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CHAPTER 1

ETHNIC IDENTITY AMONG ARAB AMERICANS: AN EXAMINATION OF CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Introduction and Background

One of the primary developmental tasks in adolescence and emerging adulthood is the formation of a coherent and positive identity (Arnett, 2000; Erikson, 1968). Through this course, young adults discover who they are and who they aspire to be. For ethnic minority youth and young adults, this process is more challenging given their membership in their ethnic group and the mainstream culture (Markstrom-Adams, 1992; Rotheram-Borus & Wyche, 1994). To achieve a congruent sense of self, ethnic minorities must face the task of exploring feelings and conceptions about their group membership and integrate an ethnic identity with a personal identity (Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992b). Accomplishing this task successfully depends on a number of factors that are the focus of the present investigation.

Grounded in Erikson’s ego identity theory, ethnic identity is a developmental process whereby individuals explore their ethnicity and come to terms regarding what their ethnic identity means to them. According to Erikson, adolescents who have actively explored different identities and meaningful alternatives and committed to specific social roles and ideologies achieve a positive identity. Consistent with these views but specific to ethnic identity, individuals who have explored the meaning of being a member of an ethnic group and developed a secure sense of their ethnic group membership are thought to have an achieved ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992).
Ethnic identity is one aspect of an individual’s overall identity. It is a complex and multidimensional construct that has been defined and measured in many different ways (Phinney & Chavira, 1992; Phinney & Ong, 2007; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997; Umaña-Taylor & Yazedjian, 2006). For instance, Phinney and Chavira (1992) have focused on two dimensions of ethnic identity: *ethnic identity achievement*, whereby individuals explore their cultural heritage, resolve uncertainties about the meaning of their ethnicity, and then commit to their ethnicity, and *ethnic identity affirmation* which denotes the sense of pride and emotional attachment to the in-group. Sellers and colleagues (1997) proposed the Multidimensional model of racial identity (MMRI) as a way to investigate racial identity among African Americans along three dimensions: *racial centrality*, the extent to which race plays an important role in one’s self-concept; *private regard*, the positive or negative affect toward one’s ethnic group; and *public regard*, beliefs about how others view one’s group. Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, and Bámaca-Gómez (2004) delineated three dimensions of ethnic identity: the extent to which individuals have examined alternatives and sought information related to their ethnicity (*exploration*), the extent to which they have developed an understanding of what their ethnicity means to them (*commitment*), and the subsequent positive (or negative) feelings about their group membership (*affirmation*).

In addition, researchers have found that different ethnic identity components may be differentially related to psychological outcomes (Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Umaña-Taylor & Shin, 2007). For instance, in an ethnically diverse sample, Greene, Way, and Pahl (2006) found that ethnic identity affirmation but not ethnic identity achievement mitigated the negative consequences of discrimination on adolescents’ self-esteem. The
current study will focus primarily on ethnic identity exploration, a developmental and cognitive aspect of ethnic identity, and affirmation, an affective aspect of ethnic identity.

A basic premise of identity theory is that identity development is greatly dependent on the context in which an adolescent is embedded; therefore, espousing an ecological approach for understanding how various environmental factors may inform this developmental process is valuable (Supple, Ghazarian, Frabutt, Plunkett, & Sands, 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). Bronfenbrenner’s (1989) ecological theory suggests that development is a result of reciprocal interaction between the individual and the developmental contexts relevant to the individual. Bronfenbrenner (1989) differentiated between the most immediate environment or context, the microsystem, and the most remote contextual setting, the macrosystem, one that can also have a strong impact on adolescents’ experiences. Applied to ethnic identity, micro ecological factors that are thought to influence, directly or indirectly, the developmental process of ethnic identity include: parenting behaviors (e.g., family ethnic socialization practices and parenting style), and other family characteristics including parents’ generation status. Other broader or macro ecological factors that may inform the process of identity formation include the socioeconomic status of the family. In addition, ethnic discrimination is pervasive and may be experienced at various levels of the environment; accordingly, evaluating its impact may be critical to understanding ethnic minorities’ experiences and development.

One of the primary microsystems recognized to have an influential role in the development of ethnic identity is the family. Empirical studies that have investigated the association between parenting behaviors and ethnic identity development have namely
focused on behaviors related to ethnic socialization, such as parents’ actions to teach their children about their culture, language, traditions, practices, and history among other things (Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). Findings of studies examining whether family ethnic socialization (FES) practices promote a positive ethnic identity among adolescents have produced mixed results. Some studies did not find a direct relation between parental ethnic socialization and ethnic identity (e.g., Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang, 2001), whereas others revealed that family ethnic socialization played a significant role in the process of ethnic identity formation among African Americans (e.g., Demo & Hughes, 1990), Latinos (e.g., Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004), Asians (e.g., Tran & Lee, 2010), and cross-racially adopted Korean children (e.g., D. C. Lee & Quintana, 2005; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Yoon, 2001, 2004).

Another means through which parents may influence ethnic identity formation is through the provision of warm, caring and supportive relationships. Although few studies have investigated the association between the characteristics of the parent-child relationship and ethnic identity development, there is mounting evidence linking the quality of the parent-child relationship to global identity formation. For example, Sartor and Youniss (2002) found that parental emotional support and knowledge of their adolescents’ social and school-activities were predictors of identity achievement. It is believed that a positive parent-child relationship characterized by warmth and support may instill in adolescents the belief that they are valued and accepted (Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985) which, in turn, promotes their ability to explore the environment and come to terms with who they are, hence develop an achieved identity. Specific to ethnic
identity, an authoritative style of parenting characterized by warmth and support is associated with identity exploration (Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010) whereas harsh parenting defined by punitiveness, negative control, and coercive parenting behaviors is negatively correlated with ethnic identity affirmation (Supple et al., 2006).

In other studies of family context, the focus has been on family characteristics, such as the parents’ immigration status. Studies focusing on generational differences in ethnic identity have yielded inconsistent findings. Some suggest a weakening of ethnic identity as an individual becomes further removed from the immigration experience whereas others document the occurrence of ethnic revitalization and maintenance (Constantinou & Harvey, 1985; Dhruvarajan, 1993; Phinney, 2003). However, the influence of generational status may depend on which ethnic identity component is examined. For example, Rosenthal and Feldman (1992a) in a study of Chinese-Australian and Chinese-American adolescents, found that while ethnic behavior as well as knowledge eroded over time, the positive evaluation of ethnic identity, or ethnic pride, remained stable. More recent studies (Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, Bámaca, & Guimond, 2009; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004) suggest that adolescents’ generational status is indirectly associated with ethnic identity through its association with familial ethnic socialization practices. Specifically, it was found that parents who immigrated recently to the U.S. were more likely to socialize their adolescents about their values and beliefs than successive generations which, in turn, resulted in higher levels of ethnic resolution and exploration. Given the inconsistent findings in the association between generational status and ethnic identity or any of its’ components, it is reasonable to assert that other variables such as family ethnic socialization may influence the relationship between the
variables. The analysis of mediating variables could be of critical significance to research in this area of study.

Another contextual factor that may play an influential role in the development of ethnic identity is the experience of discrimination. Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) social identity theory proposed that experiences of discrimination trigger ethnic minorities to assert their group identity as a way of dealing with the threats to their sense of selfhood. These theoretical affirmations have been confirmed by empirical findings when global measures of ethnic identity have been utilized (Awad, 2010; Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). Specifically, it was found that perception of discrimination increases identification with the in-group. In contrast, when the various components of ethnic identity were examined in relation to discriminatory experiences, results were mixed. A positive correlation emerged between perceived discrimination and identity exploration, a stage of development where adolescents explore and learn about their heritage and culture, but not identity affirmation, a component of ethnic identity characterized by the development of positive feelings toward their ethnic group (Romero & Roberts, 1998; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). In other studies, perceived discrimination was found to be negatively associated with ethnic affirmation (Rivas-Drake, Hughes, & Way, 2008).

Central to the ecological model is an acknowledgement that individuals are active participants in their developmental process and that individual characteristics such as gender interact with contextual forces to shape psychological outcomes. Consistent with these propositions a number of studies have documented gender differences in parents’ ethnic socialization practices and in the strength of ethnic identification. Specifically, females have been found to demonstrate a stronger ethnic identity than their male
counterparts (Martinez & Dukes, 1997; Pegg & Plybon, 2005; M. S. Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalano, & Oxford, 2000; Ting-Toomey, 1981; Yip & Fulgni, 2002). In addition, other studies revealed that females are more prone than males to be exposed to higher levels of ethnic socialization (Brown, Linver, & Evans, 2010; Dion & Dion, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Qin, 2006; Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009). Some attribute these gender differences to the prevailing assumption among ethnic minorities that women are the bearers of cultural traditions and values (Hughes et al., 2008; Phinney, 1990). In a similar line of research, gender has also been reported to moderate the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity; specifically, the link between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity was stronger for females compared to males (Hughes, Hagelskamp, Way, & Foust, 2009; Juang & Syed, 2010).

Scholars have also supported the notion that ethnic identity is crucial for the psychological well-being of minority group members. Tajfel and Turner (1986) posit that individuals are motivated to maintain a positive group identity in order to boost their self-esteem. Consequently, individuals evaluate their own ethnic group more favorably than other groups. Self-esteem is, thus, theorized to be partially derived from individuals’ sense of belonging to a social or ethnic group and the positive affect concomitant with that group membership. The empirical literature has provided some support for the positive association between ethnic identity and self-esteem, one of the most heavily investigated markers of psychological health. For instance, composite ethnic identity scores have been positively correlated with self-esteem among early adolescents (Carlson, Uppal, & Prosser, 2000; Schwartz, Zamboanga, & Jarvis, 2007), older adolescents (Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Giang & Wittig, 2006; Phinney,
Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997), as well as college students (Lorenzo-Hernández & Ouellette, 1998; Phinney & Alipuria, 1996). In addition, research examining the link between ethnic identity and self-esteem among various ethnic groups, including African Americans (Carlson et al., 2000; Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997; Lorenzo-Hernández & Ouellette, 1998; Yasui, Dorham, & Dishion, 2004), Latinos (FESM; Carlson et al., 2000; Umaña-Taylor, 2004), and Asians (Gong, 2007; Kiang, Yip, Gonzales-Backen, Witkow, & Fuligni, 2006) have also produced promotive effects.

To help explicate the link between ethnic identity and psychological health, some scholars have identified ethnic identity as a potential resource and protective factor available to ethnic minorities (Martinez & Dukes, 1997). Studies that have found that adolescents of disparaged and devalued groups maintain a positive sense of ethnic identity and high self-esteem have led theorists to contend that ethnic identity could buffer against the disadvantages of particular group memberships (Crocker & Major, 1989). Specifically, a positive ethnic identity has been argued to provide individuals with a larger repertoire of social identities that helps them effectively cope and navigate through the aversive experiences of discrimination (Yip & Fulgni, 2002). It may be that the pride of belonging to a group may help individuals focus on the positive aspects of their ethnicity or sense of self, mitigating the negative consequences of discrimination. As such, individuals with a strong ethnic identity would be able to dismiss rather than internalize negative stereotypes of one’s ethnic group (Greene et al., 2006; Mandara, Gaylord-Harden, Richards, & Ragsdale, 2009). These assumptions have been supported in studies of Mexican American (Romero & Roberts, 2003), African American (Simons
et al., 2002; Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003) and ethnically diverse high school students (Greene et al., 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Previous research studies on ethnic identity development have contributed immensely to the current and future direction of research on ethnic minority youth normative development. However, there are several limitations in the burgeoning literature that inhibit a comprehensive understanding of ethnic identity development, especially for Arab American young adults, and the current study has been designed to address those shortcomings.

First, most research studies examining ethnic identity among minority youths have focused on African-Americans, Hispanics (e.g., Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009; Umaña-Taylor, Diversi, & Fine, 2002; Umaña-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, & Guimond, 2009), Asian-Americans (R. M. Lee & Yoo, 2004; Tran & Lee, 2011) and Native Americans (e.g., Schweigman, Soto, Wright, & Unger, 2011). There appears to be a relative scarcity of research literature pertaining to other ethnic groups, namely Arabs, a minority population, gaining increasing attention in the post 9/11 era (Awad, 2010; Britto & Amer, 2007). Therefore, research is required to develop an understanding of what Arab American youths and young adults are experiencing as they develop their selfhood and identity.

Second, although researchers have acknowledged the importance of ethnic identity among adolescents and emerging adults (Umaña-Taylor, 2011) and have examined its’ relationship with psychological well-being (e.g., self-esteem), little attention has been given to the role of contextual factors in promoting and inhibiting the
process of ethnic identity development (Phinney, Romero, et al., 2001; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). The current study attempts to fill this gap by examining various sources of influence arising from different layers of the environment, including the family as well as the community since it is within these contexts that adolescents’ lives are embedded (Bronfenbrenner, 1989).

Third, the scant research examining the association between ethnic identity and parenting behaviors is surprising given that the family offers the earliest context for developing a positive sense of ethnicity (Kiang & Fuligni, 2009). At a general level, there is an indication that parental ethnic socialization experiences may be related to a positive and achieved ethnic identity although results are inconclusive. However, in line with Supple and colleagues’ (2006) recommendation, we need to move beyond ethnic socialization practices as the main source of influence and examine how other possible contextual factors related to the family such as the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship may explain the process of ethnic identity development. Identifying the influence of parenting on the development of an achieved identity is particularly relevant to immigrants of Arab descent for whom family plays a major role in their lives (Abudabbeh, 2005).

Fourth, findings from empirical studies that have examined the association between perceived discrimination and components of ethnic identity have been contradictory. Discrimination is a reality for Arab American youth, especially post September 11, 2001 events (Awad, 2010); indeed, in Zogby’s (2002) poll of Arab Americans, one in three individuals reported experiences of discrimination, and 61% of the participants were concerned about the long-term effects of discrimination. Therefore,
considering how various components of ethnic identity are associated with experiences of discrimination among Arab Americans is warranted. Awad (2010) conducted one of the first studies examining the impact of ethnic identity on perceived discrimination for Arab Americans. Using ethnic identity as a global measure, results of the study revealed that individuals with higher ethnic identity were more likely to report experiences of discrimination; to the best of my knowledge, apart of this study, no other study could be located.

Fifth, a major caveat in the literature on the association between self-esteem and ethnic identity is that although significant, the magnitude of the correlation is often reported to be low or moderate, and Pearson product correlation coefficient ($r$) has ranged from 0.14 to 0.67 (Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997; Schwartz et al., 2007; Verkuyten & Brug, 2002). In addition, in a few studies researchers failed to find a significant association between the two constructs (Hovey, Kim, & Seligman, 2006; Street, Harris-Britt, & Walker-Barnes, 2009), and still in others a negative correlation was found (Cislo, 2008; Nesdale & Mak, 2003). Indeed, some researchers caution against assuming that the link between self-esteem and ethnic identity is straightforward or automatic (Kiang et al., 2006; Verkuyten, 1995; Yip & Cross, 2004), suggesting that the relationship will vary depending on the particular ethnic group being studied and contextual factors (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Others also urge to examine the multiple components of ethnic identity and their unique association with psychological well-being rather than using a composite ethnic identity score (Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010).
Finally, a growing body of research has documented the preponderance of discrimination among various ethnic groups, including Arabs, and discrimination experiences have often been identified as a risk factor for individuals’ psychological well-being (Simons et al., 2002; Stevenson, McNeil, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2005). In a groundbreaking study on the association between psychological variables and experiences of discrimination for individuals of Arab descent, Moradi and Hasan (2004) found that 53% of the participants reported being treated unfairly because of their ethnicity, 47% reported getting into an argument with others about something racist done to them, and 46% reported being called racist names. The authors found a relationship between discriminatory experiences, decreased self-esteem, and increased psychological distress. The results underscore the importance of examining ethnic identity and its components as a potential protective resource that would help mitigate the negative consequences of discrimination among Arab Americans. Existing studies examining the relationships between perceived discrimination, ethnic identity and mental health have focused namely on one minority group: African Americans (Beiser & Hou, 2006; Pachter & García Coll, 2009); “this line of research needs to be extended to the experiences of other, often understudied minority groups” (Kiang et al., 2006, p. 1339). It is surprising that following 9/11, only one study has examined the negative psychological consequences of perceived discrimination and no studies have examined the moderating role of ethnic identity among groups from the Middle East and South Asian subcontinent (Pachter & García Coll, 2009). In addition, existing studies that have examined the potential role of ethnic identity to mediate or mitigate the negative consequences of discrimination among other ethnic minority groups have produced mixed findings
While some studies have found that ethnic identity does buffer the negative effects of discrimination (Mossakowski, 2003; Wong et al., 2003), other studies have found that it amplifies the stress concomitant with such experiences (Beiser & Hou, 2006; Bombay, Matheson, & Anisman, 2010; Noh, Beiser, Kaspar, Hou, & Rummens, 1999).

**Purpose of the Study**

Given this state of affair, the overarching purpose of this study is to extend beyond the current literature in explicating Arab American young adults’ ethnic identity development and psychological functioning. The goals for the present are threefold. Guided largely by Bronfenbrenner’s (1989) ecological model, the first goal of this study is to examine how multiple contextual factors influence ethnic identity development. By examining the interrelationships of various contexts of development, the current investigation will offer a comprehensive understanding of the process of ethnic identity formation among Arab American youth. The second goal is to explore the potential role of ethnic identity to promote adjustment; self-esteem and depressive symptomatology are indexes of psychological functioning that are examined in the present study. Following García Coll, Crnic, Lamberty, and Waski’s (1996) integrative model and the risk and resilience framework, the final goal of this study is to examine whether ethnic identity buffers the negative effects of discrimination on two indices of psychological functioning (self-esteem and depressive symptomatology) among members of an ethnic group that have long been ignored in the psychological literature: Arab Americans. As Umaña-Taylor (2011) concluded in her review chapter on ethnic identity: “… it is important to consider specific ethnic groups, and, particularly, not to assume homogeneity in ethnic
identity experiences and outcomes among ethnic minority groups. What will be important to understand more clearly … is the specific function that ethnic identity serves for each specific minority group” (p. 805). This study responds to this need.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. Are family ethnic socialization practices, parenting styles, generational status, and perceptions of discrimination associated with ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation)?

2. Do family ethnic socialization practices mediate the relationship between ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) and generational status?

3. Does gender moderate the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation)?

4. Does perceived ethnic discrimination and ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) predict psychological well-being?

5. Does ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological well-being?

**Significance of the Study**

The number of ethnic minorities in the United States has grown significantly between 1990 and 2000 from approximately 22 million to about 80 million (U.S. Census
Bureau, 2000). In 2005, the minority population totaled 98 million, consisting about 33% of the total population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). In light of the emergence of ethnically diverse societies, it is important to understand the role that individuals’ ethnic identities play in their lives. Particularly, this study would add meaningful information to the very scant literature base on Arab Americans. Arab Americans are one of the most misunderstood ethnic groups whose unique characteristics, experiences, needs, and cultural heritage have received little public and scholarly attention (Erickson & Al-Timimi, 2001; Moradi & Hasan, 2004).

The importance of a positive sense of self as a member of an ethnic minority group is supported through a growing body of research suggesting that ethnic identity is closely associated with positive outcomes for ethnic minority youth (Kiang et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2002). Specifically, an increased sense of ethnic identity is associated with emotional well-being (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2002), intrinsic motivation for learning (Okagaki, Frensch, & Dodson, 1996), academic success (Supple et al., 2006), and abilities to cope with racism and discrimination (Dubow, Pargament, Boxer, & Tarakeshwar, 2000). One of the most commonly investigated indices of well-being that has been associated with ethnic identity is self-esteem. A number of research studies have found a positive relationship between ethnic identity and self-image or self-esteem. In these studies, scores on various dimensions of ethnic identity, including exploration, commitment, ethnic behaviors, affirmation, and belonging, were combined to assess ethnic identity, and a significant positive relationship emerged between this construct and self-esteem (e.g., Carlson et al., 2000; Martinez & Dukes, 1997).
Similarly, research indicates that youth who fail to develop a coherent ethnic identity are more likely to engage in high-risk and maladaptive behaviors, such as substance abuse (Belgrave, Brome, & Hampton, 2000), pregnancy, and truancy, among other things (Phinney, 1990). Ethnic identity, therefore, may serve as a protective resource for minority youth (Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). Accordingly, further exploration and findings on how contextual factors influence the development of a stable and achieved ethnic identity can provide mental health professional, educators, and parents with a better understanding of this developmental process.

In addition, discrimination is a common experience for ethnic minorities; it has been associated with negative psychological outcomes including lower self-esteem (Romero & Roberts, 2003), increased psychological distress (Sellers & Shelton, 2003), negative mood and depressive symptoms (Mossakowski, 2003; Umaña-Taylor, Updegraff, & Gonzales-Backen, 2011), as well as lower academic functioning (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2011; Wong et al., 2003). As such, it is crucial to identify individual-level resources such as ethnic identity that could help mitigate the negative effects of discrimination on psychological health outcomes (i.e., specifically, self-esteem and depressive symptoms). A close examination of the potential buffering effects of individual resources is needed to guide future intervention programs aimed at promoting well-being and at coping with discrimination and racism.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms were defined for use in this study:

**Arab Americans.** Individuals whose ancestry is rooted in any of the 22 Arab countries, these are: Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, Algeria, Bahrain, the
Comoros Islands, Djibouti, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Mauritania, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen (Erickson & Al-Timimi, 2001).

**Ethnic Identity.** Is a construct that consists of two interrelated components: exploration (the extent to which individuals have explored what their ethnicity means to them) and affirmation (the positive or negative affect associated with individuals’ ethnic group membership) (Roberts et al., 1999).

**Familial ethnic socialization.** Drawing on Umaña-Taylor and colleagues’ work (2004), familial ethnic socialization refers to the degree to which adolescents perceive that their families socialize them with respect to their ethnicity.

**Parenting style.** Refers to parental authority or disciplinary practices from the child’s point of view as measured by the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) (Buri, 1991) and reflecting three different parenting styles: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive.

**Perceived ethnic discrimination.** Drawing on Contrada and colleagues’ work (2001) ethnic discrimination is defined as unfair treatment due to one’s group membership or ethnicity.

**Self-esteem.** Refers to positive or negative orientation toward oneself; an overall evaluation of one's worth or value.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Perspectives Guiding the Study of Ethnic Identity

Scholars from various disciplines have used a number of theoretical perspectives to guide their conceptualization, understanding, and work on ethnic identity. The three most prevalent perspectives are: social identity, ego identity, and acculturation (Phinney, 1990; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2002). The social identity perspective, drawn from social psychology, is largely based on Tajfel’s (1981) work. The ego identity framework stems from psychoanalytic views, namely Eriskon’s identity theory (1968). The last theoretical framework for studying ethnic identity is acculturation. The present study is guided largely by the social identity and ego identity perspectives; however, to develop a comprehensive understanding of the existing work on ethnic identity, a review of all three approaches is provided below.

Social Identity Perspective. The social identity theory developed by Henry Tajfel and John Turner in 1979 is a prominent framework that has often been used in the growing literature on ethnic identity. Advocates of this theory argue that ethnic identity is a component of a more complex construct referred to as social identity (Pizarro & Vera, 2001). This theory posits that individuals are motivated to develop social identities based on their group membership. These groups (e.g., social class, ethnicity, football team) give them a sense of belonging to the world, and are, consequently, a valuable source of pride and self-esteem (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This may become problematic for ethnic minorities (Tajfel, 1978) because if they are, and they often are,
held in low regard by the dominant group, then they will be at risk for developing a negative identity accompanied by feelings of low self-esteem.

