1999

Identity of biracial college students

MyTra Fitzpatrick
San Jose State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

IDENTITY OF BIRACIAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of

Child Development

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

By

MyTra Fitzpatrick

May, 1999

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Kathryn J. Lindholm

Dr. Kathryn J. Lindholm

Robert A. Hicks

Dr. Robert A. Hicks

Robin L. Love

Dr. Robin L. Love

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

William Fisk

ABSTRACT

IDENTITY OF BIRACIAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

By MyTra Fitzpatrick

This thesis examined the identity of biracial college students and the relationship between parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) and biracial identity development. Biracial subjects were defined as individuals having parents who were from two different ethnic/racial groups. Of the total of 104 subjects, 65 students were classified into one of three mixed-groups categories according to the two ethnicities of their parents: Asian/Euro-American, Asian/Latino, and Latino/Euro-American. Results showed that students identified strongly with one or both ethnicities, and that strong bicultural identity was associated with positive self-esteem. The majority of parents utilized authoritative parenting styles, regardless of their ethnic mix. While authoritative parents were more likely to have offspring who exhibited higher levels of bicultural identity and self-esteem, these results were not statistically significant. These findings are consistent with the parenting styles literature and with studies showing positive identity for biracial students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to my family and professors whom have supported and encouraged me from the beginning of my graduate work. I would first like to thank Dr. Lindholm for her optimism and generosity from the very beginning. She has spent endless hours assisting me in finishing the thesis. I am so grateful to her for believing in me, and holding my hand through this whole process. Without her commitment, dedication, and support, completion of this master thesis would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Dr. Hicks for his guidance, encouragement, and assistance throughout my college career. He inspired and motivated me to go into graduate school. He showed me the strength and courage that I had within me to be the successful person that I am today. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Love for her time and effort in assisting me during the final process of completing this thesis. Lastly, I want to express my appreciation for my parents, Loc and Uyen Nguyen, who have taught me the value of obtaining a higher education, and for my father- and mother-in-law, Charles and Chrysanthe Fitzpatrick, for believing in me. I would also like to thank Gary Cava for being a wonderful friend ever since we were undergraduate students and for the countless hours he spent tutoring me on statistics. And a very special thanks to my husband, Nicholas Fitzpatrick, for his unconditional love, support, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction to the Problem

This century has witnessed numerous changes in the social, cultural, and demographic structure of the United States. These changes include a significant increase in interracial relationships and marriages among various people of diverse ethnicities (Cretzer & Leon, 1982). Interracial marriages now exist at every socioeconomic level, from the wealthy to the impoverished (Johnson, 1992). The rate of interracial marriage has doubled every ten years since 1970. Currently, the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1992) reports that there were over 1.2 million interracial marriages in the United States. As a result, a significant number of offspring (estimates are between one and ten million) with distinct mixtures of ethnic origins now resides in the United States.

Interracial Marriages

Interracial marriages and relationships were prohibited in the United States from about 1600 to 1967, and they were also considered socially unacceptable (Kitano & Kikumura, 1973; Spickard, 1989). Individuals involved in interracial relationships or marriages were often viewed as having ulterior motives, such as sexual conquest, societal protest, or social advancement (Aldridge, 1978). As recently as 1984, Shackford noted that many people, including psychologists, teachers, and social workers still viewed interracial marriages or relationships as pathological and unstable. As a result, many biracial individuals have been perceived as "products of negative and abnormal relationships" (Wardle, 1991, p. 216). However, Serbing (1985) and Wardle (1987) have noted that there was greater

acceptance of interracial marriages and relationships at the time of their studies than in the previous 15 to 20 years. Telephone surveys conducted in 1991 indicated that black and white groups showed increased approval of interracial marriage among the respondents. In 1991, 48% of Americans approved of interracial marriages, compared to 28% of Americans who approved of interracial marriages in 1968 (Gallup Poll, 1991). Those who were more likely to approve of interracial marriages had higher levels of education, higher yearly incomes, resided in larger cities outside of the South, possessed more liberal ideology, and were younger than 50 years old (Root, 1996). Attitudes among Americans toward interracial marriages and the biracial offspring have slowly changed as a result of the civil rights movement and important legislation, including the "school desegregation decision (Brown vs. Board of Education, 1954), the civil rights legislation of the 1960s, and the Supreme Court decision outlawing anti-miscegenation laws" (Wardle, 1991, p. 217).

The increase in interracial marriages may be partially the result of the U.S. Supreme Court Decision, Richard Perry Loving vs. State of Virginia (1967), which proclaimed that all laws prohibiting interracial marriages and intimate dating were unconstitutional. In this Supreme Court Case, Mildred Jeter, an African American woman, married Richard Perry Loving, a white man, in June 1958 in the District of Columbia. Jeter and Loving were residents of the State of Virginia, but chose to marry in the District of Columbia because the District of Columbia permitted interracial marriage. However, shortly after they were married, the couple returned to their home in Caroline County, Virginia. Then, in October of 1958, the

Circuit Court of Caroline County charged the Lovings with violating Virginia's law against interracial marriage. The Virginia Code sections 20-58 proclaimed:

> Leaving State to evade law: If any white person and colored person shall go out of this State, for the purpose of being married, and with the intention of returning, and be married out of it, and afterwards return to and reside in it, cohabiting as man and wife, shall be punished as provided in sections 20-59, and the marriage shall be governed by the same law as if it had been solemnized in this State. The fact of their cohabitation here as man and wife shall be evidence of their marriage. (Richard Perry Loving vs. State of Virginia, 1967)

The Lovings pleaded guilty on January 6, 1959 and were sentenced to prison for one year by Judge Leon Brazile (Richard Perry Loving vs. State of Virginia, 1967). However, the trial judge suspended the sentence on the condition that the Lovings leave the State of Virginia and not return together for 25 years. The judge stated:

> Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, malay and red, and he place them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix. (Richard Perry Loving vs. State of Virginia, 1967)

The Lovings' case went to the Supreme Court in 1967, at which time the Court decided that miscegenation laws were unconstitutional (Richard Perry Loving vs. State of Virginia). Thus, there were no longer any legal

barriers to interracial marriages or relationships. Statistics have shown that interracial marriages among Euro-Americans and Asian-Americans are among the most common interracial marriages (Johnson, 1992). However, there is no exact percentage of Asian and Euro-American or Hispanic and Euro-American interracial marriages presented in the recent literature. It is estimated that of the 1.2 million interracial marriages, only 246,000 or .5% of the interracial marriages were between black and white Americans.

Other researchers have noted that people of biracial origins were more likely to marry others of mixed-heritage (Alba & Golden, 1986; Tinker, 1973). Stephan (1992) asserted that "if mixed-heritage individuals identify less strongly with their heritage groups than do single-heritage individuals, then intermarriages may reduce the number of individuals who identify themselves as members of single minority groups" (p. 52).

Definition of Biracial Individuals

Biracial individuals are often labeled as mulatta(o), half-breeds, mixed race, biracial, Amerasian, or multiracial. Root (1996) defined a biracial individual as "a person whose parents are of two different socially designated groups, for example, black mother, white father" (p. 9). According to Root, individuals who are Amerasian are those who have both American and Asian ethnic origin, for instance, the father is white and the mother is Asian. Individuals who are from mixed African and European heritage are sometimes labeled mulatta(o). Some believe the word mulatta(o) came from a Spanish word mulatto, meaning mule; mule is a hybrid between a donkey and a horse (Root, 1996).

In the United States there was the "one-drop rule" which stated that if a person had one drop of black blood, he/she was considered black. The rationale behind this rule was "to preserve the purity of White society, and thereby limit access to economic (and political) control by people other than White" (Miller, 1992, p. 26). Historically, to preserve and protect the social order by the dominant group, people who were racially mixed or biracial were molded and shaped to fit into the American culture (Nakashima, 1992). Legal distinctions still exist today which identify the biracial individual with the race or ethnicity of the minority parent (Wardle, 1991). The legal distinctions were developed because the white community would not consider these individuals as Caucasian. Shackford (1984) noted that, "children with one white parent and one parent of color will generally be identified with the parent of color; their biracial identity is ignored. Children with one black parent and one parent of another Third World background are usually perceived as black" (p. 4).

Statement of the Problem and Purpose of this Study

There is a scarcity of research on biracial individuals. While some studies suggest that the socio-emotional development of biracial youngsters is negatively impacted by having parents of two or more distinct ethnic groups (e.g., Benson, 1981; Gibbs, 1987), other research demonstrates the resilience and benefits of mixed heritage on biracial individual's socio-emotional development (Poussaint, 1984). From this research, it is hypothesized that there is a significant relationship between identity and self-esteem; individuals with a strong bicultural identity will have more positive self-esteem, those who report rejection or alienation from at least

one cultural group will experience lower level of self-esteem.

There has been minimal research conducted on interracial families and the socio-emotional development of biracial individuals. One way of understanding the socio-emotional development of biracial individuals is to examine the family socialization influences. The theoretical approach used here is Baumrind's (1971, 1973) typology of parenting styles. Research (e.g., Maccoby, 1980; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991) has suggested that the parenting style labeled "authoritative" results in more positive socio-emotional outcome, in children than the parenting styles of "permissive" and "authoritarian." Research that has been conducted on the developmental outcomes of biracial individuals has not included consideration of the parenting styles of the interracial couples. Another hypothesis extends the findings from Euro-American families to biracial families: that there is a significant relationship between parenting styles and self-esteem. It is hypothesized that individuals with authoritative parents will have more positive self-esteem than individuals with permissive or authoritarian parents. An additional hypothesis is that a significant relationship will exist between parenting styles and identity. Individuals with authoritative parents will have more positive bicultural identity than individuals with permissive or authoritarian parents.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Currently, no data exists which provides an accurate account of the number of biracial individuals in the United States (Wardle, 1987). The reason is that census forms have not included an interracial or mixed category (Wardle, 1987), forcing biracial individuals to choose one ethnicity (Gibbs & Hines, 1992). Estimates place the number of biracial individuals at between one and ten million (Gibbs, 1987). However, these estimates may be low given that many biracial individuals were born to unwed mothers and, at birth, may have been identified in the hospital records as monoracial (Johnson, 1992).

