

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 469

CG 031 018

AUTHOR Chae, Mark H.  
TITLE Gender and Ethnic Identity Development among College Students from Four Ethnic Groups.  
PUB DATE 2000-08-00  
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association (108th, Washington, DC, August 4-8, 2000).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Asian American Students; Black Students; \*Cultural Background; \*Cultural Differences; Ethnic Groups; Ethnicity; Family Attitudes; Higher Education; Hispanic American Students; \*Identification (Psychology); \*Personality Measures; \*Self Concept; Sex Differences; Sexual Identity; Student Surveys; White Students  
IDENTIFIERS \*Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status; \*Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

## ABSTRACT

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) and the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOM-EIS) were administered to 150 male and female college students from four ethnic groups (African American; Asian American; Hispanic American; White American) to assess the influence of gender and ethnic group membership upon ego and ethnic identity formation. The results revealed striking differences among ethnic group members in the way that they identified with their ethnicity and cultural heritage. Most notable was that African Americans scored highest in ethnic identity compared to other groups except Latino Americans. These results suggest that the values of family interdependence and collectivism, which characterize traditional Latino and African American values, may discourage ego identity exploration and foster an attitude of acceptance and commitment to cultural traditions. In light of the fact that Asian Americans scored the lowest on ethnic identity, it suggests that more research is needed in examining ethnic identity with Asian concepts of self. This study also found that female participants scored significantly higher in ethnic identity than their male counterparts. Additional analysis revealed that the ego identity status, foreclosure, was a significant predictor of ethnic identity. (Contains 41 references.) (JDM)

ED 454 469

Running Head: ETHNIC IDENTITY

### Gender and Ethnic Identity Development among College Students from Four Ethnic Groups<sup>1</sup>

Mark H. Chae<sup>2</sup>

Seton Hall University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

M. CHAE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at the 108<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in Washington, D.C. It was awarded Outstanding Poster Presentation (Honorable Mention) by the Society of the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues (Division 45).

<sup>2</sup> Mark H. Chae, M.A., Ed.M. received his Master's degrees from Teachers College, Columbia University. Currently, he is a doctoral candidate in the counseling psychology program at Seton Hall University. Phone Number: (973) 740-1976; Address: 48 Wingate Drive, Livingston, N.J. 07039; mchae34241@aol.com

331018  
ERIC  
Full Text Provided by ERIC

## Abstract

The present study investigated the influence of gender and ethnic group membership upon ego and ethnic identity formation. The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) and the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOM-EIS) were administered to 150 male and female college students from four ethnic groups (i.e., African American, Asian American, Hispanic American and White American). Results revealed striking differences among ethnic group members in the way that they identify with their ethnicity and cultural heritage. Most notable is that African Americans scored highest in ethnic identity compared to other groups. African Americans scored significantly higher in ethnic identity compared to Asian Americans and White Americans, but not Latino Americans. This study also found that female participants scored significantly higher in ethnic identity than their male counterparts. In addition, the ego identity status, foreclosure, was significant rendering African Americans and Latino Americans significantly more foreclosed than White Americans. A stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed that the ego identity status, foreclosure, was a significant predictor of ethnic identity.

## Gender and Ethnic Identity Development among College Students from Four Ethnic Groups

Ego identity formation is an ongoing process that achieves special and central importance during the period of adolescence (Erikson, 1968). The process of constructing a whole and cohesive sense of self is a complex procedure, characterized by the progressive advancement toward a developed and integrated psyche. Identity, in this case, serves as a construct, which functions to organize and harmonize the dynamic aspects of the self-system. Ego identity researchers have acknowledged the important role of personality dispositions related to political, religious, and vocational orientations. Moreover, they have shown how these variables impinge upon and interact with identity development (Kroger, 1996). It has been argued that these personal orientations transform personality structure (Marcia, 1980).

