

A Multicultural Critique of Identity Status Theory and Research: A Call for Integration

Joel R. Sneed
New York University

Seth J. Schwartz
*Department of Psychiatry
University of Miami School of Medicine*

William E. Cross, Jr.
*Graduate Center
City University of New York*

Although identity status theory has inspired over 500 theoretical and empirical publications, it is unclear to what extent this tradition has incorporated non-White ethnic groups and theories of racial and ethnic identity development. We reviewed 57 empirical articles published between 1993 and 2003 in 6 leading outlets for identity status research and found that (a) 35% failed to report the ethnic composition of the sample, and (b) 74% of the samples consisted primarily of White participants. Given the increasing diversity of the United States and other Western countries, non-White ethnic groups need to be incorporated in identity status research, and the ethnic composition of research samples need to be adequately described. We review 4 models of racial and ethnic identity development that parallel the more general identity development process. We conclude by providing both methodological and theoretical suggestions for how identity status and racial or ethnic identity models can be integrated.

Erikson's (1963) eight-stage model of psychosocial development is one of the most influential life span developmental theories in the personality literature. It is by far the most frequently presented stage theory of development in both introduc-

tory and advanced undergraduate psychology textbooks (Whitbourne & Hulicka, 1990). Each of Erikson's "ages" involves a convergence of biological, psychological, and social forces. Together, these forces are posited to guide the progression of personality development over the life span.

Although each of Erikson's (1963) eight stages is present to varying degrees at any one point in the life cycle, developmental progression through these stages is seen as fixed, with each crisis having a time of special ascendancy (e.g., identity vs. identity diffusion in adolescence). Each stage is defined by a bipolar axis with negative and positive endpoints. A crisis has been successfully resolved to the extent that the positive pole of the crisis stage predominates over the negative pole. Moreover, in accordance with Erikson's principle of epigenesis, the successful resolution of earlier crises provides the groundwork for the successful resolution of later crises. These stages are never completely resolved; rather, they are continually revisited to varying degrees throughout the life span.

The cornerstone of Erikson's theory is the identity versus role confusion stage (Erikson, 1963). For Erikson (1968), the struggle to form a sense of wholeness, to create a bridge between childhood and anticipated adulthood, and to experience continuity between one's self-conception and the self as perceived by others defines the normative identity crisis that is generally experienced and addressed in late adolescence and early adulthood. Erikson posited that identity is formed through exchanges with the social world, such that aspects of the social world are selected and integrated into one's developing sense of self.

Based on his reading of Erikson's work, Marcia (1966) defined exploration and commitment as two dimensions of identity formation. He delineated four identity statuses, each of which represents a level (high or low) of exploration juxtaposed with a level (high or low) of commitment. Identity achievement is characterized by identity exploration followed by commitment, identity moratorium by exploration without commitment, identity foreclosure by commitments enacted without prior exploration, and identity diffusion by the relative lack of both exploration and commitment. Broadly speaking, identity achievement corresponds to Erikson's conception of identity resolution, whereas identity diffusion corresponds to Erikson's notion of identity confusion (Côté & Schwartz, 2002). Exploration, commitment, and identity status are assumed to operate within both ideological (e.g., religious, occupational, political beliefs, values, philosophical lifestyle) and interpersonal (e.g., dating, friendship, gender roles, family relationships, and recreation) domains (Goossens, 2001; Grotevant, Thorbecke, & Meyer, 1982). To date, the identity status approach has inspired approximately 500 theoretical and empirical publications (see Berzonsky & Adams, 1999; Marcia, 1993; Schwartz, 2001; Waterman, 1999, for recent reviews).

As originally conceived, the identity statuses pertained to the structure of ego identity, but they had little to say regarding the process of identity formation. Indeed, the identity statuses have been criticized as being overly narrow and static

(e.g., Côté & Levine, 1988). Since their original formulation, however, researchers have extended identity status theory to reflect the fact that identity formation is a lifelong process. For example, Stephen, Fraser, and Marcia (1992) found that, even after individuals had initially reached identity achievement, they often reentered the moratorium status (and subsequently returned to achievement) on multiple occasions later in life.

Grotevant (1987) referred to exploration as “the work of the identity exploration process” (p. 204) in his model of life span identity development. According to Grotevant, exploration is a function of the skills (e.g., critical thinking, problem solving, perspective taking) and orientations (e.g., rigidity, procrastination) that individuals bring to the task of identity formation. Grotevant assumed that abilities and orientations were independent components of exploration. Exploration would be most likely to occur if the individual was oriented toward exploration and if he or she possessed the necessary critical-thinking, problem-solving, and perspective-taking skills. In addition to postulating two principal components of identity exploration, Grotevant identified five antecedents to the exploration process: (a) information-seeking tendency, (b) the presence or absence of competing forces in one’s life, (c) satisfaction or dissatisfaction with one’s current identity, (d) expectations for the exploration process, and (e) willingness to explore. Grotevant argued that each of these components contributes to one’s level of identity exploration. Taken together, they may predict the degree of exploration undertaken by a given individual.

Berzonsky (1990) added a process component to the identity statuses by organizing the statuses in terms of three information or social–cognitive processing orientations. The *informational style* refers to actively seeking identity-salient information to solve problems and make decisions. The *normative style* refers to reliance on standards associated primarily with parentally or socially endorsed norms. The *diffuse* or *avoidant style* refers to an evasive and procrastinating approach in which the individual makes decisions only when forced by situational demands. Berzonsky and Neimeyer (1994) found that foreclosed individuals were most likely to utilize a normative orientation, that diffuse individuals were most likely to utilize a diffuse or avoidant orientation, and that identity achieved and moratorium individuals were most likely to utilize an information orientation.

IDENTITY STATUS AND RACIAL OR ETHNIC IDENTITY THEORIES: A CALL FOR THEORY AND RESEARCH

Erikson’s theory of identity is posited as a universal theory of identity development in terms of both structure and process. Despite the plethora of research that has been conducted on the identity statuses, however, it is unclear how relevant this research is to identity development in non-White populations. The purpose of this ar-

ticle is to (a) evaluate the extent to which identity status research has incorporated non-White populations and (b) suggest ways in which non-White populations and their identity concerns can be incorporated into research on identity status and related constructs. We argue that members of non-White racial and ethnic¹ groups have not been adequately represented in this research and that, therefore, identity status research is not as culturally relevant as it should be based on its theoretical origins. We also aim to introduce “mainstream” identity researchers to ethnic and racial identity theories that have been, in large part, based on the identity status paradigm. We conclude with two recommendations. First, given the fact that Erikson’s (1963) theory was rooted in and drawn from cross-cultural investigation, we recommend that identity status research incorporate ethnically and socioeconomically diverse populations. Second, we recommend that identity status theory be expanded to incorporate racial and ethnic identity theories. We present some ways in which this can be accomplished at the level of both theory and research.

