

NAVIGATING MULTIPLE CULTURAL WORLDS:  
EXPLORING THE PROCESSES AND CONTEXTS  
OF BEING DIFFERENTIALLY MARKED

A dissertation

submitted by

Elizabeth S. Pufall Jones

In partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Child Development

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Date

May 2011

ADVISER: Jayanthi Mistry

**Abstract**

In this dissertation I examine how the sociohistoric background and lived experiences of individuals from multicultural backgrounds influence the strategies that they develop to navigate their multiple cultural worlds. As such, I explore how contextual and community circumstances, in particular the experience of being differentially marked, influence the salience of racial, ethnic and cultural difference to an individual. Further, I examine how cultural conflict and affiliation mediate feelings of difference, the strategies that individuals develop to navigate and negotiate their multiple cultural worlds, and their self-identification. Personal narratives were elicited through semi-structured interviews from 25 self-identified African American and 19 self-identified mixed ethnicity youth (18-22 years of age), focusing on their life experiences as multi cultural individuals. Interviews were coded and then analyzed using mixed methods of analysis. Results indicate relationships among diversity of the participant's community of practice, level of perceived conflict and navigational strategies, as well as among basis of differential marking, level of perceived conflict and feelings of otherness. Results support the assumption that identification is not a static outcome built through static stages, rather, it is a process that is shaped by contextual circumstances.

### Acknowledgements

- I am indebted to my dissertation committee for all of their comments, constructive criticism and constant support: Jayanthi Mistry, Calvin Gidney, Keith Maddox, and Christopher Lalonde
- To Jayanthi Mistry, for giving me the opportunity to do this research and sticking with me as my adviser for six years (I know it wasn't always easy)
- To the Tufts University Academic Resource Center, and Nicole Flynn, thank you so much for organizing the summer and winter Dissertation Writing Retreats, without them this would not have come to fruition
- To my Tuesday writing group, Jessica Greenstone and Surina Basho, ladies, thank you for the company, you will be done sooner than you think
- To the many wonderful friends that I made in Eliot Pearson over the course of these past six years, in particular Claudia Miranda Jullian, Cynthia Davis, Clement Chau, TJ Trochlil McGreevy, and Mary Eisenberg
- To my family who constantly sets the bar higher and inspires me to attain that bar; I love you mom, dad, Teresa, Miles, Matthew, David and all of your many appendages
- To my very helpful kitty Agnes, who embarked on this journey with me six years ago and never failed to lend her support in her own special way.
- And, without a doubt, I must thank my husband, Ted Jones, for single-handedly rebuilding our 120 year old home while putting up with my many moods and tantrums, late night dinners, boring weekends, and general ennui for the past five years. You are truly my savior and I love you for it.

**Table of Contents**

**ABSTRACT** ..... **ii**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**..... **iii**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**..... **iv**

**LIST OF TABLES**..... **vii**

**INTRODUCTION** ..... **1**

**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**..... **7**

    MINORITY STATUS IN THE UNITED STATES: THE MEANING OF RACE, ETHNICITY, CULTURE AND  
IDENTITY ..... 8

    CRITICAL RACE THEORY AND THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF RACE, ETHNICITY, CULTURE AND  
IDENTITY ..... 15

*Defining the cultural context of race: interest convergence, racial realism, revisionist  
history, material determinism, and race as property.* ..... 16

*Critical Race Theory and identity.*..... 22

            Contextual effects on racial salience and identity.....30

            Differential marking as an outgrowth of the social construction of race.....37

    THE DIALOGIC SELF..... 46

    THE PROCESS OF CONSTRUCTING IDENTITY IN THE UNITED STATES..... 49

    RESEARCH METHODS THAT SUPPORT THE STUDY OF THE DIALOGIC SELF ..... 55

*A phenomenological perspective.* ..... 56

*Narratives and ethnic identity.* ..... 59

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**..... **62**

**METHODS** ..... **65**

    INTRODUCTION ..... 65

    PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT ..... 66

    DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE..... 69

CODING AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CODING SCHEME ..... 70

*Unpacking coding related to race, ethnicity, and culture.* ..... 72

**ANALYSIS AND RESULTS ..... 79**

    PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF CORE CONSTRUCTS ..... 80

*Basis of differential marking.* ..... 82

*Psychological experience of otherness.* ..... 83

*Diversity of community.* ..... 84

*Perceived cultural conflict.* ..... 87

*Transforming the data for quantitative analysis.*..... 90

    RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CORE CONSTRUCTS: EXPLORATORY CONFIGURAL FREQUENCY

    ANALYSIS..... 91

*Revised categorical variables.*..... 93

            Basis of Differential Marking and the group variable.....93

            Otherness redefined.....96

            Extent of perceived cultural conflict. ....97

*Pattern of relationships among being differentially marked, perceived cultural conflict and the experience of otherness.* .....101

*Diversity of context and navigating/negotiating differences.* .....102

            Relationship between navigation and negotiation. ....105

            Relationship between the diversity of the primary community of practice and the level of negotiation and navigation.....106

            Relationship between perceived level of conflict or otherness and navigation and negotiation....109

    INTEGRATION OF FINDINGS ACROSS MIXED METHODS .....110

*Experiencing a diverse community of practice, high levels of perceived conflict, and high levels of navigation.* .....111

*Experiencing a cultural basis of differential marking, high levels of perceived conflict, and a marked feeling of otherness.*.....116

**DISCUSSION .....122**

DESCRIBING THE COMMUNITY OF PARTICIPATION ..... 122

CREATING A SENSE OF PLACE THROUGH DISPLACEMENT: APPRAISING THE SITUATION ..... 124

CULTURE AS A SOURCE OF DIFFERENTIAL MARKING ..... 128

LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH ..... 130

**REFERENCES ..... 134**

**APPENDICES ..... 144**

APPENDIX A ..... 144

APPENDIX B ..... 146

APPENDIX C ..... 153

CODING SCHEME USED IN THE ANALYSIS WITH EXPLANATION FOR CODES. .... 153

**List of Tables**

Table 1	
<i>Revised/Final Coding Scheme for the Relationships within the Individual Context.....</i>	<i>77</i>
Table 2	
<i>Code Frequencies for N=44 Subjects.....</i>	<i>82</i>
Table 3	
<i>Initial Categorical Variables Used for Quantitative Analysis.....</i>	<i>90</i>
Table 4	
<i>Final Definitions for Categorical Variables Group, Basis of Differential Marking, Perceived Level of Conflict and Feeling of Otherness .....</i>	<i>100</i>
Table 5	
<i>Comparison of Levels of Navigation and Negotiation .....</i>	<i>106</i>
Table 6	
<i>Comparison of Diverse Community of Practice and Level of Negotiation .....</i>	<i>107</i>
Table 7	
<i>Comparison of Diverse Community of Practice and Level of Navigation .....</i>	<i>108</i>
Table 8	
<i>Comparison of Level of Perceived Conflict and Level of Navigation.....</i>	<i>109</i>

## Introduction

A rapid increase in the foreign born population in the U.S. from 9.6 million in 1970 to 28.4 million in 2000 is responsible for a noticeable increase of minorities in the U.S. population (Cooper, García Coll, Thorne, & Orellana, 2005). While the majority of the population in the United States is European American, other ethnicities contribute significantly to the cultural make-up of the country; as President Barak Obama said in his inauguration address in January of 2009, America is a “patchwork” of many cultures. European Americans comprise 68% (Ferguson, 2009), however this percentage will fall to the minority in 2050, making up only 46% of the population. These statistics are confirmed by the United States Census Bureau (Bernstein & Edwards, 2008) indicating that the Hispanic population is projected to comprise 30% of the US population in 2050, growing from 15% in 2008, and 55% of the population of working age will be minorities, which is up from 34% in 2008. These projections underscore the importance of understanding children’s development in ethnic and minority families (García Coll & Pachter, 2002).

However, theories of children’s development are often based on research samples that inadequately represent ethnic minorities and their communities. Additionally, and as a consequence of misrepresentation, the developmental characteristics of the “majority” are the norm to which “minority” children are compared, leaving minority children and their development interpreted as “different” at best, or as beleaguered with “deficits” at worst (Mistry & Wu, 2010). Some scholars have developed theoretical frameworks and models for the

study of minority children that lead to a paradigm shift away from deficit models towards a theory that captures the assets that members of the minority possess, both as a group and individually (e.g., Boykin, 2000; García Coll, Lamberty, Jenkins, McAdoo, Crnic, Wasik, & García, 1998; and Ogbu, 1994). This shift causes researchers to look at previously considered deficits as strategies, competencies, or facilitative and protective factors that support minority children's developmental pathways.

Historically, research regarding identity development saw identity as composed of static stages, with each stage possessing a certain criteria for completion, resulting in a static state of identity until an individual met the developmental criteria to surmount the next step (Phinney, 1990). Using social developmental theories, or acculturation theories (Berry, 2003), to describe the development of ethnic identity in minority individuals offers the perspective that minority individuals are deficient in their development as they do not meet all of the criteria, or conform to the requirements of the dominant culture. Further, these theories ignore the situated nature of development. That is, an individual does not develop in isolation, but instead develops through complex social interactions with the world around him/her. Adopting a sociocultural perspective to the development of identity offers a perspective that emphasizes the facilitative factors that an individual possesses and uses to navigate his/her world, the *process* of development, all the while acknowledging the influence of sociohistorical experiences in the developmental process, thus supporting a fluid, asset based, perspective to identity and its development.

In the present study I adopt the developmental perspective offered by Mistry and Wu (2010), in that I will follow a framework that emphasizes the culturally complex nature of identity development.

...we argue that multiple developmental pathways are likely, especially in non-universal domains that are contextualized. Further, we suggest that variations in developmental pathways and outcomes may arise from the salience hierarchy in the structural organization of the dimensions of navigating across cultures, and the strategies used to maintain coherence and flexibility... Since we conceptualize the process of navigation between worlds as multidimensional and as situated within particular sociohistorical contexts, it is reasonable to expect the trajectories and outcomes to vary depending on features of the immediate context. (Mistry & Wu, 2010, p. 14-15)

From the sociocultural perspective, constructs are also influenced by sociohistoric factors. As such, ethnicity, race and culture are not merely biological but are instead constructs influenced, and defined, by socio-political and historical factors (i.e., they are social constructions), all of which affects how these constructs are used and experienced within society. While an individual may ascribe a certain racial, ethnic or cultural identity, society may also prescribe them an identity based on the social constructions of these factors. Thus, minority individuals, particularly in the United States, experience multiple identities; identities they mark for themselves and the ones that others mark them with, for example when they are racialized. In order to escape being differentially marked,

and the affective experience of being marked, minority individuals must navigate and negotiate their multiple cultural settings (Mistry & Wu, 2010). Navigation and negotiation requires tools. In the instance of identity development, these tools often take the form of internal strategies used to interpret and process experiences in the world, in particular experiences fueled by the social constructions of race, ethnicity and culture. As such, developing strategies to navigate multiple cultural worlds is a critical component to how minority individuals develop their self and identity (Mistry & Wu, 2010).

The study presented in this dissertation is part of an overall research agenda focused on understanding the processes through which sociocultural, economic, and community-level contexts interact with family and individual practices to create the conditions under which children construct and develop expertise in navigating multiple cultural worlds and identities (Mistry & Wu, 2010). The process of navigating between multiple worlds and identities is a critical component of the development of self and identity – especially for children of immigrants and those from underrepresented ethnic communities who experience life as minorities. Building upon Mistry and Wu (2010) as well as my previous research (Mistry & Pufall, 2009; Pufall Jones & Mistry, 2010), this paper explores certain “features of the immediate context,” and how they mediate the development of strategies for negotiating multiple cultural worlds and their influence on ethnic identity formation.

My dissertation is a theoretical discussion focusing on the exploration of constructs related to the dynamic nature of identity and its development. To facilitate this discussion I ask the following research questions:

- Is there a relationship between being differentially marked and an individual's experience of otherness (generic, marked, disruptive)?
- What experiences of differential marking do individuals have within the community that make their difference salient, and how are these experiences perceived and interpreted?
- How do experiences of otherness influence an individual's appraisal of their life experiences, as well as the strategies that they employ to navigate these experiences of otherness?

My focus on the process of navigating between multiple worlds is based on the assumption that for the populations of interest, that is, youth from diverse ethnic minority backgrounds, the ability to maintain flexible identities or integrate multiple facets of self and identity has implications for aspects of psychological adjustment. Further, given the personal nature of successful strategies and how they develop, that is, strategies are individual in their effectiveness and in terms of the experiences that contribute to their development, this research takes an *emic*, or phenomenological, perspective to data collection and interpretation. To this end, data were collected and analyzed in a manner specific to the cultural community studied, thus sampling individuals from diverse and homogeneous minority backgrounds (Cooper, García Coll, Thorne & Orellana, 2005; Mirandé & Tanno 1993). In further support of the emic perspective, the data for this study

come from participants' individual interviews, conducted in such a manner as to elicit personal narratives of their experiences in and with their worlds. In addition, the codes for the thematic analysis of these narratives emerged from my previous research on personal narratives regarding the navigation of multiple cultural worlds (Mistry & Pufall, 2009; Mistry & Wu, 2010; and Pufall Jones & Mistry, 2010) as well as current literature in this area of study (e.g., Bhatia, 2007).

To summarize, my dissertation is a theoretical discussion regard community and contextual circumstances that influence individuals' lived experience, especially with regards to the experience of race and its personal and social salience. Further, in this discussion I examine how meaning making processes, influenced by cultural conflict and affiliation mediate feelings of difference, the strategies that individuals develop to navigate and negotiate their multiple cultural worlds, as well as their self-identification.

### **Review of the Literature**

In this study I examine how contextual and community circumstances, as well as the extent of being marked as “other,” are conditions that structure the salience of an individual’s difference, and how this difference is in turn experienced and interpreted. Further, I explore how the relationship among these variables (i.e., context, being marked, salience, experience, and interpretation) influences the processes and strategies an individual employs for navigating and negotiating experiences of cultural distance and conflict. The justification for the research focus as well as the methodology used in this study is developed in this chapter.

First I discuss the constructs of race, ethnicity and culture to understand the meaning of minority status. As related to the research contained in this dissertation, these constructs are contextual circumstances that relate to an individual’s development, and influence their identity. I argue that although each construct is distinct from the other analytically, race, ethnicity, and culture are also socially constructed notions that are often conflated in the lived experiences of individuals dependent upon their context.

Being that race, ethnicity, culture are socially constructed, and that the social and political makeup of an individual’s context influences how experiences of race, ethnicity and culture are interpreted, I then situate and frame these constructs, and their context, using Critical Race Theory. I see Critical Race Theory as a means by which to understand the socially constructed nature of an individual’s community and context, especially with regards to their interpretation

of lived experiences associated with experiences of difference as a minority in the United States. I follow the Critical Race framework with a discussion of how the lived experience of being marked as different, or as a minority, on the basis of these constructs can marginalize identity processes and affiliations.

In the third section I argue that conceptualizations of identity formation that focus on the dynamic and dialogic processes are better suited to examine how the context and lived experiences of being marked as “other” require individuals to navigate and negotiate perceived cultural conflict between their multiple worlds. In the final section I argue that an interpretive methodology is necessary to examine the processes whereby individuals understand, experience, and interpret their experience of being differentially marked. Thus, I take a phenomenological approach focusing on the collection and interpretation of personal narratives in order to reveal the experiences and processes that multi-cultural individuals associate with the experiences of being differentially marked.

### **Minority Status in the United States: The meaning of race, ethnicity, culture and identity**

The questions pertaining to definitions of race...are not principally biological or genetic, but social and political. (Harris, 1993, p. 1763)

In order to understand the minority experience, and how it is conceptualized for my research and analysis, one must first understand the social constructions used to mark individuals as a minority. These markers, such as race, ethnicity and culture, may not define minority individuals personally, but they are often used to define them socially. However, the way in which

individuals interpret and process experiences of being marked, whether it be personally or socially, does influence their identity development. In this way, race, ethnicity, culture and identity can be conceived as processes that influence, and are influenced by, the environment in which they are conceived.

Race is often interpreted and defined by phenotype, in that it is generally based on a biological trait that sets someone apart from another. Sansone (2003) indicates that race has an “intrinsic naturality,” because, “race is one of many ways to express and experience ethnicity – one that places an emphasis on phenotype (skin color, shape of head and nose, etc.)” (p. 6). Given that race is a manner by which ethnic experiences can be expressed, Phinney (1996) asserts that race does not exist as a biological reality in the United States or the world in general. She states that characteristics, such as skin color, considered to be “racial” by society do not adequately or accurately define biologically distinct groups. Rather, if race is indeed an expression of ethnicity, then it is important to take a pragmatic approach to the definition and analysis of how race manifests in various contexts (Sansone, 2003). That is, race is constantly constructed and reconstructed via its existence and interpretation within society, as well as by its relationship with the constructs of ethnicity and culture.

Ethnicity, like race, is used as a social marker to categorize individuals. McMahon and Watts (2002) explicate the difference between race and ethnicity in discussing their different relationships with identity and categorization.

Racial identity focuses more on the social and political impact of visible group membership on psychological functioning. Ethnicity is often

related to race, but need not be; ethnicity refers to a shared worldview, language, and set of behaviors that is associated with a cultural heritage. As distinct from culture, ethnicity usually refers to the characteristics of a subpopulation that interact with other ethnic groups in a larger cultural milieu. (p. 412)

Similarly, in indicating that psychological literature treats ethnic and racial identity separately, Smith and Silva (2011) describe ethnic identity as "one's sense of self in broader terms including culture, race, language, or kinship...the principle [of which] applies across multiple racial and ethnic groups...[while] descriptions of racial identity explicitly account for intergroup relations, social structures, and internalized stereotypes" (p. 43). Notice that the definitions of ethnic identity offered by both McMahon and Watts (2002) and Smith and Silva (2011) are themselves infused with factors from the constructs of race and culture (e.g., language and other cultural practices and behaviors). Further, the intergroup relationships, social structures, stereotypes and political world view that define racial identity are in and of themselves influenced by societal interpretations of ethnic and cultural structures. Sansone (2003) furthers this argument by emphasizing that the cultural heritage explicated by ethnicity is influenced by contemporary and historical constructions of different groups on both a local and global level.

Cross (2005) indicates that the work of Rumbaut (2005) makes a clear distinction between race and ethnicity while at the same time illustrating how the

two can be construed as inextricable from the other due to their social construction.

The racial part of the identity is often forged by experiences with discrimination, while the rapprochement with ethnicity is, in part, a reaction to being labeled as racially different. (Cross, 2005, p. 174)

As such, being marked as a member of a racial group induces a psychological experience fueled by the sociohistoric nature of race within the context of the United States, and one's ethnic identification is often a reaction to this racializing experience. It is important to note that, while ethnicity can be related to race, it can also be associated with other social stratifications such as language, belief systems, and customs (Rogoff, 2003) (i.e., an individual's culture) which do not necessarily have external visible markers.

McMahon and Watts (2002) indicate that ethnicity is used as a reference to the characteristics and experiences of a population, which is not the same as a person's culture. In this way, Cross (2005), Rumbaut (2005), and McMahon and Watts (2002) describe ethnicity almost as an intermediary between race and culture, with ethnicity acting as a response to, and/or interpretation of, experiences of/with race, and participation in a cultural community context. According to Sansone (2003),

...culture supposes the transmission of specific cultural patterns or principles from one generation to the next, within certain social groups, which might include a variety of phenotypic types of people...[t]his transmission takes place at home, where parents teach children about their

past, or by means of group performances, where older people or people with recognized knowledge of what is held as...culture [and] socialize this knowledge with others. (pp. 10-11)

Given that the acquisition of one's culture is tied to experience, Sansone emphasizes that how culture manifests actually varies according to contextual characteristics (i.e., one culture does not look the same everywhere). Bhatia (2007), like Sansone, believes that culture is a process rather than a static entity, and that it varies according to participation in varying communities of practice (Rogoff, 2003). Bhatia further indicates that culture is manifest through participation in groups that have a shared value and belief system, through engagement in common activities and through the use of common tools.

Being human involves constraints and possibilities stemming from long histories of human practices. At the same time each generation continues to revise and adapt its human cultural and biological heritage in the face of current circumstances. (p. 3, Rogoff, 2003)

Thus, culture comprises a community's practices and traditions, which an individual learns through participation with, and acquisition of, common cultural tools, tools that are derived both socially and historically. As such, culture is more than a racial category or a set of shared characteristics in the sense of ethnicity, it has a dynamicism that influences and is influenced by lived experiences.

While the above argument indicates that race, ethnicity and culture are definitively separate constructs that should not be used interchangeably, it also

emphasizes that race, ethnicity, and culture are similar in that they are all socially and historically constructed notions that relate to one another in varying ways, and are contextually dependent. Thus, in one's lived experiences, these constructs are highly conflated with one another, being that, dependent upon context, assumptions are associated with the process of using these constructs as markers and the interpretation of being marked (e.g., when an individual is called "Black," the individual marking them as such may assume that the individual has certain ethnic belongings – they are African-American rather than Haitian – and cultural practices – they eat a lot of southern barbeque). To this end, Cross and Cross (2008) state that race, ethnicity and culture, "overlap at the level of the *lived experience* to the point that there is little reason to associate each construct with a distinct identity constellation." (p. 156)

In this dissertation I adopt separate definitions of race, ethnicity, and culture for the purpose of analysis in an attempt to unpack their individual influences on development. For the purpose of my quantitative analysis I adopt a definition of race that emphasizes the intrinsic naturalness posited by Sansone (2003), viewing it as a phenotype based on biological traits that set someone apart from another. My operating definition for ethnicity emphasizes kinship, geographical origin and heritage. Finally, I define culture as comprising an individual's practices and traditions, which he/she learns through participation with, and acquisition of, common cultural tools, tools that are derived both socially and historically. However, so that my analysis does not ignore the

conflation of these three constructs, I explore how race, ethnicity and culture are present qualitatively within participants' lived experiences.

I argue that an individual's lived experiences of race, ethnicity and culture are heavily influenced by the social and political history of said constructs. Further, I believe that Critical Race Theory offers a means for interpreting and describing the lived experiences of minority individuals in the United States, specifically as it relates to the social and political history of these constructs. According to critical race theorists, the social construction of race underlies how each of these constructs (i.e., race, ethnicity or culture) has been, and is, interpreted and applied within the context of the United States, both socially and within academic fields of research. Understanding the evolution and social power of race, ethnicity, and culture is essential to understanding the context in which underrepresented individuals develop given, "that humans develop through their changing participation in the sociocultural activities of their communities, which also change" (p. 36, Rogoff, 2003). Critical Race Theory provides a frame to situate and interpret the intersection of race and ethnicity within the U.S. cultural environment by illustrating the development of these constructs within society, how they interact with one another, and their location in the current social structure and context of the United States. Given that this study is designed to examine how lived experiences of race, ethnicity, and culture (i.e., being differentially marked by these constructs) influence a multi cultural individual's feelings of difference, and also their use of strategies for negotiating and navigating the intersections between their multiple cultural worlds, it is critical to

understand how these constructs are created and socialized within the context in which they were constructed, that is in the United States.