While numerous researchers have studied the role of varying components of self in identity formation, it is surprising that there is a paucity of research addressing sociocultural variables, such as ethnicity and its influence on identity formation. In *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, Erikson (1968) suggested that an individual's identity development was located "in the course of [her] or his communal culture" (p. 22). However, he devoted only one chapter to race and ethnicity in his book. The works of Erikson and his stages of psychosocial development have been considered universal, yet the majority of his work fails to address important sociocultural influences (Carter, 1995). This fact is particularly striking when we consider North America's rapidly changing demographic landscape, which has resulted from trends in immigration and high birth rates among racial and ethnic minorities (Atkinson, Morton, & Sue, 1993; Comas-Diaz,

1992). The Basic Behavioral Science Task Force (1996) has projected that racial and ethnic minorities "will account for 47% [of the U.S. population] by the year 2050" (p. 725).

#### Definitions: Ethnic Identity and Ego Identity

Ethnic identity considers the way in which minority individuals deal with their own group as a distinct sub-group of majority society (Phinney, 1990). Ethnic identity development is a complex task of integrating the influences of (ethnic) ingroup culture with societal perceptions of one's ethnic group (e.g., the group's social status). Tajfel (1981) described ethnic identity as "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (p. 255). Conceptually, ethnic identity serves as a means to understand whether and to what degree a person has explored the meaning of her or his ethnicity (e.g., cultural values) and developed a sense of commitment to her or his ethnic heritage.

Ethnic identity finds its roots in Marcia's (1966) developmental identity framework based on a set of assumptions regarding the composition of ego identity. Under this framework, ego identity is derived from two broad cognitive categories: ideological perspectives and interpersonal views. Ideological ego identity is measured by considering perspectives regarding religion, politics, philosophical life-style and occupation, while interpersonal views are based on friendship, dating, sex roles and recreation (Marcia, 1966).

Marcia (1966) classified ego identity in four discrete stages: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium and achievement. Diffusion describes a person lacking

direction. Foreclosure indicates that an individual embraces a set of values, beliefs and goals articulated by another rather than adopting self-attained values, beliefs and goals. Moratorium characterizes a person experiencing crisis, seeking to form individual values, beliefs and goals. Last, Achievement classifies an individual who has successfully passed through the moratorium stage and embraced self-derived values, beliefs and goals (Marcia, 1980).

### Review of Research

The majority of ego identity research has shown that there are differences between ethnic minority group members and White Americans (Abraham, 1986; Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990). In a study with high school students, Markstrom-Adams and Adams (1995) found that individuals belonging to ethnic minority groups were significantly more foreclosed than majority group members. However, few differences were found between ethnic minority group member's scores. Likewise, Streitmatter (1988) and Abraham (1986) found that ethnic minority group members were more foreclosed than their White American counterparts. Again, no significant differences were found between minority groups. It is not clear as to why no differences were found between groups. It may be that the measurement tools used did not assess dimensions of ethnicity and culture. These personal orientations have been considered central to ethnic minority personality development (Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992). Waterman (1988) suggested that the ego-identity construct may not be relevant for ethnic minorities. He noted, "few individuals from...societies outside of the western sphere of influence would be found with an achieved identity" (Waterman, 1988, p. 200).

Recognizing this deficit in current identity measures, Phinney (1992) developed a scale that measures the degree of ethnic identity exploration and commitment. Her work has provided support for differences between ethnic groups with regard to ethnic identity exploration and commitment (Phinney & Alipuria, 1990; Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Phinney, Dupont, Espinosa, Revil, & Sanders, 1994). In one study with high school and college students, Phinney et al. (1994) found that African Americans had the highest ethnic identity, followed by Latino Americans, Asian Americans, and finally, White Americans. A t-test revealed that African Americans scored significantly higher than Asian Americans ( $p < .001$ ). In another study, Phinney (1992) reported differences between ethnic minority groups among 417 high school students and 136 college participants. Ethnic minority group members scored higher on ethnic identity compared to White American participants. Moreover, the sample revealed that African American college students scored the highest in ethnic identity, followed by Latino Americans, Asian Americans, then White Americans. Significant differences were found between African and Latino Americans ( $p < .05$ ). Finally, Branch, Tayal, and Triplett (2000) conducted a study examining ethnic identity development among 254 adolescents and young adults. The findings revealed that African Americans and Latino Americans demonstrated more advanced ethnic identity statuses as compared to their White American counterparts. These studies confirm other research that has shown that ethnic minorities demonstrate different identity statuses compared to White Americans (Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990). Furthermore, these studies provide additional evidence that there are important distinctions between ethnic minority groups.