THE INCLUSION OF ETHNIC AND MINORITIES GROUPS IN MAINSTREAM IDENTITY STATUS RESEARCH

Following Graham’s (1992) warning that psychology was in danger of becoming raceless, we sought to evaluate the extent to which ethnic and racial minorities have been incorporated in mainstream identity status research. We conducted a systematic review of the identity status research literature in the decade between 1993 and 2003. We searched the PsycINFO database, using *identity status* and *identity statuses* as keywords, to identify empirical, English-language journal articles published in this decade. This search yielded 124 articles. We eliminated from consideration 16 articles that were unrelated to mainstream identity status research: articles on sexual and gender identity, articles exclusively on ethnic and racial identity (i.e., that did not include identity status), several articles on the teaching of psychology, and 1 qualitative case report on identity statuses. We considered journals with 4 or more publications on the identity statuses between 1993 and 2003 to be major outlets of identity status research. Six journals met this criteria: *Journal of Adolescence*, *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, and

¹Race generally refers to phenotypic similarities such as skin color and facial features, whereas *ethnicity* refers more broadly to the cultural values, attitudes, and behaviors common to a particular group (Phinney, 1996). Although Phinney argued in favor of using ethnicity, which she believes subsumes race, others have disagreed (Helms & Talleyrand, 1997). Because the purpose of this article is to evaluate to what extent identity status research has incorporated members of ethnic and racial minorities, we simply use the terms synonymously while recognizing the importance of the debate.

Journal of Research in Personality. These six major outlets accounted for 53% (57 out of 108) of the empirical, English-language articles published from 1993 to 2003.

We systematically reviewed each of these 57 articles for the inclusion of non-White groups and report the ethnic and racial composition of each of the samples used in Table 1.² The 57 articles reviewed used a total of 62 distinct samples. Examining Table 1 yields the conclusion that approximately one third (35%, or 22 of the 62 samples reviewed) of authors did not report the ethnic or racial composition of their samples. Of these 22, 14 (64%) were non-American studies conducted in countries such as Canada, Belgium, Germany, New Zealand, Turkey, and Portugal. Indeed, of the 19 non-American studies or samples listed in Table 1, for almost three quarters (74%), no information is provided about racial or ethnic composition of the sample. Researchers in the United States may be more sensitive to the racial and ethnic composition of their samples in light of the large degree of racial and ethnic heterogeneity in the U.S. population. As other Western countries (e.g., Canada, Western Europe, and Australia) become increasingly ethnically diverse, however, there is a growing necessity for researchers in these countries to consider the effect of race and ethnicity on their findings and, therefore, report the ethnic and racial composition of their samples. Table 1 makes this point clearly.

Forty of the 62 (65%) studies or samples listed in Table 1 reported some information about race and ethnicity. Of these 40, 29 (a little less than half of the total number of studies listed in Table 1) reported the ethnic and racial breakdown of the sample, whereas 11 simply listed the most commonly occurring ethnic group in the sample (10 out of 11 or 91% of these samples indicated the majority was White). Approximately two thirds (63%) of the 40 studies providing some indication of the ethnic composition of the samples were predominately (at least 70%) White, whereas 14 of the 40 (35%) were ethnically diverse. As a result, when studies do report ethnic distributions, there is approximately a 50% chance that they used an ethnically diverse sample (14 out of 29). When studies are included that indicate the most commonly occurring ethnic group in the sample, however, the likelihood of ethnic diversity decreases to about one third. What this indicates is that not only are the majority studies using predominantly White samples, but that the

²There is no consensus in the literature on the appropriate way to categorize ethnic and racial groups. For example, some researchers treat Puerto Rican, Dominican, and Mexican as separate ethnic groups, whereas others lump these groups together as Hispanics under a broader classification system. Similarly, some researchers treat Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans as separate ethnic categories, whereas others lump them together as Asians. Although we recognize these distinctions are important for identity (both global and domain specific), the purpose of this article is to evaluate the extent to which non-White participants are included in mainstream identity status research. Therefore, we group race and ethnicity under the broader categorical system in Table 1.

TABLE 1
 Percentage of Ethnic and Racial Composition of Samples Used in 57 Empirical Articles on Identity Statuses
 Published Between 1993–2003

	<i>N</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>African American</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>Asian</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Adams (2001)	2,001	74.0	0.6	1.0	5.8	16.7	Grades 7–12, Calgary and Edmonton, Canada; 1,374 provided ethnic background
Akers, Jones, and Coyl (1998)	1,159	89.0	—	—	—	—	Urban HS in Utah; Grades 10–12
Allison and Schultz (2001)	356	82.0	15.0	3.0	—	—	Junior HS students in Ohio
Bartle-Haring, Brucker, and Hock (2002)	149	—	—	—	—	—	Large university in midwestern, USA; predominantly White and middle to upper middle class
Berzonsky and Kuk (2000)	3888	—	—	—	—	—	State college students, upstate New York; approximately 90% White overall
Berzonsky and Neimeyer (1994)	148	—	—	—	—	—	Introductory psychology students
Bishop, Macy-Lewis, Schneklloth, Puswella, Suleka, and Struessel (1997)	419	—	—	—	—	—	First year students at liberal arts 4-year college
Branch and Boothe (2002)	77	—	100.0	—	—	—	Public HS students in northeastern USA
Côté and Schwartz (2002)							Study 1: Canadian university students; Studies 2 and 3: American university students
Study 1	276	81.0	2.0	—	11.5	5.5	
Study 2	501	17.0	9.0	59.5	—	14.0	
Study 3	114	16.6	12.3	65.7	—	5.3	
Cramer (1995)	118	—	—	—	—	—	First year students at small liberal arts college
Cramer (1997)	91	66.6	25.0	—	5.0	—	Participants of larger longitudinal study; reside in urban areas, diverse SES and educational level
Cramer (1998)	88	—	—	—	—	—	Follow-up study of students at small liberal arts college
Cramer (2000)	200	—	—	—	—	—	Introductory psychology students