However, Tajfel and Turner (1986) asserted that members of disparaged ethnic groups engage in renegotiating the meaning of their identity by employing one of three strategies to improve their status or self-regard: (a) *individual mobility* – individuals can abandon or dissociate themselves from the group, but this strategy is associated with negative psychological outcomes. In addition, this strategy may not be plausible for those who are racially distinct and are identified by others as members of particular ethnic or racial groups; in this instance, individuals may choose to psychologically “leave” or disconnect from the group in order to detach from the negative views ascribed to them; (b) *social creativity* – individuals may also prefer to develop pride in their group by comparing themselves to the out-group on a new dimension on which they are superior, by re-defining an in-group characteristic from negative to positive (e.g., black is beautiful), or by changing the out-group they are comparing themselves to and using a low status rather than a high status out-group as a comparative frame of reference; and c) *social competition* – ethnic minorities may seek to create or stress a group characteristic that reflects the positive distinctiveness of their own group.

**Ego Identity Perspective.** The second prominent approach to the study of ethnic identity is based on Erikson’s (1968) theory. According to Erikson, identity formation is a central developmental task of adolescence and emerging adulthood. He posits that this period is characterized by an identity crisis whereby individuals actively search to develop an awareness of a unique sense of self. As a result of *exploration* of options, which eventually leads to *commitment* to various important identity domains (e.g., career,
politics, religion, gender roles, and relational choices), a secure and positive identity is constructed. Therefore, exploration, an important prelude to establishing a coherent sense of self, is the process of examining and experimenting with different roles and beliefs. Commitment, on the other hand, reflects a process whereby individuals choose a particular identity alternative and adhere to it as well as integrate it as their own (Schwartz & Pantin, 2006)

Marcia (1966, 1980) extended and operationalized Erikson’s identity theory by providing a paradigm which includes four identity statuses based on the absence or presence of exploration and commitment across different life areas; these statuses are: diffuse, foreclosed, moratorium, and achieved. According to Marcia, someone who has neither explored nor reached a commitment is said to be identity diffused. A person who has committed to particular ideologies by solely adopting family values and goals without having personally explored options is in the foreclosure status. An individual who is actively exploring alternatives but whose commitments are still absent is said to be in moratorium. Finally, a person who has experienced an identity crisis and has resolved it by committing to an identity is said to be identity achieved. Marcia postulates that an achieved identity is the ideal endpoint to identity development. In contrast, failure to develop a stable and positive identity is associated with detrimental psychological outcomes.

Drawing from Erikson’s and Marcia’s theory, Phinney (1989) proposed a model of ethnic identity development that parallels models of ego identity formation and includes analogous stages ranging from a lack of interest in one’s ethnicity to acceptance and pride of ethnic group membership. This model of ethnic identity is divided into three
stages: ethnic identity diffusion/foreclosure (also referred to as unexamined), moratorium, and achievement. The first stage, ethnic identity diffusion/foreclosure, is characterized by a lack of exploration of or concern regarding ethnic identity issues (i.e., diffuse). Adolescents who have given little thought to what their ethnicity means to them may internalize positive views of their own group that have been inculcated by their parents and community. Alternatively, they may accept negative views of their group that are often held by the majority culture (i.e., foreclosed). In either case, attitudes towards one’s ethnicity are passively transmitted from parents or the dominant group rather than reached independently (Phinney, 1989, 1990, 1996a).

The second stage is described as a period of exploration of the meaning of one’s ethnicity (Phinney, 1990) as well as the personal implications of one’s ethnic group membership (Cross, 1978); this stage is akin to Marcia’s status of moratorium. The search for the meaning of one’s identity involves talking to friends, family, and members of one’s community about ethnic related issues, reading books about ethnicity, visiting ethnic museums, as well as participating in cultural events. The onset of active exploration is triggered when individuals experience discrimination or are increasingly exposed to people from backgrounds different from their own. These experiences, or crises as Erikson (1968) defined them, initiate an interest in learning and comprehending the history, traditions, and cultural values of the ingroup (Phinney, 1989, 1991, 1996a). This state of search and exploration is considered to be a prerequisite for reaching an achieved identity status (Phinney, 1992).

In the third stage, ethnic identity achievement, adolescents resolve uncertainties about their ethnic group membership and develop a deeper understanding of their
ethnicity. At this time, individuals build a stronger sense of belonging to their ethnic group based on knowledge obtained through active exploration of their cultural background (Phinney, 1993). However, Phinney (1990) suggests that commitment to one’s ethnicity is not necessarily associated with ethnic involvement as individuals may be strongly attached to their ingroup but choose not to maintain their ethnic language or customs. Empirical research indicates that achievement is the optimal outcome of the process of ethnic identity formation and is associated with psychological adjustment (Farver, Xu, Bhadha, Narang, & Lieber, 2007; Roberts et al., 1999).

**Acculturation Framework.** Finally, the third theoretical framework that has often been used for studying ethnic identity is the acculturation perspective. Acculturation is defined as the process whereby a group of individuals come into contact with members of a new culture resulting in changes in beliefs, values, and attitudes of either or both groups (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). Ethnic identity, on the other hand, while being an aspect of acculturation, refers to individuals’ sense of belonging to a group and the extent of ethnic group involvement and affiliation (Phinney, Horenczyk, et al., 2001). Researchers adopting this perspective examine variations in ethnic identity as a function of acculturation processes and influences (Cuéllar, Nyberg, Maldonado, & Roberts, 1997; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2002).

Two distinct models of acculturation have often been used in the literature: the unidirectional model and the two-dimensional model. In the unidirectional models, acculturation is synonymous with assimilation, or absorption of minority groups into the majority culture. Individuals are described as being along a continuum between either strong affiliation with their heritage culture or strong affiliation with the dominant culture.
(Park & Miller, 1921). The assumption underlying this model is that as individuals adopt the values and customs of the majority culture, they concurrently relinquish the values and customs of the culture of origin and achieve full assimilation; thus, a negative relationship between the two cultures is implicated (Andujo, 1988). However, this monolithic view of culture is very simplistic and has been criticized for not being able to explain the process of acculturation fully. The two-dimensional model asserts that the levels of identification with the host and heritage cultures are two independent dimensions of the acculturation process (Berry, 1990, 1997). Therefore, individuals may wish to establish strong ties with the dominant culture while still maintaining a strong and positive ethnic identity.

The most cited and widely used two-dimensional conceptualization of acculturation has been put forward by John Berry (1974, 1980). He suggests that minority groups grapple with the concern of how to acculturate. In their daily encounters with members of the heritage and mainstream cultures, individuals must find answers to the following two questions: 1) is it important to be involved in the dominant culture? and 2) is it important to identify and maintain the heritage culture? Yes or no answers to these questions generate four acculturation strategies: integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. Integration occurs when maintenance of the heritage culture and engagement in the mainstream culture are sought. At the opposite end, marginalization exists when one reports little concern for holding on to the heritage culture or for learning or negotiating a new culture. Assimilation is present when there is preference for the new culture combined with little interest in maintaining the original culture. Finally, separation is characterized by strong identification with the culture of
origin and retraction from the receiving culture (Berry, 1997, 2006). Early theories of acculturation assert that assimilation is the healthiest form of adaptation for immigrants. However, more recent studies indicate that integration is the most adaptive mode of acculturation and the one that has often been associated with psychological well-being (Giang & Wittig, 2006; Lieber, Chin, Nihira, & Mink, 2001; Phinney, Horenczyk, et al., 2001) while marginalization is the least beneficial for adjustment (Berry, 1997).

In summary, these three theoretical perspectives have guided the empirical work on ethnic identity. In some research studies more than one theoretical framework has been utilized while in others no specific orientation has been identified. However, a review of these differing conceptualizations is warranted to develop a comprehensive understanding of ethnic identity.

**Contextual Factors that Shape Ethnic Identity Formation**

**Parenting behaviors.** The family has often been cited as the primary context from which adolescents derive a sense of ethnic belonging (Bernal, Knight, Garza, & Ocampo, 1990; Hughes et al., 2008; Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006). Parents provide instrumental support to their children by helping them develop a deep understanding of the meaning of their ethnicity. They do so by teaching them about their cultural heritage and preparing them to deal with discriminatory experiences (i.e., ethnic socialization). An alternative way through which parents may influence ethnic identity development is through the provision of a warm and supportive relationship.

**Familial ethnic socialization.** One contextual factor related to the family that has been the focus of the burgeoning literature on ethnic identity is familial ethnic socialization. Broadly defined, familial ethnic socialization refers to the full range of
parenting practices that aim at transmitting information about ethnicity to children (Hughes, Bachman, Ruble, & Fuligni, 2006; Hughes et al., 2008; Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006; Knight, Bernal, Garza, & Cota, 1993). Studies suggest that parents from various ethnic backgrounds including African Americans (Hughes, Witherspoon, Rivas-Drake, & West-Bey, 2009), Mexican Americans (Bernal et al., 1990; Umaña-Taylor, 2004), Haitians (Joseph & Hunter, 2011), and Asian Americans (Tran & Lee, 2010) engage in these socializing practices.

A number of empirical studies have examined the content of the ethnic socialization messages parents communicate to their children. In their review of 46 studies examining familial ethnic socialization, Hughes and colleagues (2006) identified four common types of messages that have emerged in parents’ communication about ethnicity; these include: cultural socialization, preparation for bias, egalitarianism, and promotion of mistrust (e.g., Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006). Cultural socialization messages provide information about one’s cultural heritage, traditions, and history and instill feelings of ethnic pride. These messages could be explicit or implicit. Parents can deliberately teach their children about their ethnicity by visiting their country of origin, buying books about their culture and demanding children to read them, and requiring only native language to be spoken at home (Hughes, Bachman, et al., 2006; Hughes & Chen, 1999; Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004). Other forms of cultural socialization are seamlessly woven into the parents’ daily practices and include eating ethnic food, listening to ethnic music, and being exposed to various ethnic media outlets; Umaña-Taylor and Fine (2004) coined the term covert ethnic socialization to refer to such practices.
Preparation for bias messages help children gain awareness of discrimination and develop strategies to cope with it (Hughes et al., 2008). However, in general, research indicates that parents are more likely to engage in cultural socialization rather than openly discuss issues of discrimination. It is not clear why preparation for bias is less salient, but the lower salience has been attributed in some instances to the parents’ discomfort in discussing experiences of ethnic bias that might be too painful for them to mention (Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006). In addition, research indicates that the prevalence of preparation for bias messages varies across ethnic groups. Specifically, it was found that African American parents, compared to Latino, Dominican, Puerto Rican, and Caribbean parents, placed greatest importance on preparing their children to deal with prejudice and discrimination (Hughes & Chen, 1999; Hughes et al., 2008).

Egalitarianism messages encourage children to believe that all people are equal, value individual qualities over ethnic group membership, and develop the skills needed to thrive in the dominant culture. Results of various research studies indicate that egalitarianism is highly prevalent among parents from different ethnic groups. For example, in individual and focus-group interviews, a number of African American parents expressed an appreciation for egalitarian principles; specifically, parents revealed that highlighting the importance of hard work, virtue, self-acceptance, as well as equality is the main ethnic-racial socialization tactic that they employ (Demo & Hughes, 1990; Hughes & DuMont, 1993; Marshall, 1995). In another research study, using survey questions along with in-depth interviews to assess egalitarianism and other dimensions of socialization practices, it was found that African Americans, Latinos, and Chinese all
promoted egalitarian views. Mothers reported more egalitarian messages than promotion of mistrust or preparation for bias messages (Hughes et al., 2008).

Finally, promotion of mistrust messages emphasize mistrust and caution upon interaction with individuals from other ethnic groups (Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006). It is the least researched dimension of familial ethnic socialization probably because it has been observed among only small number of parents (Hughes et al., 2008). In various studies, promotion of mistrust has been reported by fewer than 10 percent of minority families (Hughes & Chen, 1997, 1999).

Familial ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. The literature, to date, pertaining to the association between ethnic socialization and youth outcomes is fragmented and not well-developed. Even though a variety of outcomes have been investigated in relation to ethnic socialization practices, only a limited number of studies have examined any particular one of them. However, one outcome of ethnic socialization that has received the most empirical attention is ethnic identity (Hughes et al., 2008; Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006).

Overall, empirical work emphasizes the salutary effect of ethnic socialization on various indices of ethnic identity among children. For example, Knight and colleagues (1993) investigated the role of maternal ethnic socialization practices on ethnic identity development among forty-five Mexican-American children aged 6 to 10 years. Findings indicated that children who received information about their Mexican culture had higher levels of ethnic knowledge (i.e., knowledge about values, customs, traditions, and history of one’s group), behaviors, and self-labels (i.e., identification as of Mexican origin) than those who did not receive any cultural socialization messages. Similarly, among
Mexican-origin children, Quintana and Vera (1999) found that parental communication about ethnic discrimination was correlated with children’s knowledge about their ethnic group, an aspect of ethnic identity. Parental racial-ethnic socialization experiences are also instrumental in African American children’s development, especially in terms of their group identity (Hughes & Chen, 1997). Research indicates that African American parents’ report of racial-ethnic socialization (i.e. preparing their children for the significance of race in American society) is correlated with elevated racial pride and racial identity (Marshall, 1995).

However, at adolescence, studies related to the influence of family ethnic socialization on ethnic identity have produced mixed results. For example, Phinney and Chavira (1995) did not find an association between parental ethnic socialization practices, defined as parents’ efforts to instill cultural pride in their children as well as conversations about discrimination, and ethnic identity among Japanese-American, African-American, and Mexican-American adolescents, aged 16 to 18 years. Similarly, in a separate study, Phinney, Horenczyk and colleagues (2001) did not find a link between parental socialization for cultural maintenance and ethnic identity among Vietnamese or Mexican adolescents.

Conversely, in other studies in which overall scores of ethnic identity were used, higher levels of ethnic identity were associated with higher familial ethnic socialization (e.g., McHale et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004). For instance, Umaña-Taylor and Fine (2004) found a positive correlation between overt (intentional) or covert (unintentional) forms of cultural socialization and ethnic identity achievement, an overall measure of ethnic identity, among 513 Mexican-origin
adolescents. The same findings were reported in other research studies conducted with adolescents from Asian Indian, Chinese, Filippino, Vietnamese, and Salvadoran backgrounds (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006). The authors concluded that familial ethnic socialization plays an important role in the process of ethnic identity development for all adolescents, regardless of their ethnic background.

When examining the influence of parental ethnic socialization on three separate but related components of ethnic identity (exploration, resolution, and affirmation), research findings reveal that family ethnic socialization is positively associated with ethnic exploration (i.e., the degree to which adolescents have explored their ethnicity) and resolution (i.e., the degree to which adolescents have resolved what their ethnicity means to them) but not affirmation (i.e., the affect or positive feelings towards one’s group membership) (Supple et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004). It was postulated that participating and engaging in specific ethnic behaviors and activities as well as socializing with other same-ethnic group members may lead to increased knowledge about one’s ethnicity; however, these socialization practices may not essentially promote the development of positive feelings about the in-group. Similarly, in a separate study, among a sample of multiple ethnic groups that included Asians, Latinos, White, and mixed-ethnic young adults, Juang and Syed (2010) found that cultural socialization was more strongly related to identity exploration rather than commitment. The authors concluded that familial ethnic socialization may trigger individuals to explore or seek out information about their ethnicity but may not inevitably inculcate a sense of attachment to one’s ethnic group.
**Parenting style.** Whereas most research highlights familial ethnic socialization as the key influence of ethnic identity, few studies investigating parental influence on ethnic identity development focused on differences in parenting style. According to Diane Baumrind, parenting styles are defined by a person’s status on two dimensions of parenting: *demandingness* and *responsiveness*. Parental demandingness refers to the “claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys” (Baumrind, 1991a, p. 62). Parental responsiveness refers to “the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s special needs and demands” (Baumrind, 1991a, pp. 61-62). Based on these two dimensions, three parenting prototypes were identified: *authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive*.

The authoritative parenting style is characterized by high levels of demandingness and responsiveness. Parents of this style are able to stay in authority and set limits, enforce rules, and make reasonable demands of their children. They respect and encourage their children’s independence while also obtaining conformity. This disciplinary clarity and firmness is always accompanied with warmth, love, support, flexibility and encouragement of verbal expression (Baumrind, 1991a; Buri, 1991).

The authoritarian parenting style is characterized by high demandingness but not responsiveness. It is a restrictive and punitive style whereby children are expected to demonstrate obedience and comply with parental demands and directions without questioning the rationale behind the enforced rules (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Authoritarian parents are likely to rely on coercion to force the child’s compliance.
Coercion includes the use of threat, intimidation, and physical punishment to curb children’s self-will (Baumrind, 1978). Finally, the permissive parenting style is characterized by more responsiveness than demandingness. Permissive parents make few demands on their children, granting them the freedom to regulate their own behavior as much as possible. They are likely to tolerate their children’s misbehavior and avoid the use of punishment (Baumrind, 1978, 1991a).

Research conducted with adolescents and young adults suggests that parental authoritativeness promotes ethnic identity development because of the three prominent factors that comprise this parenting style. The components of authoritative parenting are: parental warmth, behavioral supervision and control, and psychological autonomy granting or democracy (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). For instance, a study of Mexican-origin young adults found that parental warmth influence the intrinsic motivation to adopt parents’ norms and values. Specifically, the young adults who reported a warm and nurturing relationship with their parents expressed a stronger desire to adopt and internalize their parent’s ethnic values and beliefs than those who were more emotionally distant (Okagaki & Moore, 2000). Similarly, Su and Costigan (2009) also found that parent-child relationships characterized by high levels of warmth and open-communication are related to a more positive ethnic identity. By negotiating identity issues in a warm and supportive context, children may more accurately perceive parental values and demands since such an environment provides them with the latitude to ask and discuss questions related to their cultural heritage. Accordingly, parental warmth is a pre-requisite for identity exploration, which, in turn, potentially culminates in identity commitment and identification with parental values.
In conjunction with parental warmth, firm control is another aspect of parenting that may positively influence the formation of a strong and positive ethnic identity. Rosenthal and Feldman (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992b) examined two aspects of ethnic identity: ethnic knowledge or behavior and ethnic pride in relation to various dimensions of parenting including warmth, control, and monitoring among Chinese-American adolescents. Results revealed that consistent parental warmth, monitoring, and control were associated with ethnic pride, an evaluative component of ethnic identity. That is, adolescents who were socialized in a warm environment, where rules are emphasized and respected, and where activities and whereabouts are closely monitored, reported stronger identification with their parents and, by this means, internalized their values and norms as well as developed a sense of pride and appreciation of group traditions. However, these same parenting practices were not associated with ethnic knowledge or participation in cultural activities.

Psychological autonomy, a third dimension of authoritative parenting, also facilitates the development ethnic identity (Abad & Sheldon, 2008; Cohen, Milyavskaya, & Koestner, 2009). Building on self-determination theory, Cohen, Milyavskaya, and Koestner (2009) highlighted the importance of an autonomy supportive parenting style in promoting internalization of cultural values and norms among Jewish adolescents. Unlike controlling or permissive parents, autonomy supportive parents take into account their children’s perspective, offer a rationale for engaging in cultural activities, and allow their children a fair amount of latitude in negotiating their ethnic identities. The authors found that by being granted some freedom to explore identity issues, adolescents identified more strongly with their heritage culture and were intrinsically motivated to
adopt its values and norms. Similar results have been obtained in other studies conducted with an ethnically diverse sample of young adults including Latinos, Asians, and Canadians (Abad & Sheldon, 2008). Specifically, participants were more likely to fully internalize their heritage culture and to rigorously explore their ethnic identities when they reported that their parents were autonomy supportive. In contrast, they were less likely to explore their ethnic identities and, hence, were less ethnically identified when they perceived their parents as restrictive and controlling. Accordingly, adolescents’ and young adults’ relationship with their parents serves as a barometer for the degree to which they will internalize parents’ cultural values and norms and develop an achieved ethnic identity. In sum, findings in the literature suggest that authoritative parenting is positively associated with ethnic identification (Abad & Sheldon, 2008), exploration (Su & Costigan, 2009), and affirmation whereas authoritarian parenting is negatively correlated with identity affirmation (Supple et al., 2006). When parents employ coercive tactics to ensure adherence to ethnic culture, adolescents may develop identities that are contrary to their parents’ wishes (Cheng & Kuo, 2000).

**Generational status.** Ethnic identity may also be influenced by generational status. Researchers have made divergent speculations regarding the stability of ethnic identity over generations. Straight-line theorists suggest a “rapid decline and eventual extinction of ethnicity” across generations (Gans, 1979, p. 3). The underlying assumption is that ethnic identity is attenuated through increased exposure and receptivity to alternative values, beliefs, and practices of the host society (Rogler, Cooney, & Ortiz, 1980). This theoretical postulate has been supported by early studies that have used ethnic self-identification, the label (i.e., ethnic, national, or compound label) assigned to
oneself, as the marker of ethnic identity. In a study of over 5,000 of immigrant adolescents from Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean living in the San Diego and Miami metropolitan areas, Rumbaut (1994) found that first generation adolescents (foreign-born) were more likely to use a label referring to their national origin such as Mexican or Chinese (43%) than second generation or U.S. born adolescents (11%). Second-generation adolescents showed a preference for hyphenated-American labels such as Chinese-American (46%) compared to first-generation adolescents (32%). In addition, an unhyphenated American label increased from 3% to about 20% across the two generations. Similar patterns have been documented among adolescents of Mexican, Chinese (Fuligni, Witkow, & Garcia, 2005), Italian (Cameron & Lalonde, 1994) and Puerto Rican immigrants (Rogler et al., 1980). For instance, in their study of first- and second-generation Puerto Rican families living the Bronx, a town with the highest concentration of Puerto Ricans in New York City, Rogler and colleagues (1980) found that children were more likely than their parents to consider themselves to be partly American rather than exclusively Puerto Rican. Research in Canada (Lay & Verkuyten, 1999) also showed that second- compared to first-generation Chinese adolescent immigrants were less likely to label themselves as Chinese (but rather Chinese-Canadian) or to include references to their ethnicity when responding to an open-ended Whom Am I Questionnaire, indicating a lower salience of ethnicity for them. The rate of use of the Chinese label dropped from 76% among first-generation to 25% among second-generation youth. Similar findings have been reported among Indo-Guyanese living in Ottawa, Canada (Clément, Singh, & Gaudet, 2006).
Others, however, contend that ethnic identity erosion observed among first- to second-generation minorities is usually followed by ethnic revival in later generations, a phenomenon best described by Hansen’s (1938, 1952) “third generation return” hypothesis or “law”: “What the son wishes to forget the grandson wishes to remember (Hansen, 1938, p. 14). Hansen believed that while first-generation immigrants must grapple with issues of acculturation and economic instability, members of the second-generation consciously relinquish their ethnic values, customs, and language. Described as “traitors, prostitutes, vacuous dilutees: the second generation has not been portrayed very flattering” (Sollors, 1986, p. 215). For Hansen, however, with the third generation comes the hope for ethnic redemption. The third generation is, thus, perceived as being successful at rediscovering ancestral roots and salvaging a long lost ethnic identity (Bakalian, 1993).

Early studies examining the association between ethnic identity and generational status provide some support for the ethnic resurgence hypothesis (Constantinou & Harvey, 1985; Ting-Toomey, 1981). For instance, Ting-Toomey assessed ethnic identity among four generations of Chinese American college students who were classified as either Chinese, American or bicultural (both American and Chinese). Results revealed that first-generation participants strongly identified with the Chinese culture whereas the second-generation appeared more bicultural. In addition, 78% of third-generation Chinese Americans continued to identity themselves as bicultural, indicating a retention of the Chinese identity. Two-thirds of the fourth generation maintained their Chinese identity, with only one-third identifying themselves as namely American. Ethnic identity was described to be a cyclical rather than a linear process, whereby the fourth generation
becomes once again interested in their heritage, “the heritage of blood” as Hansen’s puts it. Similarly, Constantinou and Harvey (1985) investigated the influence of generations on ethnic identity among Greek Americans and reported evidence for supporting Hansen’s hypothesis. They found that some members of the third generation reported high levels of ethnic identity, comparable to those of first generation.