Research on Biracial Individuals

Very little published research exists on biracial individuals. However, there is some evidence that biracial adolescents encounter difficulty in "developing positive identities in terms of their racial identification" (Gibbs, 1987, p. 266). In an ethnographic study of mixed-race families in London (Benson, 1981), the author concluded that almost all of the children and adolescents dismissed their black identity verbally, behaviorally, or through social identification with white peers. Other researchers have indicated that biracial individuals develop racial attitudes and self-concepts differently than those of other individuals (e.g., Gunthrope, 1978). For example, Gibbs (1987) noted that interracial youngsters may have problems integrating two diverse cultures into a single identity. Often these youngsters experienced prejudice from both racial groups. Due to the difficult barriers that the biracial individuals

faced, they often exhibited low self-esteem, depression, conduct disorder, and had conflicts with peers and their parents. Gibbs also reported that biracial youngsters had a difficult time incorporating two various parenting styles and comprehending their parents' points of view.

A number of common themes identified by researchers have been shown to contribute to the biracial individual's difficulty in belonging to two or more ethnic groups. Common themes often cited by researchers include: belonging and accepting ("not fitting into a group"), feeling ambiguity about one's own appearance (not easily identified race), and experiencing uncertainty of one's identity (Root, 1992). Researchers (Benson, 1981; Cretzer & Leon, 1982; Gibbs, 1987; Jacobs, 1977) have suggested that biracial individuals often have difficulty in defining their racial identity. In addition, they may have problems in school and with substance abuse. They were also more likely to commit suicide, become juvenile delinquents, and possess feelings of isolation (Benson, 1981). Past research, which was based on qualitative data, indicated that biracial individuals encountered higher levels of anxiety, insecurity, guilt, anger, depression, and identity conflicts (Gordon, 1964; Henriques, 1974; McDermott & Fukunaga, 1977; Piskacek & Golub, 1973). However, there is relatively little quantitative data existing in the literature which indicates the "consequences of being of mixed heritage" (Stephan, 1992, p. 58).

On the contrary, other studies have found that biracial individuals had equivalent or higher levels of self-esteem as compared to individuals who were not biracial (Chang, 1974; Jacobs, 1978). There is growing evidence in recent literature indicating that biracial individuals do not have

identity problems, but rather are successful people who have developed appropriate coping skills. Poussaint (1984) suggested that biracial children seemed to be a "rather successful group in this society" (p. 9); that biracial college students were more likely to be independent and assertive than the average students. In addition, some researchers observed that biracial individuals had normal developmental challenges and that the individuals' ethnic identity did not comprise the majority of their personal problems (Brandell, 1988; McRoy & Freeman, 1986).

Identity Development: Definitions and Theories

The formation of identity is a complex and ongoing process. According to Erickson's (1968) stage theory of psychosocial development, identity development is an important stage in which adolescents explore and reflect about themselves, and compare themselves to other people. Erikson called this stage Identity versus Role Confusion. Erikson proposed that identity develops through judgments and comparisons with others. In addition, he suggested that identity "contains a complementary of past and future both in the individual and society; it links the actuality of a living past with that of a promising future" (p. 310).

In Erikson's theory, identity is emphasized as the important task of adolescence. He proposed four important challenges during this stage of identity development. These major tasks are establishing personal identity, establishing autonomy and independence, relating to members of the same and opposite sex, and committing to a career choice. It is an important stage that adolescents must pass through as they develop their identity. It is a crisis in which the adolescents strive to conciliate "a conscious sense of

individual uniqueness" with "an unconscious striving for a continuity of experience ... and a solidarity with a group's ideal" (Erikson, 1968, p. 108). In addition, the adolescents must complete one stage successfully in order to move to the next stage of development. Identity development is an important process for all adolescents. However, identity formation may be more challenging for ethnic minority and particularly biracial individuals due to ethnic identification, preferences, and attitudes. Wardle (1992) suggested:

> Critical to the positive resolution of this state accurate and serious responses by adults to the child's myriad questions and support as the child experiences the physical and social world. Because self-concept and racial identity development are so closely tied together, Erikson's views of this age are important to our understanding and support of biracial identity development. (p. 166)

Identity Development of Ethnic Minority Individuals

In general, development of self identity for ethnic minority individuals is no different from the identity development of individuals from the majority group. However, ethnic minority adolescents may encounter more difficulty in identity formation during Erikson's fifth stage of Identity versus Role Confusion as they confront "constructs of ethnic and racial identification, ethnic and racial preference, ethnic and racial attitudes, and reference group orientation" (Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990, p. 292). Ethnic and racial identification indicates that a person is aware that they identify with a particular group. Sue (1981) defined racial identity development as acquiring pride in one's racial and cultural identity.

Ethnic and racial preferences imply possessing pride for one's ethnic group. The purpose of ethnic or racial pride is to enhance one's self-respect and self-concept (DeVos & Rommanucci-Ross, 1982b). Ethnic and racial attitudes refer "to the view of minorities reflected in society at large" (Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990, p. 292). Some studies have indicated that children form attitudes by the time they are three years old. According to Spencer and Markstrom-Adams (1990), identity formation for ethnic minority adolescents is a difficult task due to four factors. These four factors are values conflict among cultures, not enough role models who have achieved positive identities, lack of family guidance on culture, and the fact that minority groups are often perceived more negatively.

Ethnic identity formation relates to an important question that adolescence often ask themselves, "Who am I?" Bernal and Knight (1993) explained:

> It constitutes a basic part of the ethnic individual's personality, and is a powerful contributor to ethnic group formation, maintenance, and social ties. It is a psychological construct, a set of self-ideas about one's own ethnic group membership, and it is multi-dimensional in that it has several dimensions or components along which these self-ideas vary. (p. 1)

The significance in identifying ethnic identity is to know about one's own ethnic group and how one sees himself or herself as a member of that group. Bernal and Knight also suggested that ethnic identity evolves slowly in children. Phinney (1991) defined individuals with a positive ethnic identity as "those who identify with members of their group and who

evaluate their group positively, are interested in and or knowledgeable about, and committed to the group, and are involved in ethnic practices" (p. 194).

Bernal and Knight (1993) proposed a developmental process of five components of a child's ethnic identity. The first stage is Ethnic Identification. In this stage children classify themselves as a member of their ethnic group. The requisition for this classification is that the children "have an own-ethnic group category, with its appropriate label and distinguishing cues" (Bernal & Knight, 1993, p. 33). The second stage of ethnic identity is Ethnic Constancy. Children in this phase acknowledge their ethnic characteristics and distinguish the attributes of their ethnic group. In developing through the third stage, Ethnic Role Behaviors, children participate in the various activities that reveal their ethnic cultural customs, values, traditions, language, and styles. The fourth stage is Ethnic Knowledge; children in this phase are aware that their ethnic group exhibits certain traditions, traits, language, style, customs, values, and behaviors. The last stage of ethnic identity is Ethnic Feelings and Preferences: children have strong feelings and prefer their own ethnic group's traits, language, values, and behaviors. As they proceed into adolescence, most of kids are at this stage of ethnic preferences and feelings. However, for biracial individuals, this process may be even more complicated because there are two groups with which they have to identify.

A few models of ethnic identity development have been presented in the literature. Such models include: Marcia (1966), Cross' Model (1971) of identity development for African-Americans, and Morten and Atkinson's

Model of Minority Identity Development (1983). Marcia (1966) proposed identity development as having four statuses. These four statuses were achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion. Identity achievement referred to an individual who has already explored and committed to an identity. Moratorium is characterized as an individual who had explored an identity, but has not made a commitment to an identity. Foreclosure status indicated that an individual had given up exploring an identity prematurely. Identity diffusion referred to an individual unable to resolve their identity. According to Marcia (1966), adolescents who remained in the foreclosure and diffusion statuses have not completely explored the different identities. Adolescents who are at the foreclosed status have already made commitment to an identity, however, those who are in the diffusion status have not.

Cross' Model (1971) attempted to explain African Americans' ethnic identity development. He proposed a model which primarily focused on African Americans' adaptation to racial and psychological oppression. According to Cross, there are five stages of black identity development. The five stages include Pre-Encounter (pre-discovery), Encounter (discovery), Immersion-Emersion, Internalization, and Commitment. Individuals in the first stage, termed "Pre-Encounter," view the world as being "non-black, anti-black, or opposite of Black" (p. 15). In this stage, individuals are influenced by a Euro-American point of view. Encounter is the second stage of identity development. Cross defined Encounter as "some experience that manages to slip by or even shatters the person's current feeling about himself and his interpretation of the condition of blacks in

America" (p. 17). Cross noted that Encounter stage is a visual or verbal rather than an intellectual experience. There are two substages within the Encounter stage. First, the individual has to experience the encounter, and second the individual begins to reinterpret the world as a result of the encounter. Stage three is Immersion-Emersion in which the person immerses himself/herself in the black culture and feels liberated from the white culture. The person's view is that "everything that is black is good and romantic" (Cross, 1971, p. 18). The person accepts everything about himself/herself such as his/her hair and skin color and view their characteristics to be beautiful. In addition, during this stage the person is immersed in black literature, art, and poetry. The fourth stage of Black identity development is Internalization. This stage is a complex process due to events that may frustrate or inspire the individual during the third stage - Immersion-Emersion. Three substages that a person may be experiencing: Disappointment and Rejection, Continuation and Fixation, and Internalization. Lastly, Internalization-Commitment is the fifth stage of black identity development. At this stage, the individual has shifted from being concerned with how others see him/her to self-love. The person who once felt an uncontrolled rage toward white people now feels in control. Cross indicated that as "internalization and incorporation increase, attitudes toward white people become less hostile, or at least realistically contained" (p. 22).

