DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESSES RELATED TO INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF CULTURE: GROWING UP WITH TWO CULTURES IN THE UNITED STATES

Amado M. Padilla

Stanford University

September17, 2004

DRAFT NOT FOR CITATION

Abstract

The transmission and conditions that result in bicultural social development of children and adolescents in the United States represents the central focus of this chapter. Biculturalism is defined as behavioral competence and positive affect in two cultures. The literature surrounding bicultural development is reviewed from four perspectives: (a) immigrant children and adolescents in the United States, (b) second generation Americans or the offspring of immigrants, (c) later generation ethnic children and adolescents, and (d) mixed ethnic/racial heritage individuals. Each of these situations presents different socialization contexts and challenges for parents and offspring in the transmission of culture across generations and the rationale for biculturalism. In this analysis, the concepts of acculturation, marginality, and biculturalism are examined for their relevance in today's American context. The focus is on contrasting the assumptions inherent in each of these constructs. Although the primary focus of the empirical literature reviewed in this paper is from studies that have employed Hispanics and Asian Americans, the position taken here is that a general model of cultural transmission and biculturalism is applicable to other ethnic and racial groups. An important assumption derived in the analysis is that maintenance of ethnic identity and bicultural orientation is often imposed on individuals depending on their phenotype which mark them as "outsiders" to the majority group. Thus, ethnic loyalty and biculturalism can serve as positive coping responses in a racist society. Finally, regardless of the reasons for bicultural socialization, the psychological and social benefits of bicultural competence are discussed.

Introduction

This chapter examines the theoretical construct of biculturalism from a socialization perspective and focuses on children and adolescents who come from environments that foster dual culture socialization. Before we are able to thoroughly discuss the issues in bicultural development, it is first important to address a few general issues about socialization. Over the years there have been numerous excellent state-of-the-art summaries of the relevant research literature on socialization (e.g., Maccoby, 2000; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). In this work, we see the importance given to the role of parents and other family members in the enculturation of children to the values, beliefs, and acceptable standards of behavior of a society. This is followed by an examination of the role played by peers and institutions, such as the school in shaping the social character of the individual (Minuchin and Shapiro, 1983). This literature informs us about the ways in which adults and their institutions transmit their culture to children with the expressed purpose of transforming children into functioning members of society.

There is a glaring gap in the socialization literature, however, that is seldom mentioned and that is at the heart of this chapter. The implicit assumption in the majority of socialization research is that children are socialized into a single culture; and therefore, culture is not a relevant consideration in understanding socialization processes because if everyone has nearly the same experience via culture then differences that occur between children and socializing agents are not due to culture per se. When culture has taken on relevance in socialization research, it has been in the form of cross-cultural research that aims to compare the socialization practices of two or more distinct cultural groups to determine how differences in child rearing affect some aspect of a child's behavior.

The traditional view of socialization (e.g., Maccoby & Martin, 1983) does not take into account the fact that many individuals are members of two cultural groups and that their socialization may involve intergenerational transmission to two cultural orientations (Haritatos & Benet-Martinez, 2002). Bicultural socialization may occur simultaneously as in the case of a child who is socialized to one culture by one parent and to another culture from the other parent or socialization to one cultural perspective from parents and another from grandparents and other family members. Another way dual socialization occurs early in a child's life is when parents adhere to the life style of one culture at home and when teachers and other childcare takers practice another culture at school. This "growing up" in two cultures is the theme of this chapter.

I will first discuss why growing up in two cultures and becoming bicultural is a timely and very necessary topic for discussion in understanding developmental processes in cultural transmission. In order to understand this point, it is necessary to present information on the changing demographic profile of the United States. The intent of these data is to show how immigration is recasting the "face" of America and to suggest that there are sizeable numbers of immigrants and their children who wish to hold on to their heritage culture. From this flows the next major topic which is has to do with the conditions that favor heritage cultural socialization that result in bicultural development. Thirdly, I will discuss the theoretical issues that relate to ethnic socialization that are critical to bicultural development. Finally, a review of the empirical literature will be presented that enable us to better understand the transmission of culture across generations.

<p align="center">A Demographic Profile of the United States</p>

As we enter a new millennium, the United States is undergoing its most profound demographic transformation since the beginning of the last century. The U.S. Bureau of the

Census reports that the Hispanic population grew 58 percent to 35.3 million people in the decade between 1990 and 2000. This makes Hispanics slightly more numerous than the 34.6 million African Americans who until this latest census had been the largest minority group in the United States. In addition, the 2000 census showed that there were 10.2 million individuals who self-identified as Asian origin, 2.5 million American Indian or Alaska Native, and 0.4 million Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (U. S. Census Bureau, March 2001, Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin, www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hispanic.html).

The demographic shifts taking place are dramatic because they include the addition of new immigrants that have not been in the mix before. For instance, the population of Afro-Caribbeans from such countries as Jamaica, Haiti, and Guyana as well as Africans from Nigeria and Ghana is growing rapidly (from 4.0 percent in 1990 to 6.2 percent in 2000). More precisely, the Afro-Caribbean population grew by more than 580,000 (over 60%) and Africans grew more than 300,000 or more than 130% in a 10 year period. These two groups combined, despite being much smaller than the native African American population, contributed about 25 percent of the 3.7 million increase in the non-Hispanic black population during the 1990's. Although not an often-recognized part of the American ethnic mosaic, both of these groups are emerging as large and fast-growing populations. For instance, Afro-Caribbeans now outnumber and are growing faster than such well-established ethnic minorities as Cubans and Koreans.

An important consideration too is that these newcomers from the Caribbean and Africa have numerous advantages compared to African Americans with historical origins in slavery and in the rural South. Their own education levels and incomes tend to be higher. Also they not

only live in different neighborhoods, but in most urban areas these neighborhoods have a higher socioeconomic standing.

A similar diversity spread is happening among Latinos in recent years. Although the Mexican origin population is by far the largest group with approximately 21 million, followed by 3.41 million Puerto Ricans, and 1.24 Cuban Americans, there have been sizable increases of Hispanic immigrants from Central and South America. In proportion to their number, it is the new Latinos for whom the figures are most changed. These new Hispanics have increased in number by 2.4 million between 1990 and 2000. Conservatively, 335,000 additional Dominicans and Salvadorans have settled in the United States between 1990 and 2000 bringing the total up to 1.42 million. Add to this another 91,000 Columbians who have entered after 1990 and this group's population is approximately 471,000. Other large groups include approximately 372,000 Guatemalans and 218,000 Hondurans who call the United States home. And three other groups are quickly approaching the three quarters of a million mark – these groups are Ecuadorians, Peruvians, and Hondurans. Finally, the 2000 census counted another 670,000 new Latinos from a total of nine other Latin American countries. These groups all share a common language, but are distinct in history and cultural forms that have evolved differently because of such things as their geography, political and social institutions, their own respective immigration histories, and in their relationship with their European and indigenous roots.

In the decade between 1990 and 2000, the total Asian population increased from 7.2 million to 12.3 million. This represents a 69% rate of growth of this population in a 10 year period. The Asian share of the total population rose from 2.9% to 4.4%, still much smaller than the country's African American or Latino groups, but a much more considerable presence today

than in the past, and very prominent in some states and in some major cities.

The Chinese remain the largest single national-origin group, now about 2.7 million and nearly a quarter of the Asian total. They are followed by Filipinos (who maintained about a 20% share), now 2.4 million. Asian Indians are the fastest growing group – fifth largest in 1990 but now third, more than doubling in the decade, and reaching 1.9 million in 2000.