### **Critical Race Theory and the Social Construction of Race, Ethnicity, Culture and Identity**

According to Critical Race Theory, history contributes to the social language and stratifications that exist between races, in particular within the United States. As such, the theory posits that history gives power to the intimidation and marginalization of people. In the United States, race indicates, or marks cultural affiliations, be it accurately or inaccurately, as race is a socially constructed concept that is informed by socio-historic factors such as immigration and slavery, rather than bound to a biological interpretation based on phenotypic characteristics. Further, hegemony influences aspects of marginalized cultures in that, because it possesses the greatest social presence and power, the majority culture acts as the determinant culture. Thus, Critical Race Theory places historical and social contexts at the forefront when interpreting the lived experiences of minority individuals, emphasizing the necessity for understanding the cultural context of development, especially when describing and defining racial and ethnic identities.

In this section I explore the social and political context of race, ethnicity, and culture using a Critical Race Theory framework as outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2001) in order to illustrate the power that race has within the culture of the United States. I discuss how race acts as a marginalizing factor due to the treatment of race within social and political history, with a particular focus on

how race is treated as an indicator of an individual's worth in society. Next I explain how an individual's lived experiences within this hegemonic environment influence his/her identity as related to race, ethnicity and culture, arguing that marginalization can affect the way in which an individual feels about themselves and their culture. Finally, I unpack the notion of a marginalizing experience whereby an individual's difference is made personally salient because of being differentially marked.

**Defining the cultural context of race: interest convergence, racial realism, revisionist history, material determinism, and race as property.**

Critical Race Theory, as outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2001), indicates that there is a historical component in the relationship between race and class, and this relationship has four overriding themes; *interest convergence*, *racial realism*, *revisionist history*, and *material determinism*. *Interest convergence* indicates that things happen when the interests of society converge in a certain context at a certain point in time. In turn, these interests influence the behaviors, beliefs, and values of people during said time. For example, during the time of *Brown v Board of Education* interests converged around the belief that civil rights are human rights. These interests were especially evident in the ruling of *separate but equal* in *Plessy v Ferguson*, which, at the time of *Brown v Board of Education*, came under review for its accuracy and social impact (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Harris, 1993). During the mid to late 1950's the United States was separate and unequal for Blacks, which became nationally evident due to

publicized incidents involving race (e.g., the beating and murder of Emmett Till because he spoke to a White woman). As such, social interests converged on the separate but unequal treatment of Blacks, stressing that unequal treatment was a violation of their human rights. However, a platform to begin reforming these inequalities was necessary. Given that access to quality public education is considered a right, yet at that time was explicitly separate and unequal in the U.S., schools presented a viable context for voicing the right to equal opportunity and treatment under the law.

According to Delgado and Stefancic (2001), *racial realism* indicates that racism is more than ill feelings towards another group and/or a biological difference in skin color. The American Psychiatric Association (2006) agrees by defining racism:

...as a set of beliefs and practices:

1. that assume the existence of inherent and significant differences between the genetics of various groups of human beings;
2. that assume these differences result in racial superiority, inferiority or purity; and
3. that result in the social, political and economic advantage of one group over another by way of the practice of racial discrimination, segregation, persecution and domination. (p. 1)

Under Critical Race Theory, racial realism is a means by which society allocates privilege and status. That is, the experience of race within society is such that

race is a means by which groups are defined as lesser or greater than one another, and this definition is then used as a means to allocate the rights and privileges of each group. For instance, due to the perpetuation of hegemonic social structures, beliefs and values, neighborhoods are shaped by race, such that “White flight” occurs as the Black population increases in a neighborhood, after which property values drop, influencing the rights, privileges and the power of the political voice within the newly Black community (i.e. money is power, and being that they have no equity in their homes they have no power). A further consequence of this hegemony is that predominantly Black neighborhoods, which tend to comprise lower home values, also have a higher crime rate. Characterizing neighborhoods in this manner causes real estate prices to fall decreasing the amount that the property is worth within the community. Given this decreasing property value, Blacks have less financial equity in their homes than Whites, and fewer of the economic privileges associated with home equity (i.e., equity loans to pay for improvements on the property or tuition for higher education) thus supporting the perpetuation of an economic racial hierarchy (Smith, 2003). Therefore, race is treated as more than a skin color; it is a means to define the social hierarchy of groups and to proliferate racial hegemony.

According to *revisionist history*, individuals may interpret past events from a perspective other than that from which it was originally experienced (e.g., the old adage “hindsight is 20/20”) indicating that one can look at past events through a different lens. In terms of interpreting the history of race in the United States, experiences of different groups can be revised in order to suit the needs of

the individual or group recalling the events. For example, the internment camps for Japanese individuals living in the United States during World War II are not emphasized to the degree of German concentration camps for the Jews, perhaps because the majority in the U.S. does not want to be seen in a similar vein to Germany and Hitler. Further, the United States internment camps may not get the same emphasis in historical retelling because they were for a racial minority (Japanese), where as concentration camps comprised a racial majority (White). Thus, history is revised in order to emphasize, or deemphasize, racial inequities.

Finally, *material determinism* indicates that, due to changing circumstances throughout history, one group may seize power in order to exploit another – most often the powerless group is taken advantage of in order to manipulate their property. In detailing this final theme, Delgado and Stefancic (2001) believe that color blindness can only alleviate the most egregious offenses of exploitation, but color consciousness is what is needed to challenge the entrenched, unconscious, racism and the status quo within society. In a sense, this perspective begs the question, is colorblindness the same as equality of opportunity and treatment? That is, if race is eliminated as a factor in material deals, then, on the surface, dealings between individuals should be equal. However, the status quo within society, in particular with regards to race, and its interpretation and value in society, is unconsciously, and inextricably, tied to, and perpetuated by, the hegemony of the majority group. As such, material dealings cannot be truly equal until the status quo is confronted.

The themes of Critical Race Theory outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2001) illustrate the power that race has within the culture of the United States, in that it acts as a marginalizing factor due to the treatment of race within social and political history. That is, race was, and is, used to organize and oppress certain individuals, while protecting and supporting others. Harris (1993) interprets this marginalization to mean that “whiteness” is property. Harris asserts that, much like the construct of material determinism outlined by Delgado and Stefancic (2001), race is used as an indicator of property, and the quantity and quality, of one’s property, especially within the United States, is an indicator of one’s worth and power. “Whites have come to expect and rely on these benefits, and over time these expectations have been affirmed, legitimated, and protected by the law” (Harris, 1993, p. 1713). As such the relationship between race and property is such that, much like material determinism, property rights are inextricably intertwined with, and fueled by, race (Harris, 1993).

Harris asserts that this relationship between race and property in the United States began with slavery. During the era of slavery, and, as Harris contends, even today, “whiteness” was used as a way to distinguish between those who were, or could be, slaves. Whiteness became a protective and powerful factor. As further support for the relationship between race and property, slaves were not merely acquired but bought and sold based on material qualities. For example, slaves were advertised based on fitness, dependability and production value (e.g., how much and how quickly the individual could pick cotton). For these reasons, Blacks were in fact the property of the White race.

Through time, this social stratification based on skin color perpetuated, in spite of changes in history due to *interest convergence*, such as the abolition of slavery after the Civil War, which attempted to remove the stigma of race. Delgado and Stefancic (2001) argue that *material determinism* is so deeply ingrained that *racial realism*, the reality of race, indicates that race will continue to be a means by which status and privilege are assessed and asserted. Thus, whiteness as property designates that the needs, beliefs, and values (i.e., the culture of White individuals) will continue to be paramount over those from other races, because the social structures in place are informed by a long history of marginalization, ingrained and thus difficult to eradicate and overcome.

The law's construction of whiteness defined and affirmed critical aspects of identity, (who is White); of privilege (what benefits accrue to that status); and of property (what *legal* entitlements arise from that status)... The inequalities that are produced and reproduced are not givens or inevitabilities, but rather are conscious selections regarding the structuring of social relations. (Harris, 1993, pp. 1725 - 1730)

Thus, race is socially, and judicially, constructed as property, which affords an individual certain rights and privileges. Defining race as such lends to how individuals experience their race, and racial identity, within society. For Blacks in the United States, this means that their lived experiences within society are constantly influenced by the social and political history of Blacks. In my research I emphasize the importance of the social and political climate of the context, believing that the sociohistoric nature of an individual's environment

impacts their development, especially in terms of how they navigate and negotiate their multiple cultural worlds and, in turn, their identity. Thus, I argue that an individual's racial identity is informed through experiences in different social contexts, and is not their own interpretation, but instead influenced and construed by society's social construction of race.

### **Critical Race Theory and identity.**

Regarding race as property indicates that race comes with certain rights and privileges that are upheld by the law. This interpretation of race asserts that, as Harris (1993) implies, the association of power and privilege with race as property can affect an individual's perception of their race as well as their racial identity, which is, according to Harris (1993), "...simultaneously an aspect of self-identity and of personhood" (p. 1725). Being that, "racial identity and property are deeply interrelated concepts" (Harris, 1993, p. 1709), a group's marginalized history affects the manner in which a group, and individuals within those groups, value their racial identity, as well as how they value the culture associated with their identified racial, or ethnic, group. That is, the identities of racial groups are influenced by socio-historic factors that contribute to their conceptions of self as member of their cultural group.

Hasn't America taught us to associate blackness with savagery, ignorance, crime, and inferiority – the very antitheses of "culture"? Blackness has signified spontaneity, not self-consciousness, the lack of culture, not cultural difference; and correspondingly, black people have been regarded by America as social problems, not social partners. (Smith, 1997, p. 179)

Smith (1997) asserts that the culture attributed to Blacks – in this case Black is broadly defined as all individuals with “black skin” in the United States – is always perceived through a deficit lens. That is, Black individuals in the United States are often seen as deprived of culture, or rather their culture is insufficient or invaluable when compared to majority culture. Just as race conveys power and privilege so does the ascribed culture of an individual. Further, negative conceptions of racial groups and culture, and a lack of power and privilege due to membership in a marginalized group, cause individuals within these groups to “leave themselves” and their culture in order to feel successful in the eyes of the majority culture, which often has devastating consequences.

Upon entering adolescence, individuals are more aware of outlying social factors and evaluations in such a way that they now feel vulnerable to their effects (Spencer, 2005). In this way, minority adolescents recognize that the culture with which they identify, and attempt to incorporate into their overall personal identity, may not be evaluated positively by the majority culture. These positive and negative evaluations may in turn be related to adolescents’ feelings of global self-worth; if one aspect of the self has a negative valence, this negativity may reverberate through the system causing disruptions in aspects of the individual’s development. This begs the question as to whether or not identity affiliations in terms of race, ethnicity, and culture could be protective in nature.

To study the effect of ethnic identity’s valence, either positive or negative, on an adolescent’s development, McMahon and Watts (2002) studied a sample of

209 youth ranging in age from 10 to 15 years of age in order to see how it, along with and independent of levels of global self-worth, related to the mental health outcomes of African-American youth. They examined areas such as depression, coping strategies, and aggressive behavior and attitudes noting that previous research indicates that while, “higher levels of ethnic identity [does] indeed make...adolescents more sensitive to culture-specific stressors...their strong sense of ethnic identity help[s] them to use more effective coping strategies” (p. 414). They found that adolescents with a higher level of ethnic identity had more active coping strategies for stressors and a lower approval rating for aggression. Further, their results indicated that, “[a]lthough ethnic identity was significantly correlated with depression, it was not a significant predictor of depression, when taking into account global self-worth. These findings suggest that “... feelings of connection with one’s group may be a protective factor for depression” (McMahon & Watts, 2002, p 422).

Incorporating the ideas of the social construction of racial and ethnic identity, and the effects of marginalization on identity, Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol and Hallett, (2003) and Chandler and Lalonde, (2008) studied the effect of marginalization on First Nations youth in British Columbia, Canada, specifically the relationship between indicators of cultural continuity and suicide rates among the aboriginal youth population. These researchers asserted that suicide rates, rather than being evenly distributed across the “almost 200 separate bands and 23 tribal councils” (Chandler & Lalonde, 2008, p. 4), vary due to differential negative interactions with the non-aboriginal, majority, world, and “their

collective responses” (Chandler & Lalonde, 2008, p. 4), to such adversity. Thus, these researchers indicate that, much like critical race theorists, the lived experiences of First Nations youth within British Columbian society are constantly influenced by the social and political history of their band or tribal council, and further that their identity, which is informed through experiences in different social contexts, is not their own interpretation, but instead influenced and construed by society’s social construction of their ethnic group. Taking these variations into account, Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol and Hallett, (2003) and Chandler and Lalonde, (2008), “hypothesized that youth suicide rates would prove to be remarkably lower in those bands that have achieved a greater measure of success in reconnecting to their traditional past, and in building ties to some shared future” (Chandler & Lalonde, 2008, pp. 4-5). In other words, bands who display cultural continuity counteract marginalizing factors, and protect their youth from the negative outcome of suicide.

Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol and Hallett, (2003) and Chandler and Lalonde, (2008) reviewed two waves of data, 1987-1992 and 1993-2001, from 197 bands of First Nations. Data were collected on the number of recorded suicides among the youth in each band and population estimates for the bands to use as common denominators for calculating suicide rates. Given the effects of possible small populations within bands, data were also organized via three other modes of categorization; categorizing each band via their tribal council membership, given that there are 29 councils as opposed to 197 bands, grouping bands by traditional

language used, and also by the physical location of the band, be it an urban, rural, or remote geographical area.

The data indicated that, while suicide rates among all First Nations youth remain relatively stable over time, when categorized via band, council and language variability exists, in that some categories had no recorded suicides while others had several hundred. The researchers interpreted the variability not just as statistical noise, “but rather an invitation to search for some method of parsing variance that makes room for some of the different approaches to cultural and communal life that characterize the groups under study” (Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol & Hallett, 2003, p. 42).

As such, the researchers gathered information from each First Nations community related to 6 markers of cultural continuity in terms of governance. The researchers decided to use a macro level approach to describing the culture of these many groups as a way to concentrate the data and depict an overarching structure to the daily lives of youth living in the communities. The six cultural markers used were land claims (length and history of securing title to), self-government (i.e., economic and political independence from provincial/federal government), education (attending band administered schools), Police and Fire-Protection services (community owned and operated as opposed to outside contracts), Health services (again level of control over), and cultural facilities (communal facilities dedicated to cultural activities). In the later study (Chandler and Lalonde, 2008), two more markers were added, one being control over child welfare and the other greater than 50% of the elected band council being female.

The results from both studies indicate that measures of cultural continuity act as protective factors, with the presence of at least one factor having a significant impact on reducing suicide rates among first nation youth. Individually, the presence of self-government showed an 85% reduction, land claims 41%, education 52%, Health 29%, cultural facilities 23%, and police and fire services a 20% reduction in suicide rates. When taken in combination, communities exhibiting zero cultural markers had 137.5 suicides per 100,000, while communities exhibiting all six had zero suicides. A Chi Square analysis indicated a strong linear relation between suicide and number of markers present. Similar results were found in the second study, Chandler and Lalonde (2008), with the addition of the seventh and eighth markers.

While these results can only reliably be attributed to First Nations Youth, this research does indicate that cultural continuity plays a vital role in the lives of youth. Cultural continuity provides a protective factor in youths' lives, and further in the identity formation of youth (i.e., the greater the continuity the stronger their identification) and positive self-concept. In communities where cultures are marginalized, as they are among underrepresented groups in the United States, individuals struggle to find their identity and maintain a sense of continuity. Thus, these results illuminate the importance of a strong cultural community in the positive development of youth, particularly youth from marginalized groups, and the influence of community on the individual's development.

As a narrative example of the psychological effects of the social construction of race in the United States, as well as the importance of cultural continuity, Harris (1993) offers her grandmother's racial and cultural experience:

Each evening, my grandmother, tired and worn, retraced her steps home, laid aside her mask, and reentered herself. Day in and day out, she made herself invisible, then visible again, for a price too inconsequential to do more than barely sustain her family and at a cost too precious to conceive. She left the job some years later, finding the strain too much to bear.  
(Harris, 1993, p. 1711)

Harris' grandmother negotiated the worlds that she lived in, the White world in which she was employed and the Black world of her family, in order to "achieve" value within society. However, this dualism was taxing on her personhood, on her identity, and so she had to end the relationship.

Another narrative example can be found in Barack Obama's (1995) memoir "Dreams from My Father: A story of race and inheritance." In particular, Obama's story illustrates how whiteness as property is communicated and perpetuated to Black youth in the education system. In his book, Obama recalls a conversation with a teacher on the South Side of Chicago regarding schools and what reforms were/are necessary to support the success of Black students. The teacher says to Obama:

The first thing you have to realize...is that the public school system is not about educating black children. Never has been. Inner-city schools are about social control...They're operated as holding pens – miniature jails,

really. It's only when black children start breaking out of their pens and bothering white people that society even pays any attention to the issue of whether these children are being educated. Just think about what a real education for these children would involve. It would start by giving a child an understanding of *himself*, *his* world, *his* culture, *his* community. That's the starting point of any educational process. That's what makes a child hungry to learn – the promise of being part of something, of mastering his environment. But for the black child, everything's turned upside down. From day one, what's he learning about? Someone else's history. Someone else's culture. Not only that, this culture he is supposed to learn is the same culture that's systematically rejected him, denied his humanity. (p. 258)

In this teacher's words you can hear how Black individuals in the United States struggle, especially Black children growing up and learning in the United States; can they recognize, value and identify with their race and culture when society communicates the opposite message?

Given that the examples offered above illustrate the importance of cultural continuity on an individual's development, and that cultural continuity is highly influenced by the context in which development occurs, it is essential to further explore two factors related to the social construction of race, ethnicity, and culture, and their influence on the formation of identity; the factors of varying communities of practice and the process of being differentially marked. Specifically, it appears that the social make-up of the context for lived

experiences, which can be referred to as an individual's community of practice, may moderate the individual's salience of difference, as it appeared to do so for Harris' grandmother. Further, within contexts, and due to social construction of race perpetuated within said community of practice, individuals may be more or less likely to be differentially marked by these social constructs. In my research, and in the next section, I explore the relationship among context, being differentially marked, and identity formation in the lived experiences of multi cultural individuals.

*Contextual effects on racial salience and identity.*

In his memoir, Barak Obama (1995) explores his racial and cultural experiences and their effect on his identity development. While race had always been a prominent factor in his life, its role became especially salient when he traveled to Europe and then on to Kenya to visit his father's family. Traveling in Europe made his racial differences, and his struggle with his own racial identity, personally visible.

It wasn't that Europe wasn't beautiful; everything was just as I'd imagined it. It just wasn't mine. I felt as if I were living out someone else's romance; the incompleteness of my own history stood between me and the sites I saw like a hard pane of glass. (Obama, 1995, p. 301)

However, when he arrived in Kenya he had a different, positive, racial experience. In this context, where a black racial identity does not indicate your social worth, or the value of your "property," he was able to understand and value his own identity and cultural affiliations. Obama recalls, "here the world was black, and

so you were just you; you could discover all those things that were unique to your life without living a lie or committing betrayal” (p. 311). Thus, the social makeup of an environment, context, or community of practice, may have an influence on an individual’s experiences and psychological processing, especially with regards to race, ethnicity and culture.

Related to the concept that the salience of these constructs in varying contexts affect a minority individual’s lived experiences, Chen, Benet-Martínez, and Bond (2008) examined the impact of social context on the psychological adjustment among Mainland Chinese immigrants in Hong Kong, Filipino domestic workers/immigrant workers in Hong Kong, and Hong Kong and Mainland Chinese college students. Although each of these groups were living in the same global context of Hong Kong, a city that is both economically and culturally diverse, each of these samples had unique, perhaps conflicting, lived experiences due to their ethnic heritage (e.g., Mainland China is not diverse culturally, so those participants from the mainland should, in theory, have a very different experience in Hong Kong than those native to the Hong Kong area).

Survey techniques were used with all three samples, and separate regression analyses were done with each. For Mainland Chinese immigrants to Hong Kong, identification with the Hong Kong culture and Bicultural Identity Integration (i.e., coming to terms with multiple identities rather than feeling conflicted or distant from either culture), were positive predictors of psychological adjustment. That is, the community of practice provided an atmosphere that demanded reconciliation between both sets of cultural beliefs,

values and practices (i.e., Mainland Chinese and Hong Kong cultures) to ensure well-being. For the Filipino immigrant worker participants, knowledge of the receiving language was predictive of psychological adjustment rather than identification or Bicultural Identity Integration, indicating that the more immediate demands of the working environment, which was knowledge of the local language, was imperative to their survival and well-being rather than reconciling their differing cultural worlds. For the college students, identification with one's ethnicity negatively predicted adjustment while Bicultural Identity Integration positively predicted psychological adjustment. For the students it appears that strong ethnic ties may be detrimental to their psychological adjustment, perhaps because the college years are usually an opportunity to explore identification, and strong identification with a single ethnicity does not allow for Bicultural Identity Integration. Given these results, Chen et al. (2008) indicate that, "individuals who perceive the cultural meaning systems that are intersecting in their multicultural contexts as compatible and integrated are better adjusted than those who perceive these contexts as opposing" (p. 829).

Critical to understanding context and its influence on identity and well-being appears to be the theoretical construct of Bicultural Identity Integration offered by Benet-Martinez and Haritatos (2005), which is, "a framework for investigating individual differences in bicultural identity organization, focusing on biculturals' subjective perceptions of how much their dual cultural identities intersect or overlap" (p. 1019), within any given context. Bicultural Identity Integration comprises two processes, that is, cultural conflict, or the level of

harmony between cultures in the environment, and cultural distance, or rather amount of overlap that the individual perceives between cultures in the environment. According to Benet-Martínez and Haritatos (2005), effective processing of one's environment, meaning acculturating to the environment and having a positive sense of well-being, requires that a multi cultural individual resolve any conflict that they perceive among the cultures that compose the environment, and reconcile any distance that they see among the many cultural systems that affect their lived experiences.

To study the factors that predict cultural conflict and distance, Benet-Martínez and Haritatos (2005) studied a sample of 133 first generation Chinese Americans adults with a mean age of 24.5 years who met the criterion of immigration (e.g., emigrating from a Chinese country after having lived there for at least five years) and self identifying as bicultural. These participants completed an anonymous questionnaire containing questions pertaining to basic demographic information, acculturation (e.g., language and bicultural competencies), acculturation stress, personality factors, and bicultural identity.

Through the use of structural equation modeling they found that the process of cultural conflict was predicted by acculturation stress with regards to their relationships with the varying cultures in the environment, linguistic challenges and moderately by discrimination. Feelings of cultural distance were, “predicted largely by feelings of cultural isolation and, like cultural conflict, by linguistic challenges” (p.1036). Further, personality traits such as low levels of openness, high levels of neuroticism in the form of anxiety and vulnerability, low

levels of extraversion and agreeableness, were indicators of high levels of acculturative stress, which was a predictor of both cultural conflict and distance. Thus, the manner by which an individual resolves feelings of conflict and distance with the cultures that compose their community of practice affect the manner by which multi cultural individuals feel a sense of well being in their environment, as well as compose their identity within said context.