Morten and Atkinson's (1983) Model of Minority Identity Development proposed three main stages of identity development. The three stages are Conformity Stage, Resistance and Immersion Stage, and

Synergetic Articulation and Awareness Stage. Individuals who are in the Conformity Stage are more likely to show positive preference "for cultural values and behaviors associated with the dominant group over those associated with their own minority group" (1983, p. 157). Individuals in the Resistance and Immersion Stage tend to express more favoritism toward minority values and are more likely to exclude values associated with the dominant group. Individuals in the Synergetic Articulation and Awareness Stage are able to accept both values and behaviors from the minority and dominant groups.

Phinney (1993) proposed a three-stage model of ethnic identity formation which encompasses Marcia's (1966), Cross' (1971), and Morten & Atkinson's (1983) models. The first stage is Unexamined Ethnic Identity. The individual in this stage does not make an attempt to explore his or her ethnicity. Recent models of ethnic identity development indicate that minority individuals approve the values and attitudes of the majority group and often "internalized negative views of their own group that are held by the majority" (Phinney, 1993, p. 66); for example, Marcia's Foreclosure status, Cross' Pre-encounter stage, and Morten & Atkinson's Conformity stage. However, Phinney found little evidence of such internalized negative views in her study. Stage two is Ethnic Identity Search/Moratorium. According to Phinney, ethnic identity is a continuous process until the adolescents are confronted with a situation requires them to confront and think about their ethnic identity. Erikson (1968) referred to this process as identity crisis. Phinney suggested that this identity crisis process is "a necessary turning point, a crucial moment, when development must move

one way or another, marshaling resources of growth, recovery, and further differentiation" (Erikson, 1968, p. 16). In her research, Phinney found that tenth-graders encountered dissonance, a term developed by Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1993). Dissonance is when the individual realizes that the cultural values of the majority group may not be advantageous to ethnic minority groups. This increase of awareness is the foundation for an ethnic identity search. As discussed previously, many researchers have recounted this stage as a period of experimentation and inquisition. Lastly, Phinney described stage three as Ethnic Identity Achievement. The goal of the identity process is to attain an achieved identity.

According to Marcia (1980), individuals who have attained an achieved identity have resolved issues about their future goals and committed to future actions. By achieving ethnic identity, the individuals have accepted and internalized their ethnicity (Phinney, 1993). This research on the process of identity formation in ethnic minority groups is helpful to understanding the identity development of biracial individuals.

Identity Development of Biracial Individuals

Identity development of biracial individuals is similar to that of ethnic minority individuals for ethnic group identity, but distinct because they have two identities to coalesce. As mentioned earlier in this literature review, identity formation is a complex task for all adolescents. However, identity development for biracial individuals may be more difficult because they must identify two various cultures and define their racial identity. Often this causes the individuals confusion and conflict as they decide with which culture they wish to primarily identify.

One model that has been proposed regarding identity development of biracial individuals is Stonequist's (1937) model of "marginal" identity. According to Stonequist, "the individual who through migration, education, marriage, or some other influence leaves one social group or culture without making a satisfactory adjustment to another finds himself on the margin of each but a member of neither. He is a "marginal man" (Stonequist, 1937, pp. 2-3). Stonequist called the "racial hybrid" the most obvious type of "marginal man." He noted that those individuals who have marginal personality often possessed two or more traditions, religions, languages, and moral codes. In addition, marginal personality occurred when there were conflicts between cultures. Individuals who identified themselves with two or more cultures are often in conflict due to the particular standards set by those different cultures. As a result, these individuals experienced personality conflicts due to the conflicting cultures. Therefore, according to Stonequist (1937), the marginal man was considered:

> One who is poised in psychological uncertainty between two (or more) social worlds; reflecting in his soul the discords and harmonies, repulsion and attractions of these worlds, one of which is often dominant over the other; within which membership is implicitly based upon birth or ancestry race or nationality; and where exclusion removes the individual from a system of group relations. (p. 8)

In addition, many biracial individuals are often judged by their physical appearance. Their physical appearance is often expressed in

labels such as "exotic, beautiful, or fascinating" (Bradshaw, 1992, p. 77). Biracial individuals are also often asked "What are you? Where are you from? Whose side are you on? Your dad in the military?" (Root, 1996, p. xiii). Most people tend to judge others by their physical appearances and attempt to predict their race or ethnicity (Root, 1990). Omi and Winant (1986) stated:

> One of the first things we notice about people when we meet them (along with their sex) is their race. We utilize race to provide clues about who a person is. The fact is made painfully obvious when we encounter someone whom we cannot conveniently racially categorize - someone who is, for example, racially mixed. Such an encounter becomes a source of discomfort and momentarily a crisis of racial meaning. Without a racial identity, one is in danger of having no identity. (p. 60)

Additionally, the ambiguity of one's appearance may lead the individual to feel devalued and rejected. According to Bradshaw (1992), "regardless of physical attractiveness, a person's awareness of his or her racial ambiguity contributes to a sense of vulnerability and a feeling of being an outsider in some situations" (p. 77). Often times biracial individuals are judged only by their facial features. Bradshaw noted that other people often made attributions and conclusions about biracial individuals. However, these attributions are usually based on racial stereotypes. Stereotyping people who are monoracial does not hold the same implications for biracial or multiracial individuals. Bradshaw explained, "the monoracial individual's racial self-identification is most likely congruent with her or

his phenotype" (Bradshaw, 1992, p. 81). The most common and accepted stereotype of biracial or multiracial individuals is that they are beautiful and handsome (Nakashima, 1992). However, Nakashima noted that it is important to question this seemingly "positive" image. Nakashima (1992) explained:

> For example, is it because multiracial people who are part Caucasian often look like "Anglicized" versions of people of color that they are considered to be handsome or beautiful? This could help to explain why so many of the "Black" and "Asian" actors and actresses in U.S. media are actually multiracial. On the other hand, for those who are attracted to people with "exotic" looks, multiracial people are often extra exotic looking in that they do not look much like any designated racial and ethnic group. (p. 170)

During the process of identity development, most individuals accept or reject certain aspects of the identity group to which they have chosen to belong. Therefore, it is only natural for biracial individuals to reject, for instance, their white or nonwhite background (Wardle, 1991). Poston (1990) proposed that racial identity development is especially important for biracial children. Poston (1990) proposed two reasons why biracial identity development is so important:

> (1) It helps shape individuals' attitudes about themselves, attitudes about other individuals in their racial/ethnic group, attitudes about individuals from other racial/ethnic minority groups, and attitudes about individuals from the majority and (2) It dispels the cultural conformity myth, that is, that all individuals from a particular

> minority group are the same, with the same attitudes and preferences. (p. 152)

Jacobs (1992) suggested that as individuals mature cognitively, their biracial self-concepts will emerge. He proposed three stages of racial identity development that biracial adolescents pass through. In Stage I, Pre-Color Constancy: Play and Experimentation with Color, which begins around 3 years of age, biracial children begin to experiment with pigment coloring. At this stage biracial children "have not yet classified people into socially defined racial categories and do not yet understand that skin color is invariant" (p. 205). The typical biracial child is able to identify with his or her skin color and to experiment freely with skin color in identifying families and doll selection. Jacobs explained why some biracial individuals do not exhibit playful experiments with color in this stage:

> Low self-esteem and/or painful personal experience of racial prejudice can lead to avoidance of exploratory play with color or to precocious rageful evaluations by color in the young child who has not yet achieved color constancy. (pp. 200-201)

In Stage II, Post-Color Constancy: Biracial Label and Racial Ambivalence, which begins around the age of 4.5 years, biracial children know that their color will not change and have accepted their biracial label. However, they are not quite sure of their racial status. For instance, in studies of doll preference, both white and black children most commonly select white over black dolls. Jacobs (1992) noted that it is necessary for biracial individuals to experience ambivalence about their racial status. He proposed that "if the child can maintain ambivalence, his or her

development of racial awareness moves forward to the level where discordant elements can be reconciled in a unified identity" (Jacobs, 1992, p. 201).

Lastly, biracial individuals enter Stage III, Biracial Identity, which begins from ages 8 to 12 years. At this stage they are no longer ambiguous about their racial status because they ascertain that belonging to a racial group is not determined by skin color but by parentage. Jacobs indicated that in Stage III:

> The child's discovery that his or her parents' racial group membership and not color per se defines the child as biracial allow him or her to separate skin color and racial group memberships and rate him- or herself and family members' skin color accurately. (p. 203)

Jacobs suggested that biracial adolescents who display low self-esteem or have experienced some form of racial prejudice would avoid exploring freely with skin color. The implication of this could lead the adolescents to reject their dual cultural heritage and ethnic identities. As a result, Jacobs asserts that biracial individuals are more likely to exhibit depression, conduct disorder, and low self-esteem.

Studies conducted by Coddington (1972a, 1972b) have found that monoracial adolescents from the ages of 12 to 14 experienced tremendous amounts of stress. The young adolescents are beginning to form new friendships and date, and becoming more conscious of their looks (Cauce et al., 1992). The biracial adolescents, in addition to experiencing these stressors, must deal with the uniqueness of their biraciality (Gibbs, 1985,

1987; Gordon, 1964; Ladner, 1977). The biracial adolescents must also incorporate two different cultures into one identity. Faced with these difficult obstacles, it was suggested by some researchers that adolescents from biracial families are at a greater risk of depression, anti-social behavior, low self-esteem, and conflict with their peers (Gibbs, 1987; McRoy & Freeman, 1986). However, on the contrary, other researchers indicated that biracial adolescents may be more resilient to the obstacles they must face, therefore giving them the strengths to overcome such difficulties (Adams, 1973; Hall, 1980; Johnson & Nagoshi, 1986; Poussaint, 1984).

In addition, biracial individuals will often exhibit more insight and sensitivity to both of their parents' racial groups. In fact, some studies have shown that individuals from biracial or biethnic backgrounds have several advantages. These individuals are often exposed to a larger range of values, roles, norms, and behaviors than those from a single culture (Garza & Lipton, 1982). Individuals who are from the dominant culture need to be sensitive to only one racial group, whereas minority children learn to be sensitive to the minority and majority cultures.