Dollinger and Dollinger (1997)							Study 1: psychology students; Study 2: personality psychology students
Study 1	156	—	—	—	—	—	
Study 1	156	—	—	—	—	—	
Study 2	243	85.0	8.0	—	5.0	—	
Dunkel (2000)	277	80.5	7.2	3.6	4.3	0.7	Undergraduate psychology students
Dunkel and Anthis (2001)	116	80.0	3.4	6.8	6.0	1.7	Undergraduate psychology students
Erlanger (1998)	177	55.9	5.0	7.3	17.5	9.6	New York metropolitan area college students
Forbes and Shton (1998)	48	—	100.0	—	—	—	North-central Florida HS students
Fulton (1997)	176	100.0	—	—	—	—	Christian liberal arts college, northern California; Non-White excluded
Goosens (2001)	339	—	—	—	—	—	First-year students in engineering and psychology in Belgium
Hamer and Bruch (1994)	171	—	—	—	—	—	Introductory psychology students
Hosek (2002)	8	—	62.5	12.5	—	25.0	HIV-infected adolescents
Hunsberger, Pratt, and Pancer (2001)	137	—	—	—	—	—	Students from small university in Ontario, Canada
Iedema and Meeus (1998)	706	—	—	—	—	—	Dutch sample (Utrecht Study of Adolescent Development)
Imbimbo (1995)	96	—	—	—	—	—	Primarily white middle-class college students
Jones, Akers, and White (1994)	2,004	58.0	1.0	20.0	4.0	15.0	HS students from Arizona and southern CA
Klaczynski, Fauth, and Swanger (1998)	49	46.9	28.6	16.3	—	8.1	HS students in summer programs; predominantly from urban areas and lower SES
Kroger (1995)							Students at a New Zealand university; two time-point longitudinal study of
Time 1	131	89.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	7.0	
Time 2	80	91.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	6.0	
Kroger and Green (1996)	100	—	—	—	—	—	Sample of midlife New Zealanders
Lew (2003)	434	39.0	16.0	20.0	18.0	6.4	Undergraduates from large urban university
Mackey, Arnold, and Pratt (2001)	51	—	—	—	—	—	Canadian middle school students; almost all White

(continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	<i>N</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>African American</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>Asian</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Makros and McCabe (2001)	336	—	—	—	—	—	Primarily Anglo-Saxon HS students from middle-to-high SES
Markstrom-Adams and Adams (1995)	123	24.3	29.3	30.8	0.0	15.4	HS students in small southwestern rural area, USA
Markstrom-Adams, Hofstra, and Dougher (1994)	83	—	—	—	—	—	Largely White and middle-class HS students from largely Mormon area
Matos, Barbosa, de Almeida, and Costa (1999)	361	—	—	—	—	—	Undergraduate psychology and communications students
Meeus (1993)	300	—	—	—	—	—	Late adolescent Dutch sample
Meeus (1996)	2,557	—	—	—	—	—	Dutch sample (Utrecht Study of Adolescent Development)
Nelson, Hughes, Handal, Katz, and Searight (1993)	285	83.0	—	—	—	—	Undergraduates from two midwestern USA liberal arts colleges
O'Connor (1995)	418	—	—	—	—	—	HS and first-year college students from Ontario, Canada
Pastorino, Dunham, Kidwell, Bacho, and Lamborn (1997)	210	87.0	7.6	4.3	1.0	—	Introductory psychology students, Florida State University, middle and upper-middle SES
Perosa, Perosa, and Tam (1996)	164	97.0	1	—	2.0	—	Middle-class college students, large university in midwestern USA
Perosa, Perosa, and Tam (2002)	164	97.0	1	—	2.0	—	Middle-class students, large university in midwestern USA
Pulkkinen and Kokko (2000)							Two time-point longitudinal study, racially homogeneous Finnish-speaking sample
Time 1	249	—	—	—	—	—	
Time 2	249	—	—	—	—	—	
Sankey and Young (1996)	47	—	—	—	—	—	Psychology students from large Canadian city

Schwartz (2002)	758	17.0	9.8	61.6	0.0	4.0	Undergraduates from public university in southeastern USA
Schwartz and Dunham (2000)							Study 1: Florida State University (75% Caucasian overall); Study 2: Florida International University (60% Hispanic overall)
Study 1	113	—	—	—	—	—	
Study 2	325	—	—	—	—	—	
Schwartz and Montgomery (2002)	357	24.6	12.6	57.4	3.4	2.0	University students from Miami, Florida
Schwartz, Mullis, Waterman, and Dunham (2000)							Sample 1: Florida State University students (75% White overall); Sample 2: Florida International University students
Sample 1	113	—	—	—	—	—	
Sample 2	196	16.8	4.6	66.8	0.0	1.5	
Serafina and Adams (2001)							Studies 1 and 2: students from University of Guelph, Canada
Study 1	332	—	—	—	—	—	
Study 2	133	—	—	—	—	—	
Streitmatter (1993)	74	82.4	1.4	13.5	—	—	University students in southwestern USA
Vondracek, Schulenberg, Skorikov, Gillespie, and Wahlheim (1995)	407	—	—	—	—	—	HS students, rural northeastern USA (97% Caucasian overall)
Vondracek, Silbereisen, Reitzle, and Wiesner (1999)	49	—	—	—	—	—	Adolescents from former East and West Germany
Wires, Barocas, and Hollenbeck (1994)	197	82.0	—	—	—	—	Middle-class, male adolescents from Virginia
Zimmerman and Becker-Stoll (2002)							Follow-up of Regensburg longitudinal study
Time 1	43	—	—	—	—	—	
Time 2	41	—	—	—	—	—	

Note. HS = high school; SES = socioeconomic status.

default assumption (given the lack of ethnicity information) for most identity status studies is that the sample is mostly White.

It should be noted that the description provided here is extremely conservative. Of the 22 samples that did not provide any information on ethnicity, 8 were composed of introductory psychology students from liberal arts colleges, and 13 were studies conducted in Western Europe (Belgium, Germany, and Portugal), Canada, and New Zealand. In all likelihood, the majority of these samples were predominantly White. This suggests that almost three quarters (46 of 62, or 74%) of the samples published in six of the leading outlets for identity status research between 1993 and 2003 were predominantly White.

RACIAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT

Researchers working in the area of racial and ethnic identity have often based their theoretical approaches on Marcia's (1966) identity status model. Four such approaches will be reviewed here: Cross's (1991) nigrescence model, Helms's (1995) model of White ethnic identity formation, D. W. Sue and Sue's (1990) Racial/Cultural Identity Development Model (R/CID), and Phinney's (1989) model of ethnic identity formation. Each of these models draws on Erikson and/or Marcia to some extent, and each model offers components that can be integrated with identity status theories (e.g., Marcia, Berzonsky, Grotevant) in terms of both structure and process.

Cross: Nigrescence Theory

Nigrescence theory (Cross, 1971, 1991) was developed based on Fanon's (1963, 1967a, 1967b) thinking about racial or cultural identity development and liberation struggles. Nigrescence theory originally tracked the identity development stages that Black American adults traverse in movement away from an identity that places low or even negative salience on Black identity toward the achievement of an identity that places positive emphasis on race and Black culture. In addition to Fanon's influence, the original model borrowed from the anthropological and sociological literature on identity conversions and social movements (Gerlach & Hine, 1970; Wallace, 1956, 1970). The first stage, preencounter, depicts a mature, fully developed adult identity that is grounded in something other than race and Black culture or that is riddled by racial self-hatred. In the aftermath of a racial *epiphany* or encounter (Stage 2), the person is jolted into awareness that her or his current worldview does not accord enough importance to race and Black culture or is too negative. Such an epiphany often leads to identity change. The vortex of identity change, immersion-emersion (Stage 3), captures the state of *identity*

in-between-ness, as the identity under attack resists and eventually gives way to the nascent “Black”-focused identity. In Stage 4, called internalization, the new identity is crystallized and, unlike the previous pre-encounter identity, is free of hatred or negativity toward the in-group and provides a comfortable psychological platform on which rests a very Black-oriented ideology. The fifth stage, internalization-commitment, integrates the “We” and “I” aspects of the self as the person becomes committed to the long-term struggle for Black social justice through sustained collective action.