Three other groups have more than a million residents, and each represents about a tenth of Asians. Of these, the Japanese have the longest history in the country, but their growth from 847,562 in 1990 to 1.15 million in 2000 was modest in comparison to other groups. The other two Asian subgroups are Koreans (up by 54%) from 798,849 in 1990 to 1.23 million in 2000 and Vietnamese who doubled since 1990 from 614,547 in 1990 to 1.22 million in 2000.

The impact that the growth of these new populations is having on regional economies and politics is also important to understand. For instance, in Florida Hispanics now outnumber blacks, and in California, the most populous state, they outnumber blacks and make up one-third of state's total population. Another way to gauge the transformation is by the sheer magnitude of immigration to this country. Whether measured in terms of size, composition, or geographic concentration, the numbers are impressive. The 2000 census reported a foreign-born population of more than 30 million people. Combining immigrants and the roughly 28 million U.S. born children of immigrants, one-fifth of the total national population is of recent foreign origin. Also relevant is the fact that the overwhelming majority of immigrants since 1960 are non-European. Of the post-1960 immigrants, slightly more than half (52%) have come from Latin America and the Caribbean, with Mexico alone accounting for 28 percent of the total. Another 29 percent

have come from Asia and the Middle East. An added statistic is that Filipinos, Chinese, and Indochinese alone account for 15 percent of the immigrant pool.

For the first time ever the 2000 census also gave Americans the option of identifying themselves as belonging to more than one race. Nearly 7 million people, or 2.4 percent of the nation, described themselves as multiracial. The new choice was a hit in places where people of different races have long intermarried, like Alaska and Hawaii, and in states such as California and New York that have grown rapidly in their ethnic and racial mix. However, the mixed race category hardly registered a blimp in some states such as Mississippi which historically has not encouraged interracial relationships. Today, 5% of all U.S. marriages are mixed. The steady growth of mixed marriages is evidence that racial and ethnic barriers are softening. Texas, New York and Florida are home to about a quarter of U.S. mixed marriages.

Within racial and ethnic groups, mixed-marriage rates vary widely. Hispanics and Asians, the nation's fastest-growing minority groups, marry partners of different races at about three times the rate of whites. Asian women and black men are more than twice as likely to marry outside their groups as Asian men and black women. Whereas only 3.1 percent of whites were involved in an inter-racial marriage in 2000, 16.3 percent of Asians and 16.3 percent of Hispanics were married to someone of a different race. The rates were highest for Asian women (21.4% vs. 10.6% for Asian men) and Hispanic females (17.2% vs. 15.1% for Hispanic males).

At the same time, the non-Hispanic white population is a shrinking share of the country, dropping to 69% from 76% in 1990. Non-Hispanic whites are now a minority in California and may soon be in Texas. In addition, there are other population shifts taking place. For instance, many non-Hispanic whites are moving to what demographers call the New Sun Belt, states like

Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina, where in most cases they are meeting new immigrants from Asia and Latin America.

Immigrants are typically thought of as relatively poor newcomers who often sacrifice so that their children will have the opportunity to succeed in this country. However this perception is colored by the fact that immigrants are largely members of minority groups, especially Hispanics who have less than average income and education even among those born in the U.S.

Data from a large-scale survey (the Census 2000 Supplemental Survey) conducted as part of Census 2000 provide solid information about how immigrants actually compare to native-born members of the same racial or ethnic group. Results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Socioeconomic Characteristics of Major Race and Ethnic Groups by Nativity, 2000						
		U.S. Citizen	Speak Only English	Years of Education	Median Household Income	Unemployed	Below Poverty
White	Native	100.0%	96.5%	13.5	$52,000	3.9%	8.5%
	Immigrant	60.8%	43.9%	13.4	$51,000	3.7%	11.4%
Black	Native	100.0%	97.5%	12.5	$33,200	10.0%	24.4%
	Immigrant	46.9%	57.8%	13.2	$42,000	6.5%	15.9%
Hispanic	Native	100.0%	35.3%	12.1	$38,000	8.3%	21.7%
	Immigrant	28.4%	4.3%	9.7	$37,200	5.8%	22.0%
Asian	Native	100.0%	60.2%	14.5	$67,000	5.9%	10.4%
	Immigrant	52.3%	12.7%	13.8	$62,500	4.5%	12.7%

The first two columns show data for citizenship and language usage, characteristics that naturally distinguish immigrants and native-born Americans. Interestingly, the differences among racial and ethnic groups are almost as great as those between immigrants and natives. The share of immigrants who are citizens ranges from less than 30% for Hispanics to over 60% for

whites. This difference, however, reflects the timing of immigration, since many white immigrants came to the U.S. more than thirty years ago, while immigration by Hispanics and Asians surged in the last two decades of the 20th century.

Within every racial/ethnic category, persons born in the U.S. are much more likely than those born in another country to speak only English at home. At the extremes, this includes only 4.3% of Hispanic immigrants and 12.7% of Asian immigrants. But the percent of Hispanic (65%) and Asian (40%) origin U.S. born ethnics who retain a non-English heritage language in the home in addition to English proficiency is telling of the persistence of heritage languages for these groups. On the other hand, Black immigrants are much more likely to be English-speakers, reflecting the origin of many of them in former British colonies in the Caribbean.

Immigrants are found in every part of the country, but just 13 metropolitan areas, that collectively have a quarter of the U.S. population, is home to more than half of all immigrants. These locations are listed in Table 2, which gives the 1990 and 2000 numbers of immigrants in each urban center, along with the percentage of the total population that is foreign-born. Importantly this table shows us not only the scale of immigration, but also the diversity of origins and the variations across the country in order to understand the settlement patterns of different immigrant groups in the United States.

Los Angeles, by virtue of its size and location near the Mexican border and the Pacific Ocean, claims the largest foreign-born population with 3.4 million. By far the largest number – more than 2 million – is Latino, and mainly of Mexican origin. This is more than double the number of Latino immigrants in any other major city. Los Angeles too has the largest number of Asian immigrants, with a recorded 900,000. In 2000 there were also 400,000 white immigrants

mostly from Iran, rather than Europe in the Los Angeles area. Although Los Angeles has long

been a port of entry and settlement for immigrants from many parts of the world, it slipped in its

appeal to immigrants between 1990 and 2000 when its share of the total metropolitan foreign-

born population dropped from 15.4% to 11.7%. Part of the shift is a trend that had already

begun in the 1980's, migration of Hispanic immigrants from Los Angeles to other large

metropolitan areas in California -- Orange County, Riverside-San Bernardino, and San Diego.

These areas are also among the ten large cities with the highest number of foreign-born.

Counting Los Angeles, these four Southern California metropolitan areas are the home of fully

19% of foreign-born residents.