However, the process of acculturation that the biracial individuals will go through "is rooted in two potentially contradictory frames of reference" (Brown, 1990, p. 320). Cavell (1977) characterized these two contradictory frames of references as "non-linear" rather than "linear." "Whole race" individuals do not experience the cultural conflicts posed by parents who belong to different racial groups. Furthermore, these "whole race" individuals' racial identities are reinforced by society. Because of this unhindered identity development, the author considered "whole race"

individuals to be more likely to exhibit "linear" development. Conversely, Cavell described biracial individuals as constantly being required to reconcile conflicting values posed by their parents' different ethnic groups. Additionally, Cavell implied that society does not always reinforce the cultural identity that these biracial individuals assume. Because of this complex identity formation required by biracial individuals, Cavell termed their identity development as "non-linear."

Previous studies (e.g., Gunthrope, 1978; Benson, 1981; Gibbs, 1987) suggested that biracial adolescents may have lower self-esteem due to having difficulty integrating two diverse cultures. Often times these individuals experience prejudice from these two cultures. Other studies (Adam, 1973; Hall, 1980; Johnson & Nagoshi, 1986; Poussaint, 1984) indicated that biracial individuals' self-esteem may be high since these adolescents are more resilient. Stonequist (1937) and others would argue that biracial adolescents who have a strong sense of bicultural identity would have more positive psychosocial outcomes. According to Wardle (1991), "the pride interracial children have in both parents' heritage and the pride the parents have in their children helps to create a strong, secure identity" (p. 218). Theories in identity formation suggest that a strong sense of identity leads to better psychosocial outcomes. Thus, one set of hypotheses in this study relates to the outcomes of self-esteem resulting from identity formation. From the pervious research findings, one would expect that individuals with a strong bicultural identity would have a more positive sense of self-esteem. In contrast, those to felt that they belonged to neither group (Stonequist's "marginal man") would exhibit the lowest

levels of self-esteem. Being rejected by one group would also result in lower self-esteem. Individuals develop their sense of self and identities in a variety of contexts. The family is one significant context particularly for biracial individuals who may experience different values and childrearing styles in their parents. It is to this topic that we now turn.

Parenting Styles and the Relationship to Adolescents' Social and Emotional Development

Researchers have conducted studies on the influence of various types of socialization practices on children's competence and adjustment. This research demonstrates that different parenting styles are associated with distinct developmental outcomes (Baumrind, 1968, 1971, 1973; Maccoby, 1980; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989; Lamborn et al., 1991). However, few studies have included ethnic minority or biracial groups but are rather typically comprised of middle class white urban families (Wardle, 1991). In order to understand the socialization of minority and biracial groups it is pertinent to explore and extend existing models of parenting styles in the literature.

Baumrind (1971, 1973) defined three models of parenting styles: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. These parenting styles were distinguished on the basis of four dimensions of parental behavior: parental control, maturity demands, clarity of parent-child communication, and nurturance. The parenting dimensions and styles are described below.

Baumrind's Four Dimensions of Parental Behavior

Baumrind (1973) analyzed over 100 observations of interactions between parents and their pre-school children on the basis of these

observations, Baumrind defined four dimensions of parental behavior.

- Parental Control: Parents who scored high in this area exerted considerable influence over their children and were consistent with the rules that they set. These parents also were not easily persuaded by their children.
- Maturity Demands: Parents with high ratings in this area encouraged their children to perform to the best of their potential in social, intellectual, or emotional capabilities.
- Clarity of Parent-Child Communication: Parents who scored high in this area used rationalization and explanation children in order to obtain compliance from their children. These parents did not use corporal punishment, but instead made an effort to use discussion and logic to modify their children's behavior. These parents prompted their children to give reasons if they did not agree with the parents' rules. In turn, these parents would modify the rules if they felt their children presented good arguments.
- Nurturance: Parents who were given high ratings in this dimension were considered warm and involved with their children. According to Baumrind, warmth referred to "the parent's love and compassion for the child, expressed by sensory stimulation, verbal approval, and tenderness of expression and touch" (p. 7). Involvement referred to parents who experienced pride or gratification in reaction to the child's success or achievement.

Further analysis of these dimensions resulted in the formation of parenting behavior clusters, most commonly referred to as Baumrind's parenting styles.

Baumrind's Three Parenting Style Typologies

Baumrind (1971, 1973) defined three models of parenting styles based on the four dimensions of parental behaviors. It is important to note that while these parenting styles are distinct in theory, few parents adhere to only one parenting style in reality. In fact, some parents may exhibit several styles of parenting. However, typically, a dominant parenting style emerges (Maccoby, 1980).

Permissive

Permissive parents tolerated and approved their children's impulses and seldom employed punishment. The parents had low expectations of their children and infrequently demanded mature behavior. They permitted their children to be in control by yielding to their desires. In addition, these parents sometimes gave reasons or explanations for why they set certain rules, but they did not expect their children to obey the rules. They also "allow considerable self-regulation by the child" (Dornbusch et al., 1987, p. 1245). In terms of the four dimensions of parental behavior, permissive parents scored low in both control and maturity demands. However, they did not necessarily score low in nurturance. Baumrind's study noted that permissive parents scored low on rationalization and explanation, which are two components comprising clarity of parent-child communication (Baumrind, 1971).

Authoritarian

Authoritarian parents strive to mold and control their children in accordance with absolute standards (Baumrind, 1968). These parents extensively valued and respected authority figures. Authoritarian parents

considered obedience to be the primary objective and believed in corporal punishment if their children disobeyed the laws or rules. They were concerned with order and preserving traditions. Authoritarian parents did not encourage or engage their children in decision making, nor did they engage in "believing that the child should accept her word for what is right" (Baumrind, 1968, p. 261). In terms of the four dimensions of parental behavior, authoritarian parents scored high in control and maturity demands, but comparatively low in clarity of communication, and also had low scores in nurturance (Baumrind, 1973).

Authoritative

Authoritative parents attempted to guide their children in a logical and analytical way to solve problems. These parents gave clear expectations and set firm limits. They also provided explanations to why they set those rules. Additionally, authoritative parents encouraged their children to be independent and to explore the world around them. They motivated their children to ask questions and encouraged their children to give input into everyday decisions. These parents promoted communication between themselves and their children. Authoritative parents respected and recognized the rights of both themselves and their children. They also used positive feedback and reinforcement to obtain compliance from their children. Consequently, authoritative parents scored high in control, clarity of parent-child communication, maturity demands, and nurturance (Baumrind, 1973).

Research has indicated that certain parenting styles relate to particular developmental outcomes. In recent research, studies have

shown that the authoritative parenting style promotes the most positive development outcomes and adjustment in young children and adolescents (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1989; Lamborn, et al., 1991). These outcomes include high self-esteem and strong identity formation. However, it is important to note that authoritative parenting style has more of a positive influence in Euro-American and Hispanic households than in Asian and African-American families (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992).

Ethnic Differences in Parenting Styles

Baumrind's three types of parenting styles may not apply the same interpretation or standard across cultures. Hill (1995) indicated that "cross-culturally, parenting behaviors may be similar, but their meaning and implications for a child's development may differ" (p. 410). In fact, studies have shown that the authoritative parenting style had positive outcomes for white, but not black, children's competence development (Hill, 1995). Baumrind (1971) found that the authoritarian parenting style utilized in black families resulted in daughters who were more likely to be assertive and independent. Researchers have generally found that authoritative parenting style is associated with positive family characteristics (Baldwin, Baldwin, & Cole, 1990), such as "cohesion, intellectual orientation, organization, and achievement" (Hill, 1995, p. 418). In her research, Hill (1995) found that authoritative parenting did lead to positive family environments in black families. In addition, Hill found that the authoritarian parenting style actually lead to less independence and less expressiveness in black families, a result inconsistent with

Baumrind's (1971) earlier findings.

Similarly, Bronstein's (1994) research with Mexican American families found that parents who were companionable and supportive have same-sex children who offered help to them, and these children were eager to please their parents. The study also found that parents who were more controlling had sons who replied very slowly to the parents' commands, responded in one word rather than full sentences, and did not display assertiveness and self-expressiveness to their parents. In addition, parents who were punitively controlling have "same-sex children who were likely to be openly defiant and challenging, to make a joke at the parent's expense, to talk back, and to refuse outright to do something they did not want to do" (Bronstein, 1994, p. 438). These results are similar to those of Hill (1995) and provide further support for Baumrind's (1968) parenting styles.

Researchers have also conducted studies in regards to child-rearing practices with Chinese and immigrant Chinese American parents (Lin & Fu, 1990). Socialization in the Chinese culture is greatly influenced by Confucian principles. Confucianism is based on "parental control, obedience, strict discipline, emphasis on education, filial piety, respect for elders, family obligations, reverence for tradition, maintenance of harmony, and negation of conflict" (Lin & Fu, 1990, p. 429). Studies show that there are differences in child-rearing practices among Chinese and American cultures. The differences may be due to different traditions and values placed on the family and on parent-child relationships (Chao, 1983; Glenn, 1983).

There are four differences of child-rearing practices that researchers

have identified between Chinese and American families. The first is that Chinese parents are more likely to be controlling than Euro-American parents (Hsu, 1981; Chao, 1983). In the Chinese culture, there is a strong emphasis on parental authority and filial piety. In addition, Confucian principles dictate that 'parents are always right'; which has an impact on parental control and children discipline (Hsu, 1981; Chao, 1983). Second, Chinese parents are not as affectionate as American parents. According to Bond and Wang (1983), Chinese tradition stresses that in order for the family to be harmonious they have to restrain from displaying any emotion. Thus, Chinese fathers are less likely to show affection toward their children than are American fathers. Third, Chinese parents do not encourage their children to be as independent as American parents. The Chinese tradition emphasizes more interdependence and how the child will fit in with the social group of family or society (Ho, 1981). This approach is in indirect contrast to that embraced by American parents, who encourage their children to be independent and praise them for individualism (King & Bond, 1985). Lastly, Chinese parents stress the value of academic achievement more than American parents. According to Sigel (1988) and Ho (1981), the Chinese family places a strong emphasis on collectivism and group identification. This contributes to the child's academic achievement which is a reflection of the entire community and family. In addition, Chinese parents view academic achievement as a necessary tool for wealth, personal achievement, respect from the Chinese community, obtaining higher social status, and as a way of overcoming discrimination and gaining opportunities in the United States (Lum & Char, 1985).