While Chen, Benet-Martínez, and Bond (2008) examined the impact of differing contexts, as well as the factors involved in processing the many cultures that compose the context (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005), they did not explore the exact composition of the context. That is, they did describe the type of environment that affects these processes, feelings of well-being, and the development of identity. In fact, few research studies have explored this question, but those that do primarily examine the effects of diversity in schools and classrooms on acts of discrimination and identity formation.

Using a sample of 224 African American adolescents, Yip, Seaton, and Sellers (2010) examined the relationship between the diversity of school context, opportunities for inter and intra-racial contact, and the stability of racial identity status over the course of three years. The students in the sample attended 10 different schools in the Midwest, six middle schools and four high schools. While all of the schools were predominantly White, the racial composition and ratio of diverse individuals did vary from low to high. That is, the diverse population within the primarily White schools could comprise primarily Black children (low

diversity) or youth from several different racial and ethnic backgrounds (high diversity).

While there was no significant main effect for diversity of school context, over the three year period researchers did find a three-way interaction between opportunities for contact with students of the same ethnicity, the level of diversity at the school, and the number of reported close White friends with changes in reported identity. The interaction was such that Black students who reported low contact with Black students were less likely to report a change in their identity over the course of the three year period if they attended low diversity schools and had many close relationships with White peers. Conversely, Black students who reported having high levels of contact with Black students who attended low diversity schools were less likely to report a change in identity if they had few close White friends. It should be noted that the difference was greater in the second relationship than the first, in that those with low levels of contact with Black students, attending a low diversity schools who reported having many White friends were moderately less likely to report a change in their identity than those with few White friends, where as participants who reported high contact with Black peers in a low diversity school with few White friends were almost 60% less likely to report a change in their identity over the course of three years than did those who reported having many White friends.

Yip et al. (2010) attribute these findings to the possibility that youth are active in the development of their identity by the choices that they make in terms of close friendships. These researchers argue that context may act to shape

identity through the theory of Nigresence (Cross, 1991), in that identity is reevaluated due to amount, and type, of contact with individuals from same and different ethnicities, be they positive or negative experiences. As such, higher diversity schools may allow for more experiences with peers from a variety of ethnicities, and thus greater exploration of one's identity, or, in these same schools, students may form ethnic enclaves that do not allow them to explore their identity beyond its borders. Thus, context does not appear to have a top-down effect, in that it does not directly affect the outcome of identity, rather it shapes the choices that the youth make in their personal lives in order to navigate and negotiate their many cultural worlds.

Similar to Yip et al. (2010), Nishina, Bellmore, Witkow and Nylund Gidson (2010) examined the consistency in self-reported ethnic identity from 1,589 students in 11 schools in the Los Angeles, California area that varied in terms of the composition of their ethnic diversity. For the purpose of their study, survey data was collected from the participants over the course of their three middle school years to see if the school contexts, specifically the ethnic composition of the schools, predicted shifts in the participants' ethnic identification. To measure ethnic identification, participants were asked at each time point across the three years to choose from one of ten possible ethnicities. A two-way interaction was found between school context and ethnic group in that African American students were more consistent in their identity across the three years when attending primarily African American population schools, Latino/Latina students were more consistent in primarily Mexican/Latino schools,

and multi-ethnic participants were more consistent in their ethnic identification if they attended diverse school settings that did not have a majority population. Thus, being in an environment where one's ethnicity is in the majority appears to promote a stable, or consistent, ethnic identification.

As opposed to Yip et al. (2010), Nishina et al. (2010) explored the exact ethnic composition of the schools, while Yip et al. (2010) merely reported whether the school was low or high in diversity. Further, as opposed to Nishina et al., none of the schools in the Yip et al. study actually had a minority population in the majority. The research illustrated above indicates that the developmental context, in particular aspects related to the diversity of the context, relate to the level of cultural continuity in and individual's life, and in turn their sense and interpretation of self. I argue for a similar relationship, indicating that the racial, ethnic, and/or cultural makeup of an individual's primary community of practice perpetuates feelings and experiences of marginalization, particularly in the form of discrimination, or rather differential marking. Further, I argue that these experiences affect identity formation. Given the importance of this argument in my research I now outline how differential marking is in fact an outgrowth of the developmental context and the social construction of race.

***Differential marking as an outgrowth of the social construction of race.***

According to Hall (1997) race has a diasporic logic. Hall proposes that the original, homogeneous conception of a race was dispersed in such a manner that it became increasingly complex and convoluted by individuals who are classified by a certain race, and/or by those who perceive different races. For example, Barack

Obama is considered Black by some and bi-racial by others. Individuals use these terms simplistically to classify him as a person. However, as the quotes contained within this paper indicate, Obama's identity cannot be described adequately based on the logic of skin color. If, as indicated in the previous section of this paper, context matters, perhaps he might identify as Black, since Kenya was the first place where he could "just be." However, by just being, and able to "discover all those things that were unique to" his life, without it being tied to the social construction of race as present in the United States, Obama may have found an identity detached from race, but instead tied to something different altogether. Regardless of the identity he chose, Obama was only able to fully understand himself, and his identity, by stepping outside the diasporic logic of race, and shedding the racial, ethnic and cultural markings he received from others.

With the example from Barak Obama it appears that the attributions associated with differential marking, be they racial, ethnic or cultural, and the social constructions associated with marking, are critical to understanding the experience of multicultural individuals. Further, given the moderate association that Benet-Martínez and Haritatos (2005) noted between feelings of cultural conflict and discrimination, the fact that discrimination acts to marginalize another, and the negative consequences Chandler and Lalonde (2008) and Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol and Hallett (2003) associate with the marginalization of First Nations youth, it is important to further explore differential marking, what it is, and how it affects youth.

Operating under the belief that both the racial make-up of the classroom and larger societal beliefs regarding racial differences influence children's differential treatment of others, Jackson, Barth, Powell and Lochman (2006) used a person-environment congruency perspective, indicating that children's risk factors are, "best evaluated within the context of the child's larger community" (p. 1325), to test the hypotheses that children receive more favorable peer nominations when they are in the majority as opposed to the minority population in the classroom, that the race of the teacher has a moderating affect on the nominations, and that social preference ratings affect leader and fighter nominations. Further, the researchers wondered how the prevalent social-cultural view played into the results.

Jackson et al. (2006) used a sample of 1268 fifth graders from eight different schools of varying socio economic and racial backgrounds. Of the entire student sample, 53 percent were Black and 41 percent were White. The racial composition of each classroom ranged from three to 95 percent of the students being Black. Children were asked to nominate individuals in their class by who they liked the most and the least as well as who they considered leaders and fighters, after which they were asked to complete a survey regarding peer relationships.

The researchers found a significant interaction between child's race and the racial composition of the classroom, indicating that as the proportion of Blacks in the classroom increased so did the positive nominations for Black children in the class. Likewise, White children were rated most favorably in

classrooms with a higher White child population, however the average nomination of White children was not that much lower in classrooms where they were in the minority. Finally, regardless of whether White children were in the minority or in the majority, they were always rated more favorably than the Black children. This result points to race as a socially constructed, and loaded variable, in that regardless of the prominence of Black children in a classroom, White children still prevailed with positive nominations and leadership positions, much like the prevalent race relationships that constitute the social environment outside the classroom. Even when the teacher's race was taken into account (i.e., the teacher represents a leader) White children still prevailed in peer nominations for leadership. However, even if the classrooms in this study appear to perpetuate societal beliefs and values surrounding racial and ethnic groupings, Jackson et al. (2006) do show that as an environment becomes more diverse, with children who are usually in the minority being close to or in the majority, minority children may feel comfortable navigating and negotiating their multiple cultural worlds because the oppression and discrimination that prevail in the larger society are decreased.

In a similar vein to studying the relationship between context and the differential treatment of others as measured through peer nominations of Black children versus White children, Maddox and Gray Chase (2004) explored the relationship between *subcategories* of "Black" (i.e., variations in skin tone) and "socially meaningful beliefs that guide social perception" (p. 535), thus exploring the notion that racial marking is not about skin color alone, but instead differential

marking also implies processing of ethnic and cultural factors on the part of the individual assigning the mark. As such, this study utilized a category salience model in that “person factors (characteristics that a perceiver brings to a context) and situational factors (characteristics that are present in a particular context)...determine the salience of a potential category cue” (p. 535). The researchers explored this relationship by measuring the situational accessibility of a category and the perceived fit of said category, indicating that the beliefs a perceiver uses to differentiate between light and dark skin toned blacks are triggered by a context that makes these beliefs relevant.

Maddox and Gray Chase had 232 college students view simulated discussions between six males. Conditions of these discussions varied in terms of skin tones of the participants in the discussion (three light skinned and three dark skinned Black males), racial composition (in this case three White and three Black males), and discussion content (innocuous activities versus race relations in the United States). Results affirmed their hypotheses indicating that when the participant witnessed a discussion of race relations, rather than a discussion of innocuous activities, they were more likely to organize and encode the discussants via skin tone and race.

The research from both Jackson et al. (2006) and Maddox and Gray Chase (2004) indicate how contextual cues influence how an individual marks or categorizes another. These results relate to studies of contextual composition and identity development (e.g., Nishina, Bellmore, Witkow & Nylund Gidson, 2010; Yip, Seaton & Sellers, 2010), in that differential marking is tied to attributes of

the context in which it occurs, be they the racial composition or the content of the conversations within the context, specifically as they are related to aspects of the social construction of race in society. However, which construct, race, ethnicity or culture, is most frequently used as a source of discrimination, and how does their use vary the effect on the individual being discriminated against?

In a second study, Maddox and Gray (2002) explored the notion of skin tone and its relationship with bias and in turn discrimination, indicating that the darker the skin tone the greater bias and discriminatory acts targeting the individual. Maddox and Gray predicted that this relationship would be the case regardless of the race of the participant perceiving the individual in the experimental situation. To test these hypotheses, the researchers recruited 82 participants distributed evenly for both gender and race. Participants were instructed to complete a questionnaire regarding personal knowledge of different racial and ethnic groups. The questionnaire was designed so that each page indicated a social group at the top, under which were subsections to list the positive, negative, and neutral characteristics that the participant associated with said group. Participants provided this information for seven different social groups indicated, which were described by the darkness of skin tone and gender (e.g., dark skinned Black women). Finally, participants were asked to indicate which of the characteristics that they listed were congruent with their own personal beliefs regarding the group.

Results from a mixed model ANOVA indicated that there was a significant interaction between skin tone and valence, with more negative than

positive characteristics being associated with dark skin tone social groups, and fewer negative than positive characteristics being listed for lighter skin tones. These results indicate that discrimination is closely tied to gradations in skin tone rather than simply to race in and of itself. Further, there was a significant interaction between skin tone and the stereotypic nature of characteristics listed, with dark skinned individuals receiving more stereotypic attributes than light skinned individuals. “Both black and white participants were significantly more likely to use the traits criminal and tough/aggressive and less likely to use the trait wealthy to describe dark-skinned men as compared to light-skinned men” (p. 257). Further, participants were also significantly more likely to label dark-skinned, as opposed to light-skinned, women with the traits lazy, poor, and unattractive. Thus, minority individuals whose skin tone makes them more visible as a minority in the United States are stereotyped to a greater degree than minorities whose skin tone is closer to the White majority. Further, the stereotypes used to mark these individuals are most often associated with negative attributes related to attractiveness, social position, and level of contribution to society. Although we can say that stereotypes exist, that they can be triggered by contextual factors, and are used to marginalize minority individuals, what effects do these stereotypic, or discriminatory, markers have on individuals?

To this end, Seaton, Caldwell, Sellers and Jackson (2010) studied the relationship between discrimination attributions (i.e., the perceived bases of differential marking) and psychological well-being. Drawing upon the responses of 810 African American and 360 Caribbean Black 13-17 year-old youth to the

National Survey of American Youth, the researchers explored whether the youth's attribution of discrimination, such as race/ethnicity, gender or physical appearance (e.g., tall, short, or overweight) moderated the relationship between the youth's perception of differential marking and their psychological well-being.

The greatest proportion of youth, at 43 percent, indicated race/ethnicity as their attribution of discrimination in their daily lives, followed at a distance by age at 17 percent. Further, youth who attributed discrimination to race/ethnicity reported significantly more incidents of discrimination than those who attributed discrimination to any of the other attributes. Finally, the researchers found significant main effects for psychological well-being and life satisfaction, in that those who reported more incidents of discrimination also reported significantly lower levels of psychological well-being and life satisfaction, regardless of the attribution of discrimination. These results indicate that discrimination, or rather differential marking, regardless of its attribution, has significant detrimental effects on the psychological well-being and the lived experiences of multicultural youth.

You come together to see what you can do about shouldering up all of your energies so that you and your kind can survive...that space should be a nurturing space where you sift out what people are saying about you and decide who you really are. And you take the time to try to construct within yourself and within your community who you would be if you were running society (Lubiano, 1997, p. 234).

Lubiano thus provides a summation of the argument contained in this section, in that minority individuals must “sift” through their experiences of differential marking specifically with regards to the socially constructed notions of their identified race, ethnicity, and culture.

The research presented in these sections regarding the social construction of race, ethnicity, and culture, and the influence that these social constructions have on an individual’s developmental context, offer a window into the experiences of minority individuals, experiences that we can learn from and interpret in order to understand the construction of race, how it is manifest in people’s lives, and how their consciousness of race helps them to form, or hinders them from forming, their racial and ethnic identity and cultural affiliations. Further, Critical Race Theory offers a framework through which we can unpack these experiences in order to understand race in the United States, and the essential factors that influence how it contributes to the development of an individual’s identity.

The above quote from Lubiano indicates that a sifting process enables individuals’ decision regarding who they really are, their identity, which I explore further in the next section, offering my operational interpretation of the findings and observations presented above. Specifically I describe a dialogic self. That is, I describe a process related self, indicating that an individual’s identity involves a constant dialog among their lived experiences of race, ethnicity, and culture (i.e., being differentially marked by these constructs), their feelings of difference, and

their use of strategies for negotiating and navigating the intersections between their multiple cultural worlds.

### **The Dialogic Self**

Critical Race Theory takes the perspective that race, and the experience of race, is shaped by the sociohistoric and political factors associated with the construct. As such, race is a complex factor that cannot be defined simply by indicating skin color, but instead by how one experiences the social and historical construction of race in the world. Further, as McMahon and Watts (2002), among others, indicate one's racial experiences and identity act to inform an individual's ethnic identity, the intermediary between race and culture. Therefore one's racial, ethnic or cultural identity is formed through his/her interpretation and embodiment of sociohistorical experiences.

Rogoff (2003) defines identity as an individual's ever-changing connection and participation in a community, indicating that race, ethnicity, and culture cannot be used simply as a "social address," that is, a box that is checked off on a questionnaire or survey. Although categorizing an individual by the race, ethnicity, or culture that they ascribe to has its merits, equating them with these labels loses sight of the variation that can occur within a group, as well as the individual's personal interpretation of said construct. In terms of identity, using these constructs as social addresses places minority individuals in situations where they feel it necessary to wear a mask, or play the part of a *socially* prescribed identity, with the self being at once visible and invisible (Harris, 1993), or what Mohanty (2004) terms as multiple consciousness or intersectional

individuals. For example, although Black individuals may have a Black racial identity they also have a unique experience of race that may diverge from the Black social construction, and thus they experience dual identities, their own in addition to the identity in which they are socially perceived.

This marking can result in what Bhatia (2007) terms, “racial otherness.” This otherness can take three forms, *generic*, *marked* or *disruptive*. Generic otherness involves the appropriation, or acknowledgement, of social voices resulting in a general notion of one’s cultural difference. Marked otherness results from identifying markers, such as skin color or dress, making one’s difference more or less salient due to the composition of context (e.g., wearing a Sari in a predominantly “western” dress context will mark an individual as different, where as they would not be marked if everyone else were wearing a Sari). Further, this marker is something that the individual acknowledges and processes as a part of their identity. Finally, disruptive otherness is such that marked and generic otherness results in deep feelings of alienation and marginalization, especially when these forms of otherness result from an act of racism, ethnic bias, or any form of discrimination. The danger here is that, in order to maintain a stable sense of self, a multicultural individual may feel the need to acculturate, or relinquish their culture, in order to appease and “fit in” to the dominant, prevailing, culture, or, even worse, harm themselves because they can not reconcile their differing cultures (Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol & Hallet, 2003; Chandler & Lalonde, 2008).

However, Bhatia (2007) argues that, rather than relinquishing culture, a multicultural individual can adopt a *dialogic self*. That is, rather than embracing a socially ascribed racial identity, an individual can make their own ethnic and cultural choices, and therefore provide their own interpretation and meaning to their race, ethnicity, and culture. Bhatia (2007) indicates that this is navigating the “diaspora,” consciously trying to maintain connection to one’s personal sense of culture by recognizing the self as acting within his/her community of practice. Bhatia states, “I use the concept of a relational self embedded in a network of conversation and dialogues with others to explain the stories of self-identity that emerge from the Indian diaspora” (p. 114). Indeed, while multiple identities entail their acknowledgement as separate entities, they are related and in dialogue with one another, both inter and intra personally, in that they are socially constructed and influence the interpretation and ascription of the other. Therefore, understanding one’s race, ethnicity, culture, and identity involves an internal and external discourse among the personal, social, and sociohistorical contexts. Although Critical Race Theory helps us frame the social construction of lived experience, especially the experience of being a minority in varying contexts of racial, ethnic and cultural salience, it does not explain the dialogue and how it develops. How can we understand a dialogic self and its development; what processes and strategies enable navigation between multiple cultural worlds and identities? I explore the answer to this question in the next section, looking at the process of constructing identity for individuals living in the United States.

### **The Process of Constructing Identity in the United States**

Although multiple models of racial, ethnic, and cultural identity development have been proposed (e.g., Cross, 1991; Helms, 1990; Marcia, 1980; Phinney, 1990) and generated much research, there is relatively little empirical testing of the developmental process and its contributing factors. Further, the assumption of a linear sequence of stages towards an idealized end point (e.g., achieved identity) is challenged by evidence of multiple dimensions of ethnic and racial identities that appear to follow different developmental trajectories, depending on individual context and backgrounds (e.g., Nishina, Bellmore, Witkow & Nylund Gidson, 2010; Yip, Seaton & Sellers, 2010).

In a recent short-term longitudinal study of ethnic identity development during adolescence (French, Seidman, Allen, & Aber, 2006), two components of ethnic identity were assessed – group esteem (how one feels about being a member of one’s racial or ethnic group) and exploration (how much an individual tries to find out what it means to be a member of one’s ethnic or racial group). Results over a three-year period indicated that the two dimensions followed different trajectories. In addition, the course of the trajectories varied between pan-ethnic groups – African American, Latino, and European American – for example group esteem remained consistent across the years for European Americans, but increased for the African-American and Latino adolescents. More interestingly, French et al. (2006) interpreted their findings by theorizing about the role of school context and transitions. For example, in discussing the increase in exploration from middle to high school, but not from elementary to middle

school, they argue that transitions from middle to high school, which often meant moving from relatively homogeneous (in terms of race and ethnicity) to relatively diverse high schools, represent the “encounter” phase in the Cross (1991) model of Nigresence, and thereby facilitated the increase in exploration.

In contrast to these models, or perhaps complementing these models, other researchers, such as Cooper (1999) and Cooper, García Coll, Thorne and Orellana (2005), approach this phenomenon from a sociocultural perspective. From the sociocultural perspective, the *actions* and *processes* of human activity are the focus of analysis in the empirical study of developmental constructs such as self and identity, rather than static capabilities or traits (Rogoff, 2003). Thus, those that follow this perspective offer conceptual and methodological critiques of ethnic identity and acculturation outcomes as fixed entities or trait-like characteristics of individuals, suggesting that such models underestimate and under-represent the complexity and situated nature of these constructs (Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Rudmin, 2003; and Schwartz, Montgomery & Briones, 2005).

Drawing upon this perspective and in an attempt to capture the situatedness of the development of self within multiple worlds, Cooper (1999) indicates that a *world* can be defined as a boundaried group that has a unique set of values, beliefs, behaviors and emotional reactions that are known only to the group insiders, that is a specific cultural community (Rogoff, 2003). As such, *worlds* are often delineated as the individual’s peer, family and school communities. Additionally, given that these groups have specific boundaries, minorities must learn to negotiate the boundaries, or engage in borderwork

(Cooper, García Coll, Thorne & Orellana, 2005), thus developing their ability to navigate the boundaries of each cultural world. Thus, like Cooper (1999), I conceptualize *expertise in navigating multiple worlds* as a developmental construct that reflects the ability to effectively manage the process of living in multiple cultural settings (LaFramboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). The assumption is that its development is a process of appropriating the tools and practices of the communities within which an individual participates, and thereby transforming behaviors and understandings that are mediated by the appropriated tools and practices (Mistry, 2006). Further, instead of focusing on biculturalism as a unitary attribute of an individual, I emphasize developing expertise within the construct of navigating multiple cultural worlds and identities, arguing that this approach enables us to forefront the multidimensional and situated nature of children's development.

The perspective that development of expertise within this construct is both multidimensional and situated leads one to consider the specific aspects of a minority individual's sociocultural, economic, and community-level contexts that might facilitate or hinder development. Mistry and Wu (2010) offer a conceptual model for the complex relationships and formative interactions between the aforementioned dimensions involved in the development of one's ability to negotiate the multiple cultural worlds and identities. This unique model builds upon the sociocultural perspective and relational developmental systems theory (Lerner & Overton, 2008), or a relational embodied action theory (Overton, 2010).

Going beyond the dualism of traditional acculturation ethnic identity formation theories that offer static traits and stages as levels of achievement, Overton (2010) proposes that the dual constructs offered in these theoretical viewpoints can be maintained while at the same time realizing that these constructs constitute and are constituted by one another. The differences noted between concepts in traditional theories, for example identity achievement versus identity exploration, can be studied, but they only represent a certain moment in time without acknowledging the differences and similarities in relationships at other points in time and in different contexts, that is, there is no definitive relationship.

Being that constructs cannot be split in a pure way, but instead flow into one another and are each other, Overton (2010) states that “truth is found within the coherence and organization of multiple viewpoints, all of which work within a relational context.” As such, he argues that, in order to understand this truth, we must find a way in which to synthesize the whole. To do this we must find the broadest polarities and discover a universal system of their coordination, much like the sociocultural perspective (Rogoff, 2003) that there can be commonality among variability.

Like Overton, Mistry and Wu (2010) argue that there is neither a linear nor additive relationship between contexts and the strategies that an individual develops to negotiate the worlds in which they live. Following this, their conceptual model indicates a relational system wherein the individual is situated, and develops through an embodiment of, community and familial contexts.

According to this theory, there are three contexts that are mutually related to one another, Community, Familial and Individual. Each of these contexts has characteristics that describe the context dynamically. Key concepts for this theoretical perspective are *situatedness*, *embodiment*, *salience* and *mediating* and *meaning making processes*. According to the authors, two contexts *situated* within each other indicate that they are in a mutually constitutive relationship, or they embody one another. According to Overton (2010), *embodiment* is a bridge concept in the form of a lived experience, which emphasizes active engagement with the world. Thus, the racial/ethnic diversity within the community influences the possibility for experienced discrimination by the family (the idea being that more diversity indicates a decrease in possibility for minority discrimination), and if there is increased discrimination experienced by the family in the community it may influence the diversity of the population within the community (i.e., more minorities coming in to support their discriminated peers, or minorities leaving so as not to experience discrimination).