Still other studies suggest that the various components of ethnic identity may show differential patterns of stability/instability over generations. That is, ethnic identity erosion is likely to be observed when examining the behavioral aspects of ethnicity such as language, food preferences, and traditional celebrations while ethnic identity preservation is documented when assessing the evaluative dimension or the feelings towards one’s in-group (Arbona, Flores, & Novy, 1995; Keefe & Padilla, 1987; Phinney, 2003; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992a). For instance, Rosenthal and Feldman (1992a), in a study of first- and second-generation Chinese adolescents living in Australia and United States focused on four domains of ethnic identity: ethnic self-identification, ethnic behavior, ethnic importance, and ethnic evaluation. Significant generational differences emerged in behaviors, language fluency, and ethnic self-labeling, with 34% of the second- compared to 9% of the first-generation dropping the ethnic label altogether and considering themselves as “totally American”. On the other hand, no difference emerged between first- and second- generation adolescents on their positive evaluation of their ethnic group or importance of their ethnicity. It was suggested that while the most peripheral components of ethnic identity may be more readily relinquished with increased acculturation, the core elements are more resistant to change over time.
Similar findings have been reported by Keefe and Padilla (1987) who differentiated between cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty. Cultural awareness represents individuals’ knowledge of their culture of origin, including the language, standards of behaviors and values, and history. On the other hand, ethnic loyalty refers to one’s preference for ethnic group or ethnic pride. Exploratory factor analyses showed that cultural awareness decreased considerably from the first to the second generation and continued to wane gradually through the fourth generation. Ethnic loyalty, on the other hand, slightly declined from the first to the second generation but remained stable thereafter for later generations. In other words, even when individuals do not retain their ethnic language or knowledge of their culture by the third or fourth generation, they still identify with their heritage culture and prefer friends of the same ethnic background.

Still, more recent studies indicate that generational status may be indirectly related to ethnic identity through its’ association with familial ethnic socialization. Specifically, it has been found that recent immigrants are more likely to socialize their children about their ethnic culture, traditions, language, and values than those who have been for a longer time in the United States (Cheng & Kuo, 2000; Knight et al., 1993; Quintana, Castañeda-English, & Ybarra, 1999; Rumbaut, 1994; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004); in turn, adolescents whose families socialize them more with regard to their ethnicity are likely to report higher levels of ethnic identity. Therefore, the influence of generational status on ethnic identity development has appeared to be fully mediated by familial ethnic socialization among Mexican-origin children (Knight et al., 1993) and adolescents (Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004).
Perceived discrimination. While children, adolescents, and young adults may receive positive ethnic-related messages from their parents, they may also be exposed to more negative, discriminatory messages from other contexts such as teachers, peers, and the media. Many theoretical approaches suggest that experiences of discrimination play an influential role in the development of ethnic identity (Cross, 1991, 1995; García Coll et al., 1996; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The contention is that encounters of prejudice and discrimination may act as impetuses for exploring the meaning of one’s ethnicity (Cross, 1991) and for increasing in-group identification and cohesiveness which, in turn, result in feelings of acceptance and psychological well-being (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

The empirical research that examined the association between perceived discrimination and global measures of ethnic identity support the contention that discriminatory instances may be significantly related to ethnic identity (Awad, 2010; Branscombe et al., 1999; Cislo, 2008; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rumbaut, 1994). For instance, using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure as a composite measure (i.e., a sum score) of ethnic identity, Branscombe and colleagues (1999) found that levels of ethnic identification among African Americans increased in response to perceived prejudice and discrimination. Similar findings have also been demonstrated among Arab Americans whereby perception of more discrimination was predicted by higher ethnic identity. It was contended that the direction of the relationship between these two constructs is still not clear (Awad, 2010). While experiences of discrimination may precede ethnic identification (Branscombe et al., 1999) the reverse direction - that increased group identification may lead to increased attributions of negative incidents to
discrimination and prejudice - is theorized to be plausible (Awad, 2010; Crocker & Major, 1989).

When individual ethnic identity components were examined, ethnic identity exploration was uniquely positively associated with perceived discrimination among Chinese American college students (Juang & Syed, 2010), Latino adolescents (Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010), as well as among a diverse sample of ethnic minority groups that included Europeans, Mexicans, and Vietnamese adolescents (Romero & Roberts, 1998) and another that included Black and Latino urban adolescents (Pahl & Way, 2006). Whereas overt acts of discrimination may serve as an encounter (Cross, 1991, 1995) that stimulate examination of the meaning of one’s ethnicity, it is still not clear whether these negative experiences may influence the emotional attachment to one’s ethnic group, ethnic affirmation.

Indeed, studies focusing on the association between perceived discrimination and ethnic affirmation have produced mixed results. For instance, perceived discrimination tended to be negatively associated with ethnic affirmation among Chinese American adolescents (Juang & Nguyen, 2010), Mexican origin adolescents (Romero & Roberts, 2003; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010), and an ethnically diverse sample of early adolescents (Rivas-Drake, Hughes, & Way, 2009). It was concluded that it is likely that higher levels of perceived discrimination may be related to negative feelings about one’s group because, in the face of discrimination, adolescents may be more cognizant that their ethnic group is viewed negatively which, in turn, may motivate them to opt-out or dissociate themselves from their in-group in order to maintain a positive social identity (Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). Accordingly, discrimination is portrayed as a
*double-edged sword*, igniting an understanding of one’s ethnicity while thinning pride in one’s group (Juang & Nguyen, 2010). On the other hand, other studies did not find an association between perceived discrimination and ethnic affirmation (Pahl & Way, 2006; Romero & Roberts, 1998).

**Potential Variability in Relations by Gender.** Gender is the lens through which individuals interpret experiences. Indeed, a number of studies reveal that gender may influence the strength of ethnic identification along with one’s experiences with ethnic socialization. Specifically, research documents a greater involvement in ethnicity by females than by males (Clément et al., 2006; Hughes, Hagelskamp, et al., 2009; Martinez & Dukes, 1997; Rumbaut, 1994; Schwartz & Montgomery, 2002; M. S. Spencer et al., 2000; Suárez-Orozco & Qin, 2006). For instance, using a daily diary method, Yip and Fulgni (2002) examined the role of gender in ethnic identity salience among Chinese American adolescents. Subjects of the study completed a daily checklist indicating how “Chinese” felt on a 7-point Likert scale. Results revealed that females reported higher ethnic identity salience than their male counterparts. In addition, studies with African American, Asian, Jewish, and Irish adolescents documented that girls in each group were significantly more likely than boys to adopt a strong ethnic identity (Davey, Fish, Askew, & Robila, 2003; Martinez & Dukes, 1997; Ullah, 1985). In contrast, findings from studies of Arab Americans indicated a stronger ethnic identity for male than female adolescents (Abu-Laban & Abu-Laban, 1999a, 1999b). Abu-Laban and Abu-Laban (1999a) found that 36% of females compared to 14% of males identified more strongly with the Canadian culture than with the Arab culture. Moreover, 3 out of 10 females compared to 1 out of 10 males concealed their Arab identity. The discrepant findings
may be because ethnic identity development depends largely on the values of the cultural group under investigation. That is, the specific gender roles in each minority group may shape how identity is experienced (Yip & Fulgni, 2002).

Similarly, gender differences in parents’ ethnic socialization practices have also been documented (Brown et al., 2010; Dion & Dion, 2001; Gonzalez, Umana-Taylor, & Bamaca, 2006; Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006; Thomas & Speight, 1999) whereby girls report higher levels of ethnic socialization than males with few exceptions (e.g., Hughes, Witherspoon, et al., 2009; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). For example, Brown and colleagues (2010) explored gender differences in ethnic socialization among 218 African American adolescents attending a racially and economically diverse public high school in the northeastern United States. The Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS) was used to assess five dimensions of ethnic socialization including: African American cultural values, African American cultural embeddedness, African American history, African American heritage, as well as promotion of ethnic pride. Findings indicated that females, compared to their male counterparts, reported more ethnic socialization for many of the measured socialization dimensions. Also, studies with Latino and Asian American adolescents revealed that adolescent girls in each group reported higher levels of ethnic socialization than boys (Dion & Dion, 2001; Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006). It is suggested that these gender differences may emerge because women are often perceived as the carriers of culture (Pegg & Plybon, 2005; Phinney, 1990) as well as the kin keepers (Delgado, Updegraff, Roosa, & Umana-Taylor, 2011) and, thus, are expected to impart their ethnic values and traditions to future generations. A similar line of research has found that gender moderates the relationship between
ethnic identity and ethnic socialization. Specifically, the link between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity was reported to be stronger for females compared to males (Hughes, Hagelskamp, et al., 2009; Juang & Syed, 2010; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). This view is consistent with Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model, which suggests that personal characteristics interact with environmental forces to shape development.

**Ethnic Identity, Perceived Discrimination and Psychological Well-being**

**Ethnic identity and self-esteem.** Self-esteem is one of the most widely investigated aspects of the self and is, in general, accepted as an indicator of psychological well-being (Benjet & Hernandez-Guzman, 2001; Bracey et al., 2004). Self-esteem reflects a person’s positive or negative view of self and is defined as “a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself” (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 5). The role of ethnic identity in the development of self-esteem has been of interest to various scholars for many years. Both social psychological and developmental perspectives propose that ethnic identity is crucial for the psychological health of ethnic minorities. Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) posits that there is an underlying motivation to develop a positive social identity or a sense of group membership. Group members are seen as differentiating and comparing their in-group to the out-group as well as evaluating their in-group more favorably. Holding positive perceptions of and strongly identifying with the in-group is hypothesized to bolster minorities’ self-esteem and provide them with the resources from which they can draw on in the face of ethnic-related stress.
Developmental theories also support the view of a positive relationship between identity and psychological health. It is contended that individuals with a higher identity status (i.e., achieved status) reveal various psychological strengths (Marcia, 1980), and a similar relationship has been postulated for ethnic identity. Specifically, Phinney (1990) found that minority adolescents who have explored and made commitments regarding what their ethnicity means to them (i.e., ethnic identity achieved) had the most positive self-concept compared to those with diffused or foreclosed status.

In line with these ideas, empirical research has found support for the positive correlation between ethnic identity and self-esteem. This relationship was found among many ethnic groups, including African Americans (Branscombe et al., 1999; Carlson et al., 2000; Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997; Lorenzo-Hernández & Ouellette, 1998; McMahon & Watts, 2002; Turnage, 2004), Asian Americans (Farver et al., 2007; Gong, 2007; R. M. Lee, 2003), European Americans (Phinney, 1992; Roberts et al., 1999), Latinos (Carlson et al., 2000; Greene et al., 2006; Kiang et al., 2006; Schwartz et al., 2007; Umaña-Taylor, 2004), monoracial and biracial adolescents (Bracey et al., 2004), samples of multiple ethnic minority groups (Giang & Wittig, 2006), as well as ethnic minorities living outside the U.S. (Gaudet, Clément, & Deuzeman, 2005; Verkuyten, 1995, 2002). However, although significant, the magnitude of the association between ethnic identity and self-esteem is small in most studies (e.g., Bracey et al., 2004; Verkuyten & Brug, 2002), and ethnic identity accounted for a small proportion of the variance in self-esteem (Phinney et al., 1997; Verkuyten, 2001).

Whereas research generally suggests that ethnic identity and self-esteem are positively correlated, other studies have not found such correlation (Hovey et al., 2006;
Nesdale & Mak, 2003; Street et al., 2009). For instance, among first- and second-generation Korean-American college students living in California, Washington, and Michigan, ethnic identity was not related to either self-esteem or depressive symptoms. The authors argued that going to college entails geographical and psychological disconnection from one’s community, leading to lower salience of ethnicity; as such, ethnic identity is unlikely to inform one’s self-esteem. Interestingly, in a study (Street et al., 2009) examining the cumulative effects of ethnic identity and family cohesion on African American adolescents’ self-esteem, composite ethnic identity scores were associated with higher self-esteem; however, when linear regression analyses were performed and all variables were included, ethnic identity was no longer correlated with self-esteem. The results suggest that other variables, such as family cohesion, are more significant in predicting the psychological health of African Americans. Still, in other studies, ethnic identity was found to be detrimental to the self-esteem of Nicaraguans living in South Florida (Cislo, 2008) and a sample of Chinese, New Zealanders, Vietnamese, Bosnians, Sri Lankans residing in four major Australian cities (Nesdale & Mak, 2003).

The scant research that explored how individual components of ethnic identity, rather than a single composite ethnic identity score, are related to self-esteem revealed a more complex relationship between the constructs (Yuh, 2005). For instance, ethnic identity exploration and resolution have been uniquely and positively associated with self-esteem among Latino and ethnic minority high school (Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007; Umaña-Taylor, Vargas-Chanes, Garcia, & Gonzales-Backen, 2008; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004) as well as college students (Umaña-Taylor & Shin, 2007). Umaña-taylor and
colleagues suggest that individuals who explore their ethnicity and develop a clear sense of what the group membership means to them are better equipped and more confident to discuss issues related to their ethnicity. However, when the affective component of ethnic identity (i.e., ethnic identity affirmation) was investigated mixed results emerged. For instance, in an ethnically diverse minority group, affirmation was related to higher levels of self-esteem among high school but not college students (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004). The authors concluded that young adults’ identities are multifaceted, and various aspects of their identity including religion, occupation, and relationships may more strongly influence personal self-esteem than ethnicity. In another study, a positive correlation was found between ethnic identity affirmation and self-esteem among African Americans (Resnicow, Soler, Braithwaite, Selassie, & Smith, 1999) and Asians but not among Latinos (Umaña-Taylor & Shin, 2007). These results highlight the need to account for the heterogeneity among the various ethnic groups and examine the unique experience of ethnicity along with the associated developmental outcomes for each minority population (Umaña-Taylor, 2011).

**Perceived discrimination and psychological well-being.** Discrimination is a ubiquitous experience for ethnic minorities residing in the U.S. and around the world (Brondolo et al., 2009; García Coll et al., 1996; Greene et al., 2006; Utsey, Chae, Brown, & Kelly, 2002). Early theoretical models postulate that discrimination is associated with negative psychological outcomes as a result of the fundamental and pervasive human drive to belong to social groups and to avoid social rejection (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Maslow, 1968; Rosenberg, 1979). In addition, the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981) suggests that the perception of being a member of a devalued group cause a threat to
one’s self-concept, leading to negative feelings of self-worth and adverse mental health outcomes.

Consistent with this zeitgeist, findings of a growing body of cross-sectional research indicate that perceived discrimination is detrimental for the psychological functioning of ethnic minorities (Bombay et al., 2010). As such, discrimination has been regarded as a risk factor for individuals’ psychological well-being (Tynes, Umaña-Taylor, Rose, Lin, & Anderson, 2012). Among the most heavily investigated psychological constructs associated with ethnic discrimination are self-esteem and depression. Romero and Roberts (2003) found that perceived discrimination, defined as an everyday stressor, was associated with lower levels of self-esteem among a sample of Mexican American youth. Similarly, in a sample of 273 Latino youths enrolled in high schools in the Midwest, Umaña-Taylor and Updergraff (2007) found that global experiences of discrimination were linked with lower self-esteem. In another cross-sectional study, both perceiving and worrying about discrimination were associated with lower self-esteem and higher depressive symptoms among Puerto Rican adolescents but not among children (Szalacha et al., 2003). In addition, in few longitudinal studies, experiences of discrimination were associated with increased depressive symptoms (Brody et al., 2006; Greene et al., 2006; Wong et al., 2003) and lower self-esteem over time (Greene et al., 2006; Wong et al., 2003).

Ethnic discrimination has also been linked to psychological distress among African Americans adolescents (Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006) and young adults (Bynum, Burton, & Best, 2007; Sellers & Shelton, 2003) as well as immigrants of Arab descent (Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000; Moradi & Hasan, 2004).
For instance, in a cross-sectional study of Arab American adolescents and young adults, Moradi and Hasan (2004) found that perceived discrimination was directly linked to psychological distress. In addition, they found evidence for the mediating role of personal control in the discrimination-mental health link such that perceived discrimination was associated with lower levels of personal control which, in turn, was associated with higher levels of psychological stress. Similarly, Liebkind and Jasinskaja-Lahati (2000) examined experiences of discrimination and their influence on psychological distress of seven minority groups: Arabs, Somalis, Turks, Russians, Ingrian/Finnish, Estonians, and Vietnamese living in Finland. They found that among all immigrant groups, higher levels of discrimination were related to increased levels of psychological stress. For immigrants of Arab descent, discrimination along with the degree of trust in Finnish authorities accounted for 47% of the variance (compared to 15% among Vietnamese) in psychological distress. In addition, discrimination predicted substantially more unique variance in psychological distress for Arab immigrants than for immigrants from any other group in the study.

Similar associations have been reported in studies that have explored discriminatory experiences in relation to academic outcomes among various minority groups (Alfaro, Umaña-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, Bámaca, & Zeiders, 2009; Berkel et al., 2010; Neblett, Philip, Cogburn, & Sellers, 2006). For instance, Umaña-Taylor, Wong, Gonzales, and Dumka (2012) found higher levels of perceived discrimination to be associated with lower academic adjustment defined by grade point average, externalizing behaviors in school, and association with deviant peers. In addition, a longitudinal study of Mexican American adolescents revealed that discrimination led to
worsening of academic self-efficacy and academic achievement over time (Berkel et al., 2010). In another study of 629 African American junior high school students, adolescents’ perceptions of discrimination at school were associated with lower grades, lower beliefs in academic competence, and a decreased value for schooling, indicating that school performance is unlikely to be useful for their future (Wong et al., 2003). It is suggested that the association between perceived discrimination and academic functioning is namely due to the stress arising from the adverse experiences of discrimination which, in turn, may negatively interfere with students’ ability to concentrate on learning (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2008). Taken together, there is empirical evidence to suggest that discriminatory experiences have deleterious consequences for minority groups.

**Ethnic identity as a protective factor or buffer.** While discrimination may place ethnic minorities at risk for negative psychological outcomes (Wong et al., 2003), various theoretical perspectives suggest that cultural-specific resources may protect them from the negative consequences of stress and adversity. For instance, according to a risk and resilience framework (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998; Rutter, 1987) people with particular positive qualities will either not be adversely influenced by risk or be influenced to a lower extent than those who do not possess such assets. Following this line of thought, ethnic identity has been conceptualized as a valuable protective resource for members of disparaged groups that would serve to buffer the negative effects of discrimination on mental health (Phinney, 1990, 2003). The Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) also supports the stress-buffering effect hypothesis of ethnic identity by highlighting that a positive sense of group membership helps bolster individuals’ self-
esteem. More importantly, the more individuals identify with their in-group, the more likely they will focus on the positive attributes of that group, and as such the higher their self-esteem will be. Accordingly, if discrimination undermines one’s sense of self, pride in one’s group membership helps mitigate discrimination and its’ negative effects. Having a positive identity allows individuals to not be concerned as much about others’ perceptions and helps them avoid defining themselves based on the negative stereotypes of their in-group (McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi, & Wilson, 2000; M. B. Spencer, Cunningham, & Swanson, 1995; M. B. Spencer, Fegley, & Harpalani, 2003).

However, a contradictory hypothesis is that a strong ethnic identity may exacerbate the negative effects of discrimination, leading to increased adverse consequences on psychological health. It is theorized that ethnic identity may heighten the negative effects of discrimination by accentuating one’s difference from the dominant culture and increasing, accordingly, the stress of minority status (Phinney, 1991). Self-categorization theory also provides support for the exacerbating hypothesis. According to this theory, individuals are sensitive to environmental cues that are relevant to a central aspect of their ethnic identity; discriminatory experiences may be considered such cues that are relevant to their ethnic identity. In fact, research indicates that strongly identified minorities, who affiliate and derive meaning from their group, are more likely to report experiences of discrimination and to perceive themselves as targets of discrimination (Operario & Fiske, 2001) than those who are less ethnically identified. The exacerbating hypothesis extends this notion by suggesting that not only are highly identified individuals more likely to be more sensitive to subtle forms of discrimination but that
they also react more negatively to such aversive experiences (Yip, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2008).

Empirical research that has examined the potential role of ethnic identity as a protective factor or risk factor has found support for both hypotheses: buffering and exacerbating effects of ethnic identity. For instance, some studies have documented the protective role of ethnic identity against involvement in externalizing behavior problems (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2011; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2012; Wong et al., 2003). In a study of Mexican-origin adolescent mothers, Umaña-Taylor and colleagues (2011) found that ethnic identity affirmation, defined as the positive or negative feeling about one’s ethnic group membership, moderated the negative relationship between perceived discrimination and engagement in risky behaviors. As such, individuals with high ethnic affirmation, compared to those with low ethnic affirmation, were less likely to engage in risky behavior even when they reported higher levels of discrimination. The authors provided two possible explanations for the buffering effect of ethnic identity affirmation. It was contended that the positive feelings adolescents with high ethnic affirmation have toward their in-group might allow them to adopt constructive coping strategies to deal with discrimination. Adolescents might also use socially acceptable coping strategies in order to avoid conforming to common stereotypes of being Mexican (e.g., gang member).

Similarly, in another study, using the same conceptualization of ethnic identity affirmation, Umaña-Taylor and colleagues (2012) found that this construct emerged as a significant protective factor, mitigating the negative consequences of perceived discrimination on externalizing behaviors in school among Mexican-origin adolescents. Specifically, results revealed that perceived discrimination was positively associated with
engagement in externalizing behavior problems at school for adolescents with low ethnic affirmation; however, it was negatively linked with externalizing behaviors for those with high ethnic affirmation. In a longitudinal study examining African American adolescents, Wong et al. (2003) also tested the potential role of ethnic identity, defined as “positive connection to one’s ethnic group,” in buffering the positive relation between school discrimination and problem behaviors (e.g., damaging a property, shoplifting). To measure discrimination, participants reported on how frequently their peers and teachers treated them negatively because of their race. Results of the study showed that as adolescents’ ethnic identity increased, greater perceived discrimination by peers and teachers was related to smaller increases in problem behaviors; however, for those with lower ethnic identity, greater perceived discrimination was associated with larger increases in problem behaviors. As such, adolescents’ ethnic identity reduced the magnitude of the association between perceived discrimination and problem behaviors, and connection to one’s group was considered to have a protective function for African American adolescents.

Other studies have found that ethnic identity also mitigate the negative effects of discrimination on self-esteem. For example, Romero and Roberts (2003) examined the association between two components of ethnic identity (ethnic identity exploration and affirmation), perceived discrimination, and self-esteem among Mexican-origin adolescents. They found that perceived discrimination was negatively associated with self-esteem. However, ethnic identity affirmation protected adolescents’ self-esteem from the aversive consequences of discrimination. Participants with high ethnic affirmation had high self-esteem even after encountering discrimination whereas those
with low ethnic affirmation had low self-esteem following aversive discriminatory events. Greene and colleagues (2006) also found support for the salutary role of ethnic identity in protecting members of minority groups from the negative effects of discrimination in a sample of Black, Latino, and Asian American adolescents. Specifically, the authors found that ethnic identity affirmation, the sense of pride or emotional attachment to the group, moderated the association between perceived discrimination by peers and self-esteem. As such, higher perceived discrimination was correlated with an increased decline in self-esteem among adolescents with low ethnic affirmation but not among their counterparts with high ethnic affirmation.