Studies by Dornbusch and Lamborn and their colleagues (e.g., Steinberg et al., 1992) demonstrated that the authoritative parenting style was found more often in Caucasian families than in ethnic minorities. The authors also found that Asian-American individuals were unlikely to come from authoritative homes, yet, the Asian-American students by far received higher grades than other students. In this study, the authors found that in relation to school success, Caucasian and Hispanic individuals were more likely to benefit from an authoritative home environment than were African-American and Asian-American individuals. It was also noted in this study that parents and peers were an important factor on the influence of students' achievement. For the Caucasian and Hispanic students, parents had a greater influence on the individuals' school performance. But this was not true for Asian-American students. These students were more likely to be influenced in their academic achievement by their peers than by their parents. The Asian-American students relied more on their peers for support in school and "reported the highest level of peer support for academic achievement" (Steinberg et al., 1992, p. 728). These students were more likely to study together and work together on assignments that were difficult. The data from Steinberg et al. (1992) indicated that Asian-American parents were not as involved in their children's schooling compared to other ethnic families. However, those students who received support from both their peers and parents overall had the highest school performance (Steinberg et al., 1992). The authors indicated that the influence of peers and parents combined was greater for Caucasian and Asian-American students than for Hispanic and African-American

adolescents.

As a result of this research showing more positive socio-emotional development in children with authoritative parents, it is hypothesized in the present study that biracial students with authoritative parents will have higher self-esteem than biracial students with permissive or authoritarian parents. A second hypothesis is that individuals with authoritative parents will have a more positive bicultural identity than individuals with permissive or authoritarian parents.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Participants

Subjects consisted of 104 students attending San Jose State University. The mean age of the participants was 28 years old, and 88 (85%) were females and 16 (15%) were males. Out of 104 subjects, 68 (65%) lived with both parents, 26 (25%) lived with their mothers, 3 (3%) lived with their fathers, and 7 (7%) indicated as other living arrangements. Biracial students were defined as individuals who had parents from two different ethnic or racial groups. The ethnic groups that were included in this study were Latino, Black, Asian, and Native American. Of the total of 104 participants, 39 subjects were dropped from the study because they did not fit into the three mixed-groups. The remaining 65 subjects were classified into one of three mixed-groups categories to assess how subjects identified according to the ethnicity of their parents: (1) Asian/ Euro-American (n=23, 35.4%), (2) Asian/Latino (n=11, 16.9%), and (3) Latino/Euro-American (n=29, 47.7%).

Materials

Biracial adults were asked to complete a questionnaire with items relating to their identity and self-esteem and to the parenting practices that their mothers employed in their homes as they were growing up. The questionnaire consisted of 79 questions: 5 background, 29 identity, 17 self-esteem, 7 authoritative, 7 authoritarian, 5 permissive, and 9 family support. The parenting questions developed from Buri (1989, 1991), asked students to rate, on a Likert scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly

agree), the way their parents socialized them as they were growing up. Examples of the parenting questions included "I was an important person in my mother's eyes," "My mother did not allow me to question any decision that she had made," and "My mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her." The self-esteem and identity questions asked students to rate, on a Likert Scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) how much they valued themselves and with which group(s) they identified. A few examples of self-esteem questions included "I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others," "I feel I do not have much to be proud of," and "On the whole, I think that I am quite a happy person."

Procedure

Students who were biracial were recruited for this study from their classrooms in Anthropology, Child Development, and Psychology. Potential students were informed about the purpose of this study and told that the questionnaire would take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Students were also informed that their participation was entirely voluntary, they were free to refuse to answer any questions, and free to withdraw at any time. Students who responded that they would like to participate in the study were provided with a questionnaire, an addressed and stamped envelope, and two consent forms. Students were requested to complete the questionnaire outside of class time and to return the questionnaire and one consent form by mail in the addressed envelope.

Chapter 4

Results

Because of the small number of subjects, especially subjects representing distinct ethnic mixtures, students were categorized into one of the most common ethnic mixtures to enable a more detailed analysis of identity specifically related to the ethnic groups of their mother and father. Of the total of 104 subjects, 65 participants could be classified into one of three mixed-groups categories: (1) Asian/Euro-American - the mother is Asian and the father is Euro-American (n=10, 15.4% of the 65 subjects) or the father is Asian and the mother is Euro-American (n=13, 20%); (2) Asian/Latino - the mother is Asian and the father is Latino (n=6, 9.2%) or the father is Asian and the mother is Latino (n=5, 7.7%); and (3) Latino/ Euro-American - the mother is Latino and the father is Euro-American (n=18, 27.7%) or the father is Latino and the mother is Euro-American (n=11, 20%).

Table 1 shows that participants were more likely to live with both parents than with their mother as a single parent, regardless of the ethnic group. While, the Latino/Euro-American combination was less likely than other combinations to live with both parents and more likely to live with mom as a single parent, this difference was not statistically significant [$X^2(5)=.56$, NS].

Table 1
Who Subjects Live With by Ethnicity of Parents

Ethnicity of Parents	Both Parents	Mom Only
Mom-Asian/ Dad-Euro American	9(90%)	1(10%)
Dad-Asian/ Mom-Euro American	9(75%)	3(25%)
Mom-Asian/ Dad-Latino	3(50%)	3(50%)
Dad-Asian/ Mom-Latino	4(80%)	1(20%)
Mom-Latino/ Dad-Euro American	11(65%)	6(35%)
Dad-Latino/ Mom-Euro American	7(64%)	4(36%)
Total	43(71%)	18(29%)

Students were asked which group they most strongly identified with and rated the strength of their identity with that group on a scale of 1 to 10. Table 2 presents the percent of students who identified with Group 1 (primary ethnic group the students strongly identify with). As Table 2 shows, students were 2.4 times more likely to identify with the ethnic group of their mother, regardless of her ethnicity and the ethnicity of the father. The differences factors varied from 1.0 (M-L/D-A) to 4.94 (M-A/D-L). While a much greater percentage of students identified with their mothers, the relationship between the ethnicity of their parents and which parent they identified with was not statistically significant [$X^2(5)=1.38$, NS].

Table 2
Percent of Students who Identified with Their Mom vs. Their Dad

Ethnicity of Parents	Identity with Mom	Identity with Dad	Difference Factor
M-A/D-E	60%	40%	1.5
M-E/D-A	69%	31%	2.2
M-A/D-L	80%	20%	4.9
M-L/D-A	50%	50%	1.0
M-L/D-E	72%	28%	2.6
M-E/D-L	67%	33%	2.0
Total	68%	32%	2.4

Table 3 presents the mean identity strength for Group 1 (primary ethnic group the students strongly identify with). In looking at the strength of the identity with Group 1, the mean strength ranged from 7.2 to 7.9 overall. While we saw that students were more likely to identify with the ethnicity of their mothers, the strength of their identity with Group 1 does not show any consistent pattern across groups. Thus, no ethnic group or parent of a particular group (e.g. Asian mothers or Latino fathers) produced students with a higher identity strength [$F(1,5)=.29$, NS].

Table 3
Identity Strength for Group 1 by Ethnicity of Parents

Ethnicity of Parents	Asian	Euro-Am	Latino	Overall Strength
M-A/D-E	6.7	8	-	7.2
D-A/M-E	7.8	7.8	-	7.7
M-A/D-L	7.5	7	6	7.2
D-A/M-L	7.5	-	7.5	7.5
M-L/D-E	-	5.8	8.7	7.9
D-L/M-E	-	7.5	7.8	7.6
Total	7.3	7.3	8.3	7.6

The strength of identity ratings for Group 2 (second ethnic group the students identify with) appear in Table 4. Not surprisingly, students rated their identity strength significantly lower for Group 2 than for Group 1 (primary ethnic group the students strongly identify with) ($t=18.4$, $df=58$, $p<.001$). In combining moms and dads in each of the three ethnic mixes, Asian-Euro mixtures had a strength of 5.3, Asian-Latino a strength of 6.7, and Latino-Euro a strength of 4.9. Thus, the highest Group 2 ratings were for parents of two ethnic groups - Asian and Latino. When the second parent was Euro-American, there was a statistically significant lower level of identity strength with Group 2 [$F(2,56)=3.47$, $p<.05$].

Table 4
Identity Strength for Group 2 by Ethnicity of Parents

Ethnicity of Parents	Asian	Euro-American	Latino	Overall Strength
M-A/D-E	4.7	6.0	2.0	5.1
D-A/M-E	5.0	7.3	3.0	5.4
M-A/D-L	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.5
D-A/M-L	6.0	7.0	8.0	6.8
M-L/D-E	-	4.7	5.5	4.9
D-L/M-E	-	6.3	4.1	4.7
Total	5.1	5.7	4.8	5.3

Bicultural identity was ascertained by examining the strength of both identities simultaneously. Students who scored above the median for both groups were rated as high bicultural; those who scored below the median in both groups were rated low bicultural; those who scored above the median in one group and below the median in the other group were classified as medium bicultural. Table 5 presents the results of this classification of bicultural identity from low to high. The majority of subjects (54%) reported the degree to which they identify with their bicultural heritage to be in the medium range, with 20% in the low and 25% in the high bicultural range. Consistent with the results on the strength of identity with Group 2, high bicultural students were most likely to be students with parents, both of whom were ethnic minority. Individuals with dads who were Euro-American were least likely to have high levels of bicultural identity (13-20% rated high). However, there was no statistically significant relationship between bicultural identity and ethnicity of parents [$X^2(4)=5.3$, NS].