Table 2. Metropolitan regions with the largest numbers of immigrants in 2000				
	Immigrants		Share of population	
	2000	**1990**	**2000**	**1990**
1 **Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA**	3,449,444	2,892,456	36.2%	32.7%
2 **New York, NY**	3,139,647	2,285,024	33.7%	26.8%
3 **Chicago, IL**	1,425,978	885,081	17.2%	11.9%
4 **Miami, FL**	1,147,765	874,569	50.9%	45.1%
5 **Houston, TX**	854,669	440,321	20.5%	13.3%
6 **Orange County, CA**	849,899	575,108	29.9%	23.9%
7 **Washington, DC**	832,016	489,641	16.9%	11.6%
8 **Riverside-San Bernardino, CA**	612,359	360,643	18.8%	13.9%
9 **San Diego, CA**	606,254	428,810	21.5%	17.2%
10 **Dallas, TX**	591,169	234,522	16.8%	8.8%
11 **Oakland, CA**	573,144	337,435	24.0%	16.2%
12 **San Jose, CA**	573,130	347,201	34.1%	23.2%
13 **San Francisco, CA**	554,819	441,290	32.0%	27.5%

New York is the other great immigrant metropolis. It has nearly as many immigrants as

Los Angeles (3.1 million), this population is growing faster (up about 40% in the last decade),

and it has immigrants with more diverse origins. While New York is second to Los Angeles in

the number of Hispanic and Asian immigrants, it nearly makes up the difference as the nation's

major destination for white immigrants from Europe and the Middle East (nearly 750,000) and immigrants from the Caribbean and Africa (over 500,000). Not surprisingly it draws far fewer Mexicans than is common in the Southwest. Instead it has a distinctive mix of Dominicans, Central Americans, and South Americans, groups who generally live in or near New York's large Puerto Rican neighborhoods. And it has over 700,000 Asians, especially large numbers of people from China and India. Together with Newark and the surrounding suburbs in New York and Northern New Jersey, Greater New York accounts for 16% of America's immigrants.

Chicago is the only major destination for immigrants in the Midwest. Only about one in six Chicagoans is foreign-born, compared to more than a third of residents of the New York and Los Angeles metropolitan regions. But its nearly 1.5 million immigrant residents place it third in the nation, up from about 900,000 in 1990. In an earlier time period, Chicago was the favorite settlement location for immigrants from Eastern Europe, and today still over 400,000 of its foreign-born residents are non-Hispanic whites. Nonetheless, Chicago is home to nearly 700,000 Latinos most of whom are Mexican. In addition, another 300,000 Asian newcomers call Chicago home.

Miami, famous for its long standing Cuban community, has over 1.14 million immigrants. The vast majority, over 900,000, are Latinos, with growing numbers of Salvadorans and Nicaraguans to augment the Cuban American population. Nearly 100,000 of these immigrants are black, about equally from Haiti and the English-speaking Afro-Caribbean nations. These combine with Fort Lauderdale's black immigrants to create a strong Afro-Caribbean presence in South Florida.

Houston (850,000) and Dallas (nearly 600,000) are both counted among the top ten in

number of immigrants. Historically neither of these two cities had a large Hispanic population,

compared to areas closer to the Mexican border, but their Hispanic immigrant populations both

more than doubled in the last decade. Besides Mexicans, Houston has become one of the major

destinations for Salvadoran immigrants in the U.S. In addition, both of these Texan metropolitan

areas now have over 100,000 Asian immigrants, more than doubling since 1990.

The nation's capital, Washington, D.C., completes the list of top ten immigrant

destinations with 832,000 immigrants. It is like New York in the racial diversity of immigrants,

including nearly equal shares of Asians and Hispanics along with a significant minority of white

and black immigrants.

Three additional metropolitan regions have more than 550,000 immigrants, all in the San

Francisco Bay Area – Oakland, San Jose, and San Francisco. Taken together, they have about

the same number of immigrants as Chicago, or Miami and Fort Lauderdale combined. Like the

rest of California, the Bay Area has few black immigrants. Unlike the rest of the state, the

largest immigrant group here is Asian, with a total of more than 900,000, compared to over

500,000 Hispanics and close to 300,000 whites.

<div align="center">**Uniculturalism versus Multiculturalism**</div>

In recent years considerable attention has been given to the increasing trend toward

multiculturalism. The need for multiculturalism has included debate on university campuses

concerning curriculum reform to include ethnic and gender diversity (D'Souza, 1991). Even the

noted historian and author, Arthur Schlesinger (1991), has joined the debate to argue that

multiculturalism has the potential of "breaking the bonds of cohesion -- common ideals, common

political institutions, common language, common culture, common fate -- that hold the republic

together". (p. 138)

One of the factors contributing to the attention given to multiculturalism in recent years has to do with the changing demography that is taking place in the United States as discussed above. Demographers have shown, for instance, that the influx of immigrants from Latin America and Asia between 1970 and the present constitutes the largest movement of people to this country since the turn of the century (Portes & Rumbaut, 1990). These newer immigrants also have a higher fertility ratio than is found among the American population and this too is contributing significantly to the changing demography of the United States (Portes & Rumbaut, 1990). Also configured into this changing demography is the increase in interracial and interethnic marriages over the past three decades (Root, 2001).

Social theorists are pointing to emerging "minority - majority" populations in large immigrant states such as California. Since the newcomers are a youthful population, schools are the most dramatically impacted social institution affected by the population shift and the new "minority – majority" (Olsen, 1988; 1997). Further, there is concern that the newcomers are not being absorbed (i.e., assimilated) into mainstream society as rapidly as immigrants at other times in this country's history. This has generated considerable debate having to do with why these "newcomers" are not assimilating into the mainstream. One side of the debate has centered on the issue of "absorption" into mainstream culture and has presented data to show that absorption of immigrants has never been easy and that recent immigrant groups are becoming "Americanized" at approximately the same rate as earlier immigrants. Others acknowledge the slow absorption of recent immigrants into mainstream society and explain the slow assimilation through an analysis of social barriers and racism that prevent more rapid absorption (Segal, 2002; Suarez-Orozco &

Suarez-Orozco, 2001). Still others argue that some immigrant groups, especially Mexicans, do not

want to assimilate and that this is wrecking havoc with the American way of life (Buchanan, 2002;

Hanson, 2003).

One common index of social absorption is intermarriage and there have been marked

changes in intermarriage patterns in the past three decades (Root, 2001). Although intermarriage has

been seen as a sign of reduced social distance between groups, sociologists are pointing to the

acceleration of intermarriage as another factor contributing to the current demographic shift taking

place in this country. According to this view cultural assimilation of ethnic minority individuals

results in an increase in intermarriage through the working of two mechanisms: a weakening of

ethnic attachments and the resulting increase in contact with potential mates of other groups

(Lieberson and Waters, 1988).

In retrospect it is now possible to identify the changing demography of the United States and

the Civil Rights Movement both of which can be traced to the decade of the sixties as the political

impetus for the rise in the call for multiculturalism that is now at the center of much debate in our

schools, workplaces, and communities. However, this was also the period in which ethnic parents

became more conscious of the need to pass on their ethnic culture to their children. In many

respects, the intergenerational transmission of ethnic heritage cultures is due then to important macro

level changes that have transpired in America over the last four decades. Interestingly, how these

macro level changes have altered the socialization practices of an increasing diverse population have

gone unnoticed in mainstream psychology, but not among ethnic psychologists (e.g., Bernal &

Knight, 1993; Ramirez & Castaneda, 1974; Sue & Morishima, 1983).

Today the topics of ethnic socialization, ethnic identification, and biculturalism have taken

on increased importance in ethnic psychology (Bernal, Trimble, Burlew, & Leong, 2003; Hall & Okazaki, 2002). However, an examination of our basic textbooks in psychology does not reflect the growing literature on biculturalism. In fact little attention is still given to culturally diverse children and adolescents in developmental psychology (Padilla & Lindholm, 1992). In what follows, I will discuss ethnic socialization and the macro- and micro-social conditions that lead to child rearing practices that result in socialization to two cultures. Also of importance are questions having to do with the ramifications of bicultural social transmission from the perspective of the individual and society.