The impact of gender and ethnicity is an important component of identity development for ethnic minorities. Research has produced limited evidence of gender differences in ethnic identity development. Phinney and Tarver (1988) found a higher trend toward ethnic identity search for African-American females compared to males; however, the sample consisted of only 48 subjects. Similarly, Phinney (1989) found the same trend with African American subjects: five females had an achieved ethnic identity compared to zero of the sampled males. However, once more, the sample was too small to assess real differences. Among Asian Americans, Ting-Toomey (1981) found that Chinese women were more likely to adhere to Chinese culture as compared to Chinese men.

This review has illuminated some limitations of the ego-identity construct as an assessment tool for ethnic-minority group members. In addition, it has been shown that ethnic identity may be a useful construct to assess the impact of ethnicity on identity. Studies have provided evidence that there are in fact important differences with respect to ethnic identity exploration and commitment among ethnic minority groups. Finally, the literature on gender and ethnicity has suggested that there are gender differences on the lines of ethnicity. However, two of three studies noted dealt specifically with African Americans and White Americans, and did not consider other ethnic minority groups (e.g., Asian and Latino Americans). The inadequacies found in assessing the variables, gender and ethnicity, suggest that there is a need for continuing research that assesses gender and ethnic group differences among several ethnic groups.

Accordingly, the following research questions were advanced and tested. First, are there differences in ego and ethnic identity formation among four different ethnic



groups? The four ethnic groups consist of African Americans, Asian Americans, Latino Americans and White Americans. It is expected that there are in fact differences among these ethnic groups. Second, are there differences in ego and ethnic identity on the lines of gender? It has been argued that men and women espouse different sex roles and interpersonal styles (Gilligan, 1982). As such, it is expected that gender differences would progress on the lines of ethnicity. Finally, which ego identity statuses (e.g., diffused, foreclosed, moratorium, achieved) best predict ethnic identity? Prior research has suggested that an achieved identity would be related to high ethnic identity scores. Hence, it is expected that an achieved ego identity would best predict ethnic identity.

### Method

#### Sample

The participants were drawn from a college population of three large, ethnically diverse schools in the Northeast. Participants were within the age range of 16 to 25. The participant pool (N = 150) included Latino American Americans (19 males and 17 females), African Americans (18 males and 19 females), Asian Americans (20 males and 20 females) and White Americans (15 males and 22 females). Ethnic groups were divided based on a participant's indication of "ethnicity" on a demographics measure.

#### Procedure

Participants were asked to respond to two measurement instruments and one demographics sheet. Each participant received a questionnaire after signing an informed consent. Participants were informed that involvement in the study was completely voluntary and that one could stop at any time without any negative consequences. Each participant was asked to first respond to the demographics measure, then to the two

measurement instruments. The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure and Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status were counterbalanced in order to control for instrumentation effects.

## Measurement

### Demographic Sheet

This data sheet was used to examine the individual's social background.

Participants were asked to indicate age, sex, ethnic-group, place of residence, family type (1 vs. 2 parents) as well as degree of community involvement.

### Ethnic Identity Status

Ethnic identity was assessed using the 23-item Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Phinney, 1992). The measure assesses four aspects of ethnic identity: positive attitudes and a sense of belonging to one's group - for instance, I have a strong pride in my ethnic group; ethnic behaviors and practices - for instance, "I take part in the cultural activities of my ethnic group; ethnic identity achievement--for example, I have a clear sense of my ethnic group and its meaning to me; and other group orientation - for instance, "I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own." Participants respond to these statements on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The score ranges from 1 to 4, signifying low to high ethnic identity respectively.

Reliability estimates were calculated for this measure by the procedure, coefficient alpha. Phinney (1992) calculated reliability for a high school sample (n = 417) and a college sample (n = 136) reporting a coefficient alpha of .81 for multi-ethnic high school students and .90 for multi-ethnic college students (Phinney, 1992). Likewise,

Markstrom-Adams and Smith (1996) assessed coefficient alpha with 102 Jewish middle class high school students (grades 9 through 12) and found a somewhat lower reliability, rendering a score of .71. Phinney and Alipuria (1996) assessed internal consistency with a multi-ethnic high school population ( $n = 926$ ), rendering a score of .84.