*Meaning making* relationships can *mediate* the development of characteristics within the contexts. Aspects within these contexts *mediate* the way in which the contexts are interpreted, understood, and implemented (i.e., the processes by which they make *meaning*). For example, a transition in the life of a minority, such as the referenced trip Obama (1995) took to Africa, mediates the psychological interpretation of his identity. The manner in which Obama psychologically interpreted his culture was triggered by this transition, which in turn mediated a change in the cultural conflict he experienced with his identity; he

was able to experience his culture rather than fight against it, and feel ashamed of it, as he did in the United States. Thus, these mediating processes influence the way in which an individual makes meaning of their context and their identity; Obama returns to the United States renewed and confident with his racial status, able to negotiate his “hybridity.”

The overarching concept that influences the relationships within this model is *salience*; how salient is one’s identity, one’s difference, personally and socially? Salience influences whether or not a minority individual activates the relationships and processes expressed in this model. After all, why would an individual explore the psychological experience of otherness if otherness were not salient to him/her? Why would an individual need to develop strategies to navigate across cultures if no cultural difference is perceived?

Inspired by the work of Overton (2010) and Mistry and Wu (2010), I explore how an individual’s situatedness influences their lived experiences, or their embodiment (i.e., how they actively engage in and interpret their multiple cultural worlds). In particular, I study contextual circumstances of lived experiences with regards to being differentially marked (i.e., experiences where difference is made salient), and feelings of otherness. Further, in this dissertation I examine how meaning making processes, such as an individual’s level of perceived cultural conflict between their multiple cultural worlds, mediates feelings of otherness and/or the strategies that they develop and use to navigate and negotiate their multiple cultural worlds. In the next section I consider

phenomenological research methods as the best approach for studying such a dynamic, and dialogic, self.

### **Research Methods that Support the Study of the Dialogic Self**

My previous research (Mistry & Pufall, 2009; Pufall Jones & Mistry, 2010) explored characteristics of the community and familial contexts in the Navigating across Cultures conceptual model (Mistry & Wu, 2010). This research focused on deconstructing the Familial context, specifically with regard to economic resources, experienced discrimination and their relationship with the individual level lived experiences of being a minority, with the timing of awareness at the forefront. Thus, in these studies the relationship between Family Setting characteristics (economic resources), Community characteristics (diversity of community), and the Individual characteristic of Awareness of Difference was explored. Further, my previous research looked at how timing of awareness was related to the number of strategies developed by individuals to navigate between cultural worlds.

While previous research involved an open exploration of these concepts, and offered some preliminary findings regarding relationships between concepts, the research did not adequately explore the individual processes involved in the model proposed by Mistry and Wu (2010) or the relationships among constructs within the individual context, especially in the light of Critical Race Theory. The overarching goal of this dissertation is to explore the relationships among constructs in order to unpack how contextual circumstances, as well as the extent of being marked as “other” by race, ethnicity, and culture are the structuring

conditions that create the salience of difference experienced by the individual. Further, in this dissertation I examine how these meaning making and mediating processes have potential consequences to feelings of otherness, strategies for navigating and negotiating multiple worlds, and in turn ethnic identity, or the dialogic self.

### **A phenomenological perspective.**

Capturing the nuances and details of developmental processes is critical to the study of a multidimensional and situated phenomenon. In such situations a questionnaire, as was used by most of the articles already cited in this paper (e.g., Chen, Benet-Martínez, & Bond, 2008; Nishina, Bellmore, Witkow & Nylund Gidson, 2010; Yip, Seaton & Sellers, 2010) may not suffice, given the personal nature of strategy and identity development, and thus is a marked limitation to this previous research. An alternative source of data for the subtle details of a person's life story is *personal narrative*. Personal narratives allow us, as researchers, to conceptualize the phenomena of identity and strategy development in the participants' own words, rather than beginning with, or imposing, definitions derived from the literature, thus giving our conclusions greater internal validity. As such, my research adopts an *emic*, or *phenomenological*, perspective, in that it attempts to document how *participants* define and describe their meaning making processes, their affiliations, and their development.

A phenomenological approach to research can be considered the profound reflective inquiry into the nature of human meaning and the processes involved in making meaning (Orbe, 2000). In order to maintain this reflective quality one

needs to remain close to the data, allowing the conclusions drawn regarding the workings of the human mind to emerge from the data, thus acquiring the insider's perspective. According to Orbe (2000), this reflective quality makes phenomenology viable, if not essential, for inquiry into intercultural relations and the developmental trajectory of, and contributions to, said relations. Orbe believes that phenomenology can reveal the commonalities among groups with different ethnic and racial experiences while at the same time giving credence to the individual voice and not marginalizing them as is common in scientific research. Mirandé and Tanno (1993) concur by indicating that, "outsider' research has tended to produce caricatures of ethnic communities and cultures," and they therefore, "believe it imperative that our conclusions and generalizations be validated by the groups we are studying" (p. 386).

This approach is depicted in Hecht, Ribeau and Sedano's (1990) phenomenological study of the underlying themes motivating Mexican-American interpretation of relationships with members of the mainstream (Anglo) culture. The authors indicate the importance of the insider perspective – or the emic perspective heralded in phenomenology – when defining themes and constructs within cultural research (Hecht, Ribeau & Sedano, 1990; Hecht, Sedano & Ribeau, 1993). For example, Hecht et al. (1990) asked the participants to provide their own ethnic label rather than impose one upon them. Further, they asked for the participant's justification of said label so that they might better understand the complexity of the participant's identity beyond the social address provided by an ethnic label. The authors also indicate that an emic perspective requires the

triangulation of data from many cultural sources, for example using Chicano poetry as another indicator of the insider's perspective regarding themes of relationship interpretation between Mexican-Americans and Anglos. They posit that by asking the participants for their perspective, and by collecting themes from other culturally related sources, and comparing these data sources, researchers acquire a richer understanding of the individual, their inner workings, and the relationship between these inner workings and their cultural surroundings.

Following phenomenological inquiry, my method seeks to incorporate the insider's perspective in several different ways. First, rather than using questionnaires that may not capture the subtle nuances of culture and the contributions of culture to an individual's development, members of the Navigating across Cultures research team conducted probing interviews with the objective of eliciting personal stories from participants with special attention to sources of diversity and strategies for navigating said sources. Second, I did not indicate the strategies for navigation that *I* wanted their stories to address, or the type of differential markings; instead the interview protocol used offered probing questions to the participants so that they could construct the story of their life, which would in turn lead to their personal discovery of the experiences of differential marking that were most meaningful as well as the navigational skills they found most pertinent in their life. Third, I did not impose racial or ethnic labels on our participants, but instead encouraged them to indicate the source of their diversity and why they thought this was a source of diversity. Finally, I felt

the best way to capture the richness of their stories was through the use of personal narrative.

### **Narratives and ethnic identity.**

Freud used narratives in the form of clinical interviews in order to uncover aspects of the sub- and un-conscious motivations for aberrant behavior in his patients. Piaget also used the clinical interview form in order to understand children's thinking on different science and mathematical oriented tasks (Thorne, 2008). However, while both of these theoreticians were able to capture many factors involved in their subjects of study, like a controlling mother or immature thinking patterns, they neglected to look beyond these immediate factors to the sociohistorical contributors that web an individual's development. Bhatia (2007) indicates that culture, the context for development, "...is not a static variable but symbolizes multiple realities that are painful, alienating and filled with ambiguities and ambivalences about one's racial and cultural identity" (p. 230).

From this perspective, development is more complex than mere unitary factors, it is process oriented rather than the attainment of static independent factors, and involves the complex inner dialogue of the individual as he/she navigates through the world. Given this complexity, it is important to consider as many, if not all, factors within the child and his or her context, how said factors interact with one another, and how the individual processes these factors in order to produce developmental outcomes. Personal narratives are a process-oriented source of data that can capture the inner dialogue stressed by Bhatia (2007). That is, through the telling of our life story we reveal not only the factors involved in

our development, but also how said factors interact with one another, and how we interpret them, in the process of development.

Gone, Miller and Rappaport (1999) purport that the construction of identity and self is most salient in past personal narratives. Further, Gone et al. (1999) stress narratives as an important component in the development of identity and thus a viable way to support their definition and to describe the culture of a group. Fiese, Sameroff, Grotevant, Wamboldt, Dickstein and Fravel (2001) concur with Gone et al. (1999) in that they believe narratives warrant a multiple dimensional system of analysis so that a person can be fully understood. They do not see narratives as capturing a single factor in a person's life but instead a culmination of many aspects in a person's life history. Thus, personal narratives seem perfectly attuned to the study of complex psychological development, in particular to the research questions at hand.

## **Conclusion**

The justification for the research focus as well as the methodology used in this study has been developed in this chapter. The constructs of race, ethnicity and culture were discussed to understand the meaning of minority status, arguing that although each construct is distinct from each other analytically, they are also socially constructed notions that are often conflated in the lived experiences of individuals dependent upon their context. Given their socially constructed nature, I situated and framed these constructs using Critical Race Theory, expressing how the experience of being marked as different on the basis of these constructs can marginalize identity processes and affiliations.

In this context, I argued that conceptualizations of identity formation that focus on the dynamic and dialogic processes are better suited to examine how the context and lived experiences of being marked as “other” then require individuals to navigate and negotiate the perceived cultural distance and conflict between their multiple worlds. Finally, since this study is designed to examine the interpretive processes whereby individuals understand, experience, and interpret their experience of being differentially marked, an overarching interpretive methodology is used. Thus, I take a phenomenological approach focusing on the collection and interpretation of personal narratives in order to reveal the experiences and processes that multi cultural individuals associate with the experiences of being differentially marked.

### Research Questions

In this study I examined the phenomenon of differential marking (i.e., the process of being “visibly marked” as “different”) and how this phenomenon is psychologically experienced. Specifically, I explored the following questions:

- Is there a relationship between being differentially marked and an individual’s experience of otherness (generic, marked, disruptive)?
- What experiences of differential marking do individuals have within the community that make their difference salient, and how are these experiences perceived and interpreted?
- How do experiences of otherness influence an individual’s appraisal of their life experiences, as well as the strategies that they employ to navigate these experiences of otherness?

Thus, I asked what experiences individuals have within the community that make their difference visible, how these experiences are perceived and interpreted and how differential marking is related to an individual’s sense of otherness. To this end, I posit that individuals may feel a generic sense of otherness, where difference is felt through generalized statements regarding their “displays of culture,” such as dress and skin color, from members of the individual’s community of participation (Bhatia, 2007). As an alternative, individuals may process generic otherness and use it to interpret their own sense of self; Bhatia (2007) calls this marked otherness. Due to assignments of dominance, there is a third possible feeling of otherness that is imparted for imperial and oppressive purposes, much like *material determinism* described by

Delgado and Stefancic (2001), namely disruptive otherness. Unlike marked or generic, disruptive otherness often manifests in *disruptions* to an individual's life, influencing his/her practices, beliefs, values and identity in a negative fashion.

Related to this experience, I propose that context is as a mediating factor between visibility and a psychological sense of otherness, as related to the individual's "Community Context as exposure to and Familiarity with Multiple Communities of Practice" (see Table 1). That is, context is more than a *condition* by which visibility of difference becomes salient, rather context acts as a medium between being differentially marked and feelings of otherness, such that it acts to reconcile the coherence or incoherence between the two constructs. Thus, in this study I ask if the diversity of an individual's primary community of practice is related to an individual's sense of otherness and their experiences of differential marking, and if so, how? Further, I ask if and how an individual's level of perceived conflict between his or her multiple cultural worlds is related to his or her feelings of otherness and experiences of differential marking.

Finally, in this study I explore the Psychological Processes of "Being Different" (again, see Table 1) that multi cultural individuals employ to navigate and negotiate their varying developmental contexts, experiences of being differentially marked, and their sense of otherness. Thus, I explore the navigational and negotiative strategies individuals use and whether or not they vary via the experiences of the individual and his/her varying developmental contexts.

Therefore, in this research I examine the intersections among the constructs of being Differentially Marked (i.e., made visible as a minority) the Community Context, Psychological Experience of “Being Different,” and the Psychological Processes of “Being Different.” As such, I look at the community and contextual circumstances that influence individuals’ lived experience, especially with regards to their experiences of racial, ethnic and cultural visibility – that is, experiences of being differentially marked – its personal and social salience – that is, feeling of otherness and perceived cultural conflict – and the meaning making processes they employ – that is, their strategies for navigating and negotiating – to live in their multiple cultural worlds in accordance with their identified self.

## Methods

### Introduction

For this dissertation I adopted a phenomenological approach to data collection and analysis so that I might inductively realize the participants' understanding of, and experiences in, the multiple cultural worlds in which they lived. Recall that a phenomenological approach has the ability to produce profound insights into the process of human understanding and meaning making due to its reflective quality. Thus, this approach allows researchers to understand the *participants'* definition of their identity, the multiple worlds in which they live, their experiences living in these multiple worlds and how these experiences affect their development. Further, due to the inductive quality of phenomenological research, researchers remain close to the data, allowing the similarities and variations to emerge from the participants' narrative driven interviews. Thus, while the approach allows me to see how the participants' are similar, it also enables the exploration of sources of variation within the group(s) in order to understand how background experiences contribute to differences in domains negotiated, emotions felt, and strategies used.

Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) indicate that a mixed methods embedded approach is ideal when employing a phenomenological perspective. As such, I invoke a mixed methods embedded approach given that the quantitative element to this research is embedded within an overarching interpretive approach, specifically phenomenology. For this study, the qualitative and quantitative data were collected in a concurrent fashion yet analyzed sequentially. That is,

interviews were conducted and coded using the principles of phenomenology, prominent themes captured through coding were then transformed for quantitative analysis, and the relationships found during the quantitative analysis were then reattributed to, and explained via, participant narratives. It should be noted that in terms of weight, the qualitative data in this study is given precedence given that the themes emerge from the stories told by the participants in the study and, the holistic position taken in this study is such that, quantitative results do not offer the full picture of the phenomenon at hand without integrating the voices that they represent.

### **Participant Recruitment**

I used a sample of 25 youth who self-identified as African American (18-21 years) and 19 youth who self-identified as being of mixed ethnic heritage (18-22 years). The mixed ethnic heritage can be further described given their answer to the interview question, “how would you describe yourself?” Seven of the 19 identified biracially as Black and White, however six of these seven qualified at least one of their racial identities with an ethnic marker (e.g., Tanzanian, Jamaican, West African, Italian American, Irish, and Canadian). The other 12 identified as multi cultural, multiracial or diverse because of the following racial, cultural, and/or ethnic combinations:

- Chinese, White, Venezuelan, Jewish
- French, Native American, Black, Asian, White, Cuban
- Jamaican but living in the United States
- West Indian, Filipino, American

- Jamaican, Chinese, Polish, Belgian, Jewish
- Half White, Half Puerto Rican
- Polish, Vietnamese, American
- Irish, Native American, African American
- Irish, Chinese, German
- Native American, Cape Verdean, White
- Native American and White
- Japanese, Spanish, American

These participants were recruited and interviewed as part of an ongoing study of the constructs involved in negotiating and navigating multiple worlds (e.g., Pufall & Mistry, 2010, and Mistry & Wu, 2010). As part of this ongoing research project on Navigating across Cultures (NAC), the research team collected data from multiple sets of participants to represent ethnic and racial diversity, selecting at least 20 individuals for each sample set. The team collected five diverse sample sets: two from young adolescents of mixed heritage, two with late adolescents of mixed ethnic heritage and African American heritage, and a fifth sample of late adolescent lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth. Of these five data sets collected by the research team, two were selected for use in this present study. These samples were selected due to their similarity in age – between 18 and 22 years – and the fact that they offer variation in one of the main areas of interest for this study, that is, the experience of being differentially marked by cultural, ethnic, and/or racial qualities. This sample provides diversity in ascribed ethnicity and in turn experiences with being differentially marked,

which enables examining commonalities in the variation of experiences of being differentially marked and their outcomes.

A female undergraduate student of mixed ethnic heritage on the NAC team collected the mixed ethnicity sample from three large cities on the west and east coast during the summer of 2007. Participants from the city on the west coast were recruited through three separate agencies, all of which support individuals of mixed ethnicity in the hopes of building healthy and successful neighborhoods in that city. Flyers were distributed to members of these organizations asking individuals to participate in a study documenting the experiences of multi cultural individuals. Likewise, flyers were distributed to cultural houses and groups on university campuses in the east coast city area in order to recruit participants. Interested parties were asked to complete informed consent forms, and they were offered a \$15 gift certificate for their participation in the study.

An African American female, graduate student on the NAC research team collected data from the African American participants in a similar fashion from various university campuses in a city on the east coast, as well as through cultural organizations located in a large city in the Midwest. The graduate student distributed emails, flyers and other advertisements inviting participants who self-identified as African American to participate in a study exploring the foundations of their ethnic identity. Interested parties were further informed as to the details of the study and then asked to complete informed consent forms. This sample was also offered a moderately valued gift certificate as an incentive for participating. It should be noted that the location of the samples was purposeful

in that the students who collected them were specifically interested in how individuals in these geographic areas developed the skills for navigating across cultures.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

The data collection procedure was designed in such a manner as to prime a participant's thinking regarding their personal narrative. While several different types of data were collected through the process, data were collected in a stepwise fashion with the intended final step being the creation of a written personal narrative. Thus the procedure had three steps. The first step was the administration of a questionnaire, followed by a semi-structured individual interview, concluding with an invitation to write his/her personal narrative.

For both samples, the researchers scheduled a one to two hour long semi-structured interview with each participant in a location where they felt comfortable (e.g., in their home, at a cultural center, or local library). When the participant arrived for their interview session they were asked to complete the Navigating across Cultures questionnaire, which was constructed by the research team and is based on items from several existing questionnaires measuring affiliation and differentiation among multicultural individuals (see Appendix B). Although the researchers collected this questionnaire from both samples, it was not used for analysis in the current study, which instead focused on the personal narratives captured through interviews with the participants.

Once the questionnaire was complete, the interviewer asked the participant if they had any feedback regarding the information on the questionnaire or the

questions asked. After obtaining the participant's feedback, the researcher then began the semi-structured interview. The semi-structured interviews followed the protocol found in Appendix A. As noted in the protocol, interviews were designed and conducted in such a manner as to elicit the individual's personal story or narrative account of their experiences growing-up in a multi cultural environment.

Although none of the participants opted to do so, upon completion of the interviews and questionnaires the participants were asked if they would like to write a formal personal narrative regarding their life experiences. Finally, the undergraduate student transcribed the interviews with the mixed ethnicity adolescents, while the graduate student used an online transcription service to transcribe the audio from the interviews with the African American adolescents.

### **Coding and the Development of the Coding Scheme**

The coding scheme utilized by Pufall and Mistry (2010) was modified for the present study due to the continued development of the conceptual model (e.g., Mistry & Wu, 2010, see Table 1), and the theoretical inspirations for the research questions, such as Critical Race Theory (e.g., Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) and the notion of the dialogic self (Bhatia, 2007). The research questions for the present study are:

- Is there a relationship between being differentially marked and an individual's experience of otherness (generic, marked, disruptive)?

- What experiences of differential marking do individuals have within the community that make their difference salient, and how are these experiences perceived and interpreted?
- How do experiences of otherness influence an individual's appraisal of his/her life experiences, as well as the strategies that they employ to navigate these experiences of otherness?

The changes made to the initial coding scheme increased its specificity as appropriate to the research questions above by clarifying the particular aspects of the main constructs explored in this study, with the main constructs being *Basis of Differential Marking*, *Community Context Experience in terms of "being a Minority,"* *Community Context Experienced in Terms of Exposure to and Familiarity with Multiple Communities*, *Psychological Experience of Being Different*, and the *Psychological Processes of Self and Identity*. Full explanations for the complete list of codes are found in Appendix C, while the description that follows discusses the codes and constructs most relevant to the research questions in the present study. The main construct of *Basis of Differential Marking* was created to capture the experience of being made visible as a minority due to cultural, ethnic, or racial features or markers. The construct *Community Context Experienced in Terms of Exposure to and Familiarity with Multiple Communities* captured demographic descriptors of a participant's developmental context in terms of the ethnic, racial, cultural or socio economic make-up of the environment, the human and social capital that a participant had access to, and changes that exposed them to different communities of practice.

I modified the existing coding scheme to clarify the constructs, in particular the nuances of the constructs that they captured. In some instances clarification came through increasing the descriptors associated with aspects of a construct, for example, rather than simply stating that the participant mentioned something related to “Diversity of Community of Practice,” descriptors were added to reflect the exact cultural, ethnic, and/or racial composition of the participant’s experienced context. The most significant modifications developed from theoretical discussions regarding the *Experience of Being Differentially Marked* and *The Psychological Experience of Being Different*, a construct I used to capture how the salience of difference affected an individual’s sense of belonging. I paid particular attention to these constructs as I unpacked the components related to the research questions related to the relationships between visibility and individuals’ experience of otherness, what differential markers are, and how these differential markers are interpreted. Reflecting these discussions I enhanced the definitions, and utilization, of Culture, Ethnicity and Race as markers of difference, Generic, Marked and Disruptive Otherness, and Perceived Cultural Conflict.

#### **Unpacking coding related to race, ethnicity, and culture.**

In order to answer the research question of how being a visible minority is experienced in terms of “otherness,” codes for visibility and otherness were unpacked so as to best capture the experiences of the participants. As such, I clarified the distinction between race, ethnicity, and culture to facilitate

interpretation of an individual's sense of otherness as related to these constructs and the experience of being marked.

For the purpose of interpreting the lived experiences of multi cultural individuals, race, ethnicity, and culture are conceived as processes rather than static entities. In order to tease apart how each contributes to an individual's life experiences one must identify the features that make each of these constructs unique, while remembering that these constructs are highly conflated with one another both personally and socially (Cross & Cross, 2008; Harris, 1994; Sansone, 2003). That is, there are assumptions associated with the process of marking an individual and the personal experience of being marked that eliminate any acute distinction.

In this study I separated the constructs of race, ethnicity, and culture for the sake of specificity in coding, so that the frequency with which these constructs are used to "mark" individuals, the contexts in which marking occurs, as well as the possible psychological effects come to light. Further, coding whether race, ethnic, or cultural cues are used to mark an individual as different allowed for empirical examination of whether and how these constructs were conflated in the lived experiences of the participants.

In terms of coding, defining these constructs separately enabled an elaboration of the "Basis of Differential Marking," or BDM coding category, to be used for situations in which an individual's difference becomes salient – racially, ethnically, or culturally. As such, racial, ethnic and cultural "marking" could manifest in the following ways:

**Racial Marking:** Having an aspect of one's phenotype made salient...

"I remember there were certain things about my physical differences that I recognized at quite an early age. The first feature that I saw as problematic was my nose. All the other kids in my kindergarten classroom had pointy or upturned nose, some decorated with freckles. I saw mine as boring and flat..."<sup>1</sup>

**Ethnic Marking:** Having an aspect of one's common history, geographical origin, or heritage, made salient...

"Then the summer before senior year [in high school], I went to a program at Brown University, where I took a class in epidemiology. There, I suddenly became immersed in a whole lot of "Asian-American." I was put in a hall with other people with the last name beginning with "C" and so naturally a lot of them were Asian as well. The first half of the day, I felt like I was losing my identity because I'd never been in the same room with so many other Asian girls."

