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Dean, K. K. (2004). The individual as ‘melting pot’: The flexibility of bicultural self-construals. *Current Psychology of Cognition*, 22, 181-201.
- Gallois, C., Ogay, T., & Giles, H. (2005). Communication Accommodation Theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 121-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Geary, J., & Graff, J. (2005, November 13). Restless youth: Can France bring order to the streets and hope to the restive minorities of the banlieues? *Time Europe Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/europe/html/051121/story.html>

- Haritatos, J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2002). Bicultural identities: The interface of cultural, personality, and socio-cognitive processes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 598-606.
- Higgins, E. T. (1992). Achieving 'shared reality' in the communication game: A social action that creates meaning. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 11, 107-131.
- Hong, Y., & No, S. (2005). Bicultural individuals' representation of cultures and the self: Comparing first and later generation Asian Americans. In P.K. Oles & H. J. M. Hermans (Eds.) *The Dialogical Self: Theory and Research* (pp. 61-70). Wydawnictwo KUL: Lublin.
- Hong, Y., Benet-Martinez, V., Chiu, C., & Morris, M. W. (2003). Boundaries of cultural influence: Construct activation as a mechanism for cultural differences in social perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 453-464.
- Hong, Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55, 709-720.
- Hong, Y., Wan, C., No, S., & Chiu, C. (2007). Multicultural identities. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.) *Handbook of cultural psychology*. (pp. 323-345). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Killian, C., & Hegtvedt, K. A. (2003). The role of parents in the maintenance of second generation vietnamese cultural behaviors. *Sociological Spectrum*, 23, 213-245.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 395-412.

- LaFromboise, T. D., & Rowe, W. (1983). Skills training for bicultural competence: Rationale and application. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 589-595.
- Lu, X. (2001). Bicultural identity development and Chinese community formation: An ethnographic study of Chinese schools in Chicago, *Howard Journal of Communications, 12*, 203-220.
- Mahalingam, R. (2006). Cultural psychology: An Introduction. In R. Mahalingam (Ed.). *Cultural psychology of immigrants*. (pp. 1- 12). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McGuire, W.J., McGuire, C.V., Child, P. & Fujioka, T. (1978). Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinctiveness in the social environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 511-520.
- McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., Kim, J., Burton, L. M., Davis, K. D., Dotterer, A. M., et al. (2006). Mothers' and fathers' racial socialization in african american families: Implications for youth. *Child Development, 77*, 1387-1402.
- McRoy, R. G., Zurcher, L. A., Landerdale, M. L., & Anderson, R. N. (1982). Self-esteem and racial identity in transracial and inracial adoptees. *Social Work, 27*, 522-526.
- McRoy, R. G., Zurcher, L. A., Lauderdale, M. L., & Anderson, R. E. (1984). The identity of transracial adoptees. *Social Casework, 65*, 34-39.
- Medea, L. (2002). Creolisation and globalization in a neo-colonial context: the case of Reunion. *Social Identities, 8*, 125-141.
- Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: Implications for African American students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 896-918.

- Nauck, B. (2001). Intercultural contact and intergenerational transmission in immigrant families. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. Special Issue: Perspectives on Cultural Transmission*, 32, 159-173.
- No, S., Hong, Y., Liao, H., Lee, K., Wood, D., & Chao, M. M. (2008). *Race and psychological essentialism: Lay theory of race moderates Asian Americans' responses toward American culture*. Unpublished manuscript.
- No, S., Wan, C., & Chiu, C. (2005). Cultural hybridization among Chinese and Korean ethnics residing in the United States. Unpublished data.
- Oikawa, S., & Yoshida, T. (2007). An identity based on being different: A focus on biethnic individuals in Japan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31, 633-653.
- Padilla, A. M. (2006). Bicultural social development. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 467-497.
- Pahl, K., & Way, N. (2006). Longitudinal trajectories of ethnic identity among urban Black and Latino adolescents. *Child Development*, 77, 1403-1415.
- Pinel, E.C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 114-128.
- Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9, 34-49.
- Phinney, J. S., & Devich-Navarro, M. (1997). Variations in bicultural identification among African American and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 7, 3-32.