Although the original nigrescence model explicated adult identity conversions, Tatum (1997) and Spencer (1982, 1995) have extended nigrescence theory to apply to the way Black identity evolves from infancy through early adulthood (Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001). In depicting a child-centered sense of pre-encounter, Tatum and Spencer replaced the fully formed pre-encounter identity found in the adult model with a description of Black children who are essentially naïve to the full meaning of institutional racism (i.e., preawareness or preconsciousness). As the child grows older and reaches preadolescence, he or she “encounters” racial events, racial or cultural comparisons, and racial incidents. These “encounters” are shared, discussed, and analyzed with parents, peer group members, and various significant others who help the youth to scaffold an emergent racial or cultural meaning-making perspective. In formulating a more explicit Eriksonian perspective than was present in the original nigrescence model, both Tatum and Spencer depicted adolescence as the juncture where Black youth challenge and explore the various meaning-making systems organic to the Black experience and handed down from one generation to the next that address how to negotiate positive and race-neutral as well as negative, racist, and oppressive aspects of American life. Given a smooth progression, Black youth enter early adulthood having achieved [internalization stage] a racial or cultural meaning-making system or ideology. Should the young adult attempt to link his or her personal sense of self (“I”) with the history, challenges, and needs of the larger community (“We”), a fusion of We–I dynamics is achieved, and the person engages the internalization-commitment aspects of Black identity development. Finally, racial identity is fully integrated into the person’s total identity matrix. At this point, the person develops a sense of self as a racial being. In this integrated sense of self, concerns about “race” are incorporated into the person’s larger identity matrix (Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001).

Helms: White Ethnic Identity Development

Studies have found that adolescents from non-White racial or ethnic groups tend to have higher levels of ethnic identity than do majority culture youth (Phinney, 1990; Roberts et al., 1999). According to Laursen and Williams (2002), the comparatively low salience of ethnic identity in majority adolescents is attributable to the

pervasiveness of the majority culture and the fact that majority individuals take their ethnicity for granted. Although ethnic identity may be most salient to members of ethnic minority groups within the majority culture, ethnic identity is nonetheless an essential element of the self-concept for nearly all adolescents. Indeed, Phinney maintained that ethnic identity comes into play whenever two distinct ethnic groups come in contact. Consistent with the notion that ethnic identity is an important psychological construct for members of the majority culture, Helms (1995) developed a stage model that outlines the development of racial identity in White Americans. Perhaps the most important aspect of Helms's model for mainstream identity researchers is that race and ethnicity are important to Whites as well as non-Whites and should be taken into account both theoretically and empirically.

According to Helms, White racial identity development is characterized by a series of six statuses. Each status is characterized by dynamic cognitive—behavioral and emotional processes that give rise to schemas or information processing styles. These schemas and styles govern the ways in which Whites interpret their racial world. Individuals in the contact status (Status 1) are unconcerned with the implications of their race in a racially stratified society and are unaware of their own racism. Denial, obliviousness, or avoidance of racially charged experiences characterize the information processing style inherent in this status. In the disintegration status (Status 2), individuals have been awakened to racial conflicts that cannot be resolved on the basis of their prior racial identity; these individuals struggle to reconcile their “raceless” identities with the racially relevant thinking brought on by the issues at hand. The identity processing style associated with this stage is distinguished by ambivalence and by suppression of information that is inconsistent with one's current identity. In the reintegration status (Status 3), people idealize White culture and disparage minority cultures. At this level, as opposed to other status levels, life decisions are heavily influenced by racial concerns. The information processing style associated with this stage is characterized by distortion, in that individuals distort racially relevant information to fit their current identity and beliefs.

The pseudoindependence status (Status 4) represents the beginning of positive racial identity resolution. It is characterized by the intellectual understanding of racial group membership and the search for a nonracist White identity. Governed by liberal humanistic values, the information processing style associated with this stage is characterized by attempts to fit one's experiences into an expanding worldview. Racial issues are used as opportunities for understanding rather than as justification for polarizing one's view toward non-White ethnic groups. The immersion—emersion status (Status 5) is defined by a search to personally understand the meaning of racial identity and an attempt to redefine one's “Whiteness” (Helms, 1995, p. 185). The information processing style of this stage is characterized by hypervigilance toward racially infused information and experiences. The

individual actively seeks to process and understand racial issues and situations. Finally, the autonomy status (Status 6) is characterized by the appreciation of racial diversity and, of importance, an attempt to counter racism on a societal level. It is distinguished by an information processing style that can be described as flexible and complex.

Sue and Sue: R/CID (D. W. Sue & Sue, 1990).

Like other racial and ethnic identity development models, the R/CID model is a stage model, closely paralleling the progression originally developed by Marcia, which was developed for Asian Americans but may apply to other ethnic groups as well. The R/CID model depicts individuals as progressing from a state of unexplored and unachieved racial identity to a state of explored and achieved racial identity. According to the model, an individual in the conformity stage (Stage 1) assumes that the values, norms, lifestyles, and traditions of the dominant culture are superior to his or her own. As a result, these individuals will tend to feel negatively toward themselves and will attempt to identify with the dominant cultural group (e.g., White Americans). Those in the dissonance stage (Stage 2) have begun to question the complete rejection of their culture of origin and the acceptance of the dominant cultural group. Transition to this stage is often facilitated by racial incidents or encounters that cause one to begin questioning the inferiority of their racial group. During this stage, Asian Americans begin to recognize that racism does exist, and they begin to identify racist media images and messages.

The resistance and immersion stage (Stage 3) is characterized by the complete acceptance of Asian American culture and a rejection, in turn, of mainstream European American culture. Individuals in this stage see those belonging to the dominant group as being racist, as proliferating racist messages and ideals, and as reinforcing racism in society at large. As such, members of the dominant group are generally mistrusted and disliked. Transition into the introspection stage (Stage 4) occurs when the individual begins to realize that not all dominant group members are bad or explicitly racist and that too much energy has been expended in maintaining this presumably unhealthy position. Individuals in this stage begin to grapple with how to endorse various aspects of dominant culture without being disloyal to their heritage and culture. Finally, the integrative awareness stage (Stage 5) includes those who have successfully traversed the previous four stages, have contemplated and struggled with what it means to be Asian American in American society, and have come to be secure in their unique ethnic identity. Individuals in this stage appreciate the pros and cons of all ethnic groups and have actively integrated these different aspects into their ethnic identity, which now reflects a healthy acceptance of both dominant and minority cultural group components.