**Cultural Marking:** Having an aspect of one's cultural community made salient through reference to the community's shared tools, activities, practices, beliefs, and/or values...

"...whenever we used to go to India, it was always easy to realize that we were foreigners. My American accent was so thick that when I spoke Telugu (a dialect in Southern India), it was hard to understand many of the words I said. I remember that one of my older cousins made so much fun

---

<sup>1</sup> The three quotes in this section came from a previous data set used in Pufall Jones & Mistry, 2010.

of the way I said the word box in Telugu, that I felt embarrassed to speak it.”

This refined definition indicates the experience of being “marked” as an action separate from how an individual psychologically processes the experience, thus emphasizing the research question regarding the relation between being differentially marked and the experienced of “otherness.”

The category of otherness, as utilized in the present study, emphasizes aspects of psychological processing in which the participant engages. Specifically, a feeling of Generic Otherness is indicative of an experience where difference is salient to an individual, but it has little, if any, psychological or behavioral impact. In the case of Generic Otherness, it is as if the individual says, “that’s just the way it is,” and they do not let the experience or feeling of otherness disrupt their identity, self, or daily life experiences. Marked Otherness describes instances where “difference” is more salient to an individual than is the case with Generic Otherness, which often manifests in processes intended to increase understanding, and reconciliation, of relationships between the experiences of “otherness,” self, personal identity, and/or the meaning of race/ethnicity/culture in society. This processing has an academic quality to it, where the individual contemplates the complexity of their experiences and their feelings; however, there is no psychological trauma or lasting psychological damage. Finally, with Disruptive Otherness there are indications of that the individual experiences trauma, disruption to an individual’s personal identity,

and/or an individual's daily activities. In these instances the individual portrays experiences of being lost, of hating the world, and/or themselves.

Finally, the definition of *Cultural Conflict* used in this study differs slightly from that offered by Benet Martínez and Haritatos (2005). They studied Bicultural Identity Integration (i.e., how a multi cultural individual interprets and integrates the two cultural worlds in which they live) as a relationship between the two processes/constructs of cultural conflict and cultural distance. Benet Martínez and Hariatos define cultural conflict as, "feeling caught or trapped between one's two cultural orientations" (p. 1022), where as cultural distance indicates how much overlap, or lack there of, there is between the two cultures. Thus, their research defines conflict with a focus on affect, while distance indicates a focus on the extent to which a multi cultural individual's worlds overlap.

Drawing upon these definitions, in this study I defined cultural conflict as both the feeling and sense of discordance between multiple cultural worlds, and cultural distance as the feeling of affiliation or division from one's culture, often due to cultural conflict. As such, cultural conflict was used in instances where a participant expressed experiences in which their two worlds collided (i.e., it was used only for negative experiences), where as distance was used to code experiences on both poles, those where they felt they were highly affiliated (positive) and those where they did not feel affiliated to one, or either, culture (negative).

Table 1 reflects the revised coding scheme (the code definitions along with the full coding scheme can be found in Appendix C) given the revisions to the definitions of “Basis of Differential Marking,” “Otherness,” “Cultural Conflict,” and the other categories mentioned in the previous section.

Table 1

*Revised/Final Coding Scheme for the Relationships within the Individual Context*

<b>Main Constructs</b>	<b>Coding Categories</b>
Basis of Differential Marking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture: Accent/Language</li> <li>• Culture: Dress</li> <li>• Culture: Food</li> <li>• Culture: Political viewpoint</li> <li>• Culture: Practices</li> <li>• Culture: Religion</li> <li>• Ethnicity: "checking the box"</li> <li>• Ethnicity: Group Membership</li> <li>• Ethnicity: Name</li> <li>• Race: Facial</li> <li>• Race: Hair</li> <li>• Race: Skin Color</li> </ul>
Community Context Experienced in Terms of “Being a Minority”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience of Being Different: Few but memorable</li> <li>• Experience of Being Different: Never</li> <li>• Experience of Being Different: Not often or memorable</li> <li>• Experience of Being Different: Often</li> </ul>
Community Context Experienced as Exposure to and Familiarity With Multiple Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circumstantial Triggers</li> <li>• Circumstantial Triggers: Change in Context</li> <li>• Diversity of Communities of Practice</li> <li>• Diversity of Communities of Practice: Low diversity majority non white</li> <li>• Diversity of Communities of Practice: Many communities/diverse</li> <li>• Diversity of Communities of Practice: Many places (e.g. living in many different states)</li> <li>• Diversity of Communities of Practice: Primarily White/Majority Culture</li> <li>• Diversity of Communities of Practice: Racially the same but ethnically different</li> <li>• Human and Social Capital</li> </ul>
Developmental Trajectory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timing of Awareness of Difference: Early</li> <li>• Timing of Awareness of Difference: Late</li> <li>• Timing of Awareness of Difference: Middle</li> </ul>

---

Psychological Experience of Being Different

- Perceived cultural conflict
- Perceived cultural distance
- Affect: Anger
- Affect: Confident with identity
- Affect: Desire to fit in
- Affect: Frustration
- Affect: Sadness
- Affect: Shame
- Affect: Tentative/Nervous
- Affect: Unique
- Affect: Value for integration
- Salience of Difference (no evident personal discrimination)
- Salience of experienced discrimination
- Disruptive Otherness
- Generic Otherness
- Marked Otherness

---

Psychological Processes of Self and Identity

- Content or Domain: Community
  - Content or Domain: Familial
  - Content or Domain: Institutional
  - Content or Domain: Personal
  - Process: Navigating
  - Process: Negotiating
-

### **Analysis and Results**

The objective of my research was to examine the phenomenon of differential marking (i.e., the process of being ‘visibly marked’ as ‘different’) and how this is psychologically experienced. As related to this objective, I explored answers to three specific research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between being differentially marked and an individual’s experience of otherness (generic, marked, disruptive)?
2. What experiences of differential marking do individuals have within the community that make their difference salient, and how are these experiences perceived and interpreted?
3. How do experiences of otherness influence an individual’s appraisal of their life experiences, as well as the strategies that they employ to navigate these experiences of otherness?

I used an iterative approach to the analysis of these questions, as is typical of the interpretive nature of a mixed methods embedded approach. Given the iterative nature of my approach, the process of analysis unfolded in the following manner. First, I used interpretive methods to derive the constructs central to my research questions, which I then followed with the use of Configural Frequency Analysis (CFA) to examine relationships between these core constructs. When these initial analyses did not yield any significant patterns, I returned to the coding categories delineated in the methods section in order to consolidate and/or re-configure some of the categories. After revisiting to codes and the data associated with the codes, I re-examined specific relationships related to the

research questions using Configural Frequency Analysis. Specifically I used CFA to examine relationships embodied in the first and second research questions as related to differential marking, the experience of otherness and perceived cultural conflict.

To address the relationships regarding the constructs of navigation, negotiation, and the diversity of the participant's community of practice, as related to my third research question, I used chi square analysis. Finally, returning to the interpretive aspect of my analysis, I integrated my quantitative and qualitative results, in that I represented the significant patterns that emerged from the quantitative analysis using illustrative cases for the constructs of basis of differential marking, experience of otherness, diversity of community context, cultural conflict, and navigating and negotiating the experience of being different.

### **Preliminary Analysis of Core Constructs**

The first step in the qualitative analysis component of this study consisted of using the revised coding scheme depicted in Table 3 to code the 44 interviews in Atlas ti. 5.0. As previously stated, there were 19 interviews with individuals of self-identified mixed ethnic background (e.g., Native American and Polish Vietnamese) and 25 interviews with individuals who self-identified as African American (please note that although they self-identified as African Americans, there were 5 individuals in this group who were not African American by origin but instead 2 hailed from Jamaica and 3 from African nations). I computed frequency data for the number of times a code was mentioned, and then analyzed these frequencies to unpack the core constructs as related to the research

questions, and, in turn, determine which constructs, if any, to remove from further analysis.

Based on these preliminary findings I eliminated codes from further analysis that were mentioned 9 or fewer times (i.e., if there was only one possible mention per participant that would mean only 9 participants, or 20% of the sample, mentioned something related to that code). Codes with low frequency were excluded from further analysis, as low occurrence indicated the construct was not pertinent in this sample. Codes of interest were those that were mentioned at least 44 times (i.e., the code had a high potential of occurring across all individuals, given one possible mention per participant, however the code may not have been mentioned as such) feeling that the high frequencies on these codes indicated that they were significant constructs for the majority of the sample. Otherness codes, beyond Generic, were also included in further analysis, as individuals may have experienced one category without the other, thus indicating lower numbers than 44. Although I did not do extensive analysis on the codes mentioned fewer than 44 times, some were included at various points to supplement and support relationships of interest. Finally, codes that lacked variation, specificity, or influence on the research questions were eliminated from further analysis. (See Table 2 for a listing of the codes included in the continuing analysis along with their frequencies.)

Table 2

*Code Frequencies for N=44 Subjects*

<b>Coding Category</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
BDM:Ethnicity:Group Membership	58
BDM:Race:Skin Color	49
CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice:Many communities/diverse <sup>a</sup>	43
CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice:Primarily White/Majority Culture	50
CCEMC:Human and Social Capital	82
PEBD:Perceived cultural conflict	71
PEBD:Saliency:Generic Otherness	54
PEBD:Saliency:Marked Otherness	39
PEBD:Saliency:Disruptive Otherness	12
PPSI:P:Navigating	152
PPSI:P:Negotiating	164

<sup>a</sup>Diversity of Community of Practice: Very Diverse, is reported given that is mentioned only 1 time fewer than the cut off point.

*Note.* Codes can be used more than one time per participant; it depends on the number of experiences they discuss related to a code.

Preliminary analysis based on the frequencies of the codes that represented the core constructs are presented in the following subsections; basis of differential marking, experience of otherness, diversity of context, cultural conflict, and strategies for navigating, and for negotiation.

**Basis of differential marking.**

Recalling that visibility relates to the manner by which an individual’s difference is made perceptible through the use of racial, ethnic, or cultural markers, the most frequently mentioned markers were ethnic group membership and the racial physical feature of skin color, with 58 and 49 mentions respectively. Differential marking related to dress, food, political viewpoint, and

religion (i.e., cultural markings), checking the box and name (i.e., ethnic markings), facial features and hair (i.e., racial markings) all had fewer than 10 mentions. The cultural marker of Accent/Language had 10 mentions, and cultural practices had 11. As such, marking appears, in this group of participants, most frequently as attributions to their ethnic heritage, that is, the group from which they descended, and the physical phenotypic marker of skin color. While the participants did not frequently recount other markings, in particular cultural markers, they may indeed play a prominent role. For this study, race, ethnicity, and culture were separated in an attempt to capture particular, independent experiences related to these domains. However, as discussed in the literature review, race, ethnicity and culture are highly related to one another in their social construction as well as in the continuing evolution of their definitions (e.g., Cross & Cross, 2008, Harris, 1994 and Sansone, 2003). Thus, the codes under the construct *Basis of Differential Marking* were all reserved for further analysis in order to find the way in which to best capture the experience of being marked.

#### **Psychological experience of otherness.**

Since examining the relationship between being differentially marked and the experience of otherness is one of the objectives of analysis, it was important to examine the coding category of otherness. A sense of Generic Otherness was mentioned most frequently (54 times) and a sense of Disruptive Otherness was mentioned the least (12 times). A sense of Marked Otherness was reported 39 times. For the majority of participants in this study, feelings of otherness appear to be mere hiccups in their daily lives, which is indicated by the fact that a feeling

of Generic Otherness is mentioned most frequently. While Generic Otherness may be the most prevalent feeling, there were 39 mentions of Marked Otherness indicating that many of the participants do wonder about their role and life as multi cultural individuals, as well as society's perception of multi cultural individuals. Feelings of Disruptive Otherness were only mentioned 12 times. Although this is a low frequency, the experiences associated with these feelings were due to extreme acts of prejudice and discrimination that highly affected and influenced the participants' daily lives. Given that these feelings appear to be associated with acts of marking, further analysis was done quantitatively to tease apart who reported Disruptive, Marked and Generic feelings of otherness as well as the relationship between being marked and the feeling of otherness.

#### **Diversity of community.**

In this study, experiences within the community that make an individual's difference salient are related to two constructs, the first being *Community Context Experienced in Terms of "Being a Minority,"* and the second *Community Context as Exposure to and Familiarity with Multiple Communities.* Codes under *Community Context Experienced in Terms of "Being a Minority"* captured the cultural climate of the participant's community that contributed to feelings of difference, in terms of exposure to discrimination, or actions of being marked. On the whole, the participants did not often relay information regarding how much they were exposed to acts of being marked, or aspects of the environment that may have triggered these acts of marking. However, few mentions of how often experiences occurred, or not recounting several experiences, is not an indication

that they did not have any experiences, instead it is possible that for many of them, the frequency was not the important part of being different, it was simply that they were different. Given the low frequency with which these codes occur it was/is difficult to interpret this construct. While I am not indicating the frequency as irrelevant, the manner by which this code captures the frequency is insufficient. Thus, this construct was not used for further qualitative or quantitative analysis.

Participants indicated that “circumstantial triggers,” such as changes in contexts/communities of practice, were a means by which they had “exposure to and familiarity with multiple communities.” However, instances of these circumstantial triggers were not often mentioned explicitly, that is, participants did not often say, for example, “when I changed from a diverse school to a majority white school I noticed my difference.” Further, for these participants, community context does not appear to be a trigger for feelings of difference so much as acts of differential marking, or the demographic make up of their primary communities of practice. As such, the code “circumstantial triggers” under the construct *Community Context as Exposure to and Familiarity with Multiple Communities* was not included in further analysis.

While the above categories appeared to have minimal impact on participants’ development and experiences, the environments that they reported as their primary communities of practice were often recounted as important, or impacting, their lives as multi cultural individuals. Under the construct, *Community Context as Exposure to and Familiarity with Multiple Communities*, codes were used to capture the cultural make-up, or in the traditional sense the

demographic make-up, of the participant's communities of practice (i.e., the environments they attributed to influencing their learning, development, and experiences as multi cultural individuals). Participants in this study mentioned significant developmental experiences in "primarily White/majority population" communities of practice 50 times, be they in school, peer, neighborhood and/or familial setting(s). The second most frequently mentioned community of practice as a context for developmental experiences was "diverse" (i.e., consisting of many ethnic, racial, and/or socio economic groupings); this type of environment was mentioned 43 times. While other types of environments arose from reading the participants' narratives, it appears that the type of environments that they most recognized, or that they felt had the deepest impact on them, were either primarily majority White or diverse. For example, a Native American participant recalls the impact of changing from the diverse environment of his neighborhood to a primarily White/majority community of practice:

Um, it was a little bit different. I also went to a private high school. Um, what was most different about that for me was it was in a different area from where I live, so it was in a very, very like upper class like White area and the school was even more like White and like upper class and I was basically one of maybe, there was three hundred and twenty people in our school and I was of maybe twenty minority students there. Um, and so that, that's when I started like realized the whole like race thing, um, because it was so glaringly obvious and, um, um, that was also, it was like good on one hand because a lot of my friends there, like um, we were all

mixed, like me and like my three best friends we were like the mixed kids and we would like hang out and that was really fun, but like on the other hand like there did come a lot of times where it was like really obviously there was sort of like some racial tension at that school, so...

In this instance the participant indicates that the diversity, or lack there of, in his primary community of practice impacted his development in that he realized “the whole race thing,” but he also met a lot of different friends, of mixed ethnicity, who taught him how to navigate and negotiate the multiple worlds in which he lived.

The codes related to the cultural make-up of the participants’ communities of practice were thus reserved for further quantitative analysis. Using quantitative statistical methods I hoped to discover if and how context was related to salience of difference and a perceived sense of otherness, as captured by Generic, Marked or Disruptive Otherness and Cultural Conflict.

#### **Perceived cultural conflict.**

The construct of the *Psychological Experience of Being Different* captures how differences are made salient to an individual. While being differentially marked could make one’s minority status, or difference, distinctive physically, that does not necessarily mean that this distinctiveness was personally, and psychologically evident, or rather salient to the individual. Thus, marking acts as a demographic distinction of the individual’s quality that places them in the status of an under-represented group be it racially, ethnically, or culturally. Emotive salience indicates how the individual approaches their difference, or how they

work emotionally through the navigation of the multiple worlds in which they live.

In this study I captured one such aspect of salience in measuring the participants' perceived Cultural Conflict. As previously stated, in this study, I used a definition of Cultural Conflict that indicates both the feeling and sense of discordance between multiple cultural worlds, and Cultural Distance is defined as the feeling of affiliation, or contrarily the division from, one's culture, often due to conflict, which indicates emotive salience. Participants in this study mentioned perceptions of Cultural Conflict 71 times. The exact nature of conflict is gleaned from the interviews, for example, the conflict could be between different ethnicities of the same race, or between society's perception of one's ethnicity and how the participant actually behaves, thinks and believes. For example, one participant said, while recounting her experience living in the Black community in England,

Most of the black people were Caribbeans, and those were the people who made fun of me, so within the Black community it wasn't really united. It was more like Us and Them, like Africans and Caribbeans, which was sad. In her experience the conflict was between the different ethnicities living within the same racial community. This experience made her sad, and made her wonder why there had to be such a division between people. Thus, it appears that Cultural Conflict is a prevalent theme in these individuals' lives and may indeed play a role in how they interpret acts of differential marking.

Individuals living in a world in which they perceive a high level of conflict must find a means by which to feel secure in their selves and identities, which I indicated in the research questions as “the strategies they employ to navigate experiences of otherness.” Navigating involves appraisal of a situation, experience of environment, such that one charts a course to sail through, but it does not involve the actual action of sailing. Instead, Negotiation is the action that could occur after the appraisal involved in Navigation (i.e., the action of sailing). In this study, participants mentioned qualities of Navigation and Negotiation 152 and 164 times respectively, which are indeed the highest frequencies with which any code was mentioned. As such, it appears that the participants developed and employed many strategies to cope with the feelings of conflict, otherness and experiences of being differentially marked. The unequal number with which Navigation and Negotiation are mentioned indicates that these processes act independently, and by different means, to support the individual’s self and identity.

Thus, perceived Cultural Conflict, Navigation and Negotiation were all reserved for further analysis in order to understand the relationship between these factors in addition to others.

Given the above exploratory analysis of the phenomenological data, as well as the research questions at hand, I felt it necessary to better understand, and unpack, the relationship between feelings of otherness and the experience of being differentially marked. Further, I wanted to use quantitative methods to find out if the relationships inferred in the data were indeed statistically significant. Once I

made the above decisions regarding the core constructs as pertinent to the research questions, and as such to be involved in further analysis, I embarked on the examination of relationships among core constructs. Since these relationships were to be examined using non-parametric statistics, the frequency data was first converted into categorical variables.

**Transforming the data for quantitative analysis.**

In moving from the emic to the etic level of analyses I needed to collapse the data into meaningful categories that were supported by large frequencies as noted above. Given the research questions and the analysis of frequencies I derived four initial categorical variables that reflected the main constructs of differential marking, salience due to perceived conflict, feelings of otherness, as well as a group category in order to compare differences between the mixed ethnicity and African American participants (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Initial Categorical Variables Used for Quantitative Analysis*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Levels</b>
Group	1 = Mixed 2 = African American
Basis of Differential Marking	1 = Race: Skin Color 2 = Ethnic Group Membership 3 = None or Other
Perceived Conflict	1 = Yes 2 = No
Otherness	1 = Generic 2 = Marked 3 = Disruptive 4 = None

Participants were assigned the category of the variable that they most frequently mentioned in their narrative, for example if they mentioned being

marked by ethnicity 3 times and by race 6 times they were placed in category 1 (Race: Skin Color) of the differential marking variable. The category of “none” was added to the variables BDM and Otherness to account for individuals who made no mention of these variables in their stories. Once assigned, relationships between Group, Basis of Differential Marking, Perceived Conflict, and Otherness were explored using Configural Frequency Analysis. Rather than starting with descriptive exploratory data (i.e., bivariates such as simple means, modes, and medians) this study began with CFA to explore how to interpret the coding categorically and any existing preliminary relationships.

### **Relationships among Core Constructs: Exploratory Configural Frequency Analysis**

I utilized Configural Frequency Analysis to discover the statistical significance of relationships between the coded constructs related to the research questions. Configural Frequency Analysis (CFA) is a form of exploratory data analysis that can be performed with categorical variables to detect patterns, or configurations, that occur significantly more or less often than they would by chance (von Eye, 2010). A phenomenological research perspective often eschews standard aggregation practices to analysis due to the fact that, by grouping individuals together, aggregation causes researchers to lose sight of the uniqueness, or variability, inherent in and between persons, instead limiting conclusions to variables in isolation. Instead of taking a variable-oriented approach, CFA takes a person-oriented approach to analysis, in that it looks at each individual and how the categorical variables are configured for that

individual. Once each individual is thus described, individuals are compared to see which patterns of variables occur more or less frequently for individuals than would be expected by chance.

Given that the classical model of CFA “considers the main effects of all variables...[c]ells that contain more (or fewer) cases than expected...indicate local interactions among variables” (von Eye, 2007, p. 2). If a cell contains more cases than would be expected by chance it is considered a *type*, if it contains fewer cases then it is considered an *antitype*. Comparing how individuals present the patterns depicted in these cells allows us to “make statements about individuals or homogeneous groups of individuals” (von Eye, 2010, p. 280), rather than statements about the variables alone.

Based on the research questions the following were the initial patterns for analysis:

- Is the experience of being differentially marked related to an individual’s experience of otherness? How are they related?
- Does an individual’s perceived level of conflict relate to experiences of being differentially marked and their feelings of otherness?
- Are there significant relationships between groups and these variables?

While permutations of the variables supporting these questions did not yield any significant types or antitypes, there were approaching significances on several relationships, and the cells contained within, which caused me to reconsider and revise the initial levels generated for the categorical variables as well as the specific questions and hypotheses I examined via Configural Frequency Analysis.

**Revised categorical variables.**

Configural Frequency Analysis uses categorical data, thus, I transformed the initial frequency codes into categories I thought to be reflective of the data. These initial interpretations were explored using CFA, but given the approaching, or minimal, significance level on many of the relationships tested I returned to the data and the definitions of certain categories to see if they could be reinterpreted/defined to better represent the experiences depicted in the interviews and the construct itself. Given discussions and a review of the literature, the categories for “Basis of Differential Marking (BDM)” and “Otherness” were reinterpreted, and the method by which they were converted into categorical variables was modified. Additionally, being that there were no significant differences between mixed ethnicity and African American samples I did not include this variable in further analyses.

***Basis of Differential Marking and the group variable.***

While there are two different groups, or samples, of participants used in this study, the grouping factor, in this case self-identified race/ethnicity, was used comparatively, because the two groups are indeed different from one another, but the Group variable was not intended as a predictor. As Helms (1990) indicates, race is not in and of itself an explanatory variable, instead it is how the individual is marked, and how that grouping variable is used, that speaks to the racial/ethnic/cultural identity of the individual (i.e., there is the element of demographic distinction in the act of marking but how that marking is then used and interpreted leads to the emotive salience). I chose to focus on individuals’

feelings and experiences with differential marking, their similarities and differences, regardless of the participants' ethnic or racial identification. Further, the initial analyses did not yield significant differences between groups in terms of the experience of being differentially marked and how it is interpreted. Thus, in answer to my research question,

- Are there significant relationships between groups and these variables?