- Purdie, V. J., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., & Crosby, J. R. (2001, August). The business of diversity: Minority trust within organizational cultures. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Pyke, K., & Dang, T. (2003). "FOB" and "whitewashed": Identity and internalized racism among second generation Asian Americans. *Qualitative Sociology*, 26, 147-172.
- Quintana, S. M. (2007). Racial and ethnic identity: Developmental perspectives and research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology. Special Issue: Racial and Ethnic Identity Theory, Measurement, and Research in Counseling Psychology: Present Status and Future Directions*, 54, 259-270.
- Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 417-423.
- Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 88-106.
- Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2004). Negotiating racial identity: Biracial women and interactional validation. *Women & Therapy*, 27, 85-102.
- Rosenbloom, S.R., & Way, N. (2004). Experiences of discrimination among African American, Asian American, and Latino adolescents in an Urban High School. *Youth and Society*, 35, 420-451.
- Rosenthal, D. A., & Hrynevich, C. (1985). Ethnicity and ethnic identity: A comparative study of Greek-, Italian-, and Anglo-Australian adolescents. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 723-742.
- Rosner, J.L. & Gardner, W.L. (2006). Bridge or Barrier?: Judaism's Role in the Acculturation Process of Russian Jews in the United States. Unpublished data.

- Ross, M., Xun, W. Q. E., & Wilson, A. E. (2002). Language and the bicultural self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1040-1050.
- Sciolino, E. (2007, November 28). In french suburbs, same rage, but new tactics. *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/28/world/europe/28france.html?_r=1&scp=3&sq=france+riot+2005&st=nyt&oref=slogin
- Shi, X., & Lu, X. (2007). Bilingual and bicultural development of Chinese American adolescents and young adults: A comparative study. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 18, 313-333.
- Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2007). New zealand = bicultural? Implicit and explicit associations between ethnicity and nationhood in the new zealand context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 1222-1243.
- Smith, C. S. (2005, November 11). What makes someone French? *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/11/international/europe/11france.html?fta=y>
- Spencer, S.J., Steele, C.M., Quinn, D.M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 4-28.
- Steele, C.M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797-811.
- Stone, J., Lynch, C.I., Sjomeling, M., & Darley, J.M. (1999). Stereotype threat effects on Black and White athletic performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1213-1227.

- Suarez, S. A., Fowers, B. J., Garwood, C. S., & Szapocznik, J. (1997). Biculturalism, differentness, loneliness, and alienation in Hispanic college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 19, 489-505.
- Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 34. (pp. 379-440). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press, Inc.
- Tadmor, C. T., & Tetlock, P. E. (2006). Biculturalism: A model of the effects of second-culture exposure on acculturation and integrative complexity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37, 173-190.
- Trickett, E. J., & Jones, C. J. (2007). Adolescent culture brokering and family functioning: A study of families from Vietnam. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13, 143-150.
- Tsang, A. K. T., Irving, H., Alaggia, R., Chau, S. B. Y., & Benjamin, M. (2003). Negotiating ethnic identity in Canada: The case of the "satellite children". *Youth & Society*, 34, 359-384.
- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (ed.), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D., & Wetherell, M.S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Bhanot, R., & Shin, N. (2006). Ethnic identity formation during adolescence: The critical role of families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 390-414.

- Vazquez, L. A., Garcia-Vazquez, E., Bauman, S. A., & Sierra, A. S. (1997). Skin color, acculturation, and community interest among Mexican American students: A research note. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 19*, 377-386.
- Verkuyten, M. (2004). *Ethnic identity and social context*. New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.
- Verkuyten, M., & Pouliasi, K. (2002). Biculturalism among older children: Cultural frame switching, attributions, self-identification, and attitudes. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 33*, 492-516.
- Vignoles, V. L., Regalia, C., Manzi, C., Golledge, J., & Scabini, E. (2006). Beyond self-esteem: Influence of multiple motives on identity construction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 308-333.
- Vivero, V. N., & Jenkins, S. R. (1999). Existential hazards of the multicultural individual: Defining and understanding "cultural homelessness". *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 5*, 6-26.
- Ward, C. (2006). Acculturation, identity and adaptation in dual heritage adolescents. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 243-259.
- Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weisskirch, R. S. (2007). Feelings about language brokering and family relations among Mexican American early adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 27*, 545-561.
- Willgerodt, M. A., Miller, A. M., & McElmurry, B. J. (2002). Becoming bicultural: Chinese American women and their development. *Health Care for Women International, 23*, 467-480.

- Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspective on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 635-654.
- Wong, S. T., Yoo, G. J., & Stewart, A. L. (2006). The changing meaning of family support among older Chinese and Korean immigrants. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 61, S4-S9.
- Yip, T., & Fuligni, A. J. (2002). Daily variation in ethnic identity, ethnic behaviors, and psychological well-being among American adolescents of Chinese descent. *Child Development*, 73, 1557-1572.
- Yuh, J. (2005). Ethnic identity and its relation to self-esteem and ego identity among college students in a multiethnic region. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 1111-1131.
- Zaharna, R. S. (1989). Self-shock: The double-binding challenge of identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 501-525.