The MEIM has been shown to have some degree of construct validity (Kohatsu & Richardson, 1997). Phinney (1992) found a correlation with ethnic identity exploration and self-esteem with both a high school ( $r = .31, p < .001$ ) and college population ( $r = .25, p < .01$ ). A second study by Phinney and Alipuria (1996), also found a correlation between ethnic identity progression and self-esteem with high school students ( $r = .31, p < .001$ ). Roberts, Phinney, Masse, & Chenet (1999) examined the construct validity of the MEIM with 5,423 students from diverse ethnic groups in sixth, seventh, and eighth grade. The validity of the measures was substantiated by its expected correlations with measures of psychological well being such as coping, mastery, self-esteem, optimism and happiness. Conversely, the MEIM was negatively correlated with measures of loneliness and depression.

In this study, reliability of the MEIM was determined by the procedure Cronbach's alpha, rendering a score of .83.

### Ego Identity Status

Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOM-EIS). Constructed by Bennion and Adams (1986), this scale is based on the framework of Marcia's (1966) ego-identity framework and is designed to categorize individuals by ego identity status. This instrument consists of 64 items, which relate to the domains of occupation, religion, politics, philosophy, friendship, dating, sex roles, and recreation. Each item is written to

reflect characteristics of a different identity status. Participants rate each item on a 6-point Likert-type scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Internal consistency for the four statuses (i.e., Diffusion, Foreclosure, Moratorium and Achievement) ranged from .71 to .84 (Markstrom-Adams & Adams, 1995; Markstrom-Adams and Smith, 1996), .62 to .75 (Vondracek et al., 1995), and .60 to .94 (O'Conner, 1995). Test-retest reliability was also assessed rendering scores ranging from .63 to .83 (Adams et al., 1989).

Construct validity was supported by Vondracek et al. (1995) who compared the "occupational" items of the EOM-EIS with the Career Decision Scale (CDS). The CDS has test-retest correlations of .82 to .90, and has been considered an important measurement device in career counseling (Seligman, 1994). Vondracek et al. (1995) found a significant correlation between these measures ( $r = .23, p < .05$ ). Construct validity was also supported by Waterman (1992) who found that advanced ego-identity statuses were correlated with self-esteem. Markstrom-Adams and Adams (1995) assessed construct validity by examining Marcia's (1966) original interview to the paper-pencil self-report measure (i.e., EOM-EIS) and concluded that it is an adequate substitute for the ego-identity interview.

In this study, reliability of the EOM-EIS was determined by Cronbach's alpha, rendering a score of .76

## Results

General Linear Model Multivariate of Analyses (GLM MANOVA) were employed to determine the influence of gender and ethnic group membership on ego and ethnic identity. The findings were significant for both ethnic group [Wilks'  $\lambda$ ,  $F(24,$

392) = 2.96,  $p < .0001$ ] and gender [Wilks' $\lambda$ ,  $F(8, 135) = 6.95$ ,  $p < .0001$ ]. Follow up Univariate tests revealed that ethnic group membership had a significant effect upon ethnic identity,  $F(3, 142) = 12.44$ ,  $p < .001$ . Tukey's post hoc tests revealed that Whites scored significantly lower than African Americans ( $p < .01$ ), Latino Americans ( $p < .05$ ), but not Asian Americans (see table 1).