I found that there were no significant differences and, therefore, the Group variable was not used in further analyses.

In terms of the construct *Basis of Differential Marking*, drawing upon the idea of the socially constructed nature of race, ethnicity, and culture, I saw myself as set up for failure if I separated being marked by race from being marked by ethnicity. Thus, my revisions to this construct focused on examining whether race, ethnicity, and culture could be separated or if they needed to be coded as conflated categories. Given the participants' accounts of being differentially marked, there appeared to be elements of both race and ethnicity in every act; individuals often indicated an ethnic group by using race due to the fact that, according to participants, society defined their ethnic group by their physical markings. Thus, what is visible, and how this visibility is interpreted, appears to be contextualized. As such, I re-conceptualized the category of BDM by returning to the data and regrouping the categories to frame differential marking in a manner so as to create two possible BDM categorical variables, one accounting for all aspects of race in an effort to separate it, and consider it

independent of ethnicity, and one in which race and ethnicity were combined, to reflect the socially constructed and conflated identities of the two concepts:

BDM1 = (1) Race (2) All others (3) None

BDM2 = (1) Race and ethnicity (2) All others (3) None

For BDM1 all racial BDM's were placed into one category (i.e., all experiences related to skin color, facial features and hair, that is, any physical/biological markers) were combined into the single category of Race. "All others," in this categorical instance, referred to any BDM's associated with ethnic or cultural categories. Finally, "none" indicated that the participant did not recount any experiences of being differentially marked. In the second interpretation (BDM2), all racial and ethnic BDM's were placed into one category due to the proposed inextricable nature of the concepts. In this case, "all others" referred to any BDM experiences related to the individual's culture.

In instances of code co-occurrence from the qualitative analysis in Atlas (i.e., when a participant had both racial and ethnic accounts of being differentially marked in the narrative) I categorized the individual's experience according to the code that was mentioned most frequently. Individuals who mentioned the codes equally were placed, for BDM1, in category 2, "all others," in an attempt to keep the conflation between variables separate, and for BDM2 they were placed in category 2, "all others," being that I interpreted equal co-occurrence as indicating that they were differentially marked in many ways, in all ways.

*Otherness redefined.*

I revisited the definition of “otherness” to re-interpret how to categorize co-occurrence of codes from the qualitative analysis in Atlas (i.e., when individuals related feeling more than just one sense of otherness, such as relaying instances of both Generic and Marked Otherness in their personal narrative). As I reviewed the definition of otherness, I noticed that it was hierarchical in terms of feeling/intensity. That is, Generic Otherness yields little if any psychological processing on the part of the individual; for participants, differences in culture and experiences of BDM are interpreted as moot points and as such have little to no effect on their daily life or identity (almost like “water off a duck’s back”). Similarly, the definition of Marked Otherness does not greatly affect the way in which individuals live their daily life or their identity, but with a Marked sense of otherness an individual begins to question the feelings and the experience, and they contemplate the differences between cultures and society’s interpretation of race in an academic manner. Reflecting on the participants’ responses I noticed that they asked questions such as, “why are there differences in the manner by which individuals are treated and why does race need to be such a factor in the differences in treatment?” With Disruptive Otherness the individual’s interpretation and experience of differences in culture affects their daily actions as well as their identity.

Given this gradation in the definitions of otherness I decided that, in the case of co-occurrence during the qualitative analysis of the interviews, the individual would be categorized according to the strongest feeling of otherness

that they mentioned (e.g., if the individual mentions Generic Otherness twice and Marked once I put them in a Marked category because those strong feelings *did* have an influence on their life and experiences, rather than a passing, inconsequential feeling such as generic). Further, I initially had four levels for otherness (Generic, Marked, Disruptive and None) but, given that Generic is very much like no experience of otherness (i.e., it is like water off a duck's back) I decided, in defining the categories for the variable "otherness1," to group those who mentioned no feelings of otherness with those who presented a generic sense of otherness. Further, given that both Marked and Disruptive indicate an enhanced level of psychological processing, I decided to create another, third variable for otherness, "otherness2," in which Generic and None were grouped together for one category while Marked and Disruptive were grouped together as a second variable reflecting a single, high, psychological processing of being marked. Thus, I had two different otherness variables to use in analysis:

Otherness1: (1)=Generic and None, (2)=Marked, (3)=Disruptive

Otherness2: (1)=Generic and None, (2)=Marked and Disruptive

***Extent of perceived cultural conflict.***

Upon reviewing the data and the relationships approaching significance from the initial CFA analyses, and noting the relationships between salience of difference and feelings of otherness, I saw perception/interpretation/appraisal as a mediating factor between two constructs. In one instance it seemed to serve as a mediating factor between being marked and feeling otherness and, in the other instance, feeling "otherness" and employing strategies to live in multiple cultural

worlds appeared to be related. This led to revisiting the relevant literature to further clarify how best to derive the construct of perceived cultural conflict.

Benet Martínez and Haritatos (2005) posit that the relationship between life experiences and Bicultural Identity Integration involves two mediating processes. They define these processes as cultural conflict and cultural distance, where conflict is a, “feeling [of being] caught or trapped between one’s two cultural orientations” (p. 1022), and distance indicates how much overlap, or lack there of, between an individual’s multiple cultural worlds. In this study I defined Cultural Conflict as both the feeling and sense discordance between multiple cultural worlds, while cultural distance was the feeling of affiliation, or oppositionally the feeling of division, from one’s culture, often due to this conflict. Given my assumption that feelings of otherness and experiences of being differentially marked are related to identity processes such as navigation and negotiation, I believed that cultural conflict and distance might act as the mediating factor representing the perception/interpretation/appraisal of experiences and feelings. Given that there were few mentions of cultural distance gleaned from the initial qualitative frequency analysis, I decided to focus on the relationship between cultural conflict and the other variables at hand.

Based on an interest in examining the relationship between an individual’s perceived level of conflict and experiences of being differentially marked and feelings of otherness, I considered the feasibility of recoding perceived conflict to include the dimension of amount or extent to which this conflict was experienced. Thus, I returned to the data to see how many individuals mentioned perceiving

conflict, and if the frequencies with which they mentioned it indicated any differences in the amount of conflict perceived (i.e., rather than being something that is all or nothing if it was possible to represent the varying amount of conflict felt by individuals).

Returning to the data I noted that 31 participants mentioned perceiving conflict between the different cultures in which they lived between one and five times (there were 13 participants who perceived no conflict, 10 who mentioned perceiving it at least once, 10 mentioned perceiving conflict twice, five people mentioned it three times, four people mentioned it four times, and two people mentioned it five times). In transforming the variable of Perceived Cultural Conflict to reflect these variations in amount, I created two different variables, Conflict1 and Conflict2. For the variable “Conflict1” I decided to keep 0, 1, and 2 mentions as their own categories, and combine 3, 4, and 5 mentions into a fourth category. This grouping allowed for the number of participants across categories to be relatively equal, and in grouping 3, 4, and 5 mentions together it still captured the extreme feelings of conflict. Realizing that this grouping might not be an accurate representation of low, middle, and high levels of perceived conflict I created the variable, “Conflict2.” For this variable I grouped together 0 and 1 mentions as a single category (low), 2 and 3 as a representation of a mid level of perceived conflict, and 4 to 5 mentions as representing a high level of perceived conflict. (See Table 4 for the final list of categorical variables).

Table 4

*Final Definitions for Categorical Variables Group, Basis of Differential Marking, Perceived Level of Conflict and Feeling of Otherness*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Levels</b>
Group	1 = Mixed 2 = African American
BDM1	1 = Race (Any physical marker) 2 = All Others (Ethnic and Cultural markers) 3 = None
BDM2	1 = Racial and Ethnic Markings 2 = All Others (Cultural) 3 = None
Conflict1	1 = 0 instances 2 = 1 instance 3 = 2 instances 4 = 3, 4, or 5 instances
Conflict2	1 = 0 or 1 instance (low) 2 = 2 or 3 instances (moderate) 3 = 4 or 5 instances (high)
Otherness1	1 = Generic or no feeling of otherness 2 = Marked 3 = Disruptive
Otherness2	1 = Generic or no feeling of otherness 2 = Marked or Disruptive

Using the above definitions for the categorical variables, a second member of the NAC research team coded eight of the 44 interviews for reliability; four interviews from the African American cohort and four from the mixed ethnic heritage cohort were selected at random for this purpose. Using standard cutoffs, I found a strong agreement between the two coders on BDM1 (75%, with a Kappa coefficient of .62), and on BDM2 (86%, with a Kappa coefficient of .64). Agreement between raters on Conflict2 was 86% with a Kappa coefficient of .86, once again indicating strong concordance. I also found a strong agreement

between raters on Otherness1 with an 86% agreement and a Kappa of .72. Taken together, inter-rator reliability was strong for these categorical variables.

**Pattern of relationships among being differentially marked, perceived cultural conflict and the experience of otherness.**

The exploratory Configural Frequency Analysis that informed the changes made in the categorical definitions of the variables also inspired revisions to the research questions associated with the Configural Frequency Analysis. Thus, I modified the questions so that, rather than looking for differences between groups, this second set of analyses looked at differences between *individuals* regardless of their group membership.

- Are individuals who perceive themselves as being marked also more likely to report feeling Marked, Other or Disruptive Otherness?
- Are individuals who perceive themselves as being Differentially Marked also more likely to report Perceived Conflict between their cultural worlds?
- Are individuals who perceive themselves as Differentially Marked, and report a level of conflict, more likely to present a feeling of psychological otherness?

After performing several bivariate permutations in CFA I did two three variable permutations. The first analysis was BDM2, Conflict2, and Otherness1, and the second was BDM2, Conflict 2, and Otherness2. Each analysis yielded significant, and similar, types. The first analysis, (BDM2/Conflict2/Otherness1) yield a type for the pattern 232, which was culture (“all other”) as a basis of being

differentially marked, a high level of perceived cultural conflict and a sense of marked otherness ( $p < .001$ ), thus indicating that this pattern occurred more frequently than would be expected by chance.

The second analysis (BDM2/Conflict2/Otherness2) yielded a similar type, again labeled 232. In this instance, individuals present the pattern of culture as a basis for differential marking, a high level of perceived cultural conflict, and a strong psychological experience of otherness (i.e., related to both marked and disruptive senses of otherness,) more often than would be expected by chance ( $p < .001$ ).

Given these results, racial marking does not appear to invoke significant feelings of Marked or Disruptive otherness, nor does it show significant patterns of being related to Perceived Cultural Conflict. Instead otherness and cultural conflict appear to be related to a cultural sense of marking, that is when an individual's practices, beliefs and values are made visible and subject to the, often unkind, scrutiny of others. Further, this result supports the idea of a mediating, appraisal, process that occurs between differential marking and feeling a sense of otherness, and this appraisal appears to be related to whether or not the basis of differential marking indicates a cultural conflict between the different worlds in which the individual lives.

#### **Diversity of context and navigating/negotiating differences.**

Once Configural Frequency Analyses were complete, the next step was to explore the relationships among Navigating, Negotiating, and the diversity of context. Navigating and Negotiating are the strategies that an individual employs

in an effort to reduce feelings otherness and difference, to increase their sense of belonging in multiple cultural worlds, and to protect and explore their identity. Thus, an individual uses strategies to live effectively within multiple cultural worlds without compromising their selves or their daily routine. Thus, analysis of the relationship between the individual's developmental context and the processes of Navigation and Negotiation, addressed the following research question:

- How do experiences of otherness influence an individual's appraisal of their life experiences, as well as the strategies that they employ to navigate these experiences of otherness?

I employed Fisher's Exact Test as a test of independence given that my data violate the assumptions of the more traditional Chi Square test. Specifically, cross tabulation indicated that my data violate the assumptions that, "no more than 20% of the expected counts are less than 5 and all individual expected counts are 1 or greater" (Yates, Moore & McCabe, 1999, p. 734). Further, Yates (1984) indicates that, "[t]he  $X^2$  test is of course approximate and will not hold exactly when the expectations of the separate cells of a distribution or contingency table are small. According to Yates, Moore and McCabe (1999) Fisher's exact test is more accurate than the Chi Square test or G-test of independence when the expected numbers and sample sizes are small. As such, I used Fisher's to determine whether the frequency with which a participant fell in one category was independent of how frequently they fell into another, in this case testing whether or not the frequencies for Navigation or Negotiation were separate from the frequencies for diversity of the participant's community (diverse or primarily

White) or their level of perceived conflict. Thus, I explored the following relationships:

- Is there a relationship between the variables of navigation and negotiation?
- Is there a relationship between the diversity of the primary community of practice and the level of negotiation and navigation?
- Is there a relationship between perceived level of conflict or otherness and navigation and negotiation?

“Diversity of Community of Practice” was transformed into a dichotomous variable where 1 indicated that the participant qualified at least one of their community’s of practice as diverse, and 0 indicated that the participant did not evaluate any of their communities of practice as diverse. “Majority White Community of Practice” underwent a similar transformation with 1 indicating that the participant qualified at least one of their communities of practice as majority White, and 0 indicating that the participant did not describe any of their communities of practice as majority White.

The raw frequency data for Navigating and Negotiating were transformed into categories reflecting the number of times, or the amount, participants mentioned each. Participants mentioned Navigating between one and nine times in their narratives. These frequencies were then converted into an ordinal scale with 1 reflecting mentioning navigating one or two times to 4 being that the participant mentioned navigating between seven to nine times. Similarly, participants mentioned Negotiating between zero and 10 times, thus the

frequencies were converted so that 1 indicated that participants mentioned the concept between zero to two times in their narrative and 4 being that they mentioned it eight to 10 times.

Using the above definitions for the categorical variables, a second member of the NAC research team coded eight of the 44 interviews for reliability; four interviews from the African American cohort and four from the mixed ethnic heritage cohort were selected at random for this purpose. Using standard cutoffs, the coders agreed on 100% of the interviews for the variable “Diverse Community of Practice,” with a Kappa coefficient of 1. Agreement between raters on Navigation was 63%, with a Kappa coefficient of .63, indicating acceptable concordance. Agreement between raters on Negotiation was poor at 34% and a Kappa coefficient of .14. When the two coders discussed the coding for Negotiation it became clear that two related factors influenced their disagreement, one factor being the second coders level of training on the coding scheme and the second being the second coder’s understanding of the differences between Negotiation and Navigation. The second coder indicated that if she had been better trained on the coding scheme she would have recognized the differences between instances of Navigation and Negotiation. Given this discussion I decided to include Negotiation in further analysis with the caveat that I would be cautious regarding significant findings related to Negotiation.

***Relationship between navigation and negotiation.***

Using the Fisher’s Exact Test, I found a significant relationship between Navigation and Negotiation,  $p=.048$ . This relationship could be due to the

differences seen between the expected and actual frequencies for low levels (1) of Navigation and Negotiation (9 participants as opposed to the expected 5.5), and between moderately high levels (3) of Navigation and Low Levels (1 and 2) of Negotiation (with 1 participant as opposed to the expected 3.6 for Level 1 of Navigation and 6 as opposed to the expected 4.1 for Level 2 Navigation). These differences are reflected in a strong positive correlation between Navigation and Negotiation,  $r_s(44) = .410, p = .006$ , indicating that as levels of navigation increase so do levels of negotiation. (See Table 5)

Table 5

*Comparison of Levels of Navigation and Negotiation*

			Negotiation Levels				
			1 = Low	2	3	4 = High	Total
Navigation Levels	1 = Low	Count	9	4	1	1	15
		Expected	5.5	6.1	2.0	1.4	15
	2	Count	6	8	1	2	17
		Expected	6.2	7.0	2.3	1.5	17
	3	Count	1	6	2	1	10
		Expected	3.6	4.1	1.4	.9	10
	4 =High	Count	0	0	2	0	2
		Expected	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.2	2
		Total (N=44)	16	18	6	4	44

***Relationship between the diversity of the primary community of practice and the level of negotiation and navigation.***

There was a significant relationship between the variables Diverse Community of Practice and Negotiation,  $p=.048$  (See Table 6). This relationship

may be due to the differences between actual and expected frequencies for High Level of Negotiation in non-Diverse environments, with less negotiation occurring in non-diverse environments than expected. There were also higher than expected high levels of negotiation in diverse communities of practice. The strong positive correlation between diversity of community of practice and level of negotiation,  $r_s(44) = .443, p = .003$ , indicates that those living in diverse environments tend to negotiate more than individuals in non-diverse environments. (Note: if an individual lives in a non-diverse environment it does *not* mean that they live in a majority White community).

Table 6

*Comparison of Diverse Community of Practice and Level of Negotiation*

			Negotiation Levels				Total
			1 = Low	2	3	4 = High	
Diversity of Community	Not Diverse	Count	10	11	0	0	21
		Expected	7.6	8.6	2.9	1.9	21
	Diverse	Count	6	7	6	4	23
		Expected	8.4	9.4	3.1	2.1	23
		Total (N=44)	16	18	6	4	44

As can be seen by the frequencies cross tabulated in Table 7, there was a significant relationship between the variables Diverse Community of Practice and Navigation,  $p=.031$ . There were fewer than expected high levels of navigation in non-diverse environments and higher frequencies of lower level (Level 2)

navigation in neighborhoods that were not diverse. Finally there were higher frequencies of moderate level navigation than expected in diverse environments.

Table 7

*Comparison of Diverse Community of Practice and Level of Navigation*

			Navigation Levels				
			1 = Low	2	3	4 = High	Total
Diversity of Community	Not Diverse	Count	7	12	2	0	21
		Expected	7.2	8.1	4.8	1	21
	Diverse	Count	8	5	8	2	23
		Expected	7.8	8.9	5.2	1	23
		Total (N=44)	15	17	10	2	44

While there was not a significant Fisher’s Exact for Primarily White Community of Practice and Negotiation or Navigation, there was a significant positive correlation between living in a Primarily White/Majority Community of Practice and Negotiation ( $r_s(44) = .375, p = .012$ ) indicating that, like participants who live in primarily diverse communities of practice, those living in a primarily White communities of practice have higher levels of negotiation than those who do not. (Note: if an individual lives in a primarily White community of practice it does *not* mean that they live in a diverse environment, they could be living in an ethnically similar environment comprised of similar races, just not those of the majority White population in the US.)

***Relationship between perceived level of conflict or otherness and navigation and negotiation.***

While there were no significant relationships between otherness or conflict and navigation and negotiation, I did note a trend towards significance for the relationship between conflict and navigation ( $p=.086$ ). This trend could be due to the fewer than expected frequencies of low levels of navigation for low levels of perceived conflict and higher than expected frequencies for high levels of navigation for high levels of perceived conflict. (See Table 8)

Table 8

*Comparison of Level of Perceived Conflict and Level of Navigation*

			Navigation Levels				
			1 = Low	2	3	4 = High	Total
Level of Perceived Conflict	Low	Count	10	8	5	0	23
		Expected	7.8	8.9	5.2	1	23
	Moderate	Count	5	6	4	0	15
		Expected	5.1	5.8	3.4	.7	15
	High	Count	0	3	1	2	6
		Expected	2	2.3	1.4	.3	6
Total (N=44)			15	17	10	2	44

Based on these results I returned to the following research questions:

- What experiences of differential marking do individuals have within the community that make their difference salient, and how are these experiences perceived and interpreted?

- How do experiences of otherness influence an individual's appraisal of their life experiences, as well as the strategies that they employ to navigate these experiences of otherness?

Combining the two questions I wondered if there was a relationship between the participants' community of practice, their level of perceived conflict (i.e., their possible appraisal of the community), and their levels of navigation and/or negotiation. To examine the relationship between these three constructs by illuminating case based patterns, I returned to CFA. While CFA with Negotiation did not yield significant results, CFA with Navigation yielded a significant type for the cell 234, indicating that the pattern of developing in a primarily diverse community of practice, experiencing a high amount of perceived cultural conflict, and use of a high amount of navigational strategies, occurred more frequently than expected by chance ( $p < .001$ ).

### **Integration of Findings across Mixed Methods**

The quantitative analyses offered a statistical confirmation of two interesting relationships. One relationship is that between cultural marking, high levels of perceived cultural conflict and feelings of marked otherness. The other relationship is between a diverse community of practice, a high level of perceived conflict and high levels of negotiation. Given the nature of Configural Frequency Analysis one can easily return to the individuals whose data provided the results. It should also be noted that, given the sensitivity of CFA, significant findings could result from only a few participants' responses. In this instance, two

participants from the mixed ethnicity group presented the first relationship, while two individuals from the African American group presented the second.

**Experiencing a diverse community of practice, high levels of perceived conflict, and high levels of navigation.**

Both of the participants who presented the significant pattern of diverse community of practice, high levels of perceived conflict and high levels of navigation indicated growing up in diverse neighborhoods and having a diverse group of friends, during childhood through college. For example, the participant who identified as Spanish, Japanese, and American recalled the neighborhood that she grew up in as follows:

Interviewee: Uh, actually my neighborhood was like I think the way the real estate works they filter all the, uh, minority people there, or whatever, because my neighborhood is actually pretty diverse.

Interviewer: Oh, yeah? Where were your neighbors from?

Interviewee: There was like uhh, we have like a Cuban family, there's a bunch of different families in our neighborhood. There's like a Cuban family, uh, there's this like mixed another mixed family that was half Black and half White, a lot of Black neighbors, I mean obviously there was a lot White neighbors too, but it was pretty, for the town, like compared to the rest of the town it was...

When the researcher asked the same participant about her peer group in college she answered:

Interviewee: Um, it was Filipino (laughs) no, I yeah it was pretty diverse I guess. But, uh, I mean, I think it like I mean I've met people in the multi-racial group and then also in the FCS [Filipino Cultural Society] where I started to spend more time. So, I guess like it started to be specially my senior year I had a lot of Filipino friends.

Not only did she have a diverse group of friends, but she also got involved with diverse student groups, ones that did not necessarily have a relationship with her own ethnicity but that she and her friends were interested in.

These two participants also recounted several occurrences of perceiving cultural conflict throughout their life. The other participant, who was Native American, recalled having to attend Native American ceremonies with his family when he would rather have stayed at home with his friends.

Yeah, yeah and like yeah I hated it then because it would be like for example there was one ceremony called Sundance which happens in the summer and we would always drive up to see my relatives in Oregon and I just hated it, but on top of that I would always have to leave school like a week early and my friends of the year and I was always really sad because I was like "everyone gets to have a party on the last day of school and like I have to miss it" and I was always in such a bad mood because I didn't want to go 'cause I wanted to be with my friends and stuff like that and so like I really didn't want to participate in a lot of stuff like for reasons like that.