Phinney: Three-Stage Model of Ethnic Identity Formation

Phinney (1989) developed a three-stage model of ethnic identity formation in which one progresses from an unexamined ethnic identity to a committed ethnic identity. The sequence proposed by Phinney parallels the developmental sequence thought to underlie the identity status model (see Kroger, 2003; Waterman, 1982). Stage 1 refers to adolescents who have not examined issues related to ethnic identity and are characterized as either diffuse (i.e., unconcerned with one's own ethnic identity) or foreclosed (i.e., accepting the values and attitudes of the dominant culture toward one's ethnic group). Stage 2 refers to the moratorium phase in which adolescents explore ethnic identity issues, such as what it means to a member of a non-White ethnic group in a White majority culture. Stage 3 refers to ethnic identity achievement in which one (a) moves to a deeper understanding of one's ethnicity and place in the social world and (b) comes to terms with cultural differences between one's ethnic group and the majority culture. Phinney's ethnic identity model is broadly applicable and is relevant to multiple ethnic groups (Roberts et al., 1999), making it perhaps the most useful for the mainstream researcher.

INTEGRATING ERIKSONIAN AND ETHNIC IDENTITY THEORIES

More than 10 years ago, Graham (1992) warned that psychology was in danger of becoming "raceless" (p. 629). This conclusion was based on a systematic review of empirical research in six leading American Psychological Association journals, showing that only 3.6% of all studies published between 1970 and 1989 included more than a small percentage of non-White participants in their samples. Ten years later, in a content analysis of the clinical psychology literature, Iwamasa, Sorocco, and Koonce (2002) found that only 29.3% of articles published included ethnic minorities, and only 5.4% focused exclusively on minorities. In this review, we, too, found that, in the decade following Graham's warning, the majority of empirical identity status research published in six leading outlets was based predominantly on Whites. Census projections indicate that, by the year 2050, Whites will no longer constitute the majority of the U.S. population (Day, 1996; Hall, 1997). The same is true of many European countries. To be responsive to this increasing ethnic diversity, and to more accurately reflect Erikson's original cross-cultural conceptualization of personality development, we recommend that identity status researchers (a) use socioeconomically and racially diverse samples (D. W. Sue, Bingham, Porch-Burke, & Vasquez, 1999; S. Sue, 1999), (b) adequately describe the ethnic and racial makeup of their research samples, and (c) not rely exclusively on introductory psychology student samples that often exclude minorities and individuals of lower socioeconomic status (Hall, 1997). The degree to which identity

status theory and research can be applied to non-White individuals will likely be a key determinant of the extent to which the theory will continue to be useful as the 21st century progresses (cf. Schwartz & Montgomery, 2002).

Some initial steps toward integrating ethnic and racial identity developmental theories with mainstream identity status research have begun to be taken. These steps have the potential to greatly increase the relevance of this important developmental domain and theory to non-White people. For example, Schwartz (2001) suggested that ethnicity may represent an additional domain in which non-White individuals address identity issues as they develop a sense of self. Some empirical studies have explored the relation between identity status and ethnic identity in adolescents and young adults. For example, Milville, Koonce, Darlington, and Whitlock (2000) found that the pre-encounter ethnic identity stage was related to identity diffusion and moratorium, whereas the internalization of an ethnic identity was related to identity achievement. Moreover, supporting Schwartz's position, Branch, Tayal, and Triplett (2000) found that identity diffusion was negatively related to ethnic identity for Hispanics and Asians, but not for non-Hispanic Whites. Markstrom and Hunter (1999) found that ideological identity achievement was significantly related to ethnic identity for African Americans, but not for non-Hispanic Whites.

These research findings support the contention that including ethnic identification as a component of identity development, particularly for non-White individuals, may help to render identity status theory and research more relevant for non-White populations. A potential starting point for such an integration may lie in the theoretical parallels between (a) Marcia's identity statuses and several theories of ethnic identity formation (e.g., Cross, 1991; Helms, 1995; Phinney, 1989, 2003; D. W. Sue & Sue, 1990), (b) Berzonsky's (1990) identity styles and the race-related identity processing styles proposed by Helms (1995), and (c) the revisiting of identity formation (Grotevant, 1987; Stephen et al., 1992) and the ethnic-identity notion of recycling (Parham, 1989; see section that immediately follows). For example, just as the identity stage for Erikson (1963) is a time when individuals move from a diffuse, undifferentiated state to a state of self-knowledge and self-direction, each of the ethnic and racial identity theorists propose that the person moves from having unexplored her or his ethnicity, through active consideration of ethnic issues, and finally to a personally meaningful understanding of the role that ethnicity plays in her or his life (whether or not one chooses to make race a defining feature of her or his identity).

The process of ethnic and racial identity development is not a static phenomenon, but rather one that continues throughout the life course. Similar to the assumption of continued identity exploration throughout the life span (Stephen et al., 1992) and to the notion of repeated appraisals of the need for exploration (Grotevant, 1987), additional growth in ethnic identity during adulthood is assumed to follow a pattern of recycling (Parham, 1989). *Recycling* refers to the

ways and means by which additional ethnic identity development in adulthood is achieved over the course of the life span. When non-White individuals undergo experiences that cause them to question their ethnic identity, a process of recycling occurs. Rather than causing individuals to return, for example, to Cross' pre-encounter level of racial identity, such experiences prompt a return to the encounter stage. Similarly, racial encounters may cause White Americans in the autonomy stage in Helms' model to return to a state of pseudoindependence, in which one revisits and continues to explore the meaning of racial group membership. These encounters serve to set the process of identity exploration in motion again, but at a new level; what results is not a new identity, but a re-resolved ethnic or racial identity (see Cross & Fhagen-Smith, 2001).

The racial and ethnic identity theories reviewed in this article parallel mainstream identity status theories not only in terms of life span identity formation, but also in terms of identity processing approaches that emerge or characterize particular stages or statuses of racial or ethnic identity achievement. For example, Helms' White racial identity statuses are characterized by distinct processing style in a way that parallels Berzonsky's (1990) identity processing approach. For example, the information processing style of the contact status is characterized by denial, obliviousness, or avoidance of racially charged experiences similar to Berzonsky's diffuse-avoidant orientation. For another example, the information processing style of the autonomy status (Status 6) is characterized by flexibility and appreciation for complexity in a way that is similar to Berzonsky's informational orientation. Of importance, recent research has shown that the relations between the identity statuses and Berzonsky's identity processing styles may generalize to non-White samples (Schwartz & Montgomery, 2002; Schwartz, Mullis, Waterman, & Dunham, 2000).