-----  
 Insert Table 1 about here  
 -----

Ethnic group membership also rendered a significant main effect upon the ethnic identity subscale, affirmation of belonging,  $F(3, 142) = 6.93$ ,  $p < .001$ . Tukey's multiple comparison revealed that African Americans scored significantly higher than White Americans ( $p < .0001$ ) and Asian Americans ( $p = .006$ ), but not Latino Americans. Ethnic group membership had a significant effect upon the ethnic identity subscale, ethnic identity achievement,  $F(3, 142) = 3.2$ ,  $p = .024$ . African Americans scored the highest, followed by Latino Americans, Asian Americans and finally White Americans. Tukey's post hoc tests revealed a significant difference between African Americans and White Americans ( $p < .05$ ). Other groups were not significantly different. Ethnic group membership had a significant effect upon the ethnic identity subscale, ethnic behaviors and practices,  $F(3, 142) = 4.2$ ,  $p = .007$ . African Americans scored the highest, followed by Latino Americans, White Americans, and last Asian Americans. Tukey's post hoc tests revealed a significant difference between African Americans and White Americans ( $p < .05$ ) and Asian Americans ( $p < .05$ ).

Gender rendered a significant main effect upon ethnic identity,  $F(1, 142) = 14.6$ ,  $p < .001$ . Women ( $M=3.23$ ,  $SD = .47$ ) demonstrated significantly more advanced ethnic identity statuses compared to their male ( $M=2.9$ ,  $SD = .58$ ) counterparts.

-----  
 Insert Table 2 about here  
 -----

Ethnic group membership rendered significance in the foreclosure domain of the ego identity status,  $F(3, 142) = 4.0$ ,  $p = .009$ . Tukey's post hoc tests revealed that African Americans ( $p < .05$ ) and Latino Americans ( $p < .05$ ) were significantly more foreclosed than White Americans, but not Asian Americans (see Table 2).

A stepwise multiple regression was conducted using the ego identity statuses (i.e., diffused, foreclosed, moratorium, and achieved) as predictors and the total score on the ethnic identity measure as the criterion variable. Results showed that two independent variables were entered into the model. Results indicated that the total equation accounted for 11% of the variance,  $R^2 = .11$ ,  $F(2, 147) = 8.99$ ,  $p < .0001$ . Diffused identity was a significant predictor ( $\beta = -.343$ ,  $T = -4.0$ ,  $p < .001$ ) as was the foreclosed identity status ( $\beta = .251$ ,  $T = 2.9$ ,  $p = .004$ ).

### Discussion

This study revealed important differences among ethnic groups in the way that they identify with their ethnic background and cultural heritage. Most notable is that African Americans demonstrated more advanced ethnic identity statuses compared to other groups. African Americans scored significantly higher in ethnic identity compared to Asian Americans and White Americans, but not Latino Americans. This study also found that females scored significantly higher in ethnic identity than their male counter

parts. With regard to ego identity status, foreclosure was significant rendering African Americans and Latino Americans significantly more foreclosed than White Americans. A stepwise multiple regression revealed that ego identity statuses, diffused and foreclosed, were significant predictors of ethnic identity. It should be noted that the beta weight for diffused identity was in the negative direction, while the beta weight for foreclosed identity was in the positive direction.

The finding of high ethnic identity among African Americans is consistent with other studies (Phinney, 1992; Phinney et al., 1994). It is unclear as to why this ethnic group continues to demonstrate stable ethnic identity exploration and commitment. One explanation was offered by Phinney et al. (1994) who speculated that one might develop a strong ethnic identity in response to conditions of prejudice and discrimination. They noted, "when one's [ethnic] group faces rejection and discrimination, a common strategy, in order to preserve one's self-respect, is to reaffirm and strengthen group identity, through movements, which stress ethnic pride" (Phinney et al., 1994, p. 179). While several writers have offered similar explanations, little empirical research has supported the theory that high ethnic identity is linked to stress related to perceived discrimination. One study in support of this view showed that advanced ethnic identity statuses were related to increased sensitivity to subtle prejudice (Operario and Fiske, 2001).

An alternative explanation may be that African American families have traditionally socialized their children to develop positive feelings and self-confidence about their ethnic heritage (Demo & Hughes, 1990), which may in turn, influence ethnic identity development (Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992). Indeed, Phinney and Chavira (1995) examined ethnic identity development as it related to socialization processes and found

that African American parents provided the most extensive ethnic socialization among three ethnic minority groups (i.e., African Americans, Japanese Americans, and Mexican Americans). Their research also demonstrated that African Americans were found to have the highest ethnic identity statuses among the three groups. Hence, the emphasis on ethnic pride and commitment in African American socialization processes may lay the foundation for the development of a strong ethnic identity.