<div align="center">**Bicultural Socialization and Biculturalism: Asset or Liability**</div>

The behaviors ascribed to an individual who is bicultural were first noted in the sociological literature under the heading of dual culture personality. Accordingly, it is appropriate to begin with a historical overview of the sociology of dual culture personality. This literature, as I will show, essentially addresses the question of whether dual cultural socialization is positive or negative for the individual involved.

The question of whether there are positive or negative consequences to growing up in two cultures is not new. Robert Park was one of the first sociologists to study immigrants, children of immigrants, and mixed racial heritage individuals. His study led him to speculate on the negative consequences of dual culture exposure. In an early paper, Park (1928) put forth the idea of the "marginal" man to describe the person who found him or herself between and betwixt two cultures. Stonequist (1937) extended the idea of marginality in his classic work *The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture and Conflict*. The title of the book shows the focus that Stonequist gave to his sociological analysis of dual culture socialization. According to Stonequist, the conditions

leading to marginality and the consequences of this status are as follows:

> *"The individual who through migration, education, marriage, or some other influence leaves*
>
> *one social group or culture without making a satisfactory adjustment to another finds*
>
> *himself on the margin of each but a member of neither. He is a `marginal' man. The*
>
> *marginal personality is most clearly portrayed in those individuals who are unwittingly*
>
> *initiated into two or more historic traditions, languages, political loyalties, moral codes, or*
>
> *religions." (pp. 2 -3)*

Here we see that Stonequist is primarily referring to situations which cause the individual to

leave one cultural orientation for another and to do so "unwittingly". Further, if the person is unable

to adjust to the new culture then the person finds him or herself on the margin of both cultures. This

analysis is important because it varies to a considerable extent from the contemporary analysis of the

motivation, context, and outcome of dual culture socialization.

The "marginal" person model advanced by Park and Stonequist was the generally accepted

view for nearly half a century. Despite repeated criticisms about the lack of scientific evidence for

marginality and the vagueness of the concept (e.g., Green, 1947; Mann, 1973), the ideas emanating

from the concept of marginality are still present in current models of acculturation (Berry, 2003).

However, in their critique of the construct of marginality and whether the construct has scientific

validity, Del Pilar and Udasco (2004) conclude that

> *Marginality has endured because it seems logical and reasonable and makes common sense.*
>
> *This may explain the resistance in the field to contrary evidence about marginality's validity.*
>
> *We found whole lines of investigation that are anchored by slender threads of theory. Being*
>
> *caught between cultures frequently does result in difficulties and adjustment problems. The*

marginality investigators failed to note that these difficulties and adjustment problems can

take as many negative forms as are discussed in the voluminous diagnostic manual of

psychiatric problems or as many positive forms as are reflected in the biographies of

successful immigrants. Despite the wishes of the marginality researchers, one concept

cannot hope to cover all these variables. (p. 11)

Importantly, a new concept began to emerge in the literature when making reference to

individuals who seem to manage two cultures successfully. Psychologists began to make reference

to biculturalism in their description of individuals who by virtue of the socialization they received

from their primary caretakers to be competent in two cultures (e.g., LaFromboise, Coleman, &

Gerton, 1993; Ramirez & Castaneda, 1983). According to this more contemporary view, it is

possible to be a functioning member of two cultures without being in serious psychological conflict

about either. Importantly in this bicultural perspective, the person does not favor one culture over

the other and more often than not the dual transmission of cultural information from parents and

other care takers is quite deliberate and both cultures are presented positively.

This new view of dual culture transmission has enriched our thinking about socialization

processes and how individuals participate to varying degrees as members of two cultural groups.

Research in this area is exemplified in the work of numerous investigators (e.g., Bernal, Knight,

Garza, Ocampa, & Cota, 1990; Hurtado & Gurin, 1987; Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Phinney, Ong, &

Madden, 2000; Quintana, Castaneda-English, & Ybarra, 1999; Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004).

These researchers have examined topics germane to ethnic socialization, ethnic identification, and

biculturalism.

Lambert (1977) because of his extensive research experience with bilingual and bicultural

Francophones in Canada described the bicultural person as a member of two cultural communities who not only possesses competent skills for interacting effectively with members of the two cultural groups, but who also maintains favorable attitudes toward the customs, beliefs, and values fostered by each group. Accordingly, we see two elements that are critical in understanding biculturalism. Lambert emphasizes <u>behavioral competence</u> in two cultures which included speaking the languages of both cultures and <u>positive affect</u> toward the two cultures. Importantly, it needs to be said that there are degrees of biculturalism in the domains of behavioral competence and affect toward both cultures. For example, one person may be quite high in behavioral competence in two cultures, but have more affect toward one or the other culture. In similar fashion another person might be very high in their affect toward their cultures, but not have the same degree of competence in both cultures. We see this frequently with individuals who feel connected to their two cultures, but who may not be completely bilingual. Still a third individual may have behavioral competence in two cultures, but not feel much affect for either preferring a third culture where s/he has less behavioral competence. The point is that there may be many categories that define a person's orientation to social groups. Nonetheless, an undeniable fact persists; that is, individuals can hold membership in different cultural groups without being socially or psychologically marginalized.

This is different from the Park-Stonequist model which primarily ascribes negative personality characteristics to the marginal person (Del Pilar & Udesco, 2004). According to the Park-Stonequist model, the marginal person feels isolated and closed off from members of either the culture of origin or the culture of the host group, or worse isolated from both. Further, according to this view, the person suffers from self-hatred, low self-esteem and feelings of inferiority. The marginal person is marked by negativity and character traits that predispose the individual to serious

mental health problems.

The personality traits of the marginal person are in sharp contrast to the characteristics that have been attributed to the bicultural individual. For the "biculturalists", we see a much more positive image of the bicultural person. The bicultural person is well adjusted, open to others, and a cultural broker between peoples of different backgrounds. In the completely bicultural person, we see an individual who possesses two social persona and identities. The person is equally at ease with members of either culture and can easily switch from one cultural orientation to the other and do so often with native (or near native) like facility. Further, this comfort with two cultures extends to interactions with individuals from cultures other than those that the bicultural person has competence in. This social flexibility is viewed by the biculturalists as an advantage and one of the reasons for bicultural exposure (Aellen & Lambert, 1969; McFee, 1968).

When behavioral conflicts do occur among people with bicultural backgrounds, as they inevitably must, psychotherapists (e.g., Szapocznik, Santisteban, Kurtines, et al., 1984) call for interventions that strive to reaffirm the dual cultural background of their clients. This is a far cry from saying that the person is "irreparably" damaged in a psychological sense as is true if we listen to the marginalization theorist.

In sum, I have provided a thumbnail sketch of the idea of dual culture personality and the more recent construct of biculturalism because there is a long standing tradition of theory about individuals who are socialized into two cultural traditions. However, the theory of the dual culture personality was not buttressed by empirical support. Today, empirical research on biculturalism is commonplace in the social science literature. The missing element in much of this discussion though is why and how do people become bicultural. Before we can dwell on answers to these

questions, we must first put into perspective the topic of identity development and the more specific examination of ethnic identity formation.