Other investigators have found that ethnic identity could also protect members of minority groups from internalizing behavior problems (e.g., depression and anxiety) associated with discrimination. For instance, Torres and Ong (2010) examined components of ethnic identity (exploration and commitment) and their association with daily discrimination and daily depressive symptoms in a sample of Latino adults. Findings revealed that ethnic identity commitment served to moderate the relationship between daily discrimination and next-day depression. Specifically, for participants with high ethnic commitment, the negative consequences of discrimination on depression were decreased. The authors noted, however, that participants with high ethnic commitment were not immune to these stressful events. While high ethnic commitment protected against negative mental health outcomes, it did not eliminate depressive symptoms. Similarly, Mossakowski (2003) found that identification with an ethnic group buffered the negative effects of discrimination on depressive symptoms among a sample of Filipino Americans aged 18 to 65 years.
Counter to these findings, several other studies have found empirical support for the exacerbating hypothesis (Beiser & Hou, 2006; Bombay et al., 2010; McCoy & Major, 2003; Noh et al., 1999; Torres & Ong, 2010; Yip, Seaton, & Sellers, 2006). For example, McCoy and Major (2003) studied a group of Latino college students and found that those with stronger ethnic identification reported more negative emotions after reading vignettes about prejudice against and unfair treatment of their in-group than participants with weaker ethnic identification. These findings have been echoed in another study among a sample of Asian, African American, and Latino college students whereby a strong ethnic identity was correlated with increased vulnerability to discrimination (Operario & Fiske, 2001).

Based on personal interviews with 647 Southeast Asian adult refugees in Canada with a mean age of 41 years, ethnic identity was found to amplify the negative correlation between perceived lifetime discrimination and depressive symptoms (Noh et al., 1999). In another study of Southeast Asian adult refugees, Beiser and Hou (2006) found that individuals with higher ethnic identity or stronger attachment to the group were more vulnerable to discrimination. In addition, the association between perceived discrimination and depressive emotions was significantly stronger among respondents who scored higher on measures of ethnic identity compared to those with lower ethnic identity scores. The authors concluded that a strong ethnic identity increases individuals’ vulnerability to negative mental health outcomes since discrimination presents an assault on an aspect of the self that is deemed vital to them.

Defining ethnic identity in terms of its centrality (importance of group membership), in-group affect (group pride), and in-group ties (strong connection to other
members of the in-group), Bombay and colleagues (2010) found that greater perceptions of discrimination were associated with higher depressive symptoms among First Nations adults in Canada. In addition, ethnic centrality served a risk factor as it strengthened the positive association between perceived discrimination and depression whereas the affective component of ethnic identity (i.e., pride in one’s group) had a protective role as it offset the negative effects of discrimination. Bombay and colleagues suggested that individuals with high levels of centrality are more likely to bear the negative consequences of discrimination since their heritage is an important aspect of who they are. However, individuals with positive feelings toward their in-group (high in-group affect) are more capable of dismissing experiences of discrimination since they may perceive these discriminatory actions as unfounded and unwarranted.

Taken together, the ongoing debate regarding the stress buffering effect of ethnic identity has not been settled yet as findings of this body of work are inconsistent (Brondolo et al., 2009). One explanation of the inconsistency in the findings of the pertinent literature is that studies that examined the affective component of ethnic identity (ethnic affirmation, collective self-esteem, or private regard) have found a buffering effect whereas those that focused on cognitive components (ethnic centrality or ethnic identity achievement) have documented exacerbating effects of these components on ethnic minorities’ mental health (Greene et al., 2006). More research is needed before firm conclusions can be made.

**Arab Americans**

The presence of Arab immigrants in the U.S. dates back to the 1890s (Abudabbeh, 2005). While some argue that Arab Americans are those who speak Arabic, others have
defined Arabs as those whose ancestry is rooted in any of the 22 Arab countries; these are: Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, Algeria, Bahrain, the Comoros Islands, Djibouti, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Mauritania, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen. The exact number of Arab Americans is still not known (Erickson & Al-Timimi, 2001). According to the U.S. Census, the Arab American community is estimated to be around 1.2 million (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000), a 38% increase since the 1990 Census. However, other reports estimate the Arab American population to be around 3 million (Abudabbeh, 2005; Samhan, 2006). The largest Arab American group is Lebanese, followed by Syrian, and Egyptian (Ajrouch, 2000).

Although Arab Americans live in all 50 states, Michigan is home to one of the largest and most diverse Arab American communities in the United States. According to the Arab American Institute (AAI), 490,000 Arab Americans reside in Michigan, namely in the Greater Detroit Area and in Southeast Michigan. It is estimated that Arab Americans are the third-largest ethnic population in the state of Michigan, after African Americans and Latinos (Hassoun, 2005). Compared to the total U.S. population, a higher proportion of Arab immigrants hold a high school diploma (84% vs. 80%) and a bachelor’s degree (41% vs. 24%). This may explain why the median income of Arab Americans surpasses the national average (Brittingham & de la Cruz, 2005). In terms of religion, approximately two thirds of Arab Americans are Christians whereas Muslims consist of only 23% of the Arab American population (Samhan, 2006). In general, Muslims have had a harder time assimilating into the mainstream culture than their
Christian counterparts; this is because the latter identify more strongly with the western culture (Haboush, 2007; Nassar-McMillan & Hakim-Larson, 2003).

Even though Arab immigrants are a heterogeneous group in terms of religion, country of origin, socioeconomic status, and level of acculturation, they share common values and characteristics, one of which is the centrality of the family (Abudabbeh, 2005). Arab Americans subjugate their personal interests for the collective good of the family (Erickson & Al-Timimi, 2001). In this respect, the pursuit of personal goals is regarded as a selfish endeavor and is often discouraged. Akin to other collectivist cultures, major decisions, such as the choice of a partner or career, are highly influenced by parents who remain involved in their children’s lives as physical separation from the family is not encouraged until children marry (Haboush, 2007). In addition, respect for and duty to elder is highly enforced. Other common cultural values include the shared experience of immigration, such as learning the new language and finding a job, as well as the central role of religion (Abudabbeh, 2005).

**Research Questions and Hypotheses:**

1. Are family ethnic socialization practices, parenting styles, generational status, and perceptions of discrimination associated with ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation)?

   **H1:** Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, higher levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with higher levels of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.
H$_{1a}$: Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, higher levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with ethnic identity exploration as a measure of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.

H$_{1b}$: Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, lower levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with ethnic identity affirmation as a measure of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.

2. Do family ethnic socialization practices mediate the relationship between ethnic identity or any of its’ components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) and generational status?

H$_2$: Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity and generational status.

H$_{2a}$: Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity exploration and generational status.

H$_{2b}$: Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity affirmation and generational status.
3. Does gender moderate the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation)?

\(H_3:\) Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

\(H_{3a}:\) Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration.

\(H_{3b}:\) Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity affirmation.

4. Does perceived ethnic discrimination and ethnic identity or any of its components predict psychological well-being?

\(H_4:\) Ethnic identity is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

\(H_{4a}:\) Ethnic identity exploration is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

\(H_{4b}:\) Ethnic identity affirmation is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

\(H_{4c}:\) Perceived discrimination is negatively related to self-esteem and positively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

5. Does ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological well-being?
H₅: Ethnic identity moderates the relationship between the negative effects of
discrimination and psychological well-being (self-esteem and depressive
symptomatology).

H₅ₐ: Ethnic identity exploration does not moderate the relationship between the
negative effects of discrimination and psychological well-being (self-esteem
and depressive symptomatology).

H₅ₖ: Ethnic identity affirmation moderates the relationship between the negative
effects of discrimination and psychological well-being (self-esteem and
depressive symptomatology).
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The methods that were used to collect, analyze the data, and address the research questions and associated hypotheses are presented in this chapter. The topics included are: restatement of the problem, research design, setting for the study, participants, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures. Each of these sections is discussed separately.

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was threefold:

1. Examine how multiple contextual factors (family ethnic socialization, parenting styles, perceived discrimination, generational status) influence ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.

2. Explore the potential role of ethnic identity in promoting psychological adjustment (self-esteem and levels of depressive symptomology) among Arab American college students.

3. Examine whether ethnic identity buffers the negative effects of discrimination on two indices of psychological functioning (self-esteem and levels of depressive symptomology) among Arab American college students.

Research Design

A nonexperimental, correlational research design was used in this study. This type of research design attempts to determine relationships among variables at a specific point in time. Nonexperimental research designs are appropriate research designs when the
independent variables are not manipulated and no treatment or intervention is provided to the participants. Multiple questionnaires were used to collect data using SurveyMonkey, an internet service for data collection; these are: demographic questionnaire, the Familial Ethnic Socialization Measure (FESM; Umana-Taylor et al., 2004), Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Buri, 1991), Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ) (PEDQ; Contrada et al., 2001), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965), and Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CESD; Radloff, 1977).

**Setting for the Study**

The study was conducted at Wayne State University, a large, comprehensive university located in an urban area of the Midwest. The university is classified as a research-intensive university as determined by the Carnegie Foundation. Both graduate and undergraduate programs are offered to students. Approximately 19,000 students (including 11,000 female and 8,000 male) were enrolled in undergraduate programs during the Winter 2011 semester. Students were of varied ethnic backgrounds, including: African American ($n = 5,663, 33.1\%$); American Indian/Alaskan Native ($n = 88, 0.5\%$); Asian/Pacific Islander ($n = 1,404, 5.4\%$); Hispanic/Latino ($n = 581, 2.5\%$); Caucasians ($n = 9,315, 47.5\%$); non-resident alien ($n = 545, 4.3\%$); and race-ethnicity unknown ($n = 1,602, 6.7\%$). Approximately 3,000 students were living on campus in university housing, including 2,100 undergraduates. The student body at Wayne State is one of the most diverse of all 15 public universities in Michigan.
Participants

A total of 436 participants were recruited for the current study through advertisements and flyers placed on bulletin boards across the university campus and through announcements placed on WSU pipeline and on Arab American Student Association and the Egyptian Student Association facebook pages. After accounting for participants who were removed from the study for not completing all of the surveys or for not meeting the inclusion criteria, 323 participants remained. Inclusion criteria for participants were: being between the ages of 18 and 25 years, of Arab or Middle Eastern descent, living in the United States, and registered as a full-time or part-time student at Wayne State University. Of the remaining 323 participants, 216 were female (66.9%) and 107 (33.1%) were male. Personal characteristics of the sample are summarized using frequency distributions in Table 1. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 25 with a mean age of 20.9 (SD= 2.17). The majority of the participants were full time students (86.6%, n= 278). Most participants were Muslims (72.4%, n= 233) while 23.3% (n= 75) were Christians.

The majority of the participants were living at home with their immediate family (85.9%, n= 275); specifically, 75.6% (n= 242) were living with both parents while 10.3% (n=33) were living at home with a single parent. Few participants reported living alone (3.1%, n=10), living with a partner (4.7%, n= 15), living with a roommate (4.1%, n= 13), or living with extended family members (2.2%, n=7). The largest group of respondents (39.6%, n= 128) also reported speaking English and Arabic equally at home. The next largest group (34.1%, n= 110) indicated that they spoke mostly English. A few participants reported speaking only English (9.9%, n= 32), mostly Arabic (11.1%, n= 36),
only Arabic (2.2%, n= 7) or other languages (3.1%, n= 10) such as Assyrian, Chaldean, or a combination of Arabic and French.

Table 1

Frequency Distributions – Personal Characteristics (N = 323)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Living Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with both parents</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a single parent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with extended family members (e.g., grandparents uncle)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a partner</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a roommate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Spoken at Home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly English</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Arabic equally</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Arabic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Arabic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the participants (63.3%, n = 205) were born in the United States, while 31.4% (n=102) were born in an Arab country (see table 2 for specific distributions). Of those born in an Arab country, 9.0% were born in Iraq (n=29), 7.8% (n=25) were born in Lebanon, 6.8% (n=22) were born in Yemen, and 2.4% (n=8) were born in Saudi Arabia. A minority (5.0%, n= 16) reported being born in a non-Arab foreign country such as Canada, Ivory Coast, Greece, Iran, Australia, Bosnia, and Bangladesh.

Table 2

**Frequency Distributions – Country of Birth (N = 323)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Arab</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ also reported on their country of origin defined as the country of origin of their immediate family members and the one they most identified with. The specific distributions for participants’ country of origin are presented in Table 3. The largest subgroups in the sample were the Lebanese (32.8%, n = 103) followed by the Iraqis (21.7%, n= 68), Yemenis (15.9%, n= 50), Palestinians (11.5%, n= 36), Egyptians (6.1%, n= 19), and Syrians (5.1%, n= 16). The rest were Jordanian (2.2%, n= 7), Saudi Arabian (1.6%, n= 5), Moroccan (1.9%, n= 6), Algerian (0.3%, n = 1), Kuwaiti (0.3%, n = 1), Comorian (0.3%, n = 1), and Emirati (0.3%, n = 1).
Table 3

Frequency Distributions – Country of Origin (N = 323)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were also asked to indicate the ethnic composition of the neighborhood in which they were raised. Their responses were summarized using frequency distributions in Table 4. The largest group of participants (23.2%, n= 75) indicated that there was an equal number of people from their ethnic group and other groups in their neighborhood, and 20.7% (n= 67) reported that most people were from the same ethnic group as theirs. A total of 21.1% (n=68) of the participants indicated that almost everyone in the neighborhood they were raised in was from an ethnic group different than theirs, and another 20.1% (n= 65) indicated that most people were from an ethnic group different than theirs. A few participants (14.9%, n= 48) lived in neighborhoods where almost all people were from the same ethnic group.
Table 4

Frequency Distributions – Description of Neighborhood (N = 323)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Neighborhood</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost everyone was from an ethnic group different from mine</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people were from an ethnic group different than mine</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was an equal number of people from my ethnic group and other groups</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people were from the same ethnic group as mine</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost all people were from the same ethnic group as mine</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

*Demographic questionnaire.* Participants were asked to provide information on their gender, age, education status, religion, current living arrangement, language spoken at home, place of birth, the age at which they immigrated to the U.S., country of origin, and the neighborhood they were raised in. In addition, participants responded to specific questions related to their generational status and parents’ socioeconomic status.

*Generational Status.* To assess generational status, Umaña-Taylor and colleagues’ (Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009; 2004) method was adopted which entails creating the variable “familial births in the United States.” Participants reported their own country of birth as well as the country of birth of their parents, their paternal grandparents, and their maternal grandparents. As such, scores ranged from 0 to 7 with 0 reflecting that no one in the family was born in the U.S and 7 reflecting that the respondents along with their parents as well as their paternal and maternal grandparents were all born in the U.S. The specific distributions for generational status are presented in Table 5.
The generational status score of the overwhelming majority of the participants in this study ranged between 0 and 1 (80%, n= 244). Specifically, a total of 45.9% (n= 140) of the participants reported that one family member had been born in the United States and another 34.1% (n= 104) indicated that all family members had been born outside of the United States. Second and later generation participants comprised only 20% (n= 61) of the sample. A total of 5.9% (n= 18) of the participants indicated that two family members had been born in the United States and 3.0% (n= 9) had three family members born in the U.S. Finally, only 3.0% (n=9) indicated that all family members were born in the United States.

**Table 5**

**Frequency Distributions – Generational Status (N = 323)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – All family members born outside of the United States</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – One family member born in the United States</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Two family members born in the United States</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Three family members born in the United States</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Four family members born in the United States</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Five family members born in the United States</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Six family members born in the United States</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – All family members born in the United States</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Socio-Economic Status.** Hollingshead Four-Factor Index of Socioeconomic Status (Hollingshead, 1975) was used to determine the family’s socioeconomic status. The Index comprises four factors: gender, marital status, level of education achieved, and occupation. Information on each of the four factors was gathered as part of the demographic questionnaire. Responses to these questions were used to calculate the
socioeconomic (SES) levels using the formula developed by Hollingshead (1975). The formula is:

\[(\text{Education} \times 3) + (\text{Occupation type} \times 5) = \text{SES total score}.\]

The SES scores were obtained separately for the mother and father. If both parents were working and had a score, the scores were averaged to obtain a mean family SES. If only one parent was working, the score of the working parent was used as the family SES. The scores were then categorized into five levels based on the cut-points developed by Hollingshead (1975). The categorical levels of SES are presented in Table 6. A total of 28.7% (n= 77) of the participants were from families whose SES was categorized as upper middle and 22.5% (n= 60) were from families in the upper SES category. 21.7% (n= 58) of the participants were from families whose SES was lower middle and 20.9% (n= 56) were from families whose SES was categorized as middle class. A few participants 5.8% (n= 17) were from families whose SES was considered lower class. The SES for 55 participants could not be determined because of missing information.

**Table 6**

**Frequency Distributions – Family Socioeconomic Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Familial Ethnic Socialization Measure (FESM).** The Familial Ethnic Socialization Measure (FESM; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004) assessed the extent to which
individuals perceive that their parents have socialized them with regard to their ethnicity. The original version of the FESM included 9 items and was developed as part of an unpublished dissertation (Umaña-Taylor, 2001) due to the scarcity of measures assessing familial socialization practices. The FESM was later revised and expanded to consist of a total of 12 items (Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004). The 12 items (e.g., My family teaches me about my ethnic/cultural background; My family participates in activities that are specific to my ethnic group) were rated on a 5-point Likert scale where 1= Not at all true and 5= very much true. Responses were coded such that higher scores indicated higher levels of FES with a highest possible total FES score being 60 and the lowest possible score being 12. Permission to use the FESM was granted from the author via e-mail.

Using a sample of 13- to 19-year-old adolescents (n=513) of Mexican origin, Umaña-Taylor and Fine (2001) reported moderately strong internal consistency of the original version of the FESM with alpha coefficient of .82. The revised version of the scale, including 12-items, was also tested for internal consistency using Cronbach alpha coefficients with a sample of ethnically diverse university and high school students. The alpha coefficients for the scale were .94 and .92 for college and high school students respectively (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of .93 for the present study indicated that the instrument had good reliability.

In addition, Umaña-Taylor and Fine (2001) demonstrated concurrent validity of the FESM by finding expected correlations with the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992). Specifically, the two constructs were positively correlated for Columbian, Mexican, Nicaraguan, Puerto Rican, and Salvadorian adolescents.
Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ). The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Buri, 1991) was designed to measure the three parenting style prototypes identified by Baumrind (1967, 1978): permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Each parenting style was represented on the PAQ by 10 items, for a total of 30 items. The items required respondents to appraise the patterns of authority exercised by their parents during their years growing up at home. The items were rated using a 5-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree. Possible total scores ranged from 10 to 50 for each of the three parenting styles, with higher scores denoting a “greater appraisal level of the parental authority prototype measured” (Buri, 1991, p. 112). The questionnaire has been used with adolescents and college students alike.

In the original study, the questionnaire consisted of two separate but identical versions of the PAQ; one for perceived paternal authority and another for perceived maternal authority, resulting in a 60-item questionnaire. Only the word “mother” and “father” were interchanged on the two versions. Accordingly, six different scores for each participant were obtained: mother’s and father’s authoritativeness, mother’s and father’s authoritarianism, and mother’s and father’s permissiveness. In the current study, however, the PAQ was used to measure the overall parenting style instead of measuring mothers’ and fathers’ parenting styles separately. This is partly due to the high positive correlation between the maternal and paternal parenting styles that have been shown in previous studies. For instance, Baumrind (1991b) reported that 76% of the participants identified their fathers and mothers as having the same parenting style. Using the PAQ to measure adolescents’ perceptions of parental style, Heaven and Ciarrochi (2008) also
found that participants’ perceptions of both mother’s and father’s parenting styles were highly significantly correlated: Authoritarianism (.60), Authoritativeness (.57) and Permissiveness (.61). Based on these findings, the authors combined perceptions of mothers’ and fathers’ parenting styles for their study and examined instead family authoritativeness, authoritarianism, and permissiveness.

The PAQ has been found to have sound psychometric properties. In the original study, Buri (1991) tested the instrument for internal consistency using Conbrach alpha coefficients and using test-retest over a two-week period. The alpha coefficients ranged from .75 to .87, indicating that the questionnaire had good internal consistency. At a two-week interval, test-retest reliability ranged from .77 to .92, providing additional evidence that the PAQ had adequate reliability. Within the current study, the Cronbach coefficients for the three subscales were as follows: .87 (permissive), .88 (authoritarian), and .84 (authoritative). These outcomes were indicative of adequate internal consistency as a measure of reliability.

Discriminant related validity was also assessed in the original study by examining the intercorrelations among the three subscales (Buri, 1991). As expected, father’s authoritarianism was negatively correlated with father’s permissiveness (r = -.50) and father’s authoritativeness (r = -.52). Similarly mother’s authoritarianism was negatively correlated with mother’s permissiveness (r = -.38) and mother’s authoritativeness (r = -.48). In addition, the permissiveness scales for mothers and fathers were not correlated with the authoritativeness scales. The lack of correlations was expected because positive correlations could have resulted in questioning the validity of responses on the PAQ.
Buri (1991) also tested the criterion validity of the PAQ by examining the correlations between each of three scales (authoritativeness, authoritarianism, and permissiveness) and parental nurturance. Consistent with Baumrind’s (1971) suggestions, authoritativeness was positively correlated with nurturance; authoritarianism was negatively correlated with nurturance; and permissiveness did not correlate with nurturance, providing evidence for the criterion-related validity of the PAQ.

**Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Scale (PEDQ).** The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ) was designed to assess experiences of ethnic discrimination among college students (Contrada et al., 2001). It is a 17-item self-report measure. The instructions of the PEDQ were revised to reflect lifetime experiences of discrimination rather than experiences of discrimination over the past three months. The PEDQ begins with the statement: “Because of your ethnicity…” and is followed by questions describing exposure to some form of mistreatment (e.g., “How often have you been subjected to offensive ethnic comments aimed directly at you, spoken either in your presence or behind your back?” and “How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be violent or dangerous?”). All items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale with a response of 1 indicating that the event never happened and a response of 7 indicating that the event happened very often. The PEQD consists of four subscales: Disvaluation, Threat and Aggression, Verbal Rejection, and Avoidance. To make the PEDQ more relevant to Arab Americans, examples of ethnic name calling and slurs (i.e., “wop,” “nigger”) were replaced with the words “terrorist” and “foreigner” to reflect derogatory labels assigned to persons of Arab background.
As such, a total PEDQ score, used in various analyses in the present study, was derived by summing the numeric values associated with all the responses of each participant. The total score was then divided by 17 (total number of items) to provide a score that reflects the original scale ranging from 1 to 7. As such, the PEDQ yielded an overall index of perceived discrimination, which was used in this study. In addition, mean scores for each of the subscales were also obtained by summing the numeric values associated with the items on each subscale and then dividing it by the number of items of each of the associated subscale. The use of a mean score allows direct comparisons among the subscales and the total score. Higher scores indicated higher perceived discrimination.

The PEDQ was tested for reliability and validity using a sample of 333 undergraduate college students from diverse ethnic groups including, White (n = 208), Black (n = 34), Latino/a (n = 31), Asian American/Pacific Islander (n = 60). The alpha coefficients for the four subscales ranged from .73 (Avoidance) to .90 (Disvaluation) for all ethnic minorities included in the study. In a community version of the PEQD, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was calculated at .89 for the total-scale score (Brondolo et al., 2005). Awad (2010) also assessed the internal consistency of the PEQD among 177 individuals of Arab or Middle Eastern descent and reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .96. For the current study, the following Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were obtained: .89 (verbal rejection), .92 (avoidance), .93 (disvaluation), and .95 (threats/aggression). The alpha coefficient for the total scale of .96 provided evidence of the internal consistency of the PEDQ.
Construct validity of the PEDQ has also been established. The instrument was intended to measure seven distinct content areas, namely disvaluing actions denial of equal treatment, threat, aggression, exclusion, avoidance and verbal rejection. Contrada et al. used a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation to test the construct validity of the PEDQ. The first attempt used 22 items. Five factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 emerged from the analysis, indicating that the scale measures five different aspects of ethnic discrimination. Three of the factors (disvaluing action, avoidance, and verbal rejection) were distinct, while items measuring threat and aggression combined into a single factor. In addition, two of the three denial of equal treatment items loaded on the same factor (Factor 5) with the third item loading on four factors. Exclusion items also loaded on multiple factors. As a result, the denial of treatment and exclusion items were deleted from the instrument. A second factor analysis using data from the minority subsample was completed using the 17 items and yielded four factors (Disvaluation, Threat and Aggression, Verbal Rejection, and Avoidance) with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounted for 60% of the variance. Similar results were obtained when the White subsample’s data was used in a factor analysis.