Given these similarities, we propose that racial and ethnic identity theory and research be integrated into mainstream identity status theory and research to make mainstream research more culturally relevant and to meet the applied and theoretical research demands of the 21st century. One possible way of integrating ethnic and racial identity theory and research into mainstream identity status research is to broaden the number and type of domains within which the statuses are examined. For example, Marcia's (1966) original operationalization of the statuses revolved around occupational choice, religious beliefs, and political ideology. Identity status theory has since been extended into interpersonal domains such as friendships, dating relationships, and gender roles (Grotevant et al., 1982). Based on the review presented here, it appears that a logical next step would be to represent racial and ethnic identity themes as an additional core domain. For example, the degree to which individuals are identity achieved could depend in part on the degree to which they have reflected on the meaning of race and ethnicity in their lives, perhaps in connection to their political ideology, occupational choices, relationship preferences, and so forth.

One way of accomplishing this would be to incorporate measures of racial and ethnic identity into mainstream research. Several measures of racial and ethnic identity development have been developed and have demonstrated adequate validity and reliability. Helms developed the White Racial Identity Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990), a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 50 items (10 items per stage). This measure is designed to assess attitudes reflective of each of the five stages of White racial identity development (e.g., contact, disintegration, reintegration, pseudoindependence, and autonomy). There is considerable debate, however, over the validity of these subscales, as factor analyses have failed to identify the appropriate number of underlying factors (see Behrens, 1997; Helms, 1997; Tokar & Swanson, 1991, for a discussion). Phinney (1992) developed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) as a general measure of ethnic identity development. The MEIM is a 14-item measure that consists of three dimensions, including *self-identification* (the label that an individual uses to indicate belongingness to a particular group), ethnic affirmation and belonging, and ethnic identity achievement. Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, and Bámaca-Gómez (2004) created another general ethnic identity instrument, the Ethnic Identity Measure, in which the dimensions of ethnic identity exploration, commitment, and affirmation are more empirically distinct. The advantage of the general ethnic identity measures, especially for mainstream identity researchers, is that they can be used with members of multiple racial and ethnic groups.

In contrast to other racial and ethnic identity theories, nigrescence theory takes the position that fundamental personality change does not parallel ideological or worldview transformation. That is, for example, level of ego identity integration can remain fundamentally unchanged in the aftermath of racial identity conversion. As such, it conceives of two independent parallel processes in which ego identity achievement progresses through traditional Eriksonian lines, but the content of each Black person's meaning-making system will vary, with some finding their "identity" through religion; others through social class or occupational status; others through gender or sexual orientation; and still others, albeit the majority, through ethnicity, race, and African American culture. Producing evidence in support of this conceptualization can be somewhat illusive. If one employs a bipolar measure of ethnicity, moderate-to-high scores on such a measure may adequately tap the presence of positive ethnic themes, whereas low scores may not tap the presence of low race salience perspectives, most likely because low scores conflate self-hatred with an absence of a concern for being ethnic. Cross and his associates have developed a new measure, the Cross Racial Identity Scale (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002), for use in survey research that provides a separate and dedicated measure of racial identity grounded in something other than race (assimilation) in conjunction with separate and nonoverlapping subscales that tap two moderate-to-high salience identity categories (e.g., Afrocentric and multicultural). In a study of over 300 Black college students, this scale demonstrated convergent validity with other reputable mea-

asures of Black racial identity, and none of the three scales were strongly related to measures of either self-esteem or the Big Five personality traits, demonstrating substantial discriminant validity (Vandiver et al., 2002).

On a theoretical level, Cross and Fhagen-Smith (2001) developed an integrative approach that uses an Eriksonian perspective to integrate identity development with nigrescence over the life span. The approach proposes that the life span can be divided into six sectors. The first sector (infancy and childhood) represents the identity niche into which the African American child, for example, is born. This niche consists of the baby's parents and siblings, socioeconomic status, neighborhood, local culture, and the political and economic climate of the time. The second sector captures the multitude of ways in which preadolescent African Americans begin to identify with particular identity content domains that will shape their emerging self-concepts. In Sector 3 (adolescence), such identity content domains become crystallized into identity agendas, with some adolescents identifying with racial issues, others with sexual preference, and still others with social class. It is during adolescence that Cross and Fhagen-Smith proposed (in line with identity status theory) that African Americans will proceed with forming a sense of identity in which the content of the identity crisis may or may not center on race. Sectors 4 and 5 refer to early and middle adulthood, in which one further crystallizes the foundational identity through which life's experiences are interpreted. The sixth and last sector incorporates Parham's (1989) notion of recycling, in which racially relevant encounters in adulthood trigger subsequent reexamination and refinement of one's foundational identity. One's foundational identity can be characterized using the identity statuses during the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth sectors. In contrast to the identity status model, however, which focuses on the processes by which identity is formed, what matters the most from the perspective of nigrescence theory is the content of one's foundational identity.

Cross and Fhagen-Smith's (2001) model represents one way in which racial/ethnic identity models can be integrated with identity status theory. Other integrated models may be possible as well. What may be most important, however, is the process by which such integrated models might best be forged. To integrate racial/ethnic conceptions of identity with "mainstream" identity status theory, researchers will have to pay close attention to the portrayal of cultural differences in mainstream theory and research. According to D. W. Sue (1993), multicultural research is sociopolitical and involves consideration of issues of oppression, prejudice, discrimination, and racism. Sue also argued that non-Hispanic White researchers have often attributed differences between minorities and Whites to maladjustment, delinquency, pathology, or deviance. For example, the strong sense of familism often endorsed by Hispanics may be construed by non-Hispanic Whites as enmeshment or overdependence (e.g., Purdy & Arguello, 1992). Clearly, a commitment to include non-White participants in research samples is a necessary prerequisite to integrating non-White concerns into identity status the-

ory. Other steps are necessary as well. To conduct multicultural research, the values and beliefs of the dominant culture need to be examined in the same light as do those of non-White subcultures. Both White and non-White researchers must begin to understand themselves as racial entities embodying the cultural values, stereotypes, and biases of their culture or subculture to varying degrees. Values and behaviors of both majority and minority cultures need to be understood within the cultural context in which they occur. Such progress will help to assess the extent to which Erikson's "eight ages of man," as well as other overarching developmental theories, are universal or apply differentially depending on the cultural or sub-cultural context in question.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by National Institute of Mental Health Grant T32 MH19890.