Ethnic Identity Development

With adolescence comes the question "Who am I?" Adolescence is a time when the crisis of identity is most paramount in the mind of the young person (Erikson, 1968). The crisis of identity experienced by adolescents may be more problematic, however, for young people who for any number of reasons find themselves in a home or school context where different values, beliefs, and behaviors are practiced. Further, this may be especially true when one of the cultural orientations belongs to a low social prestige ethnic group as is often the case with immigrants and their children. For example, I have frequently worked with adolescents who must deal with their identity crises by asking themselves whether they are Mexican, Mexican American, American, Chicano, Latino, or Hispanic. There are important historical and political reasons behind each of these ethnic labels that refer to individuals of Mexican heritage regardless of whether they are immigrants or third or later generation American citizens. Each label carries important information about the cultural, social, and political stance of the parents and their children in the larger context of their immigration history and assimilation into American society.   The multiple labels and their associated meanings are often confusing even for adults. Yet each of these labels has a specific meaning and depending on the ethnic social context it is important that they be applied appropriately. Ethnic identifications create serious concerns for ethnic adolescents who often want to construct their own identities free of the ethnic and racial biases imposed on them by their grandparents, parents, teachers, peers, and other authority figures.

Erikson (1968) describes the essence of identity and the crisis of identity formation during

adolescent in this way:

> *"Individually speaking, identity includes, but is more than, the sum of all the successive identifications of those earlier years when the child wanted to be, and often was forced to become, like the people he depended on. Identity is a unique product, which now meets a crisis to be solved only in new identifications with age mates and with leader figures outside of the family. The search for a new and yet reliable identity can perhaps be seen in the persistent adolescent endeavor to define, over define, and redefine themselves and each other in often ruthless comparison...Where the resulting self-definition, for personal or for collective reasons, becomes too difficult, a sense of role confusion results: the young person counterpoints rather than synthesizes his sexual, ethnic, occupational, and typological alternatives and is often driven to decide definitely and totally for one side or the other.*
> *(p.87)*

Erikson wrote this description of the identity crisis in adolescence without consideration for the individual with a bicultural background. Imagine the crisis experienced by many adolescents as they attempt to resolve issues of identity when two cultural orientations are involved. They may receive messages about one identity from their immediate family [grandparents and parents], another from teachers, a third identity from peers, and still a fourth from official governmental sources or the media. For example, Mexican immigrant parents often place their children in conflict when they demand that their children maintain a "Mexican" identity although the young person may never even have lived in Mexico. At school the same young person is told that he lives in America and should think of himself first and foremost as "American". However, whenever the young person is asked to complete an official school form, he generally must choose an identity among the following: "non-

Hispanic white, Mexican, Mexican American, Hispanic, other". Often adolescents question the relevance of these ethnic-related questions on the grounds that they seem to make assumptions about their identity that is not accurate. For example, if they were born in the United States and are American citizens why is the question relevant. In the same way, if they are American citizens then why are they still being asked to identify themselves with racialized categories that they do not completely identify with because they see their world in a much more complicated way than a mere collection of racial/ethnic categories (Olsen, 1995). The confusion described by Erikson in the quote above becomes salient for many adolescents who then devise other ways to answer the "Who am I?" question. I have heard ethnic adolescents with whom I have worked say "*I am me*." "*I am a human being*," or as one adolescent said "*I ain't none of that shit. I'm not the man's thing to play with. I am who I am. That's it*."

Cultural Transmission: Two Cultures not One

Four major conditions have the potential for creating a situation of bicultural social transmission. In discussing each of these conditions, it is important to keep in mind whether the transmission of two cultural orientations experienced by the young person is carried out by the primary agents of socialization (e.g., parents and grandparents) or by secondary agents (e.g., teachers, peers, and other role models). This is important because these socializing agents may emphasize different aspects of culture during the transmission process. In the remainder of this chapter, I will discuss four different scenarios that result in bicultural development for many individuals. The important point is that cultural transmission is more complex for many persons who come from immigrant heritage backgrounds. Most contemporary models of parenting and socialization (e.g., Maccoby, 2000) are applicable only to children growing up in monocultural

contexts. However, as the demographic information presented earlier shows, this is not the situation in which many children live today.

Immigrant Children and Adolescents

Children and adolescents who immigrate to a new country must of necessity acquire the customs and behaviors of their adopted country. Depending on their age at the time of immigration these young immigrants have already been socialized to the culture of their parents and as a consequence may experience considerable difficulty in adapting to their new surroundings because of the demand to learn the language and cultural practices of their hosts. Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado (1987) found that immigration prior to about age 12 resulted in less acculturative stress among a group of university students who had immigrated to the U.S. The ease with which young immigrants are able to adjust to a new culture depends on the type of support and assistance they receive from their primary caretakers while they make the transition to the new culture as well as the peer and institutional supports in place to assist these youthful newcomers.

The school and peers are the main sources of cultural transmission of the new culture for immigrant children and adolescents while the immigrant parents continue to maintain the cultural practices of their home country. Today we commonly find schools that have adopted programs such as newcomer centers, English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) classes in the content areas (e.g., sheltered American History), bilingual education programs, and heritage language classes (e.g., Korean for native speakers). The intent of these programs is generally to transition immigrant students to an all English curriculum as rapidly as possible while offering a supportive environment for the language and culture of the immigrant student. The overall objective of these efforts is "Americanization", or assimilation to American culture while still valuing the cultural diversity of

students.   Peers assist in this process via English language role modeling and American youth culture orientation. Slowly, but surely, the youthful immigrants acquire enough of the language and culture of the host group to become functioning members of the new culture. In characteristic fashion these youth also retain varying degrees of competence in their home culture depending on the age of immigration.

In communities populated by immigrant groups, it is not uncommon to see children serving as translators and cultural brokers for their parents and other adult family members. Frequently, young bilingual children serve as translators between their parents and teachers, physicians, shopkeepers, etc. For the young person this is a situation of mandatory biculturalism because of the need to acquire competencies in the host culture in order to assist their parents. This is an interesting twist on the way in which cultural transmission is commonly viewed. In this situation, the immigrant child or adolescent is bringing the new culture that they have begun to learn from teachers and peers to their parents. When this happens they are the transmitters of the new culture they are learning and they are bringing this new information to their parents, rather than vice versa.

While this situation may be beneficial for the parents, on the one hand, it also has a negative side. A heavy burden is placed on the child who must serve as a cultural and linguistic broker while still in the process of being socialized to the culture of the parents as well as of the host culture. For the parents there is also the potential danger of surrendering too much power to their children because of their reliance on children as cultural brokers (Buriel, Perez, De Ment, Chavez, & Moran, 1998; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).

An equally difficult situation for immigrant parents and children has to with the conflicts in values and modes of behavior that are presented to them because of the two cultures. For example,

Sung (1985) described the bicultural conflicts experienced by Chinese immigrant children. Some of the conflicts identified by Sung had to do, for instance, with the difference in independence training seen in American parenting, but not among Chinese where socializing outside the family is discouraged until a much later age. Sung also noted the difference in respect for authority - especially toward teachers - where the Chinese teachers command great respect, American teachers are not held in the same high esteem by American students. According to Sung another difference that creates conflict for Chinese immigrants has to do with the way in which Chinese try to fit themselves into the scheme of things whereas the American way is based on individualism.

In a series of studies Chao (1994, 1996, 2000) has undertaken to show how immigrant Chinese parenting styles are different from the American parenting styles based on the typology of – authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. The Chinese parent employs a type of "training" model that has elements of both authoritarian and permissiveness coupled with a high degree of emphasis on filial piety and parental warmth. Although Chao has studied Chinese parents, she contends that the patterns of parenting are shared with other Asian groups, notably Japanese and Koreans. This parenting style is in marked contrast to the parenting styles reported for American parents that emphasizes joint decision making and mutual respect between parents and adolescents. Interestingly, Asian American adolescents become attuned to this difference in parenting styles between their immigrant parents and the parents of their American peers. On occasion this results in serious intergenerational conflict between Asian parents and their children who are less willing to toe the line when it comes to filial pity.