The same participant recalled the following experience from college when he worked on the financial campaign for the alumnae association:

Yeah, I mean like, like I notice like a couple of things were different. Like one of the things that's huge in the Native community is like respect of your elders and that the way that you treat older people um, it's like a lot more emphasized I think, um, like for example, I work at the... which is like the Alumni like you call and ask them for money or whatever, and like sometimes I'll be calling like really, really old people like who graduated in the thirties and stuff and like I would always feel like really like awkward about it and wouldn't want to do it 'cause like you know you're asking them like for money and so one time my was like "why is it such a big deal, they're just like everyone else" and I'm like well in my culture like you would never go to an elder and ask them for money like that. That's just something that's so disrespectful you would never do it, you know...

Thus, for this participant, conflict occurred when one of his identified communities of practice required that he do something at odds with another. This same participant indicated a connection between cultural conflict and navigation in his recollection of applying for college:

...in terms of like being *mixed* um, like I don't think that my family really helped me that much at all, um, just because like my dad just was sort of like whatever. And then my mom is like really into like my being Indian and like so for example when I was applying to college like I was putting

on all my applications I would check Native American and White and she's like why are you checking White, like you're Native you should only check that box and I like got into this huge argument with her I was like no I'm both. You're White like what are you saying, you know? Um, but like I think what helped most with that, um was just like first of all being like with my friends who are also mixed, 'cause then we could all sort of like come to terms with that together and be like "oh, hey we're mixed" and we'd joke about people would get confused about like what we were and we would like switch and stuff and like pretend and so I think that definitely helped a lot and also just the fact that like I didn't really have like sort of a social group to go with my culture um, so I was always sort of had to be part of like a different sort of culture, um, than my Native culture when I was outside my home, um, so I think that helped a lot too and my like little things.

In this instance the conflict occurred because the participant's parents were asking him to choose between his different cultural worlds, however, his friends helped him learn how to chart a course through the multiple worlds by pretending and switching. In recounting her identity development the Spanish, Japanese, and American participant melded the three variables of diversity, conflict and navigation into one,

Interviewer: Do you think you've, I mean in college do you think that, or maybe before did you feel that you came to terms with you're, you being mixed?

Interviewee: Uh huh

Interviewer: When was that point for you?

Interviewee: I think in high school, in like high school or middle school it was like it was a time where I was really um, uh, not comfortable with it, but then like as I got in college and like matured and you know met more people that like were into a more diverse place, um I became more uh, like comfortable with it, but I still don't think like even now that I'm like a hundred percent comfortable with my ethnic background just 'cause uh, I don't know, it's different, like when I, as you go different places like Japan and if I go to Spain like it's like hard to navigate my identity because I realize that I'm not fully Japanese or I'm not fully Spanish or something

Interviewer: um huh

Interviewee: So you know they, like people point that out and you realize like well what the fuck am I then? so

Interviewer: so

Interviewee: ...so like maybe in middle school like to give a kind of percentile thing. Like in middle school and high school like I was definitely like uh, like thirty percent comfortable with myself whereas now I'm probably like eighty-five percent comfortable with myself so

Interviewer: What do you think is the fifteen percent uh?

Interviewee: fifteen?

Interviewer: Yeah the fifteen percent left.

Interviewee: Oh, I think, uh, I think I'm always uh, like, swaying too far to one side whereas I want to be down in the middle, between, like right down the middle between Japanese and Spanish. I feel like I lean more toward my Japanese side now, but, in the future I'll probably be like as I learn, I want to learn more Spanish and get my speaking ability back and like travel there. So I think once I like, do that and start like 'cause I'm more connected to my relatives like in Japan than I am to Spain, 'cause I don't even know any of my relatives in Spain except for my aunt, really.

Interviewer: yeah

Interviewee: So, like I think like I kind of want to be in the middle.

For this participant her multiple identities developed from her ability to navigate the conflict presented by the many different cultural worlds she lives in. While she currently feels that she has to compromise her identity in order to live in multiple worlds, she indicates that meeting more people, traveling more, learning the language, becoming more familiar with both her Japanese and Spanish family were all navigational means that would help her better negotiate these worlds and achieve 100% confidence in her "middle" identity.

**Experiencing a cultural basis of differential marking, high levels of perceived conflict, and a marked feeling of otherness.**

Beyond the Configural Frequency Analysis findings regarding this relationship, a query regarding the co-occurrence of codes related to these variables in Atlas displayed similar relationships. When I analyzed the co-occurrence of perceived cultural conflict and feelings of otherness I found 16

quotes from 15 individuals related to otherness. Five of these experiences were Generic in nature, nine Marked, and two Disruptive. Thus, as the statistical findings confirm, perceived conflict occurred most often with a sense of marked otherness.

When I queried the co-occurrences between perceived conflict and basis of differential marking I found that racial categories co-occurred eight times, ethnic categories six times, and the cultural categories of language, dress and practices co-occurred with perceived conflict 10 times (four, two and four respectively). Again, as the statistical analysis confirmed, culture as a differential marker had a significant relationship with perceived cultural conflict.

Finally, when I analyzed the three-way co-occurrence between basis of differential marking, perceived cultural conflict and feelings of otherness, there were 14, eight of the total 14 co-occurred with a sense of marked otherness, (three cultural markings, four racial and one via ethnicity). There were five co-occurrences with generic otherness (two with cultural markings, one with racial, and two via ethnicity). Finally, there was one co-occurrence of perceived cultural conflict and disruptive otherness and an instance of racial marking. With these results I noted that, again, cultural marking, perceived cultural conflict and a marked sense of otherness appeared to have a significant relationship, which was confirmed through configural frequency analysis.

There were two participants in the significant configural analysis cell who recounted several experiences of being differentially marked culturally, having high levels of perceived conflict, and feelings of marked otherness. (Remember,

the categories for the variables in configural frequency analysis were based on the number of times the participant presented each variable, a ranked variable, thus the difference between the numbers for CFA and those seen in the Atlas analysis above). While these two participants recounted the most experiences in this manner, others relayed singular experiences reflecting a similar sentiment. Further, unlike the previous significant relationship, the two participants here were self-identified as African American.

One of these participants indicated these feelings as a consequence of the circumstantial trigger of joining a cultural group that supports African American youth.

Prior to entering college I was in an all White environment yet my mother entered me in Jack and Jill when I was in fourth grade so I got to be around other Black people but we were so different. They knew all the dances, dressed differently, they immediately noticed I didn't talk like them. I think they thought of me as the White girl in Jack and Jill. So I actually felt more comfortable around school than at Jack and Jill for a long while. Now that I'm in college I've found other people with the same experiences as mine and it's been great to laugh about it and move on with our lives... it's not easy because I won't change my speech to fit in with Black people but I will make myself open and approachable and I always smile at people if I find they're looking at me. I like that I have a firm understanding of the White culture but I would like to be more involved in Black culture.

This participant had the experience of being differentially marked because she did not speak, act or dress in a culturally similar manner to the other members of the group. She felt conflict between these two cultures because she felt that she had to conform to one of them, but she would not, “change my speech to fit in with Black people.” Finally, her marked feeling of otherness is present in her discomfort with the clashing cultures early in life as well as her academic questioning and desire to be more involved in Black culture. For her, being differentially marked was the impetus for her to question her identity and how she fits in this world.

The other participant indicated a significant racial/cultural event in the United States, the Rodney King beating by police in Los Angeles California, as the circumstantial trigger to his experience of being differentially marked by culture.

I think one incident that stands out is the Rodney King beatings. I was really young but I saw the beatings on TV. My parents were so scared and worried for my welfare and would try to inform me of the fact that I was Black and that meant I had to always be on my best behavior and they taught me how to act if a police officer ever approaches me...I knew it wasn't fair that the White people at school didn't have to think of that... As I mentioned before I am just all around proper, I feel like a lot of times White people want the Black person to be there for entertainment but I try never to fall into that role by the way I carry myself and speak to people. What makes it harder is that I am aware of the judgments people may be

making against me and this makes me uncomfortable, so I'm never fully comfortable and myself when I know I have to interact with White people...

I do act and behave differently, if I didn't my parents would feel that I'm a failure. I've been taught to act quote unquote appropriately and be on my best behavior. That's what they'd always say was be on your best behavior if we were going to be in a surrounding that included White people. As I got older I've learned to get rid of all slang and stand tall always.

In this case, his parents are the individuals who heightened his awareness to the cultural differential marking, such as, "being there for entertainment," not, "acting proper," by teaching him to be on his, "best behavior... get rid of slang and stand tall always," all strategies to combat cultural markings of language, practices and beliefs. This all came about due to the extreme culture conflict perceived by the participant while watching the Rodney King beatings on television, an event that portrayed to the United States the perpetuation of discrimination and degradation towards African Americans. Finally, his marked feelings associated with these experiences are feelings that are unfair to him and his cultural group, and as a consequence he never feels, "fully comfortable and [himself] when [he] knows he has to interact with White people." This participant's experiences portray a similar sentiment to the first in that differential marking, cultural conflict and feelings of marked otherness trigger a questioning of identity and a search for his place in his many cultural worlds.

The results in this study indicate three important factors in an individual's ability to navigate the multiple cultural worlds in which they live, in particular as it relates to experiences of being differentially marked. One factor is the ethnic/cultural/racial composition of their varying communities of practice, the second being how their world interacts with them or marks them, and finally how they appraise and process the differences that they encounter.

### **Discussion**

The results in this study indicate two important findings with regards to sources and experiences with being differentially marked as well as the influence of an individual's community of practice on the development of their navigational skills. These results differ from previous research in two ways, one being the source of differential marking and the other highlighting the diversity of the community of practice.

#### **Describing the Community of Participation**

The description of an individual's community of participation – or community of practice, or developmental context – often invokes the term neighborhood. According to Nicotera (2007), *neighborhood* can be separated into the concepts of *environment* and *place*. *Neighborhood* is a multidimensional concept that encompasses the objective and subjective realms in which a child lives. As a part of one's *neighborhood*, *environment* can be considered an objective description of the realm in which children are raised. The description of *environment* often encompasses aspects that visually set individuals living within the environment apart from others, such as describing the environment on the basis of ethnicity or the aggregate socio-economic status of individuals living in the area (i.e., focusing on the diversity of the environment, or lack there of). Nicotera posits that the ethnic make-up, or level of diversity, of an individual's primary community of participation influences how an individual appraises their life experiences.

The results from the current study indicate a similar sentiment in that a primarily diverse community of participation is related to higher levels of navigation and negotiation, while those who did not grow-up in a primarily diverse environment had only low levels of navigation and negotiation. Remembering that navigation involves appraisal of the context, one could infer that diverse *environments*, because they comprise many different cultures and ethnicities, invoke more navigation because there are more cultures through which to “chart a course.” Further, because of the positive relationship between navigation and negotiation, diverse environments appear to need more navigation, planning, in order to negotiate the many worlds in which one lives.

This result could be interpreted in a negative light, in that children living in diverse environments may be living in “too many” multiple worlds and as such suffer in terms of identity formation because they do not know what world to affiliate with primarily. As Benet Martínez and Haritatos (2005) indicate, “switching cognitive and behavioral frames in response to different cultural cues [can be] accompanied by feelings of confusion regarding one’s ability to maintain consistent, recognizable self-identities”

(p. 140).

To this end, Nishina, Bellmore, Witkow and Nylund-Gibson (2010) found that ethnic identity was stable when their participants were in an environment where their own culture was in the majority. That is, African American ethnic identification was most stable for students attending an African American majority school, and the identities of mixed ethnicity youth were most stable in a

mixed ethnicity environment. In fact, the two participants in this study who indicated the significant type of diverse environment, high levels of perceived conflict and many navigational strategies self-identified as African American. While ethnic group membership did not play a significant role in the current study it should be further explored in subsequent studies to see if this type holds true in all instances.

While this perspective may indeed be true, results from the current study could also be interpreted in a more positive light. That is, children developing in diverse environments may be learning earlier how to capitalize on differences between individuals, as well as finding harmony between different worlds, which are necessary skills for living in the emerging global economy, as well as in areas of the United States with high levels of immigration from many countries. In fact, many of the participants in this study indicated participation in multiple communities as a navigational means, in that their experience in these worlds helped them to learn how to negotiate any setting they encountered. Thus, the diversity of one's *environment* does play a role in how one navigates and negotiates the multiple worlds in which he or she lives, but how this interaction affects one's psychological processing of the *environment*, and the experiences that one has within his or her *neighborhood*, can be interpreted differently depending on the individual's appraisal.

#### **Creating a Sense of Place through Displacement: Appraising the situation**

According to Nicotera (2007) neighborhood also consists of an individual's sense of *place*. *Place* is more subjective than *environment* in that it

communicates the participant's lived experiences. Further, these experiences are ones that the *participant* associates with diversity. In the current study I explored how multi cultural individuals developing within varying communities of practice experienced salience of difference, in particular how experiences of differential marking made these differences salient and the effects that salience had on their development as an individual.

In the current study, differential marking is an experience where by an individual is made to feel different from the other members in their *environment*. When one is made to feel different how does it affect their sense of place; how do individuals appraise the experience of being marked as "other" and how does this appraisal influence their own feelings of otherness and their lived experiences? Results from this study indicate that there is a relationship between an individual's perceived level of cultural conflict and levels of navigation. The relationship is such that higher levels of perceived conflict produce higher levels of navigation, where as lower levels of perceived conflict inspire little if any navigation. Benet Martínez and Haritatos (2005) indicate similar findings, in that variations in cultural conflict, among other factors related to multi cultural identity, can affect an individual's behavioral and cognitive functioning, or ability to navigate and negotiate one's multiple cultural worlds. Indeed, Benet Martínez and Hariatos indicate that cultural conflict consists of the, "feelings associated with the emotional process of navigating one's position within and between each culture" (p.1044) in which they live.

One's sense of *place*, or the experiences that a participant associates with diversity (Nicotera, 2007), is thus related to perceived cultural conflict as captured in this study, in that cultural conflict indicates the necessity of a participant's actions and interactions with their multiple cultural worlds. Further, in this study I also found that cultural conflict had a relationship with being culturally marked and a feeling of psychological otherness. In support of this finding, results from Benet Martínez and Haritatos (2005) study of Bicultural Identity Integration indicate, "that cultural conflict is largely rooted in acculturation-related interpersonal causes, specifically, the feeling that one is socially rejected, mistreated, and pressured because of one's cultural/ethnic memberships" (p. 1036). That is, perceived cultural conflict emerges from experiences of being differentially marked as well as feelings of marked and disruptive otherness. Benet Martínez and Haritatos go on to state that, for multi cultural individuals:

...strains, particularly discrimination and intercultural relations stress, create a strong discrepancy between explicit and implicit attitudes toward each culture. If individuals consciously identify with and value both mainstream Anglo/American and ethnic cultures, but also experience prejudice and rejection from members of one or both of these groups, feelings of anger and distress may create an internal discrepancy that may be subjectively experienced as cultural conflict (Van Hook & Higgins, 1988) (p.1039-140).

This "internal discrepancy" may act as the appraising factor between an individual's community of participation, or *environment*, and their lived

experiences, or sense of *place*, in terms of navigating and negotiation those communities, and also between an experience of being differentially marked in one's *environment*, and having affective reactions, or feeling of otherness, associated with that experience.

While previous research examined the relationship among the diversity of an individual's community of practice and assignment of characteristics, psychological adjustment and stability of identity (e.g., Chen, Benet-Martínez & Bond, 2008; Jackson, Barth, Powell & Lochman, 2006; Yip, Seaton, & Sellers, 2010), little research has examined the processes that relate diversity to these constructs. Kiang, Yip and Fuligini (2008) indicate that the person centered approach used in this research, "would indeed argue that the emerging patterns of variables are based on individuals' *process* characteristics rather than demographic categories" (p. 665-666). Results from the current study pose a possible processing relationship through the significant finding of diverse communities of practice being related to high levels of perceived conflict and the employment of several strategies for navigating across cultures. Perhaps then, diverse communities of practice provide more voices, more cultural beliefs, values and practices that have to be integrated, and the more aspects of culture that one must integrate the more conflict felt between the cultures, which in turn necessitates the need to employ multiple strategies to navigate the many worlds. Thus, the level of diversity associated with the community may in fact incur high levels of cultural conflict for some individuals.

### **Culture as a Source of Differential Marking**

Previous research highlights race and ethnicity as the primary sources of differential marking for minority individuals. In their research, Seaton, Caldwell, Sellers, and Jackson (2010) highlight that the most common attribution of discrimination among their participants was race/ethnicity, and both Maddox and Gray (2002) and Maddox and Gray Chase (2004) focus on gradations in skin tone, or rather gradations in a racial phenotypical attribute, as a source by which others mark persons of African American descent. Further, Kiang, Yip and Fuligini (2008) measured the frequency of ethnic and racial discrimination in multicultural groups and found a negative association between the amount of perceived discrimination and measures of self-worth. By focusing on race/ethnicity as the primary attributes of discrimination, and employing measures that only account for race and ethnicity, we lose sight of a third social construct related to race and ethnicity as emphasized in the study at hand. That is, we lose sight of culture as a basis of differential marking.

As this study shows there is a significant relationship between measures of differential marking, perceived conflict, and feelings of otherness. When this relationship is examined further we notice that a significant type, or sub-relationship, in that there is a significant relationship, or type, between perceived *cultural* marking, high levels perceived cultural conflict and disruptive feelings of otherness. Thus, for this sample of participants, race as a source of differential marking does not appear to affect feelings of otherness as greatly as cultural markings.

As an indicator of the importance of accounting for culture, Chandler and Lalonde (2008) and Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol and Hallett (2003) indicate the presence of cultural continuity in the lives of First Nations youth acts as a protective factor against suicide, suggesting that a strong sense of culture may alleviate feelings of disruptive difference. The measures of cultural continuity utilized by Chandler and Lalonde (2008) and Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol and Hallett (2003) emphasize self-governance. This emphasis can be interpreted to mean that removing culture as a means by which to subjugate individuals, we reduce feelings of difference and low self-worth. Further, perhaps self-governance can alleviate the cultural conflict that multi cultural individuals perceive between their many differing communities of practice.

According to Benet Martínez and Haritatos (2005), feelings of cultural conflict can lead an individual into a reactive state in which they reject aspects of their cultural experiences and beliefs in their varying communities of practice. Kiang, Yip and Fuligini (2008) found that those who identified with many ethnicities, perhaps having resolved the conflict between cultures, reported significantly less negative affect, more positive affect, perceived more American opportunities, and higher self-esteem than individuals who had few social identifications. In a similar fashion, in the current study I suggest that perceived level of cultural conflict may play a mediating role between being differentially marked and feelings of otherness, as well as between the diversity of the community of practice and number of navigational strategies that individuals employ. As such, cultural continuity can attenuate feelings of difference in the

face of discrimination as well as the need to employ an exorbitant number of navigational strategies given the diversity of the context.

### **Limitations, Implications and Future Research**

Allowing participants to choose their own identity gives strength to the person centered nature of this research in that it enables individuality and a true expression of participant affiliations, however it does pose problems with regards to the ability to generalize these data. Regardless of the fact that I did not find a significant relationship between variables and the ethnic group with whom the participants' identified, it is important to note that the group of participants in this study who self identify as African American was not solely composed of those traditionally defined as such (i.e., individuals who descended from slaves brought from Africa to the United States against their will). As such, the experiences that individuals who are not the descendents of slaves portray a very different social construct of the African American race, ethnicity, and culture, which may not relate in any way to that of African Americans who have been in the US for many generations. Research done by Kiang, Yip and Fuligini (2008),

...emphasizes the diversity of the patterns and types of identity combinations that are available to young adults. Even those with similar backgrounds have the potential to exhibit different configurations of their multiple social identities. That is, there is no one dominant way to be. (p. 665)

Thus, the sample in this study may be an accurate depiction of these many identifications. Future research could delve into the nature of self-identification

and, if a larger sample size was used, these results may hold true, but one might also find that group membership plays a larger role in the lived experiences of multi cultural individuals than captured here.

A second limitation comes by way of differences in the collection and transcription of the data. While both graduate students conducted research using the same semi-structured interview protocol, their interview style differed as did their transcriptions of the interviews. One graduate student asked more elaborating and probing questions that elicited a more narrative form of data from the participant, while the other researcher only appeared to ask the questions as written in the protocol. This difference was further emphasized in the transcriptions, in that one sample had shorter transcriptions than the other, and, although all of them carried the information necessary for analysis, one sample did use a more narrative style when depicting their life experiences.

While this may appear to be a limitation in terms of the interviews, it may be depicting what Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol and Hallett (2003) deem as representative of *essentialist* versus *narrative* identities. According to these researchers, western cultures tend to depict personal persistence, or persistence of identity, in essentialist terms.

Essentialist positions, involve efforts to marginalize change by attaching special importance to one or more enduring attributes of the self that are imagined to somehow stand outside of or otherwise defeat time. (p. 8)

Where as cultures and researchers separate from the western perspective tend to be more driven by the narrative form.

Arranged against Essentialism, are all of those narrativists, hermeneuticists, and social constructivists, along with an assemblage of presentist historiographers and phenomenologists and champions of all things dialogical, whose generic solution to the problem of personal persistence is to emphasize the connective tissue between things, rather than to imagine the existence of anything enduring or immune to time. (p. 9)

Given the nature and intent of my research, perhaps the differences noted between the samples is not indicative of the style of the interviewer or the quality of their transcription, but instead the samples portray the polarity between the essentialist and narrative selves.

In this study I highlight the importance of listening to the individual and understanding their experience in order to achieve the successful navigation and negotiation of their cultural worlds. As such, this research, and the conceptual model that it ascribes to (Mistry & Wu, 2010), could be utilized as a part of a needs assessment for multicultural individuals receiving services in a community. Thus, this research could help further the agenda for culturally relevant and sensitive research, as well as culturally relevant and sensitive practices in institutions. For example, Somerville, Massachusetts is proceeding with a program (Somerville Promise Alliance) to support the development and academic success of children from one of their public housing developments, which comprises a diverse population represented by several different languages including Spanish, Haitian Creole, Portuguese and Nepalese. While members of

the Somerville service community are involved in the development of this program, as of late none of them are residents of the public housing community where it is to be implemented. Thus, the lived experiences, and the identities, of these residents are missing from the proposed project agenda. In fact, during my research with families in the community, as part of another project, I often heard them say that schools needed to find a way to help them balance their two cultures, that of the United States and their home country. Thus, my research gives credence to the necessity of listening to individuals living within the community about their strengths, their struggles, and their identities, in order to discover a means by which to support their navigation between the multiple worlds in which they live.

Finally, this study is a part of a larger research project focusing on the many aspects and nuances of navigating between multiple cultural worlds, and as such the findings will contribute to the continued inquiry regarding the constructs and contexts involved in the development of ethnic identity. Further, this study only explores a small number of the nuances contained in a single context of the conceptual model (i.e., the individual context) offered by Mistry and Wu (2010) (see Table 1), thus there is still further research to be done in order to continue unpacking the individual context as well as that of the community and family.

### References

- American Psychiatric Association (2006). *Resolution Against Racism and Racial Discrimination and Their Adverse Impacts on Mental Health Position Statement*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Benet-Martínez, V. & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality, 73*(4), 1015-1050.
- Bernstein, R. & Edwards, T. (2008). An older and more diverse nation by mid-century. *United States Census Press Release*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/012496.html>.
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista & G. Marín (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bhatia, S. (2007). *American Karma: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Indian Diaspora*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Bhatia, S. & Ram, A. (2001). Rethinking 'acculturation' in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities. *Human Development, 44*, 1-18.
- Boykin, A. W. (2000). The talent development model of schooling: placing students at promise for academic success. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 5*(1&2), 3-25.