Contrada and colleagues also tested the convergent and divergent validity using three scales: Stereotype Confirmation Concerns Scale (SCCS), Own-Group Conformity Pressure Scale (OGCPS), and Ethnic Group Membership Questionnaire (EGMQ). Convergent validity was found in statistically significant correlations in a positive direction between the PEDQ and SCCS and OGCPS. Divergent validity was confirmed by low and negative correlations between PEDQ and EGMQ. PEDQ was also
significantly positively correlated with depression ($\beta = .238, p < .001$) and significantly negatively correlated with life satisfaction ($\beta = -.213, p < .01$).

**Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM).** Initially, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) consisted of 14 items and denoted three main components of ethnic identity, namely a sense of belonging and attachment toward one’s group (Affirmation and Belonging), involvement with one’s ethnic group (Ethnic Behaviors and Practices), and the development of a secure sense of self characterized by an achieved sense of ethnic identity (Ethnic Identity Achievement). Subsequently, Roberts and colleagues (Roberts et al., 1999) indicated that a 12-item measure, which was used in the present study, is as adequate in measuring ethnic identity as a 14-item scale.

The MEIM revised by Roberts and colleagues consists of 12 of Phinney’s 14-item scale and assesses ethnic identity on two subscales: *Ethnic Identity Affirmation* and *Ethnic Identity Exploration.* The Ethnic Identity Affirmation consists of 7 items and is intended to measure individuals’ sense of belonging to their ethnic group in addition to their feelings of pride about the group membership. Sample items of this scale are “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments” and “I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.” The Ethnic Exploration subscale consists of 5 items and denotes the extent to which individuals explore and learn about their ethnic group. Sample items of this scale are “I am active in organization or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group” and “In order to learn about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.” Each item was rated on a 4-point Likert scale, with end points of $1 = strongly disagree$ and $4 = strongly$
Scores for each of the subscales along with an overall ethnic identity score were computed. Higher scores denoted a more positive ethnic identity, greater exploration and more positive affect toward one’s ethnic group. The MEIM has been extensively used with various ethnic groups including Arabs (Awad, 2010), African Americans (Carlson et al., 2000; Johnson & Arbona, 2006; Pegg & Plybon, 2005), Hispanics (Gamst et al., 2006; Greene et al., 2006), Asians (Giang & Wittig, 2006; Gong, 2007; Greene et al., 2006; R. M. Lee, 2003), and multiracial individuals (Bracey et al., 2004; Dandy, Durkin, McEvoy, Barber, & Houghton, 2008; M. S. Spencer et al., 2000).

Roberts and colleagues examined the psychometric properties of the MEIM among 5,423 middle school students of various ethnicities (African American, Mexican American, Chinese American, Indian American, Pakistani American, Vietnamese American, European American, and Pacific Islander). Total scores on the MEIM provided good internal consistency with an alpha level of .84. In addition, the internal consistency of the affirmation scale ranged from .81 to .89 across ethnic groups. The exploration scale, however, demonstrated less internal consistency across groups, ranging from .55 to .73. Spencer and colleagues also examined the reliability of the MEIM among 1,812 monoracial and 372 multi-racial early adolescents. The reliability coefficient of the MEIM for the entire sample was .85. Reliability coefficients for the Affirmation subscale, which they termed “Identification,” and for the exploration scale were .84 and .76 respectively for the entire sample. Cronbach alpha coefficients obtained for the present study were as follows: .94 (affirmation), .80 (exploration), and .93 (total MEIM). These results indicate the MEIM has adequate to good internal consistency.
The literature has also provided evidence of the validity of the MEIM. Exploratory factor analyses were used to examine the dimensionality of the MEIM. Results revealed a two-factor solution, explaining 51.2% of the total variance. The first factor explained 41.6% of the variance and was termed *affirmation, belonging, and commitment*. The second factor explained 9.6% of the variance and was termed *Exploration factor*. Factor loading for the affirmation scale ranged from .88 to .43 and from .79 to .53 for the exploration scale. The two scales (affirmation and exploration) were correlated at $r = .74$ for the European Americans, $r = .70$ for the African Americans, and $r = .75$ for the Mexican Americans suggesting that the factors were distinct but highly correlated. A number of other studies supported the two-factor structure of the MEIM (Pegg & Plybon, 2005; M. S. Spencer et al., 2000; Yancey, Aneshensel, & Driscoll, 2001).

Additionally, evidence concerning the construct validity of the MEIM was determined based on the associations between ethnic identity and other measures of psychological well-being theorized to be related to ethnic identity. As an indicator of convergent validity, Roberts and colleagues found a significant positive association ($r = .48$) between the MEIM scores and Ethnic Salience (Roberts et al., 1999), a measure of the importance that individuals attach to ethnicity. Divergent validity was also demonstrated through statistically significant positive correlations of the MEIM and Self-Esteem ($r = .20$), Coping ($r = .23$), Sense of Mastery ($r = .19$), and Optimism ($r = .19$). In addition, depression and loneliness were significantly negatively correlated with MEIM scores. The authors noted that although the correlations between the measures of psychological well-being and MEIM scores were “modest”, the associations found were
all in the expected and predicted directions and all were statistically significant.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965) is a widely used self-report measure of global self-esteem for adolescents (Winters, Myers, & Proud, 2002) as well as other age groups (Vasconcelos-Raposo, Fernandes, Teixeira, & Bertelli, 2012). The RSES, which was originally designed as a Guttman Scale, is now scored as a Likert-type scale. It comprises 10 items rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 *strongly disagree* to 4 *strongly agree*. Five items are positively worded whereas the other 5 are negatively worded in order to minimize response bias, individuals’ tendencies to endorse statements as true of the self-irrespective of their content. Examples of positively and negatively worded items include respectively, “I take a positive attitude toward myself,” and “At times I think I am no good at all.” The negatively valenced items were reversed scored so that higher scores represented greater self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965). Scores ranged from 1 to 4 when mean scores were computed. The advantages of the RSES are that the language requires no more than a fifth-grade reading level and the scale takes approximately five minutes to complete.

Psychometric studies have provided evidence for the unidimensionality of the scale, in tandem with its’ original purpose: measure a global dimension of self-esteem. For instance, Schmitt and Allik (2005) translated the RSES into 28 languages and administered it to 16,998 participants from 53 nations. Using principal component analysis, the authors found support for a one-factor solution with all items loading highly on the first principal component.
The reliability of the RSES has also been supported by multiple research studies. In the original study, which included 5,024 high school juniors from randomly selected schools in New York, the test-retest yielded reliabilities of .85 and .88 for the 2-week interval and .63 for the 7-month interval. The coefficient of reproducibility was also recorded at .92 (Rosenberg, 1986). Using an ethnically diverse sample of middle school students (n = 5,496), Roberts and colleagues (1999) reported the reliability of RSES at .83. The coefficients ranged between .75 and .87 across the nine ethnic groups, suggesting a satisfactory internal reliability among the groups under investigation. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the present study of .88 provided support that the RSES has adequate internal consistency.

Construct, convergent, and criterion validity of the RSES have also been tested and established (Hagborg, 1993; Pullmann & Allik, 2000; Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001; Rosenberg, 1965). For instance, strong convergent validity was reported by Robins, Hendin, and Tzesniewski (2001) who examined the relationship between RSES and the Single-Item Self-Esteem Scale (SISE) among undergraduate students of different ethnicities. Their findings indicated that correlations between RSES and SISE ranged from .72 to .76 with a median of .75; these correlations were for both men and women and for different ethnic groups.

To examine construct validity, Griffiths and colleagues (1999) correlated the RSES with various measures of eating disorders and depression among 117 patients diagnosed with anorexia nervosa, bulimia, or eating disorder not otherwise specified. Five measures of maladaptive eating attitudes and behaviors were used in the study; these are: Drive for Thinness (DT), Body Dissatisfaction (BD), Ineffectiveness (I), Eating
Attitude Test (EAT), and the Body Shape Questionnaire (BSQ). Depression was measured using the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI). Pearson correlation coefficients indicated that RSES significantly correlated in the expected direction with all 5 measures of eating behaviors and attitudes. The RSES was also significantly inversely correlated with depression \( r = -0.73 \), supporting the construct validity of the instrument.

**Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D).** The CES-D (Radloff, 1977) was used to measure the frequency of depressive symptoms. The CES-D is not intended to be a diagnostic measure and is not used to determine the severity of depression of individuals in treatment. The 20 items on the CES-D include the depressive symptoms that have been identified in the clinical literature and results of factor analysis of existing depression scales. The scale measures six elements of depression: “depressed mood, feelings of guilt and worthlessness, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, psychomotor retardation, loss of appetite, and sleep disturbance” (Radloff, 1977, p. 386). The participants were asked to rate the frequency of occurrence of each of the scale items using a 4-point scale ranging from 0 for rarely or none of the time to 3 for most or all of the time.

Four items (4, 8, 12, and 16) were reverse scored prior to summing the numeric ratings for all items to obtain a total score that could range from 0 to 60. Mean scores for each participant was obtained by dividing the total score by 20. Higher scores on this scale indicated greater depressive symptomatology.

The CES-D has been tested for reliability using Cronbach alpha coefficients as a measure of internal consistency. Radloff (1977) reported alpha coefficients of .85 for the general population. This level indicated good internal consistency for the CES-D. A
Cronbach alpha coefficient of .90 was obtained on a sample of 261 college students (Skorikov & Vandervoort, 2003). Test-retest correlations varied across time intervals. At two weeks between test-retest, the correlations were .51 and at 8 weeks, the correlations were .57. These correlations were moderate, indicating that, as expected, some changes in depression were occurring over time. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of .92 obtained for the present study was considered evidence of good internal consistency for the CESD.

Radloff (1977) also tested the CES-D for discriminant validity by comparing scores on the CES-D from a psychiatric inpatient group and the general population. Seventy percent of scores for the clinical group were above the cut-off point of 16, while 21% of the general population scored at this level. The average score for a second psychiatric group was 39.11 with all scores greater than 16.

When college students’ scores for the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and the CES-D were correlated, the results were statistically significant ($r = .75, p < .001$; Skorikov & Vandervoort, 2003) providing support for the construct validity of the CES-D. Criterion validity was determined by correlating clinical and nonclinical scores on the CES-D with the Profile of Mood State Fatigue Scale (POMS-F), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory – State (STAI-S), and Short Form (SF) 36 Mental Health Summary Scale (Hann, Winter, & Jacobsen, 1999). The correlations were in the expected direction for each group, with participants with higher frequency of depressive symptomatology more likely to have greater fatigue, anxiety, and poorer mental health functioning. Radloff (1977) correlated the scores on the CES-D with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale. A low negative correlation between the two scales was found ($r = -.18$).
**Procedure**

Approval for the current study was obtained from the Human Investigation Committee (HIC) at Wayne State University (Appendix A). Participants were recruited through flier advertisements (Appendix B) that were be posted on bulletin boards in the graduate library, undergraduate library, classroom buildings, residence halls, and student center. The flyer described the purpose of the study, the eligibility criteria for participation, the benefits of the study, and the study procedures. An invitation e-mail to participate in the study was also sent to the presidents of the Arab American Student Union and the Egyptian Student Association at Wayne State University who forwarded it to all their constituents. The e-mail briefed the potential participants about the general aim of the study and included the link to the online survey. To recruit a large group of Arab Americans, the study was also advertised on pipeline and on the Arab American Student Union and Egyptian Student Association facebook pages. All emails and flyers included the online study website (surveymonkey.com) to allow students to access the survey and complete it.

The online survey was available to potential participants from January 15, 2013 to February 14, 2013. The first page of the survey was the information sheet (Appendix C) which described the study’s purposes, eligibility criteria, incentives and risks, and contact information of the investigator. In the closing paragraph of the information sheet, participants were required to select the “Yes” or “No” box indicating their agreement/disagreement to participating in the study. Respondents were not able to begin completing the survey before providing consent for participation in the study. The second page of the survey included a question that asked participants to select the
ethnicity that best described them. If respondents chose an ethnicity other than “Arab American,” they were disqualified and redirected to a page thanking them for their participation in the study. The other pages consisted of a package of 7 batteries (Appendices D and E; demographic questionnaire, FESM, PAQ, PEDQ, MEIM, RSES, and CES-D). The last page included the Closing Information Sheet regarding their general emotional and psychological well-being (Appendix F). Participants were prompted to seek help if they experienced any distress or discomfort following completion of the survey and were provided with contact names and numbers should they require any assistance. Discontinuing the survey was possible at any time by exiting the Web browser. The time required to complete the survey was approximately 20 to 25 minutes.

Following completion of the survey, respondents received a confirmation number on their closing sheet, which was the month, day, year, and time (hour and minute) that they completed the survey. As a token of appreciation for their participation, the participants were instructed to print out the confirmation number and redeem this number for a $10.00 Starbucks or Subway gift card. The dates, place, and times when gift cards could be picked up were announced on the Educational Psychology website.

Analyses

Preliminary analyses. G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) was calculated to determine the appropriate sample size needed to achieve a power of .80. For a multiple linear regression analysis with seven predictor variables, two-tailed test, effect size of .15, alpha level of .05, a sample size of 55 is needed to achieve a power of .80. Increasing the sample size to 90 will improve the power of the analysis to .95. To
establish greater significance, a total of 323 participants were recruited for this study.

Figure 1 presents the graph of the power analysis.

**Figure 1. Power Analysis**

The data collected from the surveys on SurveyMonkey.com was downloaded into a Microsoft Excel file. The Excel file was converted into an IBM-SPSS file for statistical analysis. Statistics were performed using SPSS Statistics software (Student Version 18.0 for Windows and Mac OS X; SPSS Inc., 2010) and an SPSS macro developed by Preacher and Hayes (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The statistical analysis was divided into three sections. The first section used frequency distributions, crosstabulations, and measures of central tendency and dispersion to provide a profile of the participants in the study. The second section of the data analysis used descriptive statistics to present baseline information on the scaled variables (ethnic identity, perceived ethnic discrimination, parenting styles, and generational status). Inferential statistical analyses were used to address the research questions and test the hypotheses. The specific tests that were used were stepwise multiple linear regression analyses, Pearson product moment correlations, hierarchical multiple regression analyses and mediating analyses.
using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure followed by a Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) to investigate the significance of the indirect effects. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05. The variables and statistical analyses that were used to test each research question are presented in Table 7.
### Table 7

**Research Questions, Hypotheses and Planned Analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions/Hypotheses</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Are family ethnic socialization practices, parenting styles, generational status, and perceptions of discrimination associated with ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation).</td>
<td><strong>Criterion Variables</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Ethnic Identity&lt;br&gt;• Exploration&lt;br&gt;• Affirmation</td>
<td>A stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine which of the predictor variables can be used to predict the criterion variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₁:</strong> Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, higher levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with higher levels of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.</td>
<td><strong>Predictor Variables</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Family ethnic socialization&lt;br&gt;• Parenting styles&lt;br&gt;• Authoritative&lt;br&gt;• Authoritarian&lt;br&gt;• Permissive&lt;br&gt;• Perceived ethnic discrimination&lt;br&gt;• Generational status</td>
<td>Prior to completing the stepwise multiple linear regression analyses, a correlation matrix was developed to determine which of the predictor variables are significantly related to the criterion variables. Only those predictor variables that were significantly related to the criterion variables were used in the subsequent stepwise multiple linear regression analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₁a:</strong> Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, higher levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with ethnic identity exploration as a measure of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.</td>
<td><strong>Criterion Variables</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Ethnic Identity&lt;br&gt;• Exploration&lt;br&gt;• Affirmation</td>
<td>A stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine which of the predictor variables can be used to predict the criterion variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₁b:</strong> Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, lower levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with ethnic identity affirmation as a measure of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions/Hypotheses</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Arab American college students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do family ethnic socialization mediate the relationship between ethnic identity or any of its' components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) and generational status?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2:</strong> Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity and generational status.</td>
<td><strong>Criterion Variables</strong></td>
<td>A series of regression analyses were used to determine if family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between generational status and ethnic identity. Baron and Kenny’s recommendations for mediation were followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2a:</strong> Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity exploration and generational status.</td>
<td><strong>Predictor Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2b:</strong> Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity affirmation and generational status.</td>
<td><strong>Mediator Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does gender moderate the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3:</strong> Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.</td>
<td><strong>Criterion Variable</strong></td>
<td>Tests of moderation through hierarchical multiple regression were implemented for the predictor and criterion variables with gender used as a moderator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3a:</strong> Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration.</td>
<td><strong>Predictor Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3b:</strong> Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity affirmation.</td>
<td><strong>Moderating Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does perceived ethnic discrimination and ethnic identity or any of its components predict psychological well-being?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4:</strong> Ethnic identity is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.</td>
<td><strong>Ethnic Identity</strong></td>
<td>Pearson product moment correlations were used to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between ethnic identity (or any of its components) and psychological well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4a:</strong> Ethnic identity exploration is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.</td>
<td><strong>Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4b:</strong> Ethnic identity affirmation is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.</td>
<td><strong>Levels of depressive symptomatology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Research Questions/Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>depressive symptomatology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H4c:** Perceived discrimination is negatively related to self-esteem and positively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

5. Does ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological well-being?

- **H5:** Ethnic identity moderates the relationship between the negative effects of discrimination on psychological well-being (self-esteem and depressive symptomatology).
  - **Criterion variable:** Psychological well-being
    - Levels of depressive symptomatology
  - **Predictor variable:** Perceived discrimination
  - **Moderating variables:** Ethnic identity
    - Exploration
    - Affirmation

- **H5a:** Ethnic identity exploration does not moderate the relationship between the negative effects of discrimination on psychological well-being (self-esteem and depressive symptomatology).

- **H5b:** Ethnic identity affirmation moderates the relationship between the negative effects of discrimination on psychological well-being (self-esteem and depressive symptomatology).

Tests of moderation through hierarchical multiple regression were implemented for the predictor and criterion variables with ethnic identity or its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) used as moderators.
CHAPTER 4  
RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses that were used to test the hypotheses developed for the study. The purpose of this study was to examine the multiple contextual factors that are related to ethnic identity development and to explore the potential role of ethnic identity in promoting psychological adjustment (measured by self-esteem and depressive symptomatology) and buffering the negative consequences of discrimination. The chapter is divided into two sections. Base-line information for the scaled variables is presented in the first section. The results of the inferential statistical analyses used to test each of the hypotheses and address the research questions are presented in the second section.

Description of the Scaled Variables

Apart from the demographic questionnaire, participants completed the Family Ethnic Socialization Scale, Parental Authority Questionnaire, Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Scale, Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, and Center for Epidemiology Scale – Depression. Each of the instruments was scored using the authors’ protocols. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the results. Table 8 presents results of this analysis.
Table 8

Descriptive Statistics – Scaled Variables (N = 311)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family ethnic socialization</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Authority Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multigroup Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D Depression</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ethnic Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disvaluation</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00 7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat/Aggression</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00 7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00 7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal/Rejection</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00 7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although participants scored across the possible range of 0 to 5 on FESM, the sample demonstrated high levels of family ethnic socialization ($M = 4.08, SD = .85$). In regards to parenting style, the authoritative subscale received the highest rating while the permissive subscale received the lowest ratings. The mean scores of 3.52 for the authoritative subscale and 3.30 for the authoritarian subscales revealed that participants, overall, showed moderate agreements (i.e., between $3 = \text{undecided}$ and $4 = \text{agree}$) with items that typified authoritative and authoritarian parenting. However, a mean of 2.79 on the permissive subscale indicated that participants moderately disagreed (i.e., between $2 = \text{disagree}$ and $3 = \text{neither agree nor disagree}$) with items that described receiving permissive parenting. For ethnic identity, the mean Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) score fell in the moderately high range ($M = 3.17, SD = 0.61$). Participants also endorsed relatively high levels of ethnic identity exploration ($M = 3.02, SD = 0.64$) and
ethnic identity affirmation ($M = 3.27, SD = 0.65$). Based on the mean scores for the Rosenberg self-esteem scale ($M = 3.12, SD = 0.60$) and the CESD-D ($M = 0.95, SD = 0.60$), participants appear to have high self-esteem and low levels of depressive symptoms. For perceived ethnic discrimination, the mean obtained in the present study ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.36$) is comparable to those reported in other studies employing the same scale (Bombay et al., 2010; Contrada et al., 2001; Pieterse, Carter, Evans, & Walter, 2010) or the community version of the scale (Brondolo et al., 2008; Brondolo et al., 2005; Broudy et al., 2007; Kwok et al., 2011).

**Hypotheses Testing**

Five research questions and associated hypotheses were developed for the study. Each of these research questions and hypotheses were tested using inferential statistical analyses. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05.

**Research question 1.** Are family ethnic socialization practices, parenting styles, generational status, and perceptions of discrimination associated with ethnic identity or any of its components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation)?

$H_1$: Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, higher levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with higher levels of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.
Pearson’s correlations were conducted to test this hypothesis. The results of the intercorrelation matrix are presented in Table 9. As expected, family ethnic socialization was positively correlated with ethnic identity \( (r = .55, p < .01) \). With regard to parenting style, authoritative parenting was significantly positively correlated with ethnic identity \( (r = .51, p < .01) \) whereas permissive parenting was not significantly correlated, and authoritarian parenting yielded a weak correlation \( (r = .16, p < .01) \). Perceived ethnic discrimination was not significantly correlated with ethnic identity; only disvaluation, a subscale of PEDQ was weakly correlated with ethnic identity \( (r = -.10, p < .05) \), although in the unexpected direction. In addition, generational status was negatively correlated with ethnic identity \( (r = -.19, p < .01) \) indicating that participants of later generations (i.e., third or later) had lower ethnic identity scores than those of earlier generations (i.e., first or second).
Table 9
Intercorrelation Matrix – Ethnic Identity and Predictor Variables (N = 311)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05; ** p < .01
Note: 1 Affirmation; 2 Exploration; 3 Total Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure; 4 Family Ethnic Socialization; 5 Authoritarian; 6 Authoritative; 7 Permissive; 8 Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire; 9 Disvaluation; 10 Threat Aggression; 11 Avoidance; 12 Verbal Rejection; 13 Generational Status

Variables that were significantly correlated with ethnic identity were entered in a stepwise multiple regression analysis to determine whether these predict ethnic identity; as such, the following variables were entered: family ethnic socialization, authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting, generational status, and disvaluation. Table 10 presents results of this analysis. The model summary results indicated that family ethnic
socialization and authoritative parenting were the only two variables retained in the stepwise multiple regression equation, accounting for 40.2% of the variance in ethnic identity $F(2, 301)= 101.067, p< .001$. Family ethnic socialization entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation first, accounting for 29.9% of the variance in ethnic identity, $\beta = .409, t = 8.413, p< .001$. An additional 10.2% of the variance in ethnic identity was explained by authoritative parenting, $\beta = .349, t = 7.176, p< .001$. The positive direction of the relationships between the criterion and predictor variables indicated that participants who had higher scores for family ethnic socialization and authoritative parenting also had higher scores for ethnic identity. Authoritarian parenting, generational status, and disvaluation did not enter the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, indicating that these variables were not statistically significant predictors of ethnic identity.