I would like to thank Margaret Stephenson for the many conversations regarding racial and ethnic identity theory and her guidance in the formative stages of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G. R., Munro, B., Doherty-Poirer, M., Munro, G., Petersen, A.-M. R., & Edwards, J. (2001). Diffuse-avoidance, normative, and informational identity styles: Using identity theory to predict maladjustment. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 1*, 307–320.
- Akers, J. F., Jones, R. M., & Coyl, D. D. (1998). Adolescent friendship pairs: Similarities in identity status development, behaviors, attitudes, and intentions. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 13*, 178–201.
- Allison, B. N., & Schultz, J. B. (2001). Interpersonal identity formation during early adolescence. *Adolescence, 36*, 509–523.
- Bartle-Haring, S., Brucker, P., & Hock, E. (2002). The impact of parental separation anxiety on identity development in late adolescence and early adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 17*, 439–450.
- Behrens, J. T. (1997). Does the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale measure racial identity? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 3–12.
- Berzonsky, M. D. (1990). Self-construction over the life-span: A process perspective on identity formation. In G. J. Neimeyer & R. A. Neimeyer (Eds.), *Advances in personal construct theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 155–186). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Berzonsky, M. D., & Adams, G. R. (1999). Reevaluating the identity status paradigm: Still useful after 35 years. *Developmental Review, 19*, 557–590.
- Berzonsky, M. D., & Kuk, L. S. (2000). Identity status, identity processing style, and the transition to university. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 15*, 81–98.
- Berzonsky, M. D., & Neimeyer, G. J. (1994). Ego identity status and identity processing orientation: The mediating role of commitment. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*, 425–435.
- Bishop, D. I., Macy-Lewis, J. A., Schneklath, C. A., Puswell, S., & Struessel, G. L. (1997). Ego identity status and reported alcohol consumption: A study of first-year college students. *Journal of Adolescence, 20*, 209–218.

- Branch, C. W., & Boothe, B. (2002). The identity status of African Americans in middle adolescence: A replication and extension of Forbes and Ashton (1998). *Adolescence*, 37, 815–821.
- Branch, C. W., Tayal, P., & Triplett, C. (2000). The relationship of ethnic identity and ego identity status among adolescents and young adults. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 777–790.
- Côté, J. E., & Levine, C. (1988). A critical examination of the ego identity status paradigm. *Developmental Review*, 8, 147–184.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cross, W. E., Jr., & Fhagen-Smith, P. (2001). Patterns of African American identity development: A life span perspective. In B. W. Jackson & C. L. Wijeyesinghe (Eds.), *Reflections on racial identity development: Essays on theory, practice, and discourse* (pp. XX–XX). New York: New York University Press.
- Day, J. C. (1996). *Population projections of the United States by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1995 to 2050* (Current Population Rep. No. P25–1130). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Dollinger, S. J., & Dollinger, S. M. (1997). Individuality and identity exploration: An autophotographic study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 337–354.
- Dunkel, C. S. (2000). Possible selves as a mechanism for identity exploration. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 519–529.
- Dunkel, C. S., & Anthis, K. S. (2001). The role of possible selves in identity formation: A short-term longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 765–776.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Erlanger, D. M. (1998). Identity status and empathic response patterns: A multidimensional investigation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 21, 323–335.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove.
- Fanon, F. (1967a). *Black skins, white masks*. New York: Grove.
- Fanon, F. (1967b). *A dying colonialism*. New York: Grove.
- Forbes, S., & Ashton, P. (1998). The identity status of African Americans in middle adolescence: A re-examination of Watson and Protinsky (1991). *Adolescence*, 33, 845–849.
- Fulton, A. S. (1997). Identity status, religious orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 26(X), 1–11.
- Gerlach, L. P., & Hine, V. H. (1970). *People, power and change: Movements of social transformation*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Goossens, L. (2001). Global versus domain-specific statuses in identity research: A comparison of two self-report measures. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 681–699.
- Graham, S. (1992). “Most of the subjects were White and middle class”: Trends in published research on African Americans in selected APA journals, 1970–1989. *American Psychologist*, 47, 629–639.
- Grotevant, H. D. (1987). Toward a process model of identity formation. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 2, 203–222.
- Grotevant, H. D., Thorbecke, W., & Meyer, M. L. (1982). An extension of Marcia’s identity status interview into the interpersonal domain. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 11(X), 33–47.
- Hall, C. C. I. (1997). Cultural malpractice: The growing obsolescence of psychology with the changing U.S. population. *American Psychologist*, 52, 642–651.
- Hamer, R. J., & Bruch, M. A. (1994). The role of shyness and private self-consciousness in identity development. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28, 436–452.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms’s White and People of Color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181–198). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E. (1997). Implications of Behrens (1997) for the validity of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 44, 13–16.

- Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Attitude Inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 67–80). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Helms, J. E., & Talleyrand, R. M. (1997). Race is not ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 1246–1247.
- Hosek, S. G., Harper, G. W., & Robinson, W. (2002). Identity development in adolescents living with HIV. *Journal of Adolescence*, *25*, 335–364.
- Hunsberger, B., Pratt, M., & Pancer, S. (2001). Adolescent identity formation: Religious exploration and commitment. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *1*, 365–386.
- Iedema, J., & Meeus, W. (1998). The effects of work and relational mental incongruity on identity formation and well-being. *Journal of Adolescence*, *21*, 253–264.
- Imbimbo, P. V. (1995). Sex differences in the identity formation of college students from divorced families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *24*(X), 745–761.
- Iwamasa, G. Y., Sorocco, K. H., & Koonce, D. A. (2002). Ethnicity and clinical psychology: A content analysis of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *22*, 931–944.
- Jones, R. M., Akers, J. F., & White, J. M. (1994). Revised classification criteria for the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOMEIS). *Journal of Adolescence*, *17*, 533–549.
- Klaczynski, P. A., Fauth, J. M., & Swanger, A. (1998). Adolescent identity: Rational vs. experiential processing, formal operations, and critical thinking beliefs. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *27*(X), 185–207.
- Kroger, J. (1995). The differentiation of “firm” and “developmental” foreclosure identity statuses: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *10*, 317–337.
- Kroger, J. (2003). What transits in an identity status transition? *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *3*, 197–220.
- Kroger, J., & Green, K. E. (1996). Events associated with identity status change. *Journal of Adolescence*, *19*, 477–490.
- Kumru, A., & Thompson, R. A. (2003). Ego identity status and self-monitoring behavior in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *18*, 481–495.
- Laursen, B. L., & Williams, V. (2002). The role of ethnic identity in personality development. In L. Pulkkinen & A. Caspi (Eds.), *Path to successful development: Personality in the life course* (pp. XX–XX). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, H. L. (2003). Differences in ego identity among college students across age, ethnicity, and gender. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *3*, 159–189.
- Mackey, K., Arnold, M. L., & Pratt, M. W. (2001). Adolescents’ stories of decision making in more and less authoritative families: Representing the voices of parents in narrative. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *16*, 243–268.
- Makros, J., & McCabe, M. P. (2001). Relationships between identity and self-representations during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *30*(X), 623–639.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *3*, 551–558.
- Marcia, J. E. (1993). The status of the statuses. In J. E. Marcia, A. S. Waterman, D. Matteson, S. Archer, & J. Orlofsky (Eds.), *Ego identity* (pp. 22–41). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Markstrom, C. A., & Hunter, C. L. (1999). The roles of ethnic and ideological identity in predicting fidelity in African American and European American adolescents. *Child Study Journal*, *29*(1), 23–38.
- Markstrom-Adams, C., & Adams, G. R. (1995). Gender, ethnic group, and grade differences in psychosocial functioning during middle adolescence? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *24*(X), 397–417.
- Markstrom-Adams, C., Hofstra, G., & Dougher, K. (1994). The ego-virtue of fidelity: A case for the study of religion and identity formation in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *23*(X), 453–469.
- Matos, P. M., Barbosa, S., de Almeida, H. M., & Costa, M. E. (1999). Parental attachment and identity in Portuguese late adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *22*, 805–818.