Table 5
Bicultural Identity from Low to High by Ethnicity of Parents

Ethnicity of Parents	Low	Medium	High
M-A/D-E	20%	60%	20%
D-A/M-E	25%	50%	25%
M-A/D-L	0%	50%	50%
D-A/M-L	20%	20%	60%
M-L/D-E	25%	62%	13%
D-L/M-E	17%	58%	25%
Total	20%	55%	25%

Table 6 provides mean scores for identity questions that examined how comfortable subjects were with Group 1 (primary ethnic group the students strongly identify with), Group 2 (second ethnic group the students identify with), and with being bicultural. As Table 6 shows, individuals who identified as Hispanic had significantly higher scores in their positive feelings about Group 1 -- "being in Group 1 is a positive experience" [$F(2,60)=3.78$, $p<.05$], "feel good being in Group 1" [$F(2,61)=4.27$, $p<.05$], and "proud to speak Group 1 language" [$F(2,57)=7.09$, $p<.01$]. The item "enjoy participating in Group 1 activities" [$F(2,60)=2.78$, NS] did not vary significantly across the ethnic group identities. Hispanic students also felt the most uncomfortable with Group 2 individuals, and these group differences were statistically significant for "feel uncomfortable around Group 2 people" [$F(2,61)=3.3$, $p<.05$] and "Group 2 people do not have as much to be proud of as Group 1 people" [$F(2,62)=3.88$, $p<.05$].

Table 6
Mean Scores for Identity Items by Primary Identity Group

Question	Asian	Euro-American	Hispanic	Total	Significant Group Differences
1. Being in Group 1 is positive experience.	3.9	3.9	4.5	4.1	*
2. I feel good being in Group 1.	3.9	3.7	4.5	4	*
3. I am proud to speak Group 1 language.	3	3.6	4.3	3.7	**
4. I enjoy participating in Group 1 activities.	4	3.8	4.5	4.1	NS
5. I feel uncomfortable around Group 2 people.	1.3	1.5	2.2	1.6	*
6. Group 2 do not have as much proud of as Group 1.	1.9	2.1	2.8	2.3	*
7. Because I'm biracial I have many strengths.	3.9	3.8	4	3.9	NS
8. The most important thing about me is that I am biracial.	2	2.1	2.4	2.2	NS
9. Being biracial feels natural to me.	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	NS
10. I am determined to find my identity.	3.7	2.9	3.1	3.1	NS
11. The people I respect most are biracial.	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.3	NS
12. I wish I belong to only one ethnicity.	4.7	4.2	3.9	4.2	NS
13. I don't feel I fit with either Group 1 or Group 2.	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.7	NS

NOTE: Items were rated in a 5-point scale, from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

NS = No Significance, * = $p<.05$**, ** = $p<.01$

Several items also assessed how students felt about their biracial identity (see Table 6, items 7-11). There were no statistically significant differences in any of these items. However, there were differences across the items in how they were rated. The highest rated items with students tending to agree were " I am biracial, I have many strengths" (m=3.9) and "Being biracial feels natural to me" (m=3.7). Students felt neutral about "Because I am determined to find my identity" (m=3.1). Items that elicited disagreement included: "The most important thing about me is that I am biracial" (m=2.2) and "The people I respect most are biracial" (m=2.3).

Finally, three items (see two items on Table 6, items 12-13 and Table 7) prompted students to assess how well they fit into these groups and why they selected Group 1 over Group 2 to identify with. As Table 6 shows, students were in general agreement (m=4.2) that they "wished they belonged to only one ethnicity" though slightly more neutral with respect to the item "I don't feel I fit with either Group 1 or Group 2" (m=3.7). There were no statistically significant group differences in either of these items.

For the item that asked students why they chose Group 1 over Group 2, overall most subjects responded that their parents raised them in that group, though this was more true of students who identified as Euro-American (67%) or Hispanic (55%), than of Asian American (36%) students. Many more Asian American students said they never really thought about it (57%), though about a third of all subjects selected this alternative (35%). Few subjects (10%), though twice as many Hispanics (15%) as Asian (7%) or Euro-American (8%), said they were more accepted in Group 1 than Group 2. However, these differences were not statistically

significant. In addition, none of the subjects indicated that they were not accepted by Group 2.

Table 7
Reasons Student Select for Identifying with Primary Ethnic Identity Group

	Asian	Euro-American	Hispanic	Total
1. I never thought about it.	57%	25%	30%	35%
2. Group 2 did not accept me.	0%	0%	0%	0%
3. Parents raised me in Group 1.	36%	67%	55%	55%
4. Was more accepted in Group 1.	7%	8%	15%	10%

Table 8 shows the mean scores of students' self-esteem according to their primary (Group 1) ethnic identity. The mean score did not vary significantly across primary ethnic identity group [$F(2,52)=.37$, NS].

Table 8
Mean Score of Self-Esteem by Primary Ethnic Identity

Ethnic Identity	Asian	Euro-American	Hispanic
Mean Score	67.6	68.3	66.1

Table 9 shows the mean scores for self-esteem by bicultural identity. There was no real difference between the self-esteem means for the low ($m=65.1$) and medium ($m=66.1$) levels. For the high rating level, though, the mean score was 72.6. This difference was statistically significant [$F(2,48)=3.76$, $p<.05$].

Table 9
Mean Score of Self-Esteem by Bicultural Identity

Rating Scale	Low (n-10)	Medium (n=27)	High (n=12)
Mean Score	65.1	66.1	72.6

When self-esteem was compared according to the ethnicity of the parents, there was no significant difference [F(2,53)=1.78, NS]. The mean scores for Latino/Euro-American parents was 65.7, for Asian/Euro-American parents, it was 68.1, and 71.0 for Asian/Latino parents.

Table 10
Mean Score of Self-Esteem by Ethnicity of Parents

Ethnicity of Parents	Latino/Euro (n=24)	Asian/Euro (n=20)	Asian/Latino (n=10)
Mean Score	65.7	68.1	71.0

Table 11 shows the three parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) by the three ethnic mixed-groups (Latino/Euro-American, Asian/Euro-American, and Asian/Latino). The result indicates that the majority of the mixed-group parents (63%) fit into the authoritative parenting style. Only 22% of the parents used an authoritarian parenting style and 15% utilized a permissive style. More Asian/Latino parents were authoritative, but there were no statistically significant differences between the ethnic groups of parents and the parenting style they chose [$X^2(4)=.96$, NS].

Table 11
Parenting Styles by Ethnic Mix-Groups of Parents

Ethnicity of Parents	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Latino/Euro	61%	23%	16%
Asian/Euro	61%	22%	17%
Asian/Latino	73%	18%	9%
Total	63%	22%	15%

When parenting styles were compared with bicultural identity (as shown in Table 12) the results showed that authoritative parents were more likely to have children who identified as high bicultural. However, there was no statistically significant relationship between parenting styles and bicultural identity [$X^2(4)=.85$, NS].

Table 12
Percent of Parents Using Each Parenting Styles
by Bicultural Identity of Child

Bicultural Identity	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Low	19%	23%	20%
Medium	50%	62%	60%
High	31%	15%	20%

Lastly, Table 13 shows the mean scores for self-esteem by parenting styles. The mean scores were 69.3 for authoritative, 64.8 for authoritarian, and 64.5 for permissive. While students of authoritative parents had the highest self-esteem, the difference were not statistically significant [$F(2,53)=2.3$, NS].

Table 13
Mean Self-Esteem Scores by Parenting Styles

Parenting Styles	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Mean Score	69.3	64.8	64.5

Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the ethnic identity of biracial students and to determine whether their identity was related to self-esteem and to the parenting styles utilized by their parents. To accomplish this purpose, data were collected from 65 biracial college students who were classified into one of six mix-ethnic categories: (1) Mom-Asian/Dad-Euro American, (2) Dad-Asian/Mom-Euro American, (3) Mom-Asian/Dad-Latino, (4) Dad-Asian/Mom-Latino, (5) Mom-Latino/Dad-Euro American, and (6) Dad-Latino/Mom-Euro American. The majority of these subjects lived with both parents and some lived with their mothers only. Students were asked with which group they primarily identified. Regardless of the mother's ethnicity or with whom they lived (both parents or just mom), the majority of students were more likely to identify with their mothers. However, whether they identified more with their mother's ethnicity or their father's ethnicity did not correspond to the particular ethnicity or ethnic mix of the parents. These results are consistent with Cauce et al. (1992) and Salgado and Padilla (1980) who also found that the majority of the offspring identified themselves with the ethnicity of the mother, even when the children lived with both parents.

Students were asked to rate the strength of their identity with Group 1 on a scale of 1 to 10. Overall strength was fairly high, at 7.6. As noted earlier, the majority of students were more likely to identify with the ethnicity of their mothers, but the strength of the identity was not stronger for the mother's as compared to the father's ethnic group. Also, there was

no consistent pattern of identity strength across ethnic groups. Not surprisingly, students rated their identity strength significantly lower for Group 2 (second ethnic group the students identify with) than Group 1 (ethnic group they primary identified with). The results indicated that the highest Group 2 ratings were for parents of two ethnic groups, Asian and Latino. Lower Group 2 ratings occurred when the identity of the second parent was Euro-American. These differences were statistically significant.

When students were asked why they selected Group 1 over Group 2, half of the students responded that their parents raised them in that group and a third said they never thought about it. No students felt that Group 2 did not accept them and only a few students (primarily Hispanic) felt more accepted in Group 1 than Group 2.

Students' ratings of identity with Groups 1 and 2 were used to develop a measure of bicultural identity from low to high. The majority of students were in the medium range in bicultural identity. Students who scored high on bicultural identity were more likely to come from homes where both parents were ethnic minority. It is interesting to note that subjects whose fathers were Euro-American were least likely to have high levels of bicultural identity, though these results were not statistically significant.

There were items in the study that prompted students to examine how comfortable they were with Group 1, Group 2, and with being bicultural. Of the three ethnic identity groups, students who identified themselves as Hispanic had significantly higher scores in reporting positive feelings about Group 1 membership. However, Hispanic students

also felt the most uncomfortable with Group 2 people.