This study also found that Asian Americans scored lower on ethnic identity compared to other ethnic minority groups. It is difficult to account for this finding. Some research suggests that Asian American parents may employ socialization procedures that discourage ethnic identity exploration (Phinney & Chavira, 1995). For example, Phinney and Chavira (1995) found that Asian American parents spent very little time teaching their children about ethnicity and race. Instead, the locus of socialization practices focused on excelling academically and thriving in American society. Likewise, Sodowsky, Kwan and Pannu (1995) suggested that Asian parents may apply “undue pressure on their children to observe family beliefs and religious ways [which] may drive the children away from the ethnic culture (p. 150). An equally plausible explanation for the low scores of Asian Americans may be that the MEIM does not tap aspects of ethnic identity related to Asian conceptions of self. It is evident that more research is needed in examining ethnic identity with Asian conceptions of self in mind (Yeh & Huang, 1996).

Another interesting finding was that females demonstrated more advanced ethnic identity statuses compared to their male counterparts. Prior research has provided limited support for this finding with African Americans (Phinney, 1989; Phinney & Tarver, 1988) and Asian Americans (Ting-Toomey, 1981). Phinney (1990) suggested that



females have traditionally been “carriers of ethnic traditions” and are often more oriented toward their ethnicity than their male counterparts. Moreover, females have been found to be more oriented toward interpersonal harmony, and therefore, may be more likely to report stronger identification with the ethnic group (Rotheram-Borus, Lightfoot, Moraes, Dopkins, & LaCour, 1998).

With regard to ego identity, African Americans and Latino Americans scored significantly higher in the foreclosure status as compared to the White American sample. According to Spencer and Markstrom-Adams (1990), ethnic minority adolescents have traditionally scored higher on the foreclosure status as compared to White Americans. It is plausible that the values of family interdependence and collectivism, which characterize traditional Latino American and African American values (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1993; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cola, & Ocampo, 1993), may discourage ego identity exploration and foster an attitude of acceptance and commitment to indigenous cultural traditions and roles.

The stepwise multiple regression revealed that the ego identity statuses, diffused and foreclosed identity, were significant predictors of ethnic identity. Diffused identity was found to have an inverse relationship with ethnic identity. Hence, individuals who scored high in the diffused identity status showed low ethnic identity scores. This finding supports prior research that suggests that there is an inverse relationship between indices of poor psychological functioning (e.g., diffused identity) and high ethnic identity scores (Phinney & Kohatsu, 1997). The foreclosure status was positively related with ethnic identity. Individuals who scored high in foreclosure endorse items indicating an advanced ethnic identity status. This finding runs contrary to the ego identity research,

which has linked foreclosure with poor psychological functioning (Marcia, 1980). However, it should be noted that much of the ego identity research has been conducted with White participants. It may be fruitful for future research to consider the relationship of foreclosed status and psychological well being among ethnic minority populations.

#### Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations to this study. First, the nature of the selection process of participants may affect the generalizability of the findings. The participants were recruited from colleges in urban settings in the Northeastern portion of the United States. College students may not represent the attitudes and beliefs of those in the larger population. A second limitation may be related to the within group differences inherent in ethnic group categorization. For example, the identification of “Asian American” fails to take into consideration the within group differences that exist among people from this population. Indeed, Sue and Sue (1999) have noted that there are over 25 Asian ethnic groups that are categorized under the rubric of “Asian American.” A third limitation of this study is that it is unclear if the MEIM is a valid measure for all ethnic minority groups. While the measure purports to be a “generic” ethnic identity measure, it is unclear if it is valid for certain ethnic groups, such as Asian Americans. Finally, it is important to point out the limitations inherent in self-report measures. Participants may respond to items in a way that they deem socially acceptable, and not the way they actually feel. It is difficult to assess true attitudes of participants.