In a longitudinal study involving East Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese), Filipino, and Latino students (Mexican, Salvadoran, Nicaraguan), Tseng and Fuligni (2000) reported

that when immigrant parents and their students both communicated in the home language that there was more cohesion and less conflict between the two generations. Adolescents from these homes reported that they were more emotionally connected with their parents. However, when the parents communicated in the home language and their children spoke English all ethnic groups reported that they felt less connected with their parents and that there was less cohesion in the home. Surprisingly, in those cases where adolescents reported that they and their parents mutually communicated in English, they also reported more conflict with their fathers regarding daily household issues. Although the findings from this study are correlational, they do suggest that cultural transmission in immigrant households flows more smoothly when parents are able to establish a pattern of interpersonal communication that is based on the home language of the parents. Tseng and Fuligni (2000) maintain that their findings also suggest that in those situations where there is tension between the adolescent and the parent that the more acculturated adolescent may use English as a means to distance themselves from their parents. In this situation, the adolescent by virtue of their proficiency in English and refusal to speak the home language can effectively curtail their parents' efforts at cultural transmission.

In a study of first, second, and third generation Mexican heritage students and their parents, Buriel and Cardoza (1993) found that first-generation students exhibit more cultural continuities between themselves and their parents, since both were born in Mexico and spoke Spanish as their primary language, and cultural continuity was further augmented when members of both parent and student generations shared a common educational experience in Mexico. According, to Buriel and Cardoza, even though, the students were proficient in English since the survey was done in English their parents were predominately Spanish speakers. Moreover, despite the students' exposure to a

"Euro American" cultural milieu, they still had more in common with their parents, thereby facilitating cultural transmission than was the case with their second generation Mexican American counterparts. These authors too report that there was a congruence between the immigrant parents and their adolescents' identity as Mexican.

In sum, the cultural differences in parenting practices identified by Sung and Chao with East Asian immigrant youth are generalizability across many different immigrant groups (Tseng and Fuligni, 2000). Further, although it is possible to readily identify the cultural conflicts, little is still known about the dynamics of cultural transmission in the immigrant generation to inform parents about ways to minimize intergenerational conflict due to the effects of acculturation from secondary sources such as school and peers. The transition to the new culture may be very difficult for immigrants of all ages, but for different reasons. Immigrant parents are often involved in their own acculturation and sometimes must rely on their more rapidly acculturating children to assist them with their daily functioning. Similarly, immigrant children often are left to their own devices to make decisions about how much of their home culture they wish to retain and/or practice.

Little support is available for immigrant parents or for the teachers of immigrant students to enable them to work cooperatively to maximize home cultural transmission while also recognizing the importance of acculturation to the host culture. The ideal situation is a supportive home and community that supports bicultural development that incorporates the best of both cultures.

Second Generation Individuals

In this section I address the status of two distinct groups of children who are typically classified as second generation: (a) children born in the United States of parents who themselves are immigrants, and (b) children born in another country who immigrate to this country before the age of

five.   With the exception of citizenship these two groups of children are indistinguishable when viewed behaviorally later in life on such measures as proficiency in English, school achievement, and cultural assimilation (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001).   Because the parents of these second generation children are immigrants who generally still adhere to the traditional practices, values, and language(s) of their own upbringing they often expect the same adherence to the home culture from their second generation children that they would expect if they were still in the country of origin. Children and adolescents in this situation usually have very demarcated boundaries in the sources of the culture transmission and in how they respond to these bifurcated cultural demands. These second generation individuals, like their immigrant counterparts, frequently serve as the primary cultural and linguistic bridge between their parents and the host society. The major difference is that, unlike their first generation counterparts, the second generation youth frequently learn about the parent's culture in a social vacuum with little environmental support. In other words, the parents transmit their culture to their children while in the host culture. Thus, the home becomes the cultural focal point for most transmissions that involve the culture of the parents. This is all the more difficult too when there is not an ethnic community that can continuously reinforce what the parents are doing in the home. As one informant remarked to me in an interview involving his cultural assimilation:

> *How could I not be an American? From the moment I stepped outside to go to school my entire life was American. The first thing we did everyday in school was say the Pledge of Allegiance in English. Bingo right there I knew I was different from my Mexican parents. There was no way I could be as Mexican as they wanted me to be. It would have been different if I was going to school in Mexico, but I wasn't.* (Padilla, 2003)

Thus, second generation children and adolescents learn their parents' culture often in isolation and a different culture in other social contexts most notably the school and peers at first and later from popular culture reflected in their dress and behavior, mass media, and leisure activities. One adolescent addressed the conflict that this form of dual cultural transmission created for her:

At home with my parents and grandparents the only acceptable language was Spanish, actually that's all they really understood. Everything was like really Mexican, but at the same time they wanted me to speak good English. They also had very old fashioned customs and didn't want me to be American...or at least not too American. But at school, I felt really different because everyone was American, including me. Then I would go home in the afternoon and be Mexican again. (Padilla, 1997)

Like the two second generation individual whose quotes are presented here, some second generation youth find themselves between "a rock and a hard place". Frequently, they are expected to maintain the culture of the parents while also being given mixed messages about how "Americanized" they should become. Many immigrant parents will tell their offspring, "you're in America now and you must be an American!" However, at the same time, the young person is told by the parents not to forget who they are, referring to their ethnic or cultural group membership. Often parents go so far as to warn their adolescent children to steer clear of social relationships, especially dating members of other ethnic groups. Pressure to conform to the home culture of the parents is often more severe for immigrant and second generation females than for males (Olsen, 1997). This is even more difficult for female adolescents who come from traditional cultures, such as Muslims and Hindus, who adhere to much stricter gender roles than other immigrant groups such as those from Asia or Latin America (Olsen, 1997).

For some ethnic females when the two cultures clash as they often do around issues of gender roles and normal teenage behaviors such as dating (American culture), girls are often caught in a double bind and forced to conform -- with the possible consequence that they may have behavioral competence in the culture of the parents, but feel a certain degree of resentment against their parents who immigrated to the United States. These adolescents often complain that their parents want them to be "frozen in time" and in a culture that they only know from their parents. As native born Americans they are exposed to many of the social forces that ensure their enculturation as Americans. However, many are pulled back toward the culture of their parents and grandparents who expect their children to demonstrate loyalty to their cultural roots. How parents, grandparents, and other extended family members socialize children in bicultural contexts will determine the child's eventual level of biculturalism.

In a study of the role of grandparents in the socialization of Mexican American children Schmidt and Padilla (1983) found that both grandmothers and grandfathers were involved in the socialization of grandchildren. However, there was an important gender difference in how such socialization took place. Grandmothers were more involved with granddaughters, especially when these grandchildren were the offspring of their own daughters. Similarly, grandfathers were more involved in the socialization of male children of their own daughters. Grandparents reported that their interactions with grandchildren included the transmission of such cultural information as leaning to cook Mexican dishes, talking about Mexico and its heroes, teaching Mexican songs and dances, and talking to grandchildren in Spanish as well as teaching Spanish. Also grandparents born in Mexico reported speaking more Spanish to their grandchildren, and in turn the grandchildren spoke more Spanish to them than was reported by the grandparents born in the U.S. Interestingly,

children of daughters spoke more Spanish to their grandparents than did the children of sons of grandparents.