It was hypothesized that students with higher levels of bicultural identity would have higher levels of self-esteem. Studies by Chang (1974) and Jacobs (1978) indicated that biracial individuals had equivalent or higher levels of self-esteem. The findings from this study supported those of Chang (1974) and Jacobs (1978) in demonstrating that students with higher levels of bicultural identity had significantly higher self-esteem. Thus, these findings from this study are in contrast with other previous literature suggesting that biracial individuals often exhibit low self-esteem (Gibbs, 1987).

Perhaps Gibbs' (1987) study included subjects who had lower levels of bicultural identity or who felt rejected by one group. Stonequist (1937) has argued that individuals who felt marginalized would experience lower self-esteem. Based on this previous work, the current study hypothesized that subjects who felt alienated by one or both groups would have lower levels of self-esteem. In looking at why subjects identified with Group 1, no subject responded that Group 2 did not accept them. About 10% of subjects felt more accepted in Group 1 than Group 2. Thus, this study found few subjects who felt marginalized. These results are very important because they demonstrate that biracial individuals can have dual identity and feel positive about that identity. In addition, biracial individuals who identify strongly with both groups have higher levels of self-esteem. These results are important because they challenge two points regarding children from interracial marriages. The first point is that children of interracial marriages will be "marginal" (Stonequist, 1937; Gordon, 1964). The second

point is that individuals who are "marginalized" socially and culturally will have difficulty belonging to both ethnic groups of their parents. Thus, this study does not provide support for "marginal" biracial individuals.

Another set of hypotheses specified that the authoritative parenting style would be associated with higher self-esteem and thus higher levels of bicultural identity. Most parents (63%) were rated as authoritative, regardless of their ethnic mix. Thus, because there were so few authoritarian and permissive parents, it is not surprising that any effects due to parenting style were not significant. Findings showed that authoritative parents tended to have children who had higher levels of bicultural identity and self-esteem, though these group differences were not statistically significant. These results showing the tendency toward more positive socio-emotional identity development for authoritative parenting styles are consistent with the parenting styles literature, which demonstrates pretty conclusively that authoritative parenting styles result in more positive socio-emotional outcomes (e.g., Baumrind, 1968, 1971, 1973; Maccoby, 1980; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1989; Lamborn et al., 1991).

Considerably more research is needed in understanding biracial individuals' development and also the parenting styles among interracial couples. One of the limitations in this study was the small sample size especially of individuals in particular ethnic mixes. In addition, subjects were attending a large four-year university. The fact that they are college students may set them apart from the general population in their socio-emotional development. The majority of the students also came from two

parent authoritative homes. In addition, only three ethnic mixes are represented here and the result may not apply to other ethnic mixes. Therefore, future research should include subjects from diverse ethnic backgrounds, socio-economic groups, and parent backgrounds. Considerably more information is needed on biracial individuals' identity and socio-emotional adjustment. Further research needs to examine the developmental outcomes of biracial individuals according to various family characteristics (parenting styles, demographic background).

References

Adams, P. (1973). Counseling with interracial couples and their children. In I. Stuart & L. Abt (Eds.), Interracial marriage: Expectations and realities, (pp. 131-142). New York: Grossman.

Alba, R. D., & Golden, R. M. (1986). Patterns of ethnic marriage in the United States. Social Force, 65, 202-223.

Aldridge, D. (1978). Interracial marriage: Empirical and theoretical considerations. Journal of Black Studies, 8, 355-368.

Atkinson, D., Morten, G., & Sue, D. (1993). Counseling American minorities (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Baldwin, A. L., Baldwin, C., & Cole, R. E. (1990). Stress-resistant families and stress-resistant children. In J. Rolf, A. Masten, D. Chicchetti, K. Nuechterlein, & S. Weintraub (Eds.), Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology, (pp. 257-280). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Baptiste, H. P. (1983, December). Rearing the interracial child. Communique, pp. 4-5.

Baptiste, H. P. (1985, April). The contemporary interracial child. Communique, pp. 1-7.

Baumrind, D. (1968). Manual for the preschool behavior Q sort. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baumrind, D. (1970). Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. Young Children, 26(2),104-119.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monograph, 4 (1, Pt. 2). American Psychological Association.

Baumrind, D. (1973). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A. D. Pick (Ed.), Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology: Vol. 7(pp. 3-46). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Benson, S. (1981). Ambiguous ethnicity. London, England: Cambridge Press.

Bernal, M. E., & Knight G. P. (Eds.). (1993). Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities. Albany, New York: State University New York Press.

Bond, M. H., & Wang. S. (1983). China: Aggressive behavior and the problems of maintaining order and harmony. In A. P. Goldstein & M. H. Segall (Eds.), Aggression in global perspective (pp. 58-74). New York: Pergamon.

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

Brandell, J. R. (1988). Treatment of the biracial child: Theoretical and clinical issues. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 16, 176-186.

Bronstein, P. (1994). Patterns of parent-child interaction in Mexican families: A cross-cultural perspective. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 17(3), 423-446.

Brown, P. M. (1990). Biracial identity and social marginality. Child and Adolescent Social Work, 7(4), 319-337.

Buri, J. R. (1989). Self-esteem and appraisals of parental behavior. Journal of Adolescent Research, 4(1), 33-49.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57(1), 110-119.

Cauce, A. M., Hiraga, Y., Mason, C., Aguilar, T., Ordonez, N., & Gonzales, N. (1992). In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), Racially mixed people in America (pp. 207-222). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cavell, J. (1977). Biracial identity. Unpublished Paper, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Chang, T. (1974). The self-concept of children of ethnically different marriages. California Journal of Educational Research, 25, 245-253.

Chao, P. (1983). Chinese kinship. London: Kegan Paul International.

Coddington, R. D. (1972a). The significance of life events as etiologic factors in the diseases of children: I. A study of a normal population. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 16, 7-18.

Coddington, R. D. (1972b). The significance of life events as etiologic factors in the diseases of children: II. A study of normal population. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 16, 205-213.

Cole, M., & Cole, S. (1993). The Development of Children (2nd ed.). New York: Scientific American Books.

Cretzer, G. A., & Leon, J. J.(Eds.). (1982). Intermarriage in the United States. New York: Haworth.

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

Cross, W. E. (1985). Black identity: Rediscovering the distinction between personal identity and reference group orientation. In M. B. Spencer, G. K. Brookins, & W. R. Allen (Eds.), Beginnings: The social and affective development of black children (pp. 155-172). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

DeVos, G., & Romanucci-Ross, L. (Eds.). (1982a). Ethnic identity: Cultural continuities and change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DeVos, G., & Romanucci-Ross, L. (1982b). Ethnicity: Vessel of meaning and emblem of contrast. In G. DeVos & L. Romanucci-Ross (Eds.), Ethnic identity (pp. 363-390). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. Child Development, 58, 1224-1257.

Dornbusch, S. M., & Steinberg, L. (1991). Community influences on the relation of family statuses to adolescent school performance: Differences between African Americans and non-Hispanic Whites. American Journal of Education, 50, 543-567.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.

Gallup Poll. (1991, August). For the first time, more Americans approve of interracial marriage than disapprove. Gallup Poll Monthly, 311, 60-64.

Garza, R. T., & Lipton, J. P. (1982). Theoretical perspectives on Chicano personality development. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 4, 407-432.

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

Gibbs, J. T. (1987). Identity and marginality: Issues in the treatment of biracial adolescents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 75(2),265-278.

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

Glenn, E. N. (1983). Split household, small producer and dual wage earner: An analysis of Chinese-American family strategies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 35-46.

Gordon, A. (1964). Intermarriage: Interethnic, interracial, interfaith. Boston: Beacon.

Gunthrope, W. (1978). Skin color recognition, preference and identification in interracial children: A comparative study. Dissertation Abstract International, 38 (10-B):3468.

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

Hein, C., & Lewko, J. H. (1994). Gender differences in factors related to parenting style: A study of high performing science students. Journal of Adolescent Research, 9(2),262-281.

Henriques, F. (1974). Children of conflict: A study of interracial sex and marriage. New York: Dutton.

Hess, R. D., & McDevitt, T. M. (1984). Some cognitive consequences of maternal intervention techniques: A longitudinal study. Child Development, 53,2017-2030.

Hills, N. E. (1995). The relationship between family environment and parenting style: A preliminary study of African American families. Journal of Black Psychology, 2(4), 408-423.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1981). Traditional patterns of socialization in Chinese society. Acta Psychologica Taiwanica, 23, 81-95.

Hsu, F. L. K. (1981). Americans and Chinese: Passages to differences. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Jacobs, J. H. (1978). Black/white interracial families: Marital process and identity development in young children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38(10-B),5023-5032.

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

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

Johnson, R. C., & Nagoshi, C. T. (1986). Asians, Asian-American, and alcohol. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 22, 45-52.

Johnson, S. D. (1990). Toward clarifying culture, race, and ethnicity in the context of multicultural counseling. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 18, 41-50.

Kich, G. K. (1982). Eurasians: Ethnic/racial identity development of biracial Japanese/white adults. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wright Institute Graduate School of Psychology, Berkeley, CA.

King, A. Y. C. & Bond, M. H. (1985). The Confucian paradigm of man: A sociological view. In W. Tseng & D. Y. H. (Eds.), Chinese culture and mental health (pp. 29-46). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Kitano, H. H. L., & Kikumura, A. (1973). Interracial marriage: A picture of the Japanese American. Journal of Social Issues, 29, 66-81.

Ladner, J. A. (1977). Mixed families. Garden City, NY: Anchor/ Doubleday.

Ladner, J. A. (1984). Providing a healthy environment for interracial children. Interracial Books for Children Bulletin, 15(6), 7-8.

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. Child Development, 62, 1049-1065

Lin, C. Y. C. & Fu, V. R. (1990). A comparison of child-rearing practices among Chinese, immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. Child Development, 61, 429-433.

Lum, K., & Char, W. F. (1985). Chinese adaptation in Hawaii: Some examples. In W. Tsent & D. Y. H. Wu (Eds.), Chinese culture and mental health (pp. 215-226). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Maccoby, E. M. (1980). Social development: Psychological growth and the parent-child relationship. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Maccoby, E. M., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction? In Hetherington, E. M.(Ed.), In handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4, (pp. 158-172). New York: Wiley.