Future research should continue to examine ethnic identity development among ethnic minority group members. Moreover, it would be worthy for researchers to continue to investigate the relationship between ethnic identity and indices of

psychological well being. In addition, it also may be fruitful for researchers to begin examining within group differences among ethnic minority groups. To date, ethnic identity research has considered differences between ethnic minority groups such as African Americans and Asian Americans. However, it is important to note that there are often greater within group differences than between group differences (Carter, 1995). In addition, this study revealed a relationship between foreclosed ego identity status and ethnic identity. Future studies may seek to further examine the relationship between these identity statuses with ethnic minority populations.

In the present investigation, the influence of ethnic group membership upon ego and ethnic identity formation was examined. The results suggest that gender and ethnicity are key aspects of identity development for ethnic minorities. This research has suggested that ethnic identity is an important component of personality development for ethnic minority group members. Ongoing research examining ethnic identity may help provide a more comprehensive picture of ethnic minority identity development.

## References

- Abraham, K. G. (1986). Ego-identity differences among Anglo-American and Mexican-American adolescents. Journal of Adolescence, 3, 257-264.
- Adams, G. R., Bennion, L., & Huh, K. (1989). Objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual. Available from Gerald Adams, Department of Family Studies, University of Guelph, Guelph, Canada.
- Atkinson, D., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1993). Counseling American minorities: A cross-cultural perspective. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.
- Basic Behavioral Science Task Force of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Basic behavioral science research for mental health: Sociocultural and environmental processes. American Psychologist, 51, 722-731.
- Bennion, L. D., & Adams, G. R. (1986). A revision of the extended version of the objective measure of ego identity status: An identity instrument of use with late adolescents. Journal of Adolescent Research, 1, 183-198.
- Branch, C. W., Tayal, P., & Triplett, C. (2000). The relationship of ethnic identity and ego identity status among adolescents and young adults. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24, 777-790.
- Carter, R. T. (1995). The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy: Toward a racially inclusive mode. New York, N.Y: John Wiley & Sons.
- Comas-Diaz, L. (1992). The future of psychotherapy with ethnic minorities. Psychotherapy, 29, 1, 88 -94.
- Demo, D. H., & Hughes, M. (1990). Socialization and racial identity among Black Americans. Social Psychological Quarterly, 53, pp. 361-74.

- Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Knight, G. P., Bernal, M. E., Garza, C. A., Cota, M., K., & Ocampo, K. (1993). Family socialization and the ethnic identity of Mexican-American children. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24, 99-114.
- Kohatsu, E., & Richardson, T. (1997). Racial and ethnic identity assessment. In L. A. Suzuki, P. Meller, & J. G. Ponterotto (Eds.), Handbook of multicultural assessment: Clinical, psychological, and educational applications. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kroger, J. (1996). Identity in adolescence. London: Routledge.
- Marcia, J. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.
- Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of Adolescent Psychology. Wiley: New York.
- Markstrom-Adams, C., & Adams, G. (1995). Gender, ethnic group, and grade differences in psychosocial functioning during middle adolescence? Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24, 4, 397-417.
- Markstrom-Adams, C., & Smith, M. (1996). Identity formation and religious orientation among high school from the United States and Canada. Journal of Adolescence, 19, 247-261.
- O'Connor, B. P. (1995). Identity development and perceived parental behavior as sources of adolescent egocentrism. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24, 2, 205-226.

Operario, D., & Fiske, S. (2001). Ethnic identity moderates perceptions of prejudice: Judgments of personal versus group discrimination and subtle versus blatant bias. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *27*, 550-561.

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

Phinney, J. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. Psychological Bulletin, *108*, 499-514.

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

Phinney, J., & Alipuria, L. (1996). At the interface of cultures: Multiethnic/multiracial high school and college students. The Journal of Social Psychology, *136*, 2, 139-158.

Phinney, J., & Chavira, V. (1995). Parental ethnic socialization and adolescent coping with problems related to ethnicity. Journal of Research on Adolescence, *5*, 1, 31-53.