**Table 10**

**Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Ethnic Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>b-Weight</th>
<th>$\beta$-Weight</th>
<th>$\Delta\tau^2$</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Included Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ethnic socialization</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>8.413</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative parenting</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>7.176</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excluded Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian parenting</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.545</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disvaluation</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple R</strong></td>
<td>.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple R^2</strong></td>
<td>.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Ratio</strong></td>
<td>101.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig</strong></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H1a:** Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and
permissive parenting styles, higher levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with ethnic identity exploration of male and female Arab American college students.

Pearson’s correlations were conducted to test this hypothesis. As expected, family ethnic socialization was positively correlated with ethnic identity exploration ($r = .52$, $p < .01$). Authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles were both positively correlated with ethnic identity exploration $r = .45$ and .22, respectively ($p < .01$) whereas permissive parenting was not significantly related. The hypothesized relationship between perceived ethnic discrimination or any of its components and ethnic identity exploration was not supported. However, as predicted, generational status was found to be negatively correlated with ethnic identity exploration ($r = -.15$, $p < .01$).

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether family ethnic socialization, authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting, and generational status predict ethnic identity exploration. Table 11 presents results of this analysis. A total of 37.2% of the variance in ethnic identity exploration was accounted for by three predictor variables: family ethnic socialization, authoritative parenting, and authoritarian parenting, $F (3, 300) = 59.128$, $p < .001$. Family ethnic socialization entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation first, explaining 27.3% of the variance in ethnic exploration, $\beta = .343$, $t = 6.413$, $p < .001$. Authoritative parenting entered next, accounting for an additional 8% of the variance in ethnic identity exploration, $\beta = .343$, $t = 6.701$, $p < .001$. Two percent of the variance in ethnic identity exploration was accounted for by authoritarian parenting, $\beta = .146$, $t = 2.974$, $p < .001$. As such family ethnic socialization received the strongest weight in the model followed by authoritative
parenting; authoritarian parenting received the lowest of the three weights. The positive relationships between the criterion and predictor variables indicated that participants who tended to have higher scores for ethnic identity exploration also had higher scores for family ethnic socialization, authoritative parenting, and authoritarian parenting. One predictor variable, generational status did not enter the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, indicating that it was not a statistically significant predictor of ethnic identity exploration.

**Table 11**

**Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Ethnic Identity Exploration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>b-Weight</th>
<th>β-Weight</th>
<th>Δr²</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Included Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Ethnic Socialization</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>6.413</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>6.701</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Parenting</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>2.974</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excluded Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple R</strong></td>
<td>.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple R²</strong></td>
<td>.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Ratio</strong></td>
<td>59.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig</strong></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H1b:** Multiple contextual factors (higher levels of family ethnic socialization, high scores for authoritative parenting styles and low scores for authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, lower levels of perceived discrimination, and lower generational status) are associated with ethnic identity affirmation as a measure of ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students.

Pearson’s correlations were conducted to test the hypothesis. As expected, family ethnic socialization was positively correlated with ethnic identity affirmation ($r = .53, p < .01$). Authoritative parenting was also positively correlated with ethnic identity
affirmation \( (r = .50, p < .01) \) whereas permissive and authoritarian styles were each not significantly correlated. With regard to the relation between ethnic identity affirmation and perceived ethnic discrimination, ethnic identity affirmation was negatively correlated with perceived ethnic discrimination \( (r = -.13, p < .01) \), disvaluation \( (r = -.14, p < .01) \), threat/aggression \( (r = -.14, p < .01) \) and avoidance \( (r = -.11, p < .05) \). Generational status was also negatively correlated with ethnic identity affirmation \( (r = -.20, p < .01) \).

A stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine which of the predictor variables (family ethnic socialization, authoritative parenting, perceived discrimination, disvaluation, threat/aggression, avoidance, and generational status) could be used to predict the criterion variable, ethnic identity affirmation. Table 12 presents results of this analysis. A total of 36.7% of the variance in ethnic identity affirmation was explained by two predictor variables, family ethnic socialization and authoritative, \( F(2, 301) = 87.424, p < .001 \). Family ethnic socialization entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation first, accounting for 26.6% of the variance in ethnic identity affirmation, \( \beta = .378, t = 7.576, p < .001 \). An additional 10.1% of the variance in ethnic identity affirmation was explained by authoritative parenting, \( \beta = .347, t = 6.937, p < .001 \). The positive direction of the relationships indicated that higher scores for family ethnic socialization and authoritative parenting were associated with higher scores for ethnic identity affirmation. Generational Status, perceived ethnic discrimination, disvaluation, threat/aggression, avoidance, and generational status did not enter the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, indicating these were not statistically significant predictors of ethnic identity affirmation.
Table 12

Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Ethnic Identity Affirmation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>b-Weight</th>
<th>β-Weight</th>
<th>Δr²</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Ethnic Socialization</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>7.576</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>6.937</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>- .729</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Ethnic Discrimination</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>- .994</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disvaluation</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat/Aggression</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>- .680</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R  .606
Multiple R²  .367
F Ratio  87.424
Sig  <.001

Research question 2. Do family ethnic socialization practices mediate the relationship between ethnic identity or any of its’ components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation) and generational status?

To test for mediation, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure was followed in which several analyses are conducted to assess the effects of the mediator on the relationship between the criterion and predictor variables. The first step involves using a regression analysis to determine whether a statistically significant relationship exists between the predictor and criterion variable. The second step involves conducting a regression analysis to examine whether the predictor variable is significantly related to the mediator variable. In this analysis, the mediator variable is used as a criterion variable. If the predictor and criterion are significantly related, the third step is undertaken. The third step involves establishing a relationship between the mediator variable and the criterion variable. Finally, when the first three steps have been met, the
mediating variable is held constant and the relationship between the predictor and criterion variable is retested. In this step, if the amount of explained variance is no longer statistically significant when the mediator is controlled for, the interpretation is that the mediator variable is fully mediating the relationship between the predictor and criterion variables.

As such, in this study, for family ethnic socialization to be a mediator of generational status and ethnic identity (or any of its components), four conditions as proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) should be met: 1) generational status should be significantly related to ethnic identity (or any of its components); 2) generational status should be significantly related to family ethnic socialization; 3) family ethnic socialization should be significantly related to ethnic identity (or any of its components); 4) controlling for family ethnic socialization, the relation between generational status and ethnic identity (or any of its components) should no longer be significant.

**H₂:** Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity and generational status.

Using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure for identifying mediated relations, a meditational model was tested. Regression results indicated that generational status was negatively related to ethnic identity ($\beta = -.19$, $t = -3.44$, $p = .001$); thus, the first condition was met. Generational status was negatively related to family ethnic socialization ($\beta = -.33$, $t = -6.18$, $p < .001$) and, thus, supports Condition 2 for mediation. Further, family ethnic socialization was positively related to ethnic identity ($\beta = .54$, $t = 10.64$, $p < .001$) and, thus, supports Condition 3. Finally, after controlling for family ethnic socialization, the relation between generational status and ethnic became nonsignificant ($\beta = -.01$, $ns$),
which suggests complete mediation. To further assess the significance of the indirect effect, the Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) was computed using Preacher and Leonardelli’s (2001) online calculator. As before, the evidence suggested that the effect of generational status on ethnic identity was significantly mediated by familial ethnic socialization ($Z = -5.33, p < .001$). Figure 2 shows the mediation model in which family ethnic socialization mediated the relation between generational status and ethnic identity.

**Figure 2: Regression Model of Generational Status, Familial Ethnic Socialization (FESM), and Ethnic Identity**

\[ \beta = -.33, SE = .03 \]
\[ t(303) = -6.18, p < .001 \]

\[ \beta = -.19, SE = .02 \]
\[ t(303) = -3.44, p = .001 \]

\[ \beta = -.01, SE = .02 \]
\[ t(302) = -.23, p = .818 \]

**H2a:** Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity exploration and generational status.

Using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) regression approach, the mediation model was tested. The first of the four requirements was satisfied by a significant relation between generational status and ethnic identity exploration ($\beta = -.15, t = -2.71, p = .007$). Second, generational status was significantly related to familial ethnic socialization ($\beta = -.33, t = -6.18, p < .001$). Third, familial ethnic socialization was significantly related to ethnic
identity exploration ($\beta = .53, t = 10.19, p < .001$). The fourth requirement was also met in that the relation between ethnic identity exploration and generational status (i.e., the relation between predictor and criterion variables) was nonsignificant after controlling for familial ethnic socialization ($\beta = .02, ns$). Therefore, complete mediation was found and the hypothesis was supported. A Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) was conducted using the Web site developed by Preacher and Leonardelli (2001) to investigate if familial ethnic socialization mediated the effects of generational status on ethnic identity exploration. The results of this analysis revealed a significant indirect effect of generational status through familial ethnic socialization ($Z = -5.27, p < .001$). Figure 3 shows the mediation model in which family ethnic socialization mediated the relation between generational status and ethnic identity exploration, a component of ethnic identity.

Figure 3: Regression Model of Generational Status, Familial Ethnic Socialization (FESM), and Ethnic Exploration
H$_{2b}$: Family ethnic socialization mediates the relationship between ethnic identity affirmation and generational status.

Again, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) approach was used to test the meditational model. The first condition was supported as generational status was significantly related to ethnic identity affirmation ($\beta = -0.20, t = -3.63, p < .001$). The second condition was also supported by a significant relationship between generational status and familial ethnic socialization ($\beta = -0.33, t = -6.181, p < .001$). Third, familial ethnic socialization was significantly related to ethnic identity affirmation ($\beta = 0.50, t = 9.65, p < .001$). Finally, the fourth condition was also met in that once familial ethnic socialization was controlled for, the relation between ethnic identity affirmation and generational status was nonsignificant ($\beta = -0.03, ns$). Accordingly, complete mediation was found and the hypothesis was supported. To further assess the significance of the mediation, Sobel’s test (Sobel, 1982) for indirect effects was applied using Preacher and Leonardelli’s (2001) online calculator. Results revealed a significant indirect effect of generational status through familial ethnic socialization ($Z = - 5.18, p < .001$). Figure 4 shows the path model using the standardized regression coefficients of the analyses in which family ethnic socialization mediated the relation between generational status and ethnic identity affirmation, a component of ethnic identity.
Research question 3. Does gender moderate the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity or any of its components?

Aiken and West’s (1991) statistical procedure to examine moderator effects was used to explore whether gender would moderate the relation between family ethnic socialization (FESM) and ethnic identity or any of its components: ethnic exploration and ethnic affirmation. Three hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed, with ethnic identity, ethnic exploration, and ethnic affirmation as criterion variables. Prior to data analyses, the predictor variables were centered to decrease multicollinearity between main effects and interaction terms, as suggested by Aiken and West. As such, the mean was subtracted from each individual scale score in order to create variables with means of zero. The centered predictor was multiplied to create the interaction term.

H₃: Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

A hierarchical regression analysis was used to investigate the hypothesis that gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.
Gender and familial ethic socialization were entered in Step 1 as first-order effects variables, and the interaction term gender x FESM was entered in Step 2 as a test of the moderator hypothesis. In Step 1, results indicated that gender and ethnic family socialization accounted for 31.7% of the variance in ethnic identity, $F(2, 320) = 74.292, p < .001$. Family ethnic socialization was found to significantly predict ethnic identity ($\beta = .54, p < .001$), but gender failed to predict ethnic identity ($\beta = .07, p > .05$). In Step 2, the overall interaction effect of gender and family ethnic socialization on ethnic identity accounted for an additional non-significant 0.1% of variance, $\Delta R^2 = .001; F(3, 319) = 49.537, t = -.579, p > .05$ (see Table 13). Accordingly, results of this analysis did not support $H_3$, such that gender was not found to moderate the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

$H_{3a}$: Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic exploration.

A hierarchical regression analysis was used to investigate the hypothesis that gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration. When examining ethnic exploration as the criterion variable, gender and familial ethnic socialization were entered in Step 1. The interaction term gender x FESM was entered in Step 2 as a test of the moderator hypothesis. In Step 1, gender and ethnic family socialization accounted for 27.4% of the variance in ethnic identity, $F(2, 319) = 60.273, p < .001$. Family ethnic socialization was found to significantly predict ethnic identity exploration ($\beta = .51, p < .001$), but gender failed to predict ethnic exploration ($\beta = .04, p > .05$). In Step 2, the overall interaction effect of gender and family ethnic socialization on ethnic exploration accounted for an additional non-significant 0.1% of
variance, $\Delta R^2 = .001; F(3, 318) = 40.239, t = -.630, p > .05$ (see Table 13). As such, results did not support H$_{3a}$; that is, gender was not found to moderate the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic exploration.

**H$_{3b}$**: Gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic affirmation.

In the third hierarchical regression examining ethnic affirmation as the criterion variable, gender and familial ethic socialization were entered in Step 1. The interaction term gender x FESM was entered in Step 2 as a test of the moderator hypothesis. In Step 1, gender and ethnic family socialization accounted for 28.0% of the variance in ethnic affirmation, $F(2, 319) = 62.021, p < .001$. Family ethnic socialization was found to significantly predict ethnic identity affirmation ($\beta = .498, p < .001$), but gender failed to predict ethnic exploration ($\beta = .094, p > .05$). In Step 2, the overall interaction effect of gender and family ethnic socialization on ethnic exploration accounted for an additional non-significant 0.1% of variance, $\Delta R^2 = .001; F(3, 318) = 41.400, t = -.627, p > .05$ (see Table 13). As such, results did not support H$_{3b}$; gender was not found to moderate the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic affirmation.
Table 13

Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Moderating Effects of Gender on the Relationship Between Family Ethnic Socialization and Ethnic Identity or its’ Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{Change}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Variable: Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.317***</td>
<td>.317***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESM</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.540***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x FESM</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Variable: Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.274***</td>
<td>.274***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESM</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.511***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x FESM</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Variable: Ethnic Identity Affirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.280***</td>
<td>.280***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESM</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.498***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x FESM</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. FESM = Family Ethnic Socialization Measure, *** $p < .001$
Research question 4: Does perceived ethnic discrimination and ethnic identity or any of its components predict psychological well-being?

H₄: Ethnic identity is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

Pearson correlation analyses were used to examine the direction and strength of the relationships between ethnic identity and each of the indices of psychological well-being (self-esteem and depressive symptoms). The results of these analyses are provided in Table 14. As expected, ethnic identity was significantly positively correlated with self-esteem ($r = .45$, $p < .01$) and negatively correlated with levels of depressive symptomatology ($r = -.23$, $p < .01$). As participants reported higher levels of ethnic identity, they also tended to report higher self-esteem and lower depressive symptoms.

H₄ᵃ: Ethnic identity exploration is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

Pearson correlations were conducted to test this hypothesis. As expected, ethnic identity exploration was positively correlated with self-esteem ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) and negatively correlated with depressive symptoms ($r = -.14$ $p < .01$). As such, participants reporting higher levels of ethnic identity exploration reported higher self-esteem and lower depressive symptoms.

H₄ᵇ: Ethnic identity affirmation is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to levels of depressive symptomatology.

The Pearson correlation analysis revealed that ethnic identity affirmation and self-esteem were significantly positively related ($r = .49$, $p < .01$) and represented the strongest association of all ethnic identity constructs (total ethnic identity, ethnic identity
exploration, and ethnic identity affirmation). In addition, ethnic identity affirmation was negatively correlated with levels of depressive symptoms ($r = -0.27, p < 0.01$). Thus, as participants reported higher levels of ethnic affirmation, they also tended to report higher self-esteem and lower depressive symptoms.

**H4c:** Perceived discrimination is negatively related to self-esteem and positively related to levels of depressive symptoms.

Pearson correlation analyses were conducted to examine the association between perceived discrimination and each index of psychological well-being: self-esteem and depressive symptoms. As expected, results revealed that perceived discrimination was negatively related to self-esteem ($r = -0.33, p < 0.01$) and positively related to depressive symptoms ($r = 0.49, p < 0.01$), indicating that participants who perceived greater levels of discrimination had lower self-esteem and higher levels of depressive symptoms.

**Table 14**

**Correlations Between Ethnic Identity Constructs, Perceived Discrimination, and Well-Being.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Depressive Symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI Exploration</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI Affirmation</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01**

**Research question 5:** Does ethnic identity or any of its’ components (ethnic exploration and ethnic affirmation) moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological well-being (self-esteem and depressive symptoms)?
To test the moderating role of ethnic identity or its’ components (ethnic exploration and ethnic affirmation) on the relation between perceived discrimination and both depressive symptoms and self-esteem, a series of hierarchical regression analyses were performed for each of the criterion variables (self-esteem and depressive symptoms). As such, six hierarchical regression analyses were conducted with ethnic identity, ethnic identity exploration, and ethnic identity affirmation serving as moderators across depressive symptoms and self-esteem. Ethnic identity (or any of its’ components) and perceived discrimination entered in Step 1 and the interaction terms entered in Step 2. Predictor variables and potential moderators were centered prior to being entered in the regression analyses to reduce multicollinearity between the main effects and the interaction terms, as suggested by Aiken and West (1991).

**H1:** Ethnic identity moderates the relationship between discrimination and each index of psychological well-being (i.e., self-esteem and depressive symptoms); specifically, higher levels of ethnic identity would weaken the negative association between perceived discrimination and self-esteem and the positive association between perceived discrimination and depressive symptoms.

A hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the moderating role of ethnic identity on perceived discrimination as a predictor of self-esteem. Ethnic identity and perceived discrimination were entered in Step 1 as first-order effects variables. The interaction term ethnic identity x perceived discrimination was entered in Step 2 as a test of the moderator hypothesis. In Step 1, results revealed that ethnic identity and perceived discrimination accounted for 27.8 % of the variance in self-esteem, \( F(2, 319)= 61.462, p< .001 \) (see Table 15). A significant main effect was found
for both ethnic identity ($\beta = .418$, $p < .001$) and perceived discrimination ($\beta = -.290$, $p < .001$). In Step 2, as hypothesized, the overall interaction effect of ethnic identity and perceived discrimination was significant and contributed 1.5% of the variance, which was a small effect size, $\Delta R^2 = .015$; $F(3, 318) = 44.013$, $t = 2.619$, $p < .05$. However, interaction terms usually account for about 1 to 3% of the variance in social science research (Chaplin, 1991).

**Table 15**

Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Moderating Effects of Ethnic Identity on Psychological Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion variable: Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.290***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.418***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion Variable: Depressive Symptoms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.467***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.183***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.102*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$

The significant two-way interaction between perceived discrimination and ethnic identity was subsequently probed using PROCESS (Hayes, 2012) which computes simple
slopes at +/- 1 SD from the mean. This interaction occurred because the slopes of perceived discrimination at high and low levels of ethnic identity were significantly different (see Figure 5). For individuals with high ethnic identity, perceived discrimination was negatively related to self-esteem ($b = -.077, SE = .033, t(319) = -2.291, p = .022$); however, this relationship was even stronger for those with low ethnic identity ($b = -.172, SE = .030, t(319) = -5.727, p < .001$). As hypothesized, ethnic identity buffered the deleterious effects of perceived discrimination on self-esteem.

**Figure 5. Ethnic identity as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Perceived Discrimination and Self-esteem**

A similar analysis was conducted to examine the moderating effect of ethnic identity on perceived discrimination as a predictor of depressive symptoms. As shown in Table 15, in Step 1, ethnic identity and perceived ethnic discrimination accounted for 26.6% of the variance in depressive symptoms, $F(2, 319) = 57.825, p < .001$. Significant main effects were found for ethnic identity ($\beta = -.183, p < .001$) and perceived
discrimination ($\beta = .467, p < .001$). In Step 2, as hypothesized, the overall interaction effect of ethnic identity and perceived discrimination was significant and accounted for an additional 1% of variance, $\Delta R^2 = .10$; $F(3, 318) = 40.430, t = -.209, p < .05$.

This statistically significantly interaction was subsequently probed using PROCESS (Hayes, 2012). For individuals with high ethnic identity, perceived discrimination was positively related to depressive symptoms ($b = .164, SE = .0356, t(319) = -4.609, p < .001$); however, this relationship was even stronger for those with low ethnic identity ($b = .242, SE = .023, t(319) = -10.563, p < .001$). As such, ethnic identity buffered the negative effects of perceived discrimination on depressive symptoms (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6. Ethnic identity as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Perceived Discrimination and Depressive Symptoms**

**H$_{5b}$:** Ethnic identity exploration does not moderate the relationship between discrimination and psychological well-being (i.e., self-esteem and depressive
symptoms); specifically, higher levels of ethnic identity exploration would not weaken the negative association between perceived discrimination and self-esteem and the positive association between perceived discrimination and depressive symptoms.

A hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis with self-esteem as the predictor variable. In Step 1, results revealed that ethnic identity exploration and discrimination accounted for 21.1% of the variance in self-esteem, $F(2, 319) = 42.756, p < .001$ (see Table 16). A significant main effect was found for both ethnic identity exploration ($\beta = .326, p < .001$) and perceived discrimination ($\beta = -.320, p < .001$). In Step 2, contrary to hypothesis, the overall interaction effect of ethnic identity exploration and perceived discrimination was significant and contributed 2.4% of the variance, which was a small effect size, $\Delta R^2 = .024; F(3, 318) = 32.627, t = 3.157, p < .01$. 
Table 16
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Moderating Effects of Ethnic Identity Exploration on Psychological Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion variable: Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.320***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.326***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Variable: Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.481***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.134**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination x Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.109*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001

The significant interaction was probed using PROCESS (Hayes, 2012) and graphed based on +/- 1 standard deviation from the mean. This interaction occurred because the slopes of perceived discrimination at high and low levels of ethnic identity exploration were significantly different (see Figure 7). Perceived discrimination was negatively related to self-esteem ($b = -.082, SE = .028, t(319) = -2.86, p = .0045$) for individuals with high ethnic identity exploration; however, this relationship was even stronger for those with low ethnic identity ($b = -.197, SE = .027, t(319) = -7.226, p < .001$). Contrary to hypothesis, ethnic identity exploration buffered the negative effects of perceived discrimination on self-esteem.
Another hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to examine the moderating role of ethnic identity exploration, on perceived discrimination as a predictor of depressive symptoms. In Step 1, results revealed that ethnic identity exploration and discrimination accounted for 25.1% of the variance in depressive symptoms, $F(2, 319) = 53.328, p < .001$ (see Table 16). A significant main effect was found for both ethnic identity exploration ($\beta = -.134, p < .001$) and perceived discrimination ($\beta = .481, p < .01$). In Step 2, contrary to hypothesis, the overall interaction effect of ethnic identity and perceived discrimination was significant and contributed 1.12% of the variance, which was a small effect size, $\Delta R^2 = .012; F(3, 318) = 37.605, t = -2.206, p < .05$.

The significant interaction was probed using PROCESS (Hayes, 2012) and graphed based on +/- 1 standard deviation from the mean (see Figure 8). The relation between perceived discrimination and depressive symptoms was positive for both groups; however, discrimination was more strongly related to depressive symptoms for
individuals with low ethnic identity ($b = .251, SE = .027, t(319) = 11.172, p < .001$) than for those with low ethnic identity ($b = .171, SE = .034, t(319) = 4.978, p < .001$). Contrary to hypothesis, ethnic identity exploration buffered the negative effects of perceived discrimination on self-esteem.