- Chandler, M. J., Lalonde, C. E., Sokol, B. W. & Hallett, D. (2003). Personal persistence, identity development, and suicide: a study of non-native North American adolescents. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 68*(2), vii-130.
- Chandler, M. J. & Lalonde, C. E. (2008). Cultural continuity as a protective factor against suicide in First Nations youth. *Horizons, 9*(4), 13-24.
- Chen, S. X., Benet-Martínez, V. & Bond, M. H. (2008). Bicultural identity, bilingualism, and psychological adjustment in multicultural settings: immigration-based and globalization-based acculturation. *Journal of Personality, 76*(4), 803-838.
- Cooper, C. R. (1999). Multiple selves, multiple worlds: Cultural perspectives on individuality and connectedness in adolescent development. In A. S. Masten (Ed.), *Cultural Processes in Child Development* (pp. 25-57). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Cooper, C., García Coll, C. T., Thorne, B. & Orellana, M. F. (2005). Beyond demographic categories: How immigration, ethnicity, and “race” matter for children’s identities and pathways through school. In C. R. Cooper, C. T. García Coll, W. T. Bartko, H. Davis & C. Chatman (Eds.), *Developmental Pathways Through Middle Childhood: Rethinking contexts and diversity as resources* (pp. 181-206). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Cross, W. E. (2005). Ethnicity, race and identity. In T. S. Weisner (Ed.), *Discovering Successful Pathways in Children's Development: Mixed methods in the discovery of childhood and family life* (pp. 171-182). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cross, W. E. & Cross, T. B. (2008). Theory, research and models. In S. M. Quintana & C. McKown (Eds.), *Handbook of Race, Racism, and the Developing Child* (pp. 154-181). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical Race Theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Ferguson, R. (2009, February). *Classroom Conditions, Teaching Practices and Student Engagement: Ways that Teachers Can Help Close the Achievement Gap*. Paper presented at the Race, Culture, Identity and Achievement Seminar Series, 2008 -2009, Cambridge, MA.
- Fiese, B. H., Sameroff, A. J., Grotevant, H. D., Wamboldt, F. S., Dickstein, S. & Fravel, D. L. (2001). Observing families through the stories that they tell: A multidimensional approach. In P. K. Kerig & K. M. Lindahl (Eds.), *Observational Coding Systems: Resources for systematic research* (pp. 259-271). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- French, S. E., Seidman, E., Allen, L. & Aber, J. L. (2006). The development of ethnic identity during adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(1), 1-10.

- García Coll, C. & Pachter, L. M. (2002). Ethnic and minority parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting: Vol. 4: Social Conditions and Applied Parenting 2nd edition* (pp. 1-20). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- García Coll, C., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H. P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B. H. & García, H. V. (1998). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. In M. E. Hertzog & E. A. Farber (Eds.), *Annual Progress in Child Psychiatry and Child Development: 1997* (pp. 437-463). Philadelphia, PA, US: Brunner/Mazel.
- Gone, J. P., Miller, P. J. & Rappaport, J. (1999). Conceptual self as normatively oriented: the suitability of past personal narrative for the study of cultural identity. *Culture and Psychology*, 5(4), 371-398.
- Hall, S. (1997). Subjects in history: Making diasporic identities. In W. Lubiano (Ed.), *The House That Race Built: Black Americans, U.S. terrain* (pp. 289-299). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Harris, C. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), 1707-1791.
- Hecht, M. L., Ribeau, S. R. & Sedano, M. V. (1990). A Mexican American perspective on interethnic communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14(1), 31-55.
- Hecht, M. L., Sedano M.V. & Ribeau, S. R. (1993). Understanding, culture, communication, and research: Applications to Chicanos and Mexican

Americans. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 17(2), 157-165.

Helms, J. (1990). *Black and White Racial Identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Jackson, M. F., Barth, J. M., Powell, N. & Lochman, J. E. (2006). Classroom contextual effects of race on children's peer nominations. *Child Development*, 77(5), 1325-1337.

Kiang, L., Yip, T. & Fuligni, A. J. (2008). Multiple social identities and adjustment in young adults from ethnically diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 18(4), 643-670.

LaFramboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(3), 395-412.

Lerner, R. M., & Overton, W. F. (2008). Exemplifying the integrations of the relational developmental system: Synthesizing theory, research, and application to promote positive development and social justice. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 23, 245-255.

Lubiano, W. (1997). Black nationalism and black common sense: Placing ourselves and others. In W. Lubiano (Ed.), *The House That Race Built: Black Americans, U.S. terrain* (pp. 232-252). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

- Maddox, K. & Gray, S. A. (2002). Cognitive representation of Black Americans: reexploring the role of skin tone. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(2), 250-259.
- Maddox, K. B. & Gray Chase, S. (2004). Manipulating subcategory salience: exploring the link between skin tone and social perception of Blacks. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 533-546.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- McMahon, S. D. & Watts, R. J. (2002). Ethnic identity in urban African American youth: Exploring links with self-worth, aggression, and other psychosocial variables. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(4), 411-431.
- Mirandé, A. & Tanno, D.V. (1993). Understanding interethnic communication and research: “a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.” *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 17, 381-388.
- Mistry, J. (2006). Socio-Cultural Theory. In R. New & M. Cochran (Eds.). *Early Childhood Education: An International Encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Mistry, J. & Pufall, E. (2009, April). *Multidimensional profiles of navigating across cultures*. Poster presentation at the annual Conference for the Society For Research in Child Development, Denver, Colorado.

- Mistry, J. & Wu, J. (2010). Navigating cultural worlds and negotiating identities: A conceptual model. *Human Development, 53*(1), 5-25.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2004). Towards an anti-imperialist politics: Reflections of a desi feminist. *South Asian Popular Culture, 2*(1), 69-73.
- Nicotera, N. (2007). Measuring neighborhood: a conundrum for human services researchers and practitioners. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 40*, 26-51.
- Nishina, A., Bellmore, A., Witkow, M. R. & Nylund-Gibson, K. (2010). Longitudinal consistency of adolescent ethnic identification across varying school ethnic contexts. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(6), 1389-1401.
- Obama, B. (1995). *Dreams from My Father: A story of race and inheritance*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1994). From cultural differences to differences in cultural frame of reference. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development* (pp. 365-391). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Orbe, M. P. (2000). Centralizing diverse racial/ethnic voices in scholarly research: the value of phenomenology. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*(5), 603-621. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01471767>.
- Overton, W. (2010, April). *Relationism, Embodiment, and Developmental Systems*. Colloquium Presentation at Eliot Pearson Department of Child Development, Tufts University, Medford, MA.

- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), 499-514.
- Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist, 51*(9), 918-927.
- Pufall Jones, E. & Mistry, J. (2010). Navigating across cultures: Narrative constructions of lived experience. *Journal of Qualitative and Ethnographic Research, 4*, 57-74.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Rudmin, F. W. (2003). Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology, 7*(1), 3-37.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (2005). Sites of belonging: Acculturation, discrimination and ethnic identity among children of immigrants. In T. S. Weisner (Ed.), *Discovering Successful Pathways in Children's Development: Mixed methods in the discovery of childhood and family life* (pp. 111-163). Chicago, IL; The University of Chicago Press.
- Sansone, L. (2003). *Blackness without Ethnicity: Constructing Race in Brazil*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schwartz, S. J., Montgomery, M. J., & Briones, E. (2006). The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development, 49*(1), 1-30.

- Seaton, E. K., Caldwell, C. H., Sellers, R. M. & Jackson, J. S. (2010). Developmental characteristics of African American and Caribbean Black adolescents' attributions regarding discrimination. *Journal of Research in Adolescence, 20*(3), 774-788.
- Smith, D. L. (1997). What is black culture? In W. Lubiano (Ed.), *The House That Race Built: Black Americans, U.S. terrain* (pp. 178-194). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Smith, L.M. (Writer & Director). (2003). Episode 3: The house we live in [Television series episode]. In L. Adelman (Producer), *Race – the power of an illusion*. San Francisco: PBS.
- Smith, T. B. & Silva, L. (2011). Ethnic identity and personal well-being of people of color: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*(1), 42-60.
- Spencer, M. B. (2005). *Crafting identities and accessing opportunities post-Brown*. *American Psychologist, 60*(8), 821-830.
- Thorne, A. (2008, June). *Everyday storytelling as a context for adolescent identity development*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Piaget Society Meeting on Adolescent Development: Challenges and opportunities, Québec City, Québec.
- von Eye, A. (2010). Developing the person-oriented approach: Theory and methods of analysis. *Development and Psychopathology, 22*, 277-285.

- von Eye, A. (2007). *Configural Frequency Analysis: A Program for 32 Bit Windows Operating Systems Program Manual*. Michigan State University: Author.
- Yates, F. (1984). Tests of significance for 2 X 2 contingency tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 147(3), 426-463.
- Yates, D., Moore, Moore, D., McCabe, G. (1999). *The Practice of Statistics (1st Edition)*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Yip, T., Seaton, E. K. & Sellers, R. M. (2010). Interracial and intraracial contact, school-level diversity, and change in racial identity status among African American adolescents. *Child Development*, 81(5), 1431-1444.

## Appendices

### Appendix A

#### Personal Narrative Interview Protocol

In this country people come from many different countries, regions, and diverse cultural backgrounds. For example, sometimes we describe our background in terms of belonging to different ethnic groups, or coming from different regions of the country, or in terms of national origin, social class categories, religious affiliations and so on. We are interested in learning about your cultural background and how you have learned to move between your different cultural worlds. The questions I will ask are for you to tell us your story of learning to live in multiple cultural worlds.

**So to get started-do you feel you have to move between multiple cultural worlds? If so what are the various cultural worlds or backgrounds you have learned to navigate?**

**In terms of your cultural identity, how do you identify yourself? How do your parents or family members identify themselves? How do your parents or family members identify you?**

Family Background & Experiences

**Tell me about your family background - e.g. where you were born, where your parents were born, where you grew up, who is in your family, what do your parents do, your age, grade, school history-till now?**

Development of awareness of being different and different expectations of behavior

**Tell me about when you began to notice or think of the fact that you belong to different groups (e.g. family's group and American culture)? What childhood experiences do you recall that have something to do with your awareness of your cultural group and this being different from the larger American mainstream? Were there any particular difficult times or experiences?**

**Do you feel you have to act or behave different in the different groups? In what ways?**

Perception of Bicultural Competencies

**Now earlier you mentioned that you do move back and forth between different cultural groups. What skills do you have or use to enable you to move back and forth? What things about you do you think make it easier to go back and forth? What makes it harder?**

Experiences that facilitated becoming bicultural and those that make it harder  
**Thinking back to your childhood, what kinds of experiences do you think helped you to be able to move or go back and forth between multiple cultural worlds?**

Current sense of comfort and affiliation in different groups

**How comfortable do you feel moving between multiple cultural worlds? For example, when you are with people from your family's cultural group/s? And when you are in predominately mainstream groups (e.g. at school or in public places)? Do you prefer one more than the other?**

Integration of world

**Are there times when you feel you are able to bring both of your worlds together or experience both worlds? Is it important to you to be able to bring them together? Are there examples you can share?**

Your view of public perception of your group

**In general how do you think others see you and the cultural community you identify with? Why? How do you feel about this?**

**Appendix B**

Navigating Across Cultures Scale (NACS-P)

In this country people come from many different countries, regions, and diverse cultural backgrounds. For example, sometimes we describe our background in terms of belonging to different ethnic groups, or coming from different regions of the country, or in terms of national origin, social class categories, religious affiliations and so on. The questions on this survey are about your sense of belonging to any of these groups and your participation in the activities of multiple groups to which you feel you belong.

**1. In terms of cultural group I consider myself to be**

\_\_\_\_\_.

**2. My mother identifies me**

as \_\_\_\_\_.

**3. My father identifies me**

as \_\_\_\_\_.

**4. What generation are you? (Check the generation that best applies to you)**

\_\_\_\_\_ 1<sup>st</sup> generation = I was born in a country outside the U. S.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2<sup>nd</sup> generation = I was born in the U.S., either parent was born in a country outside the U. S.

\_\_\_\_\_ 3<sup>rd</sup> generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and all grandparents were born in a country outside the U. S.

\_\_\_\_\_ 4<sup>th</sup> generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., at least one grandparent was born in a country outside the U. S., and one born inside the U.S.

\_\_\_\_\_ 5<sup>th</sup> generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and all grandparents were born inside the U.S.

**5. I have a strong sense of belonging to my cultural group.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

6. I think of myself as being \_\_\_\_\_ (a member of my cultural group).

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

7. In general being \_\_\_\_\_ is an important part of my self image.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

8. I have a strong sense of belonging to American (mainstream) culture.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

9. I think of myself as being American (mainstream).

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

10. In general being American (mainstream) is an important part of my self image.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

11. Rate yourself on how well you fit with other people of the same cultural group.

<i>Fit very well ← 5</i>	4	3	2	<i>1 → Do not fit very well</i>
--------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

12. Rate yourself on how well you fit with other people who are American (mainstream).

<i>Fit very well ← 5</i>	4	3	2	<i>1 → Do not fit very well</i>
--------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------

13. I feel good about being American (mainstream).

<i>All of the time</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>	<i>Some of the time</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	
<i>Never</i>				
5	4	3	2	1

14. I feel good about being \_\_\_\_\_ (a member of my cultural group).

<i>All of the time</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>	<i>Some of the time</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	
<i>Never</i>				
5	4	3	2	1

**15. I feel comfortable being American (mainstream).**

<i>All of the time</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>	<i>Some of the time</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	
<i>Never</i>				
5	4	3	2	1

**16. I feel comfortable being \_\_\_\_\_ (a member of my cultural group).**

<i>All of the time</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>	<i>Some of the time</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	
<i>Never</i>				
5	4	3	2	1

**17. I worry about how my life will be affected by belonging to \_\_\_\_\_ (cultural group).**

<i>All of the time</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>	<i>Some of the time</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	
<i>Never</i>				
5	4	3	2	1

**18. I feel my cultural group has made many accomplishments and advancements.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**19. I often feel my cultural group is not well regarded by society in general.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**20. I feel that people from my cultural group are discriminated against.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**21. I think my cultural group is in the mainstream of America more than ever before.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**22. My cultural group should strive to be full members of the American political system.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**23. My cultural group should view themselves as being Americans first and foremost.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**24. Until the age of 6 my friends were...**

<i>Mostly from My cultural group mainstream</i>	<i>Mostly from diverse cultural groups</i>	<i>Mixed-both diverse and mainstream</i>
---	--	--

**25. From 6-18 years of age my friends were...**

<i>Mostly from My cultural group mainstream</i>	<i>Mostly from diverse cultural groups</i>	<i>Mixed-both diverse and mainstream</i>
---	--	--

Please answer the following questions by circling the number that best corresponds to your answer.

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Not at</b>	<b>A little</b>	<b>Some-</b>	<b>Quite a</b>
<b>A lot</b>	<b>all</b>	<b>bit</b>	<b>what</b>	<b>bit</b>

---

**How well do I know?**

**26. Popular American Television Shows?**    1            2            3            4  
5

**27. Popular American Newspapers  
And Magazines?**                    1            2            3            4  
5

**28. Popular American Actors  
And Actresses?**                    1            2            3            4  
5

**29. Popular American television shows?**    1            2            3            4  
5



*Mostly from Mainstream My cultural group*      *Both: that of my cultural group and mainstream America*      *Mostly American*

**41. I listen to music that is...**

*Mostly from Mainstream My cultural group*      *Both: that of my cultural group and mainstream America*      *Mostly American*

**42. I watch movies that are...**

*Mostly from Mainstream My cultural group*      *Both: that of my cultural group and mainstream America*      *Mostly American*

**43. I watch TV programs that are...**

*Mostly from Mainstream My cultural group*      *Both: that of my cultural group and mainstream America*      *Mostly American*

**44. I read newspapers and magazines that are...**

*Mostly from Mainstream My cultural group*      *Both: that of my cultural group and mainstream America*      *Mostly American*

**45. I think it is important for parents to surround their children with the art, music, and literature of their cultural group.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**46. I believe the most important values of my cultural group are:**

---



---



---

**47. I think the values of my cultural group are similar to American (mainstream) values.**

<i>A lot</i>	<i>Quite a bit</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A little bit</i>	<i>None at all</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**48. In general I agree with the values of mainstream Americans.**

<i>A lot all</i>	<i>Quite a bit</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A little bit</i>	<i>None at all</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**49. In general I agree with the values of my cultural group (e.g., about marriage, families, education, work)**

<i>A lot all</i>	<i>Quite a bit</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A little bit</i>	<i>None at all</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**50. In general, mainstream American values are important in my life.**

<i>A lot all</i>	<i>Quite a bit</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A little bit</i>	<i>None at all</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**51. In general, values of my cultural group are important in my life.**

<i>A lot all</i>	<i>Quite a bit</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A little bit</i>	<i>None at all</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**52. In the future, it will be important for me to raise my child with mainstream American values.**

<i>A lot all</i>	<i>Quite a bit</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A little bit</i>	<i>None at all</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**53. In the future, it will be important for me to raise my child with values of my cultural group.**

<i>A lot all</i>	<i>Quite a bit</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A little bit</i>	<i>None at all</i>
5	4	3	2	1

**Appendix C**

**Coding Scheme used in the analysis with explanation for codes.**

<p><b>Basis of Differential Marking</b></p> <p>(Note differential marking is usually done by others, sometimes by family members, or self...also, differential marking is not the code used if the person being interviewed is not being marked...if the participant is recalling someone else being marked it should be coded as PEBD:S:Salience of Difference (no evident personal discrimination))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BDM:Culture:Accent/Language</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Culture:Dress</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Culture:Food</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Culture:Political viewpoint</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Culture:Practices</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Culture:Religion</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are codes associated with the definition of culture</li> <li>• Notes, practices includes behaviors often associated by others with the culture (e.g. stereotypes)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community Context Experienced in Terms of “Being a Minority”</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BDM:Ethnicity:"checking the box"</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Ethnicity:Group Membership</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Ethnicity:Name</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ethnicity are labeling by heritage...name means marked by their first or last name (e.g. Chang), checking the box is when they are forced to choose their ethnicity on some standardized form (e.g. SATs or job application)</li> <li>• Group Memberships generalized heritage (Asians, or Blacks)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community Context Experienced as Exposure to and Familiarity With Multiple Communities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BDM:Race:Facial</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Race:Hair</b></li> <li>• <b>BDM:Race:Skin Color</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fairly self Explanatory</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community Context Experienced as Exposure to and Familiarity With Multiple Communities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CCEBD:ED:Few but memorable</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEBD:ED:Never</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEBD:ED:Not often or memorable</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEBD:ED:Often</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Code this when the participant says explicitly “often, never,” etc. Sometimes a quote can infer it (e.g. the quote recounts several experiences of being differentially marked or discriminated against)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community Context Experienced as Exposure to and Familiarity With Multiple Communities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Circumstantial Triggers</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Circumstantial Triggers:Change in Context</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are two codes her for circumstantial triggers. If the trigger for being a minority is anything other than a “change in context” code it as CCEMC:Circumstantial Triggers</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice:Low diversity majority non white</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice:Many communities/diverse</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice:Many places (e.g. living in many different states)</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice:Primarily White/Majority Culture</b></li> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice:Racially the same but ethnically different</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community of practice is any of the primary communities that the individual associates with (neighborhood, school, church...)</li> <li>• If the participant describes their community of practice outside the more specific codes, code it as CCEMC:Diversity of Communities of Practice</li> <li>• Low diversity majority non white is if the community is described as “primarily black,” or “primarily Puerto Rican”</li> <li>• Many communities/diverse is if the community is described as mixed in any way (more than one ethnicity and/or SE class)</li> <li>• Many Places is if diversity is achieved by living in several different communities throughout life (moving more than twice)</li> <li>• Majority White/Majority Culture is when the community is described as such</li> <li>• Racially the same but ethnically different is used in instances such as, “all of the black kids at school hung out together, but we weren’t all African American, some were from Africa, others from the Dominican, Jamaica and Haiti.”</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CCEMC:Human and Social Capital</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When coding for human and social capital make a note of what exactly you consider to be human and social capital within the quote (e.g. parents’ jobs or evidence of extended family, etc.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Developmental Trajectory</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>DT:ToA:Early</b></li> <li>• <b>DT:ToA:Late</b></li> <li>• <b>DT:ToA:Middle</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early = 0-5<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>• Middle = 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>• Late = after 9<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul>
<p><b>Psychological Experience of Being Different</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>PEBD:Perceived cultural conflict</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:Perceived cultural distance</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict - If the participant recounts evidence or feelings that cultures in the community, within her family, school or self</li> </ul>

		<p>are opposed to one another</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distance – in the participant indicates that he/she or the cultural communities that he/she is recounting separate themselves from one another</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Anger</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Confident with identity</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Desire to fit in</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Frustration</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Sadness</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Shame</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Tentative/Nervous</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Unique</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Affect:Value for integration</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is for any indication/mention of personal affect that the participant associates with the salience of being differentially marked, or when discrimination is made salient to the individual</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Salience of Difference (no evident personal discrimination)</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:S:Salience of experienced discrimination</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:Salience:Disruptive Otherness</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:Salience:Generic Otherness</b></li> <li>• <b>PEBD:Salience:Marked Otherness</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salience of difference is if they highlight a general sense of difference or discrimination in the community but do not mention a specific differential marking, but they do feel this discrimination themselves</li> <li>• If the salience of difference is the experience of another member of the family or any individual outside the family, but not a personal experience, then it is given the code PEBD:S:Salience of Difference (no evident personal discrimination)</li> <li>• Disruptive otherness is used when the participant indicates trauma associated with the experience of being differentially marked, or if they still haven't fully understood or processed an experience from earlier in life.</li> <li>• Generic Otherness is for experiences where they are differentially marked or discrimination is salient, but they do not indicate any psychological processing of the experience,</li> </ul>

		<p>sort of like “that’s just the way it is,” sort of attitude is conveyed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marked otherness is for differential marking that causes them to think about who they are or the meaning of race/ethnicity/culture in society (i.e. psychological processes ensue) but there is no psychological trauma or lasting damage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Psychological Processes of Self and Identity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>PPSI:CD:Community</b></li> <li>• <b>PPSI:CD:Familial</b></li> <li>• <b>PPSI:CD:Institutional</b></li> <li>• <b>PPSI:CD:Personal</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context Domain is used when the individual indicates that they must navigate/negotiate a certain context.</li> <li>• Community-can be peers, government...</li> <li>• Familial-both immediate and extended family environments</li> <li>• Institutional – for example church or school environments</li> <li>• Personal – navigating what it means to their identity or self (e.g. personal struggles)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>PPSI:P:Navigating</b></li> <li>• <b>PPSI:P:Negotiating</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Navigating=involves appraisal but no action (seek education, plot a course, context sensitivity, openness, diverse group of friends)</li> <li>• Negotiation=action after appraisal (involvement in groups, code switching...)</li> </ul>