Phinney, J., & DuPont, S., Espinosa, C., Revil, J., & Sanders, K. (1994). Ethnic identity and American identification among ethnic minority youths. In A.M. Bouvy, F. J. R. van de Vijver, P. Boski, & P. Schmitz (Eds.), Journeys into cross cultural psychology. Swets & Zeitlinger, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Phinney, J., & Rosenthal, D. (1992). Ethnic identity formation in adolescence: Process, context, and outcome. In G. Adams, T. Gulotta, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), Adolescent identity formation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Phinney, J., & Tarver, S. (1988). Ethnic identity search and commitment in Black and White eighth graders. Journal of Early Adolescence 8, 265-277.

Roberts, R., Phinney, J., Masse, L., & Chenet, R. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. Journal of Early Adolescence, 19, 301-322.

Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Lightfoot, M., Moraes, A., Dopkins, S., & LaCour, J. (1998). Developmental, ethnic, and gender differences in ethnic identity among adolescents. Journal of Adolescent Research, 13, 487-507.

Seligman, L. (1994). Developmental career counseling and assessment (2nd ed.). Sage: Thousand Oaks: CA.

Sodowsky, G. R., Kwan, K. L., & Pannu, R. (1995). Ethnic identity of Asians in the United States. In J. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), Handbook of multicultural counseling (pp. 123-154). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Spencer, M. B., & Markstrom-Adams, C. (1990). Identity processes among racial and ethnic minority children in America. Child Development, 61, 290-310.

Streitmatter, J. L. (1988). Ethnicity as a mediating variable of early adolescent identity development. Journal of Adolescence, 11, 335-346.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1999). Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). New York: Wiley.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human groups and social categories. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1981). Ethnic identity and close friendship in Chinese-American college students. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5, 383-406.

Vondracek, F. W., Schulenberg, J., Skorikov, V., Gillespie, L., & Wahlheim, C. (1995). The relationship of identity status to career indecision during adolescence. Journal of Adolescence, 18, 17-29.

Waterman, A. S. (1988). Identity status theory and Erikson's theory: Communalities and differences. Developmental Review, 8, 185-208.

Waterman, A. S. (1992). Identity as an aspect of optimal psychological functioning. In G. R. Adams, T. P. Gullotta, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), Identity formation during adolescence, Vol. 4: Advances in adolescent development. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yeh, C., & Huang, K. (1996). The collectivistic nature of ethnic identity development among Asian American college students. Adolescence, 31, 645-661.



*Table 1*  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Ethnic Identity by Ethnic Group*

	Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		African Americans		White Americans	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ethnic Identity	3.2	.48	2.8	.49	3.4	.89	2.9	.58
Ethnic Achievement	2.9	.49	2.9	.67	3.2	.49	2.7	.66
Ethnic Behaviors	2.7	.89	2.6	.83	3.2	.64	2.6	.80
Affirmation & Belonging	3.5	.57	3.2	.76	3.7	.37	3.0	.70

*Table 2*  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Ego Identity by Ethnic Group*

	Hispanic Americans		Asian Americans		African Americans		White Americans	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Achievement	63.6	12.0	61.7	11.2	63.5	10.8	66.5	11.0
Moratorium	51.0	13.0	50.3	10.8	51.7	11.4	47.5	11.4
Foreclosure	37.7	17.1	33.5	11.4	38.1	13.9	28.4	10.2
Diffusion	45.0	13.0	44.2	10.7	45.2	11.2	39.0	9.9



**U.S. Department of Education**  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



## REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

### I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Gender and Ethnic Identity Development among College students from Four Ethnic Groups</i>	
Author(s): <i>Mark H. Chae</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

### II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**1**

Level 1

↑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**2A**

Level 2A

↑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**2B**

Level 2B

↑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.  
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, → please**

Signature: <i>Mark Chae</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Mark H. Chae</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>48 Wingate Drive, Livingston NJ 07039</i>	Telephone: <i>973-740-1976</i>	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: <i>mchae34241@aol</i>	Date: <i>July 8, 2001</i>

APA 2000

© 2001

(over)



### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address: <i>Manuscript has been submitted for publication</i>

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	University of North Carolina at Greensboro ERIC/CASS 201 Ferguson Building PO Box 26171 Greensboro, NC 27402-6171
---	---

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**  
4483-A Forbes Boulevard  
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200  
Toll Free: 800-799-3742  
FAX: 301-552-4700

e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>