**Figure 8. Ethnic Identity Exploration as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Perceived Discrimination and Depressive Symptoms.**

The fifth hierarchical regression examined the moderating role of ethnic identity affirmation, on perceived discrimination as a predictor of self-esteem. In Step 1, results revealed that ethnic identity affirmation and discrimination accounted for 30.1% of the variance in self-esteem, $F(2, 319) = 68.589, p < .001$ (see Table 17). A significant main effect was found for both ethnic identity affirmation ($\beta = .446, p < .001$) and perceived discrimination ($\beta = -.270, p < .01$). In Step 2, as hypothesized, the overall interaction effect of ethnic identity and perceived discrimination was significant and contributed 1.14% of the variance, which was a small effect size, $\Delta R^2 = .014; F(3, 318) = 48.747, t = 2.577, p < .01$. 
Table 17
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Moderating Effects of Ethnic Identity Affirmation on Psychological Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion variable: Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Discrimination</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.270***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.446***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Discrimination x Ethnic Identity Affirmation</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.121**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion Variable: Depressive Symptoms

| Step 1 Discrimination                         | .201 | .021| .458***|           |                  |
| Ethnic Identity                               | -.185| .044| -.203***|           |                  |
| Step 2 Discrimination x Ethnic Identity Affirmation| -.060| .028| -.104* |           |                  |

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001

The two-way interaction was subsequently probed using PROCESS (Hayes, 2012) and plotted at one standard deviation above and below the mean of ethnic identity affirmation (see Figure 9). For individuals with high ethnic identity affirmation, perceived discrimination was negatively related to self-esteem (\( b = -0.66, SE = 0.287, t(319) = -2.309, p = 0.0216 \)); this relationship, however, was even stronger for those with low ethnic identity affirmation (\( b = -1.61, SE = 0.257, t(319) = -6.264, p < 0.001 \)). As hypothesized, ethnic identity affirmation buffered the negative impact of perceived discrimination on self-esteem.
Finally, the sixth hierarchical regression examined the moderating role of ethnic identity affirmation, on perceived discrimination as a predictor of depression. As seen in Table 17, in Step 1, ethnic identity affirmation and discrimination accounted for 27.3% of the variance in depressive symptoms, $F(2, 319) = 59.963, p < .001$. A significant main effect was found for both ethnic identity affirmation ($\beta = -.203, p < .001$) and perceived discrimination ($\beta = .458, p < .01$). In Step 2, as hypothesized, the overall interaction effect of ethnic identity and perceived discrimination was significant and contributed 1.10% of the variance, which was a small effect size, $\Delta R^2 = .010; F(3, 318)= 41.979, t= -2.154, p < .05$.

The significant interaction was probed using PROCESS (Hayes, 2012) and graphed based on +/- 1 standard deviation from the mean (see Figure 6). The relation between perceived discrimination and depressive symptoms was positive for both groups;
however, discrimination was more strongly related to depressive symptoms for individuals with low ethnic identity affirmation ($b = .239$, $SE = .0239$, $t(319) = 9.991$, $p < .001$) than for those with high ethnic identity affirmation ($b = .155$, $SE = .036$, $t(319) = 4.220$, $p < .001$). The hypothesis was supported as ethnic identity affirmation buffered the negative effects of perceived discrimination on depressive symptoms.

**Figure 10. Ethnic Identity Affirmation as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Perceived Discrimination and Depressive Symptoms**
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine various contextual factors (i.e., family ethnic socialization, parenting style, perceived discrimination and generational status) and their association with ethnic identity or any of its’ components and to explore the potential role of ethnic identity or its components to promote psychological well-being by buffering the negative effects of discrimination. Results of the statistical analyses revealed that various associations exist between and among the variables under investigation. Results associated with each of the proposed research questions and hypotheses are discussed in this section.

Participants of this study were all of Arab or Middle Eastern descent living in the United States and registered at Wayne State University as part-time or full-time students. The majority were female (66.9%) living at home with their immediate family (85.9%). In terms of their generational status, most participants appear to be recent immigrants, with the majority (80%) reporting having one or no family member born in the United States. As for their country of origin, the overwhelming majority (54.5%) were Lebanese or Iraqis. The other 11 Arab countries were represented by 45.5% of the sample.

The first set of hypotheses (1, 1a, and 1b) examined how multiple contextual factors including family ethnic socialization, parenting styles, perceived discrimination, and generational status may influence ethnic identity development of male and female Arab American college students. Family ethnic socialization was found to be positively and significantly associated with ethnic identity. As predicted in hypothesis 1, participants who reported being taught about their culture, traditions, heritage, and
ethnicity also reported higher levels of ethnic identity. It seems that because parents fear that the connection to their group may weaken and lose its significance from one generation to the other, they try to expose their children to their heritage culture and history. They do so by transmitting messages that emphasize the positive aspects (pride, history, and traditions) rather than the negative aspects (issues of discrimination) of their group membership; in turn, such positive messages may increase adolescents’ affinity and sense of belonging toward their group (Rivas-Drake et al., 2009). Therefore, these socialization practices appear to be paramount for the development of a positive ethnic identity. In fact, family ethnic socialization explained 29.9% of the variance in ethnic identity.

These findings resonate with previous research that has confirmed that family ethnic socialization practices inform the process of ethnic identity development among children and adolescents of various ethnic groups including Mexicans (Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010), African Americans (Marshall, 1995), and among adopted Korean youth (D. C. Lee & Quintana, 2005). These results also add to the small body of research literature emphasizing that the family continues to play an influential role in the process of ethnic identity development in emerging adulthood.

When examining the components of ethnic identity, as expected in hypotheses 1a and 1b, family ethnic socialization was positively associated with ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation. Specifically, participants who reported that their families more often communicated to them about ethnic pride and cultural behaviors (e.g., eating ethnic food, reading books about the country of origin, participating in ethnic organizations) also reported having actively sought information about the meaning of
their ethnicity (exploration) and showed more pride (affirmation) in their ethnic background. It is not surprising that family ethnic socialization predicted both ethnic identity exploration (Joseph & Hunter, 2011; Juang & Syed, 2010; Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009) and ethnic identity affirmation (Hughes, Hagelskamp, et al., 2009; Hughes, Witherspoon, et al., 2009). By engaging in greater ethnic socialization, minority parents foster a heightened sense of curiosity about ethnic identity and an increased affinity towards one’s ethnic group.

When examining other aspects of parenting behaviors, as expected in hypotheses 1, 1a, and 1, authoritative parenting was associated with higher ethnic identity ($r=.51$), ethnic identity exploration ($r=.45$), and ethnic identity affirmation ($r=.50$). These findings are consistent with previous empirical work with adolescents of Chinese descent, which found that children who benefit from a warm, accepting and nurturing relationship with their parents show greater pride in their ethnicity (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992b). The authors explained the mechanism through which parenting practices may be related to a positive ethnic identity by suggesting that when parents provide a warm and autonomy-promoting environment (i.e., allowing children to negotiate, question, and present their viewpoints), their children will perceive them as positive role models. When children look up to their parents and regard them as their positive role models, they may be more eager to adopt and internalize their parents’ values and beliefs, including those related to ethnicity.

In addition, in line with the hypotheses and findings of the current study, previous research indicates that parenting practices may not only be related to greater ethnic identity affirmation (Davey et al., 2003; Okagaki & Moore, 2000; Rosenthal & Feldman,
1992b) but also to greater ethnic identity exploration. For instance, in a longitudinal study of a heterogeneous group of Latino adolescents, Umaña-Taylor and Guimond (2010) found that parental warmth and support, important dimensions of authoritative parenting, were positively associated with ethnic identity exploration. Drawing on Marcia’s ego identity theory (Marcia, 1966), the authors contended that by being supportive, parents are providing their adolescents with a secure base from which they can explore who they are in terms of their ethnicity. Similarly, Su and Costigan (2009) found that children whose parents are warm and supportive feel more confident in questioning, exploring, and discussing issues related to their ethnicity and develop a sense of affiliation for their cultural heritage.

Contrary to predictions (hypotheses 1, 1a, and 1b), however, a permissive parenting style was not associated with lower levels of ethnic identity, ethnic identity exploration, or ethnic identity affirmation. Perhaps a laissez-faire approach to parenting did not predict ethnic identity or any of its components because parents adopting such an approach make no demands on their children to participate in ethnic activities and to interact with members of their in-group. As such, ethnic identity may not be salient for their children. In fact, Davey and colleagues (2003) conducted a qualitative study to develop an understanding of the link between parenting practices and the transmission of ethnic identity among Jewish parents and adolescents. Based on their semistructured interviews of Jewish families, they found that lenient parents were the least effective in instilling cultural pride in their children as the latter were categorized in the unexamined stage of ethnic identity development. The researchers reported that lenient parents seldom discussed issues related to ethnicity and rarely encouraged their children to
participate in Jewish activities. Rather, the parents seemed to provide their children with the latitude to choose the activities they were interested in. These parents were described as adopting a more passive approach when communicating with their adolescents. The lower socialization practices received from parents may not be the only explanation for the lack of association between permissive parenting style and ethnic identity. It could also be that permissive parents set few rules or standards of behaviors for their children. Growing up, children learn to self-regulate their own behavior. Given the freedom to choose, children may focus on other aspects of their life that may be more salient for them such as career goals, occupational success, or dating.

In addition, contrary to expectations, authoritarian parenting was not correlated with lower ethnic identity, ethnic identity exploration, or ethnic identity affirmation. Rather, authoritarian parenting was positively, albeit weakly, associated with ethnic identity exploration ($r = .22$) and composite ethnic identity scores ($r = .16$). Specifically, participants who reported higher levels of authoritarian parenting also reported higher levels of ethnic identity and ethnic identity exploration. These findings are in contrast to those of Chen and Kuo (2000) who found that when parents employ coercive tactics to ensure adherence to ethnic values and expectations, children might rebel and not adopt positive feelings towards their group. Participants of this study did not seem to follow the same route. The inconsistency in the findings may be related to the focus on young adults in this study as compared to the younger children and early adolescents ranging in age from 5 to 13 sampled by Cheng and Kuo. Perhaps the young participants in Cheng and Kuo’s study lack the perspective-taking abilities that are paramount to comprehending why feelings of affiliation with one’s ethnic group as well as retention of
cultural values and traditions are important to parents. Emerging adults of this study may be more mature and better developmentally equipped to understand their parents’ point of view and, hence, may not perceive their parents’ cultural expectations or obligations as forceful pressures.

Lastly, Baumrind’s typology of authoritarian parenting may not fully capture the important features of the parenting practices of Arabs. It is important to note that authoritarian parenting is not interpreted in the same way in various cultures. Kağıtçibaşı (1996) argued that in collectivist cultures, children see strong parental control as normal and not necessarily as reflecting parental rejection, whereas in individualistic societies it is perceived as not normal and as such is associated with rejection on the part of the parents. Similarly, in other studies, Arab Americans were also found to view their authoritarian parenting style as “normal” and showed that they were even satisfied with it (Dwairy, 2004). Other studies have also shown that collectivist mothers endorsed authoritarian parenting more so than individualist mothers; however, collectivist children were not found to have a lower self-esteem (Rudy & Grusec, 2006). It could be that because collectivists tend to see authoritarian parenting as normative, such parenting style may not necessarily be associated with negative outcomes such as a negative ethnic identity.

Another contextual factor that was hypothesized to play an important function in the development of ethnic identity is the experience of discrimination. However, contrary to predictions in hypotheses 1 and 1a, perceived discrimination was not associated with higher levels of ethnic identity or ethnic identity exploration. In a previous study Awad (2010) found perceived discrimination to be positively related to
ethnic identity. Although the results of the present study contradict those of Awad’s, it should be noted that, in Awad’s study, participants’ ages ranged from 14 to 65, with a mean age of 29 years and a standard deviation of 10.5 years. It could be that older participants in her sample are more likely than college students to interact on a daily basis with a larger number of members of the dominant society; in turn, higher exposure to mainstream culture increases the opportunities for negative treatment and exclusion. To salvage their self-esteem from such negative experiences, participants in Awad’s study may have developed a stronger and more positive ethnic identity in reaction to threat that they were exposed to. In fact, participants in her study reported higher levels of perceived discrimination.

Another important distinction between the current study and Awad’s is the geographical context in which both studies were conducted which could have important implications for the influential role of perceived discrimination on ethnic identity development. Awad’s participants were recruited from various states including Ohio, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, New York, and New Jersey whereas participants of the present study were recruited from a university located in Detroit, a city in close proximity to Dearborn, home to one of the largest Arab American communities in the United States. As such, the geographical context in each of the studies is markedly different. Scholars suggest the salience of ethnic identity is largely dependent on the geographic context. Ethnic salience or awareness is a result of interaction with groups that are markedly different from one’s own. Because participants of the current study have been recruited from Detroit, it is plausible to assume that they have largely interacted with other Arabs; thus, ethnicity may be less salient for them than for
participants in Awad’s study. Additionally, the lower salience may minimize the relationship between discrimination and ethnic identity.

When examining ethnic identity affirmation, another component of ethnic identity, in relation to perceived discrimination results revealed that participants who reported higher levels of perceived discrimination reported less pride in their ethnic group membership. These results support hypothesis 1b that perceived discrimination would be associated with decreased affirmation. In an effort to protect their self-esteem, the social identity theory proposes that individuals may use one of two strategies to deal with the negative and discriminatory messages about their ethnic group. One strategy involves dismissing the negative information about their group and focusing on the positive characteristics of the group; another strategy entails disconnecting themselves from their group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Results indicate that participants of this study are using the latter. While it might be difficult to completely dissociate themselves from their in-group, young adults may be internalizing and adopting more negative feelings toward their in-group. These findings are consistent with previous studies that have documented a negative relationship between perceived discrimination and ethnic affirmation among Mexican-origin adolescents (Romero & Roberts, 2003), Latino adolescents (Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010), and a sample of Chinese-American youth (Juang & Nguyen, 2010). It is important to note, however, that perceived discrimination and ethnic identity affirmation were only weakly correlated ($r = -.13$) and when entered in a stepwise multiple linear regression analysis, perceived discrimination failed to predict ethnic identity affirmation. It is possible that the affinity towards one’s ethnic group is namely established at a younger age (Rotheram-Borus, Lightfoot, Moraes, Dopkins, & LaCour,
1998) and is, subsequently, influenced by developmental factors more pertinent to younger adolescents such as parent socialization practices.

When examining generational status, it was found to be negatively associated with ethnic identity; specifically, participants with higher levels of generational status reported lower levels of ethnic identity. However, contrary to expectations in hypothesis 1, when entered in the stepwise multiple regression, generational status was not found to be a significant predictor of ethnic identity. It is possible that the absence of this hypothesized relationship may be due to the lack of variability in the generational status of the participants of the current study. In fact, 45.9% of the participants reported that only one family member was born in the U.S. while 34.1% reported no family members being born in the U.S. This lack of variability may have masked the predictive power of generational status.

When examining the components of ethnic identity, as expected in hypotheses 1a and 1b, participants with lower generational status reported higher levels of ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation. Contrary to expectations, generational status was not found to be a significant predictor of either ethnic identity exploration or ethnic identity affirmation. Again, the limited variability in generational status may have concealed the predictive power of that variable. While contrary to expectation, Umaña-Taylor and colleague (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006) failed to find a significant relationship between generational status and family ethnic socialization, a relationship that has been consistently reported among various research groups, including her own (D. C. Lee & Quintana, 2005; O'Connor, Brooks-Gunn, & Graber, 2000; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Yoon, 2004), when participants’ generational status was
restricted to those who reported having only one family member being born in the U.S. or no family members being born in the U.S. It was suggested also that this consistent and firm relationship was not established or confirmed because of the lack of variability in the participants’ generational status.

The second set of hypotheses (2, 2a, and 2b) examined family ethnic socialization as a potential mediator of the relationship between generational and ethnic identity or any of its’ components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation). As predicted in hypothesis 2, when a composite ethnic identity score was examined, results revealed that family ethnic socialization fully mediated the relationship between generational status and ethnic identity. Specifically, lower generational status was associated with higher levels of family ethnic socialization; in turn, higher levels of ethnic socialization were associated with higher ethnic identity. As such, generational status played an important but indirect role in ethnic identity development via family ethnic socialization practices.

These findings echo other studies (Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004) that have found that new immigrant, compared to old immigrant, parents are more likely to socialize their children with regard to their ethnicity by providing them with information about their cultural heritage, visiting their country of origin, buying and reading books about their culture, speaking the native language at home, and eating ethnic food. In turn, children who are more strongly socialized by their families with respect to their ethnicity, report higher levels of ethnic identity. The results are also in line with Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1989), which proposes that distal factors, such as generational status in this study, may influence a
child’s development through their impact on more proximal factors, such as family ethnic socialization.

When examining the components of ethnic identity, as predicted in hypotheses 2a and 2b, family ethnic socialization was found to fully mediate the relation between generational status and each of the components of ethnic identity (exploration and affirmation). Consistent with a previous study (Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, et al., 2009), as participants indicated having fewer family members born in the U.S., they also indicated stronger socialization with respect to their ethnicity. In addition, young adults whose parents strongly socialized them with regard to their ethnicity were more likely to explore their ethnicity and feel proud of their ethnic and cultural heritage. Therefore, it is plausible to conclude that generational status creates some variability in family ethnic socialization practices which, in turn, influences adolescents’ ethnic identity. It seems that as parents become more acculturated and further removed from the immigration experience, their children’s exposure to their heritage culture will be restricted. This variability in family ethnic socialization practices may then differentially inform the process of ethnic identity development.

The third set of hypotheses (3, 3a, and 3b) examined whether gender moderates the relationship between family ethnic socialization practices and ethnic identity or any of its components. Contrary to predictions in hypotheses (3, 3a, and 3b) the link between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity (or any of its components) was not found to differ for males and females. This finding was unexpected given that the bulk of current research has found that the association between ethnic identity and family ethnic socialization is stronger for females compared to males (Hughes, Hagelskamp, et al.,
2009; Juang & Syed, 2010; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). It has been suggested that women are often perceived as the carriers of culture and are expected to impart their values as well as their traditions to future generations (Pegg & Plybon, 2005); as such, parents are likely to socialize their daughters more than their sons with respect to ethnicity. In turn, higher socialization practices observed among girls are likely to be strongly related to higher ethnic identity. However, this trend has not been observed among Arab American males and females of this study. One possible explanation for the inconsistency between the findings of this study and other studies is that participants of the current study are relatively new immigrants, as reported by their generational status. It could be that for the new immigrant parents imparting a positive sense of ethnic identity is important regardless of their children’s gender. In fact, the majority of the participants (males and females) reported being highly socialized by their parents about their ethnicity. More research is needed to examine whether such trend continues to exist with later generations.

The fourth set of hypotheses explored the relationship among ethnic identity and its’ components, perceived discrimination, and psychological well-being. As predicted in hypothesis 4, ethnic identity composite scores were positively associated with self-esteem and negatively associated with depressive symptoms. Specifically, participants who reported higher ethnic identity also reported higher self-esteem and lower depressive symptoms. These findings add to the existing empirical studies that have consistently reported a significant association between ethnic identity and psychological well-being among both adolescents (Bracey et al., 2004; Farver et al., 2007; Roberts et al., 1999; Umaña-Taylor, 2004) and young adults (Gong, 2007; Juang, Nguyen, & Lin, 2006; R. M.
Lee, 2003; Umaña-Taylor & Shin, 2007). The mechanism through which ethnic identity may be associated with self-esteem has been explained by the social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), which posits that individuals are intrinsically motivated to develop a positive social identity. To accomplish this task, they adopt positive views of their ethnic group. The emotional attachment and the feelings of belongingness to the ethnic group, in turn, enhance their self-esteem.

With respect to the exploration subscale, as expected in hypothesis 4a, it was found that exploration was positively associated with self-esteem and negatively associated with depressive symptoms. As participants reported higher ethnic exploration, they also reported higher self-esteem and fewer depressive symptoms. These findings add to the existing body of literature in which ethnic exploration was associated with self-esteem among European American, African American, and Latino college students (Umaña-Taylor & Shin, 2007) as well as among Latino adolescents (Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007). Therefore, it seems that adolescents and young adults who explore issues related to their ethnicity may be more confident and possess the resources and the tools with which to tackle problems or concerns related to ethnicity in comparison to those who have not explored their ethnicity (Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007). As such, ethnic identity exploration may be an important protective resource for ethnic minority youth (Phinney, 2003).

With respect to the affirmation subscale, as predicted in hypothesis 4b, ethnic identity affirmation was significantly and positively correlated with self-esteem and negatively correlated with depressive symptoms. While few studies have examined the components of ethnic identity in relation to psychological health, this finding is in line
with Umaña-Taylor and colleagues’ research group who found that ethnic identity affirmation was positively associated with self-esteem among high school students from various ethnic groups (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004) and among African-American college students (Umaña-Taylor & Shin, 2007). Other studies have also found a positive relationship between ethnic identity affirmation and other indices of psychological adjustment including less drug use (Marsiglia, Kulis, & Hecht, 2001; Marsiglia, Kulis, Hecht, & Sills, 2004), fewer sexual behaviors (Wills et al., 2007), fewer behavioral problems, and more positive school attitudes (Resnicow et al., 1999).

Finally, when examining perceived discrimination in relation to psychological well-being, participants of the current study did not seem to be immune to discrimination or its negative outcomes. Consistent with the predictions in hypothesis 4c, perceived discrimination was associated with lower levels of self-esteem and higher levels of depressive symptoms. These findings echo other cross-sectional studies that have consistently found that perceived discrimination is associated with detrimental psychological outcomes including lower self-esteem (Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000; Nyborg & Curry, 2003; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Szalacha et al., 2003; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007), higher depressive symptoms (Nyborg & Curry, 2003; Szalacha et al., 2003; Tynes et al., 2012; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007), psychological distress (Bynum et al., 2007; Sellers et al., 2006), lower levels of life satisfaction (Giamo, Schmitt, & Outten, 2012), as well as lower academic achievement and academic curiosity (Alfaro et al., 2009; Neblett et al., 2006).

These findings are in line with the social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) which suggests that experiences of discrimination, where individuals receive messages of
devaluation about their group, may lead to negative self-perceptions; in turn, these negative self-conceptions undermine psychological health. In a similar vein, the social interactionist theory (Cooley, 1902) proposes that experiences of prejudice may adversely influence minority youths’ self-esteem since these negative and derogatory messages are usually internalized in their self-concepts. Because of the consistent association between perceive discrimination and negative outcomes, it is possible to assume that perceived discrimination may be a risk factor contributing to the poor psychological health of ethnic minority groups.

The fifth set of hypotheses examined the potential role of ethnic identity and of its’ components in mitigating the negative influence of perceived discrimination on self-esteem and depressive symptoms. As predicted in hypotheses 5 and 5b, ethnic identity and ethnic identity affirmation moderated the relation between perceived discrimination and the two indices of psychological adjustment (self-esteem and depressive symptoms). Specifically, the deleterious consequences of perceived discrimination on participants’ self-esteem and depressive symptoms were significantly minimized for those who endorsed higher levels of ethnic identity and ethnic identity affirmation compared to those who endorsed lower levels of ethnic identity and ethnic identity affirmation.

The social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) provides a plausible explanation for why ethnic identity or ethnic affirmation might serve as mechanisms that protect youth in the context of discrimination. According to this theory, adolescents and young adults may evaluate and treat their group more favorably than the out-group in the face of stigmatization. Such strategy helps them bolster their self-esteem, which in turn, counteracts the negative consequences of prejudice. Previous empirical research studies
also provide support for the protective function of ethnic identity and/or ethnic identity affirmation among various ethnic groups including African Americans (Sellers et al., 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Tynes et al., 2012), Mexican Americans (Romero & Roberts, 2003; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2011), Chinese Americans (Yip & Fulgni, 2002), Korean Americans (R. M. Lee, 2005), and Filippino Americans (Mossakowski, 2003). It is possible that those who develop a stronger affiliation to their group may deflate, disregard, and not internalize the negative messages they receive with regard to their ethnicity and as such protect their well-being (Mandara et al., 2009; Sellers et al., 2006; Tynes et al., 2012).