From the perspective of these grandparents proficiency in Spanish appeared important in maintaining their culture. This finding was later confirmed in a 10-year longitudinal study of 353 grandparent and adult grandchild dyads. In this study measures of acculturation which included Spanish proficiency were taken of grandparents of whom 41% were born in Mexico and of grandchild of whom only 2% were born outside the United States. The findings revealed that more acculturated grandchildren reported less frequent interactions with their grandparents. Further, the Spanish speaking ability of the grandchildren predicted greater social interaction and feelings of familism and closeness across the generations. There was also a gender difference with granddaughters reporting more fluency in Spanish and more frequent interactions with grandparents. Importantly, more acculturated grandchildren reported weaker affection for their grandparents than less acculturated grandchildren. Accordingly, acculturation differences as marked predominantly by Spanish language proficiency across the generational span of grandparent-grandchild serve to disrupt the transmission of cultural information across the generations. Apparently in the absence of a Spanish language bridge between the grandparent-grandchild dyads, there was a marked decline of interaction of any type between the generations. The weakened bonds of familism and affection among the acculturated grandchildren also heighten the difference in cultural orientations between the generations.

In two related studies (Detzner, 1996; Weinstien-Shr and Henkin, 1991) conducted with Southeast Asians, it was found that differences in language acculturation across generations in the same family result in tension and conflict between the young and old. The apparent social distance

and diminished cultural transmission across generations that is created by language acculturation calls for more research because it goes to the matter of whether bilingual proficiency is a prerequisite of biculturalism. This is an open question with no established consensus. For many immigrant parents bilingualism is essential; otherwise, how can their children communicate with them or understand the culture? Other parents are less insistent on bilingualism and do not see it as essential in the transmission of culture to their children. It is likely that immigrant parents and grandparents with more human capital (e. g., more education and higher income levels) are more likely to be bilingual themselves and capable of cultural transmission in either language depending on the circumstance, whereas parents with less human capital are restrained in linguistic flexibility and limit their communication about culture to the mother tongue.

We know from the work of sociolinguists that shift from a non-English home language to English occurs generally within one generation (e.g., Lopez 1978, 1982; Veltman, 1981). If we adhere strongly to a model that assumes that home language is critical to bicultural competence, how is it possible to still talk about biculturalism with second generation youth, if they possess little or no proficiency in the language of their elders? If immigrant parents do not insist upon home language proficiency in the socialization of their children, then what aspect of their culture are they interested in transmitting to their children and how is this accomplished? The question of cross-generational cultural transmission is important and is in need of considerably more research among immigrant populations (see Nauck, in press).

In what still stands as a landmark study of the second generation American, Child (1943) examined the psychological adjustment of second-generation offspring to determine their level of adjustment to the parents' traditional culture and to the American culture. In his study, Child

investigated second-generation Italians in New England to see whether they identified as more Italian or more American. He noted that if the second-generation Italian adolescents were "too Italian" their relations with non Italian peers were strained. However, if these second generation Italians rejected their background completely, there was the danger of being cut off from the comfort and support offered by the family and the community. Further, in his study Child subdivided the adolescents into three distinct groups: (a) the first group rebelled against their Italian background and made themselves as American as possible; (b) the second group rejected the American culture and incorporated their Italian heritage into their daily activities in nearly every respect; and (c) those in the third group were withdrawn and unsure, and refused to think of themselves in ethnic terms at all. This typology is still applicable today, but what remains unknown is how second generation individuals use the information gathered from their family and others to select one path or the other in their quest to form an identity.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) found similar trends to those reported by Child (1943), but with Franco-Americans in New England and Louisiana. Gardner and Lambert found that some adolescents preferred their French background and tried to ignore their American roots; others were pulled more toward the American side, saw no value in knowing French and in general rejected their French background; and still others tried not to think in ethnic terms at all and were ambivalent about their identity and seemed to face a conflict of cultural allegiance. However, there was a fourth group who were successful at being both French and American simultaneously. These individuals adhered to a belief reinforced by their parents that it was socially desirable to know French. According to Gardner and Lambert, the cultural orientation and the appreciation of French-English bilingualism given to the young people by their family strengthened their resolve to be proficient in

their two languages and cultures. The findings of both the Child (1943) and Gardner and Lambert

(1972) are in accord with more recent studies (e.g., Buriel & Cardoza, 1993; Hurtado & Gurin,

1987; Knight, Bernal, Cota, Garza, & Ocampo, 1993) that show that parents who are comfortable

with their own ethnic identity and who communicate positive messages about bilingualism and the

home culture are more likely to have children who hold on to the parent's language and culture.

In a much more recent study, Portes and Rumbaut (2001) studied second generation

adolescents in the San Diego, California and Miami/Fr. Lauderdale, Florida areas. In this

longitudinal study Portes and Rumbaut collected data from over 5,000 adolescents and from their

parents who had immigrated to the United States from 77 different countries. The second generation

was defined as U.S.-born children of foreign parents or foreign-born children who were brought to

the United States before adolescence. One significant finding was that there were benefits of

selective acculturation – which as used by Portes and Rumbaut is similar to how the term

biculturalism is used in this chapter.

> *The findings from our longitudinal study consistently point to the benefits of selective*
>
> *acculturation. This path is closely intertwined with preservation of fluent bilingualism and*
>
> *linked, in turn, with higher self-esteem, higher educational and occupational expectations,*
>
> *and higher academic achievement. From a theoretical standpoint, these relationships are*
>
> *reasonable. Children who learn the language and culture of their new country without*
>
> *losing those of the old have a much better understanding of their place in the world. They need not*
>
> *clash with their parents as often or feel embarrassed by them because they are able to bridge*
>
> *the gap across generations and value their elders' traditions and goals. Selective*
>
> *acculturation forges an intergenerational alliance for successful adaptation that is absent*

among youths who have severed bonds with their past in the pursuit of acceptance by their native peers. (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, pp. 274)

In sum, there is still much that we must learn about bicultural development of the second generation. These individuals are positioned between the culture of the parents and the dominant American culture that surrounds them. By definition many are enculturated into the parental culture, but how extensively depend entirely on the parents, the extended family, and an ethnic community that may or may not exist for them. Similarly, the second generation is exposed to American culture and to what extent they embrace it depends on the hold that the parent's culture places on them as well as in how assimilated they are allowed to be by the majority group. We need more longitudinal studies similar to Portes and Rumbaut (2001) that examine the role parents, grandparents, teachers, peers, and co-workers play in the adaptation of the second generation. We need a better understanding of the developmental processes, coping responses, and competencies that individuals need to effectively straddle two cultures while also developing and maintaining positive affective bonds with the culture of origin and American culture. The second generation consists of the "bridge" generation between the old and the new traditions and yet we still know relatively little about the adaptation of second generation individuals across different ethnic and cultural groups.