- McKinney, J. P., & McKinney, K. G. (1999). Prayer in the lives of late adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *22*, 279–290.
- Meeus, W. (1993). Occupational identity development, school performance, and social support in adolescence: Findings of a Dutch study. *Adolescence*, *28*, 809–818.
- Meeus, W. (1996). Studies on identity development in adolescence: An overview of research and some new data. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *25*(X), 569–598.
- Miville, M. L., Koonce, D., Darlington, P., & Whitlock, B. (2000). Exploring the relationships between racial/ethnic identity and ego identity among African Americans and Mexican Americans. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *28*, 208–224.
- Nelson, W. L., Hughes, H. M., Handal, P., Katz, B., & Searight, H. R. (1993). The relationship of family structure and family conflict to adjustment in young adult college students. *Adolescence*, *28*, 29–40.
- O'Connor, B. P. (1995). Identity development and perceived parental behavior as sources of adolescent egocentrism. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *24*(X), 205–227.
- Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of Nigrescence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *17*, 187–226.
- Pastorino, E., Dunham, R. M., Kidwell, J., Bacho, R., & Lamborn, S. D. (1997). Domain-specific gender comparisons in identity development among college youth: Ideology and relationships. *Adolescence*, *32*, 559–577.
- Perosa, L. M., Perosa, S. L., & Tam, H. P. (1996). The contribution of family structure and differentiation to identity development in females. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *25*(X), 817–837.
- Perosa, L. M., Perosa, S. L., & Tam, H. P. (2002). Intergenerational systems theory and identity development in young adult women. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *17*, 235–259.
- Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *9*, 34–49.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 499–514.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *7*, 156–176.
- Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist*, *51*, 918–927.
- Phinney, J. S. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marín (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 63–82). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Pulkkinen, L., & Kokko, K. (2000). Identity development in adulthood: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *34*, 445–470.
- Purdy, J. K., & Arguello, D. (1992). Hispanic familism in the caretaking of older adults: Is it functional? *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, *19*, 29–43.
- Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity in adolescents from diverse ethnic groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *19*, 301–322.
- Sankey, A. M., & Young, R. A. (1996). Ego-identity status and narrative structure in retrospective accounts of parental career influence. *Journal of Adolescence*, *19*, 141–153.
- Schwartz, S. J. (2001). The evolution of Eriksonian and neo-Eriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *1*, 7–58.
- Schwartz, S. J. (2002). Convergent validity in objective measures of identity status: Implications for identity status theory. *Adolescence*, *37*, 609–626.
- Schwartz, S. J., & Dunham, R. M. (2000). Identity status formulae: Generating continuous measures of the identity statuses from measures of exploration and commitment. *Adolescence*, *35*, 147–165.
- Schwartz, S. J., & Montgomery, M. J. (2002). Similarities or differences in identity development? The impact of acculturation and gender on identity process and outcome. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *31*(X), 359–372.

- Schwartz, S. J., Mullis, R. L., Waterman, A. S., & Dunham, R. M. (2000). Ego identity status, identity style, and personal expressiveness: An empirical investigation of three convergent constructs. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 15*, 504–521.
- Serafini, T. E., & Adams, G. R. (2002). Functions of identity: Scale construction and validation. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 2*, 361–389.
- Spencer, M. B. (1982). Personal and group identity of black children. *Genetic Monographs, 106*, 59–84.
- Spencer, M. B. (1995). Old and new theorizing about African American youth: A phenomenological variant of ecological systems theory. In X. X. Taylor (Ed.), *African American youth* (pp. 37–69). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Stephen, J., Fraser, E., & Marcia, J. E. (1992). Moratorium-achievement (MAMA) cycles in lifespan identity development: Value orientations and reasoning system correlates. *Journal of Adolescence, 15*, 283–300.
- Streitmatter, J. (1993). Identity status and identity style: A replication study. *Journal of Adolescence, 16*, 211–215.
- Sue, D. W. (1993). Confronting ourselves: The White and racial/ethnic-minority researcher. *The Counseling Psychologist, 21*, 244–249.
- Sue, D. W., Bingham, R. P., Porch-Burke, L., & Vasquez, M. (1999). The diversification of psychology: A multicultural revolution. *American Psychologist, 54*, 1061–1069.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different*. New York: Wiley.
- Sue, S. (1999). Science, ethnicity, and bias: Where have we gone wrong? *American Psychologist, 54*, 1070–1077.
- Tatum, B. (1997). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York: Basic Books.
- Tokar, D. M., & Swanson, J. L. (1991). An investigation of the validity of Helms's (1984) model of white racial identity development. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 296–301.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Yazedjian, A., & Bámaca-Gómez, M. (2004). Developing the Ethnic Identity Scale using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 4*, 9–38.
- Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E., Jr., Worrell, F. C., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2002). Validating the Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 71–85.
- Vondracek, F. W., Schulenberg, J., Skorikov, V., Gillespie, L. K., & Wahlheim, C. (1995). The relationship of identity status to career indecision during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 18*, 17–29.
- Vondracek, F. W., Silbereisen, R. K., Reitzle, M., & Wiesner, M. (1999). Vocational preferences of early adolescents: Their development in social context. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14*, 267–288.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1956). Revitalization movements. *American Anthropologist, 58*, 264–281.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1970). *Culture and personality*. New York: Random House.
- Waterman, A. S. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. *Developmental Review, 18*, 341–358.
- Waterman, A. S. (1999). Identity, the identity statuses, and identity status development: A contemporary statement. *Developmental Review, 19*, 591–621.
- Whitbourne, S. K., & Hulicka, I. M. (1990). Ageism in undergraduate psychology texts. *American Psychologist, 45*, 1127–1136.
- Wires, J. W., Barocas, R., & Hollenbeck, A. R. (1994). Determinants of adolescent identity development: A cross-sequential study of boarding school boys. *Adolescence, 29*, 361–378.
- Zimmermann, P., & Becker-Stoll, F. (2002). Stability of attachment representations during adolescence: The influence of ego-identity status. *Journal of Adolescence, 25*, 107–124.