However, contrary to predictions in hypothesis 5a, ethnic identity exploration moderated the relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological well-being. Specifically, for participants with higher levels of ethnic identity exploration, perceived discrimination was associated with smaller increases in depressive symptoms and smaller decreases in self-esteem. These results suggest that ethnic identity exploration acts as a protective factor given that those with lower ethnic exploration are at a higher risk for the negative effects of discrimination. This finding was unexpected given that results of various studies reveal that ethnic identity exploration exacerbates the negative effects of discrimination on mental health (Greene et al., 2006; Torres & Ong, 2010; Torres, Yznaga, & Moore, 2011). Prior research suggests that during the process of exploration, individuals are more likely to perceive and interpret events as discriminatory (Syed & Azmitia, 2009), which may worsen the psychological effects associated with these stressful experiences. On the other hand, individuals who develop a sense of pride in their ethnicity may dismiss these negative messages as the latter have
committed to their ethnicity and, thus, have a larger repertoire of social networks and cultural resources (Torres & Ong, 2010). The inconsistency in the findings between prior research and the current study may be due to the context in which the present study was conducted. The Metro-Detroit area is home to a large number of Arab Americans, as such participants may have a larger opportunity to be submerged in the Arab as well as the American culture. Researching, questioning, and learning about the meaning of one’s ethnicity may be less threatening in an area known for its cultural diversity and where access to cultural resources is available.

In sum, the results of this study suggest that ethnic identity and all its’ components may serve as important safeguards against stressful experiences among Arab American college students living in the Detroit area. However, while being protected from the deleterious impact of discrimination, participants reporting higher levels of ethnic identity (or its components) were not immune to these aversive experiences as they showed some increases in depressive symptoms and decreases in self-esteem. Therefore, a strong sense of ethnic identity helps abate rather than eliminate these negative psychological effects.

**Limitations**

This study contributed immensely to the understanding of ethnic identity among Arab Americans living in the Detroit area. However, there are a number of limitations to be noted. First, the cross-sectional nature of the data limits the ability to draw firm conclusions about the direction of the relations found since cause and effect relationships cannot be determined. An important next step would be to conduct longitudinal studies to discern the directionality of the associations among ethnic socialization, parenting
practices, perceived discrimination, generational status, and psychological well-being.

A second limitation of the present investigation is that it focused on a heterogeneous Arab population, which comprised young adults from various Arab countries including Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Algeria, Kuwait, Comoros Islands, and United Arab Emirates. The largest groups were the Lebanese followed by the Iraqis, and Yemenis. The sample size of each group, however, was too small to allow data analysis by country of origin. Therefore, results should be generalized with caution. Future research studies should try to avoid homogenizing this ethnic group and examine whether differences exist across the multiple ethnic subgroups based on the country of origin.

Another limitation of the current study is the reliance on a convenience sample recruited from a university in Detroit, an area in close proximity to Dearborn: home of many Arab Americans. As such, results of this study may not generalize to other age groups or others not attending college. In addition, given that participants were all recruited from Detroit, it is unclear to what extent the sample is representative of young adults living in other regions of the United States. Future studies should focus on a more geographically and socio-demographically diverse sample. In addition, only a self-selecting college student sample was utilized; it could be that those who participated in the study were the ones whose ethnicity is an important aspect of their identity, and therefore, have a higher ethnic identity, which may have resulted in a low variability in the levels of ethnic identity observed in this study.

Finally, the online nature of this study may be considered a limitation. Because of the anonymous nature of most web surveys, it could be that the same participants may
have submitted their answers multiple times or participated in the study without meeting
the eligibility criteria, one of which is being an Arab American, for the purpose of
earning a gift card. It could be argued, however, that this is not a very serious
shortcoming of the present study, since multiple methods were used to eliminate
ineligible participants and to limit surveys to one response per computer. Furthermore,
online-surveys have two potential risks: “harm resulting from direct participation in the
research (e.g., emotional reactions to questions or experimental manipulations) and harm
resulting from breach of confidentiality” (Kraut et al., 2004, p. 111). However, Kraut and
colleagues suggest that web surveys are not any riskier than other forms of surveys. They
argue that web surveys are relatively less risky because they provide participants with the
latitude to withdraw at any point in time if they experience discomfort or stress. The
ability to quit is an important benefit when compared to face-to-face interview studies.
Both concerns of Kraut and colleagues were addressed in this study as participants were
provided with the option of discontinuing the survey at any time by exiting the Web
browser. In addition, no personal identification information was collected; rather, upon
completion of the survey, respondents received a confirmation number on their closing
sheet, which was the month, date, year, and time (hour and minute) that they completed the
survey. The confirmation number was then submitted to the principal investigator to
redeem the gift card.

**Future Research Directions**

The research on ethnic identity among Arab Americans is still in its infancy stage
and merits further study. While the current study examined ethnic identity among young
adults, it is not clear to what extent results can be generalized to children or adolescents.
Future studies should examine a wide range of age groups especially since reports indicate that 40% of Arab American adolescents suffer from depression (Bouffard, 2004). Identifying effective coping mechanisms and protective resources (such as ethnic identity) may inform prevention and interventions programs designed to advance the psychological health of Arab American children. Similar to global identity formation, ethnic identity is a process that is revisited throughout the lifespan; as such, it is important to examine how the salience of ethnic identity changes over time (Phinney, 1996b; Umaña-Taylor, 2011). Longitudinal research work tracking changes across the life span as well as qualitative studies examining the relevance of ethnic identity for various age groups may aid in clarifying these issues (Phinney & Ong, 2007).

In addition to exploring ethnic identity across the different stages of life span development, future research should aim at recruiting and focusing on participants from different generational statuses. In the present study, participants were predominantly first generation Americans of Arab descent; this lack of variability may have masked the power of generational status to predict ethnic identity. It is argued that over generations, the meaning of one’s ethnic group membership is likely to shift and that ethnic affiliation and belonging to one’s group diminishes as an individual is further removed from the immigration experience (Cameron & Lalonde, 1994). As such, it is important to examine the fluctuation of ethnic identity through a generational lens.

Furthermore, an important consideration for future studies is the examination of the geographical locations in which individuals live and the community ethnic concentration in relation to ethnic identity. Participants of the present study who were recruited from Detroit, a large metropolitan city in which Arab Americans are a visible
minority, may encounter fewer and different stressors when compared to those who live in other regions of the United States. It is plausible that young adults who are strongly attached to their ethnic group but whose ethnic group is stigmatized and not well represented in their neighborhoods may perhaps show lower psychological well-being because of the mismatch between their identity and environment (Umaña-Taylor, 2011). As such, examination of Arab American’s ethnic identity in various geographical locations is warranted.

Finally, the present study examined self-esteem and depressive symptoms as indices of psychological well-being. However, since females are more likely to exhibit internalizing problems and males are likely to exhibit externalizing problems, it is important for future studies to examine various indices of psychological adjustment including those that would focus on externalizing behaviors.

**Clinical Implications**

Findings of the present study indicate that ethnic identity is an indicator of psychological well-being among Arab American young adults. These results expand previous research showing that individuals who explore who they are in terms of their ethnicity and feel positively about their ethnic group membership report higher levels of self-esteem and level of adjustment (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2007; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2002; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007; Yip & Cross, 2004). In addition, consistent with the findings of this study, other research studies indicate that ethnic identity protects adolescents’ and young adults’ self-esteem by minimizing the negative effects of risk, namely in the context of discrimination. As such, ethnic identity could be regarded as an anchor point in promoting adjustment and minimizing stress associated with ethnic
discrimination. These findings have important implications for psychologists, counselors, and researchers alike.

Ethnic identity could be included in prevention and intervention programs aimed at improving the psychological adjustment of ethnic minorities. Specifically, adolescents and young adults should be encouraged to examine their cultural values and practices, seek information about their ethnic group, and increase their sense of attachment to their group (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2007; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2002; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007). The few studies that have examined the role of ethnic identity in prevention programs have found that, indeed, these programs are effective. For instance, with a sample of African American adolescents, Ghee, Walker, and Younger (1997) found that an after-school program aimed at disseminating knowledge about the African culture and promoting cultural identity helped increase participants’ self-esteem.

In addition, given that the family plays a central role in the Arab culture, including the parents in these preventions programs is paramount. In fact, the present study along with previous research indicates that family ethnic socialization or parents’ efforts to teach their kids about their ethnicity is related to a positive ethnic identity. One way for including parents could be through educating them about effective ways to communicate with their children about ethnicity. For instance, celebrating ethnic holidays and reading books about cultural heritage, traditions, and history open a venue for parents to openly discuss issues related to ethnicity and help clarify the meaning of one’s ethnicity (Toomey & Umaña-Taylor, 2012).

Finally, colleges and universities can also promote a positive sense of self-identify by supporting various ethnic student clubs and encouraging students to be actively
involved in such associations. These clubs may provide a place for young adults to connect with other individuals who share similar cultural values or experiences, engage in an informal exchange of views about the salience of ethnicity, discuss current issues and concerns, socialize, plan social events to celebrate ethnic holidays on campus, and learn from each other new information about ethnic heritage.
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Educational Psychology
313-268-0164

Purpose
You are being asked to participate in a research study designed to examine factors that may influence Arab and Arab Americans’ understanding of who they are with regard to their ethnicity and to explore how varying degrees of affiliation with the American or Arab cultures are related to well-being. You are being asked to participate because you are a graduate or undergraduate Wayne State University student, of Arab or Middle Eastern descent and between the ages of 18 and 25. This study is being conducted at Wayne State University via use of SurveyMonkey, an internet data collection website.

Study Procedures
If you agree to take part in this online research study, you will be asked to answer demographic questions about yourself such as age, gender, ethnicity, generational status, educational status and about your parents’ place of birth, ethnicity, educational status, occupations, and marital status. You will also be asked to complete 6 questionnaires that address: 1) the extent to which your parents have provided you with information about your culture and exposed you to cultural practices and objects; 2) your current perceptions of your parents’ style of communication and interaction; 3) your exposure to or perceptions of ethnic discrimination; 4) your sense of belonging and attachment to your ethnic group; 5) your sense of self-worth; 6) and your current mood. The total time to complete all these questions is 20 to 25 minutes.

All responses from questionnaires will be completely anonymous. Please note that for each question, you will be asked to click on the answer that best describes you. If you wish not to respond, you may skip answering the question by clicking the “skip” box.

Benefits
As a participant in this research study, there will be no direct benefit for you; however, information from this study may benefit other people now or in the future.

Risks
By taking part in this study, you may experience minimal feelings of discomfort including: increased thoughts about past parent-child relationships, past discriminatory experiences, and current mood as well as thoughts regarding your self-worth and self-acceptance.
Costs
There will be no costs to you for participation in this research study.

Compensation
Upon completion of this survey, you will receive a code number on your Closing Information Sheet. You can print out the code number and redeem a $10.00 Starbucks or Subway gift card. The dates, place, and times when gift cards can be picked up will be announced on the Educational Psychology website. Data collection will continue until at least 150 student responses are collected.

Confidentiality:
You will be identified in the research records by a code name or number. There will be no list that links your identity with this code. You will use this code to redeem your gift card.

Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal:
Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part in this study. If you decide to participate, you may change your mind at any time and withdraw from the study. You are free to not answer any questions or withdraw at any time. Your decision will not change any present or future relationships with Wayne State University or its affiliates.

Questions:
If you have any questions about this study now or in the future, you may contact Rand Fakih at the following phone number (313) 268-0164. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Human Investigation Committee can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call (313) 577-1628 to ask questions or voice concerns or complaints.

Participation:
By clicking the “Yes” Box, you are indicating that you have been given the appropriate information and that you are agreeing to participate in the study.
APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Below you will find questions about yourself and your background. For each of the questions, please select the answer that best describes you.

1. Of the suggested list, select the answer choice that best describes your ethnicity
   - Arab or Arab American
   - Black of African American
   - American Indian or Native American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Asian or Asian American
   - Anglo- or European American
   - Other, please specify __________________

2. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

3. What is your age?
   - 18
   - 19
   - 20
   - 21
   - 22
   - 23
   - 24
   - 25

4. What is your current educational status?
   - Part-time student
   - Full-time student

5. What is your employment status?
   - Unemployed but not looking for a job
   - Unemployed but looking for a job
   - Working part-time
   - Working full-time

6. What is your religion?
   - Muslim
   - Christian
   - Druze
   - Other: ________________
   - Decline to answer
7. What country were you born in? _______________________
   o If you were not born in the U.S., how old were you when you came to the U.S.?
     i) Age: _____________

8. People think of themselves in different ways. Think about the specific ethnic group(s) you are a member of. Examples include: Latino, Native American, Asian American, etc. In your own words, what is your ethnic background? ________________________________

9. What is your country of origin? (the country of birth of the first non-US born family member)
   o Algeria
   o Bahrain
   o Comoros Islands
   o Djibouti
   o Egypt
   o Iraq
   o Jordan
   o Kuwait
   o Lebanon
   o Libya
   o Mauritania
   o Morocco
   o Oman
   o Palestine
   o Qatar
   o Saudi Arabia
   o Somalia
   o Sudan
   o Syria
   o Tunisia
   o United Arab Emirates
   o Yemen
   o Other: _____________

10. Are you?
    o A U.S. Citizen
    o A Permanent Resident (Green card holder)
    o A Temporary Visa holder (e.g. student visa, etc.)
    o A Refugee/asylum status holder
    o Decline to answer
11. What language do you speak mostly at home?
   - Only English
   - Mostly English
   - English and Arabic equally
   - Mostly Arabic
   - Only Arabic
   - Other, please specify ________________

12. Are you a member of cultural organizations or social groups (e.g., Arab American Student Association, Egyptian Student Association) that include mostly members of your ethnicity?
   - Yes.
     i) If yes, please name this group ________________
   - No

13. What is your current living situation?
   - Living with both parents
   - Living with a single parent
   - Living with extended family members (e.g., grandparents, uncles, etc.)
   - Living alone
   - Living with a partner
   - Living with a roommate

The next set of questions will ask you about your mother’s background information:

14. What is your mother’s racial/ethnic background?
   - Arab or Arab American
   - Black of African American
   - American Indian or Native American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Asian or Asian American
   - Anglo- or European American
   - Other, please specify ________________

15. In what country was your mother born?
   - United States
   - Another country, please specify ________________

16. In what country was your maternal grandmother (i.e., your mother’s mother) born?
   - United States
   - Another country, please specify ________________

17. In what country was your maternal grandfather (i.e., your mother’s father) born?
   - United States
   - Another country, please specify ________________
18. What is your mother’s occupation? (e.g., accountant, teacher, etc.). Please specify: 

19. What is your mother’s highest level of education?
   - Elementary school
   - High School
   - A 2 year degree (Associate degree or technical school degree)
   - A college degree (B.A. or B.S.)
   - A master’s degree
   - A doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., M.D., J.D.)

The next set of questions will ask you about your father’s background information:

20. What is your father’s racial/ethnic background?
   - Arab or Arab American
   - Black of African American
   - American Indian or Native American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Asian or Asian American
   - Anglo- or European American
   - Other, please specify ________________

21. In what country was your father born?
   - United States
   - Another country, please specify ________________

22. In what country was your paternal grandmother (i.e., your father’s mother) born?
   - United States
   - Another country, please specify ________________

23. In what country was your paternal grandfather (i.e., your father’s father) born?
   - United States
   - Another country, please specify ________________

24. What is your father’s occupation? (e.g., accountant, teacher, etc.). Please specify: 

25. What is your father’s highest level of education?
   - Elementary school
   - High School
   - A 2 year degree (Associate degree or technical school degree)
   - A college degree (B.A. or B.S.)
   - A master’s degree
   - A doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., M.D., J.D.)
26. What is your parents’ marital status?
   o Married
   o Divorced.
   o Separated
   o Widowed

27. If your parents are divorced, did you live mostly with
   o your mother?
   o your father?
   o Other: ___________________

28. Thinking of your neighborhood you grew up in, which statement is the most accurate description of that neighborhood?
   o Almost everyone was from an ethnic group different than mine.
   o Most people were from an ethnic group different than mine.
   o There was an equal number of people from my ethnic group and other groups.
   o Most people were from the same ethnic group than mine
   o Almost all people were from the same ethnic group than mine.

29. How often have you visited an Arab country?
   o Never
   o Once or twice in my life
   o Three to six times in my life
   o On a regular basis (every year, or every other year).
APPENDIX E: MEASURES

FESM - (Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004)

The following questions will ask you about the family you live with (biological family, step-parents, etc.). Please rate (between 1 and 5) how much you agree with each of the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= not at all true</th>
<th>3= Somewhat true</th>
<th>5= very much true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My family teaches me about my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My family encourages me to respect the cultural values and beliefs of our ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My family participates in activities that are specific to my ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our home is decorated with things that reflect my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The people who my family hangs out with the most are the people who share the same ethnic background as my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My family teaches me about the values and beliefs of our ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My family talks about how important it is to know about my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My family celebrates holidays that are specific to my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My family teaches me about the history of my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My family listens to music sung or played by artists from my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My family attends things such as concerts, plays, festivals, or other events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that represent my ethnic/cultural background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. My family feels a strong attachment to our ethnic/cultural background.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**PAQ (Buri, 1991)**

For each of the following statements, choose the number on the 5-point scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree) that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your parents. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your parents. There are no right or wrong answers, so don’t spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2= Disagree</th>
<th>3= Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4= Agree</th>
<th>5= Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. While I was growing up, my parents felt that in a well run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Even if the children didn’t agree with them, my parents felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what they thought was right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whenever my parents told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my parents discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My parents have always encouraged verbal give-and take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My parents have always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. As I was growing up, my parents did not allow me to question any decision that they had made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. As I was growing up, my parents directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2= Disagree</td>
<td>3= Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>4= Agree</td>
<td>5= Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My parents have always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. As I was growing up, my parents did <strong>not</strong> feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. As I was growing up, I knew what my parents expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my parents when I felt that they were unreasonable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My parents felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. As I was growing up, my parents seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Most of the time as I was growing up, my parents did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. As the children in my family were growing up, my parents consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. As I was growing up, my parents would get very upset if I tried to disagree with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My parents feel that most problems in society would be solved if parents would <strong>not</strong> restrict their children’s activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. As I was growing up, my parents let me know what behavior they expected of me, and if I didn’t meet those expectations, they punished me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. As I was growing up, my parents allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. As I was growing up, my parents took the children’s opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but they would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My parents did not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My parents had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but they were willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My parents gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and they expected me to follow their directions, but they were always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. As I was growing up, my parents allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and they generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My parents have always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don’t do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. As I was growing up, my parents often told me exactly what they wanted me to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. As I was growing up, my parents gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but they were also understanding when I disagreed with them.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. As I was growing up, my parents did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. As I was growing up, I knew what my parents expected of me in the family and they insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for their authority.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. As I was growing up, if my parents made a decision in the family that hurt me, they were willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if they had made a mistake.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Roberts et al., 1999)

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of the ethnic groups are Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, Native American, Irish-American, and White. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please check the number that best indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (4= strongly agree; 3= agree; 2=disagree; 1= strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Respond to each statement by clicking on the number to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1= strongly disagree</th>
<th>2= disagree</th>
<th>3= agree</th>
<th>4= strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At times, I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CES-D: (Radloff, 1977)**

Using the scale below, click on the number which best describes how often you felt or behaved this way **DURING THE PAST WEEK**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NONE or Rarely</th>
<th>SOME or A little</th>
<th>OCCASIONALLY</th>
<th>MOST or All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with the help from family and friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I felt depressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I felt hopeful about the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I thought my life had been a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I felt fearful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My sleep was restless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I was happy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I talked less than usual.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I felt lonely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People were unfriendly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONE or Rarely</td>
<td>SOME or A little</td>
<td>OCCASIONALLY</td>
<td>MOST or All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I enjoyed life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I had crying spells.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I felt sad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I felt that people disliked me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I could not get “going.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ) (Contrada et al., 2001)**

We would like to know about acts of discrimination that have been directed against or toward you personally. Please respond by checking the number that best describes how often the event occurred using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BECAUSE OF YOUR ETHNICITY/RACE....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>How often have you been subjected to offensive ethnic comments aimed directly at you, spoken either in your presence or behind your back?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How often have you been exposed to offensive comments about your ethnic group (e.g., stereotypic statements, offensive jokes), spoken either in your presence or behind your back?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How often have you been subjected to ethnic name calling or racial slurs (e.g., terrorist, foreigner)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How often have others avoided physical contact with you because of your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How often have others avoided social contact with you because of your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>How often have others outside of your ethnic group made you feel as though you don’t fit in because of your dress, speech, or other characteristics related to your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How often had others had low expectations of you because of your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be unintelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How often had it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be dishonest?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be violent and dangerous?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>some times</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How often has it been implied or suggested that because of your ethnicity you must be lazy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How often have others threatened to hurt you because of your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How often have others threatened to damage your property because of your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How often have others physically hurt you or intended to physically hurt you because of your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How often have others damaged your property because of your ethnicity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How often have you been subjected to nonverbal harassment because of your ethnicity (e.g., being framed/set up, being given the “finger”)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

ETHNIC IDENTITY AMONG ARAB AMERICANS: AN EXAMINATION OF CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING
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Existing theories and research have indicated that ethnic identity is crucial for ethnic minority young adults because ethnicity is an important component of their personal identity that is likely to influence various aspects of their development. Given the centrality of this construct, the overarching aim of the present study was to examine ethnic identity and psychological well-being among members of an ethnic group that have long been ignored in the psychological literature: Arab Americans.

Specifically, the goals of the study were threefold. The first goal was to examine the association between multiple contextual factors (such as students’ perceptions of their parents’ style of parenting, family ethnic socialization, perceived discrimination, and generational status) and ethnic identity or its’ two components (ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity affirmation). The second goal was to explore the potential role of ethnic identity or its’ components to promote psychological adjustment and well-being: self-esteem and depressive symptoms are indices of psychological functioning that were examined in the study. The final goal of the study was to examine whether ethnic
identity, or its' components, can serve as a protective factor, mitigating the negative effects of discrimination on psychological well-being.

Participants (N= 323) were recruited from Wayne State University (WSU) campus and were assessed using a package of 7 batteries: Demographic Questionnaire, Familial Ethnic Socialization Measure (FESM), Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ), Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), and Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D Scale).

Pearson correlation analyses revealed that higher family ethnic socialization, authoritative parenting and lower generational status were all significantly associated with higher ethnic identity, ethnic identity, exploration and ethnic identity affirmation. Further mediation analyses revealed that the relation between generational status and ethnic identity was fully mediated by family ethnic socialization. With respect to gender differences, results revealed that the strength of the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity did not differ for males and females.

As for the relation between ethnic identity (or its components), perceived discrimination, and psychological well-being, results from the correlational analyses revealed that higher ethnic identity, ethnic identity exploration, and ethnic identity affirmation were associated with higher self-esteem and lower depressive symptoms whereas perceived discrimination was associated with lower self-esteem and higher depressive symptoms. Finally, with respect to the potential protective roles of ethnic identity, ethnic identity exploration, and ethnic identity affirmation, hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that ethnic identity (and its components) moderated the
relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological well-being. Specifically, perceived ethnic discrimination was negatively associated with self-esteem among participants with high ethnic identity; however, this relationship was even stronger among participants with low ethnic identity. Similarly, perceived ethnic discrimination was positively associated with depressive symptoms among participants with high ethnic identity; however, this relationship was even stronger among participants with low ethnic identity.

Findings suggest that ethnic discrimination takes a toll on Arab American young adults, but, for this population, having a salient ethnic identity may have profound mental health benefits as ethnic identity may serve as valuable resource to help them deal with negative discriminatory experiences.
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