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13, 419-438.

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

Marjoriebanks, K. (1979). Family environments. In H. J. Walberg (Ed.). Educational environments and effects (pp. 15-37). Berkeley: McCuthan.

McRoy, R. G., & Freeman, E. (1986). Racial-identity issues among mixed-race children. National Association of Social Workers, 164-174.

McDermott, J. F. Jr., & Fukunaga, C. (1977). Intercultural family interaction patterns. In W. S. Tseng, J. F. McDermott, Jr., & T. W. Maretzki (Eds.), Adjustment in intercultural marriage (pp. 81-92). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

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

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

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

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960's to the 1980's. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

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

Phinney, J. (1991). Ethnic identity and self-esteem: A review and integration. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 13(2), 193-208.

Phinney, J. S. (1993). A three-stage model of ethnic identity development in adolescence. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities (pp. 61-79). Albany, New York: State University New York Press.

Piskacek, V., & Golub, M. (1973). Children of interracial marriages. In I. R. Stuart & L. E. Abt (Eds.), Interracial marriage: Expectations and realities (pp. 53-61). New York: Grossman.

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

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

Richard Perry Loving vs. Virginia, 87 S. Ct. 1817 (1967).

Root, M. P. P. (1992). Resolving "other" status: Identity development of biracial individuals. In M. Ballou & M. P. P. Root (Eds.), Complexity and diversity in feminist theory and therapy (pp. 185-205). New York: Haworth.

Root, M. P. P. (Ed.). (1996). The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rotheram, M. J., & Phinney, J. S. (1987). Introduction: Definitions and perspectives in the study of children's ethnic socialization. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), Children's ethnic socialization (pp. 10-28). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Salgado, V. N, & Padilla, A. M. (1980). Transmission of sociocultural functioning between parents and children in interethnic families. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.

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

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

Shucksmith, J., Hendry, L. B., & Glendinning, A. (1995). Models of parenting: Implications for adolescents well-being within different types of family contexts. Journal of Adolescence, 18, 253-270.

Sigel, I. E. (1988). Commentary: Cross-cultural studies of parental influences on children's achievement. Human Development, 31, 384-390.

Spencer, M. B. (1988). Self concept development. In D. T. Slaughter (Eds.), Black children in poverty: Developmental perspectives (pp. 59-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Spickard, P. R. (1989). Mixed blood: Intermarriage and ethnic identity in twentieth-century America. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., & Brown, B. B. (1992). Ethnic difference in adolescent achievement. American Psychologist, 47(6), 723-729.

Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. Child Development, 60, 1424-1436.

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

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

Sue, D. W. (1981). Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice. New York: Wiley.

Tinker, J. N. (1973). Intermarriage and ethnic boundaries: The Japanese American case. Journal of Social Issues, 29, 49-66.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1987). Statistical abstract of United States: 1987 (107th Edition). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1992). Marital status and living arrangements: March 1992, Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Wardle, F. (1987). Are you sensitive to interracial children's special identity needs? Young Children, 49, 53-59.

Wardle, F. (1989). Biracial children: The identity issue. Interrace, 6(1), 52-54.

Wardle, F. (1991). Interracial children and their families: How school social workers should respond. Social Work in Education, 13(4), 215-223.

Wardle, F. (1992). Supporting the biracial children in the school setting. Education and Treatment of Children, 15(2), 163-172.

Identity of Biracial College Students

Appendix A

Questions were adapted from other studies for the purpose of the study.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please answer as carefully as you can, as there is not a particular right or wrong answer. Mark only one answer for each statement. Answer the following questions thinking of your mother or other primary female caretaker.

YOUR ANSWERS ARE CONFIDENTIAL!

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
As I was growing up:					
1. I was an important person in my mother's eyes.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My mother enjoyed spending time with me.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My mother expressed her warmth and affection for me.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My mother was easy for me to talk to.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My mother took an active interest in my affairs.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I felt very close to my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
7. When I was growing up my mother believed in me.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My mother was a warm and caring individual.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My mother was very interested in the things that concerned me.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My mother consoled me and helped me when I was unhappy or in trouble.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I received a lot of affirmation from my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
12. As I was growing up my mother was very understanding and sympathetic.	1	2	3	4	5
13. My mother did not feel that I was important and interesting.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My mother seldom showed me any affection.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I felt that my mother found fault with me more often than I deserved.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My mother seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
17. My mother didn't really know what kind person I was.	1	2	3	4	5
18. My mother did not allow me to question any decision that she had made.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I was tense and uneasy when my mother and I were together.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My mother often acted as if she didn't care about me.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My mother felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.	1	2	3	4	5
22. My mother did not understand me.	1	2	3	4	5
23. My mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her.	1	2	3	4	5
24. My mother seldom said nice things about me.	1	2	3	4	5
25. My mother was often critical of me and nothing I did ever seemed to please her.	1	2	3	4	5
26. My mother was generally cold and removed.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I knew what my mother expected of me in the family and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority.	1	2	3	4	5

28. If my mother made a decision in the family that hurt me, she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if she had made a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I feel pretty accepted by people of most ethnic groups.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on equal plan with others.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	1	2	3	4	5
32. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	1	2	3	4	5
36. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I certainly feel useless at times.	1	2	3	4	5
39. On the whole, I think I am quite a happy person.	1	2	3	4	5
40. At times I think I am no good at all.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I get a lot of fun out of life.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.	1	2	3	4	5

43. On the whole, how happy would you say you are?
    a. Very Happy
    b. Fairly Happy
    c. Not Very Happy
    d. Very Unhappy
44. In general, how would you say you feel most of the time - in good spirits or in low spirits?
    a. Very Good Spirits
    b. Fairly Good Spirits
    c. Neither Good nor Low Spirits
    d. Fairly Low Spirits
    e. Very Low Spirits
45. How often do you feel downcast and dejected?
    a. Very Often
    b. Fairly Often
    c. Occasionally
    d. Rarely
    e. Never
46. As you were growing up who did you live with?
    a. Mother
    b. Father
    c. Both Parents
    d. Grandparents
    e. Uncles & Aunts (Relatives)
    f. Foster Parents
    g. Other _____(describe)
47. What is the ethnicity of your mother?
    a. Latino/Hispanic/Mexican American/Other Latino Heritage
    b. African American/Black
    c. Anglo/White non-Hispanic
    d. Asian/Filipino/Chinese/Japanese/Korean/Vietnamese
    e. Native American/Alaskan/Native/American Indian
48. What is the ethnicity of your father?
    a. Latino/Hispanic/Mexican American/Other Latino Heritage
    b. African American/Black
    c. Anglo/White non-Hispanic
    d. Asian/Filipino/Chinese/Japanese/Korean/Vietnamese
    e. Native American/Alaskan/Native/American Indian

49. Which ethnic group do you strongly identify with? This group will be called Group One.
    a. Latino/Hispanic/Mexican American/Other Latino Heritage
    b. African American/Black
    c. Anglo/White non-Hispanic
    d. Asian/Filipino/Chinese/Japanese/Korean/Vietnamese
    e. Native American/Alaskan/Native/American Indian

Rate how strongly you identify with Group One on a scale of 1 to 10:

Not at All									Very Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

50. Is there a second ethnic group you identify with? This group will be called Group Two.
    a. Latino/Hispanic/Mexican American/Other Latino Heritage
    b. African American/Black
    c. Anglo/White non-Hispanic
    d. Asian/Filipino/Chinese/Japanese/Korean/Vietnamese
    e. Native American/Alaskan/Native/American Indian

Rate how strongly you identify with Group Two on a scale of 1 to 10:

Not at All									Very Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
51. I believe that being in Group One is a positive experience.	1	2	3	4	5
52. I feel comfortable wherever I am.	1	2	3	4	5
53. I feel uncomfortable around Group Two people.	1	2	3	4	5
54. I feel good belonging to Group One.	1	2	3	4	5
55. I believe that the world should be interpreted from Group One's perspective.	1	2	3	4	5
56. I have changed my style of life to fit my beliefs about Group One.	1	2	3	4	5
57. I feel excitement and joy being in Group One's surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5
58. I believe that Group Two people came from a strange and uncivilized culture.	1	2	3	4	5
59. People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.	1	2	3	4	5
60. I find myself reading a lot of Group One's literature and thinking about being in that group.	1	2	3	4	5
61. I feel guilty and/or anxious about some of the things I believe about Group Two.	1	2	3	4	5
62. I believe that because I am biracial, I have many strengths.	1	2	3	4	5
63. A person's race has little to do with whether or not he/she is a good person.	1	2	3	4	5
64. I am determined to find my identity.	1	2	3	4	5
65. I believe that Group One people are intellectually superior to Group Two people.	1	2	3	4	5
66. I feel that Group Two people do not have as much to be proud as Group One people.	1	2	3	4	5
67. The most important thing about me is that I am biracial.	1	2	3	4	5
68. Being biracial just feels natural to me.	1	2	3	4	5
69. Sometimes, I wish I belonged to another race.	1	2	3	4	5
70. The people I respect most are biracial.	1	2	3	4	5
71. A person's race usually is not important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
72. I am satisfied with myself.	1	2	3	4	5

73. I have a positive attitude about myself because I am biracial.	1	2	3	4	5
74. Sometimes people think I'm not very smart because all they see is what I look like.	1	2	3	4	5
75. I wish I belonged to only one race/ethnicity.	1	2	3	4	5
76. I enjoy participating in Group One's activities.	1	2	3	4	5
77. I am proud to speak Group One's language.	1	2	3	4	5
78. I don't feel like I fit in with either Group One or Group Two.	1	2	3	4	5

79. I identify more strongly with Group One because:
    a. I was accepted most by that group.
    b. My parents raised me more in that group.
    c. Group Two never really accepted me.
    d. I never really thought about it.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY!

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

150mm

6"

APPLIED IMAGE . Inc
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989