Third and Later Generation Ethnics

In this section attention is on third and later generation individuals who like their parents were born in the United States. The issues to explore have to do with how parents of third and later generation children transmit their heritage culture to their offspring. This is obviously a complicated question, remember back to the discussion of the second generation and how language acculturation, parents' comfort with their own ethnic background, and the influence of grandparents in cultural

transmission were all instrumental in whether the second generation maintained an ethnic identity. Biculturalism as practiced by parents, teachers, and significant community leaders and role models serve as the major conduit for cultural transmission to the third generation, but the process is not smooth and there is little longitudinal research to on rely in a review such as this. Today there is no shortage of bicultural communities everywhere in the United States. They can be found in the Chinatowns, little Saigon's, little Italy's, Latino barrios, Greek neighborhoods, Korean Saturday schools, and Persian communities in all our metropolitan centers. One of the interesting things about these communities is that the support the new generations of immigrants while also providing a small bit of the heritage culture for the later generation ethnics. For example, an examination of Mexican Americans in the Southwest offers an excellent case study of an ethnic group that is constantly being infused by newcomers from Mexico while also having developed a specific culture of their own because of their long standing residence within the borders of the United States (Tatum, 2001). Many members of this ethnic group still trace their lineage back to 1848 when the American Southwest was colonized by the United States in an unfairly matched war with Mexico who was still reeling from its own struggle of independence from Spain. Many of these native born Americans of Mexican heritage continue to steadfastly identify with a form of Mexican culture and maintain many of the values, beliefs, and customs of Mexico. Importantly, many of these later generation ethnics are more loyal to their ethnic heritage than they are knowledgeable of its culture (e.g., history, art, literature, etc.) and the Spanish language (Keefe & Padilla, 1987).

Because of their commitment to their ethnic heritage, later generation Mexican American parents and grandparents may practice dual culture socialization with their children. For reasons that differ across ethnic groups, the bicultural oriented later generation individual maintains his/her

biculturalism by choice and views it often as a benefit rather than a liability. For these individuals, acceptance of their membership in an ethnic community does not imply that they are "disloyal" Americans. Unfortunately, with the growing ethnic diversity in the United States, some social theorists have difficulty grasping the idea that biculturalism does not imply disloyalty to one side or the other contrary to their argument that multiculturalism can have dire consequences for the unity of the country (e.g., Schlesinger, 1991).

Involvement in ethnic community activities by no means implies a rejection of American culture since prior research has shown that ethnic involvement and national identity are not strongly correlated. This is consistent with Der-Karabetian's (1980) finding among Armenian-Americans, and Zak's (1973) finding with Jewish Americans, and supports the bicultural hypothesis of acculturation. Thus, participation in ethnic community affairs is associated with a stronger sense of bicultural ethnic belonging. Exposure to the dominant majority culture with eventual assimilation into it does not need to result in the rejection of one's ethnic and cultural heritage. This is quite a different perspective from that expounded by the Park-Stonequist model that described the individual as "leaving" their group and joining another.

There are some important considerations that make this situation more problematic, however, than how I have described it. In an early paper on acculturation (Padilla, 1980), I drew a distinction between cultural awareness (CA) and ethnic loyalty (EL). Cultural awareness is the cognitive dimension that specifies the knowledge that a person possesses of their culture. In Padilla (1980) and Keefe & Padilla (1987) knowledge consists of self-rated proficiency in Spanish and English; knowledge of the history, art, and music of both Mexico and the United States; and knowledge of current events that shape culture. In this model, a specific acculturation score is

assigned to respondents based on their responses to a questionnaire. The score then locates the individual on a multidimensional space of Mexican and American cultural awareness. In this context, biculturalism refers specifically to the individual's knowledge (or competence) about each of their two cultures. Ethnic loyalty, on the other hand, was the behavioral component of the model and was measured by assessing a respondent's preferences regarding language, other forms of cultural expression, leisure activities, and friendships. The rationale is that the affect that a person expresses toward a social group will also dictate the preferences that he or she holds toward activities and members of the group.

In using this distinction, Keefe and I found that with a community sample of Mexican Americans adults in three distinct geographical areas in California, it was possible to demonstrate how Cultural Awareness and Ethnic Loyalty change across generations. This is important because most work on acculturation and subsequently biculturalism has concentrated on only immigrants or their immediate offspring. Using our cross-sectional design, we found that cultural awareness decreased markedly between the first and second generation and continued to decrease so that by the fourth generation our respondents possessed little knowledge of the culture of their great grandparents. With the loss of specific cultural knowledge including a language shift to English, parents and grandparents have little heritage culture to transmit to their children and grandchildren (see earlier discussion on the role of grandparents and linguistic acculturation with second generation grandchildren). Thus, our later generation respondents compensated by transmitted more messages about ethnic loyalty and ethnic identification and less about actual cultural content. Arbona (1991) and Montgomery (1992) replicated this finding with a college student population of Mexican American respondents in South Texas.

A major question of theoretical significance is why <u>ethnic loyalty</u> persists across generations in the face of decreasing or near total absence of cultural knowledge. In our work, Keefe and I created typologies based on our respondents' scores on CA and EL that enabled us to describe how respondents of different generations change in CA and how these individuals manifest loyalty to a social group that they have been removed from physically in some cases by as much as 75 to 100 years when their great grandparents immigrated to the United States. Using a cluster analysis technique, we identified five subgroups based on their scores on Cultural Awareness and Ethnic Loyalty. We called these groups: La Raza, Changing Ethnics, Cultural Blends, Emerging Americans, and New Americans.

The *Cultural Blends* and *Emerging Americans* are most associated with the description of biculturals that we find in the literature. These individuals were primarily second and third generation Mexican Americans with between 9 to 12 years of education. Extensive interviews carried out with a subset of respondents revealed that they held generally positive attitudes toward both Mexican and American culture and saw benefits in being participatory members of both cultures. These individuals reported varying degrees of proficiency in Spanish, but were mostly dominant English speakers. They spoke about the benefits of knowing two languages and some wished that they were more bilingual than they were. They also spoke about the richness of their biculturalism in being able to celebrate American holidays such as July 4th, as well as Mexican holidays such as <u>Dia de los Muertos</u> (Day of the Dead). Our adult informants also shared how they either were actually or intended to transmit information about their dual cultural membership to their own children. These informants shared how they encouraged their children to be bilingual and how they modeled pride in their biculturalism. In the homes of these informants, we noted many

Mexican cultural artifacts (e.g., statues of the Virgin of Guadalupe the patroness saint of Mexico) along with displays of the American flag.

On a less pleasant note our informants spoke about experiences where they felt singled out by non-Hispanic whites because of their ethnic group which made them feel uncomfortable. Our respondents related experiences where they or close acquaintances were the objects of negative stereotypes and discrimination. In a closer examination of our data, Keefe and I also observed two interesting and important findings. The first was that the higher our respondents scored on a measure of *perceived discrimination* which was one of several subscales making up the *Ethnic Loyalty* dimension, the higher the respondents scored on a measure of Ethnic Loyalty. Further, regardless of how seemingly bicultural and/or Americanized our respondents appeared, they were still relatively insulated within their ethnic group. For example, few had intimate friends outside their ethnic group and most had only limited social contacts with non Mexican Americans. This was true even though the more acculturated or bicultural an informant was, the more likely they were to have co-workers from other ethnic groups. So while acculturation serves to distance the person from less acculturated family members, it does not at the same time function to have the person incorporated into a broader social network of non-ethnics!

Based on these findings, it is possible to advance a model of social distance and cultural assimilation. This model can be depicted by a 2 by 2 matrix represented on one axis by the degree of similarity between cultures ranging from a hypothesized very similar to very dissimilar, and on the other axis by Shared Physical Attributes again ranging from very similar to very dissimilar. Two quadrants are of particular interest in this discussion. The first consists of individuals with Minimal Physical Stigma (i.e., they share the same phenotype as members of the dominant group) and who

originate from a culture that allows for Maximum Assimilation because of its similarity to U. S.

culture (e.g., an Anglophone Canadian immigrant). In other words, immigrants and their

descendants from cultures that are similar to mainstream U.S. culture and who share physical

attributes with white "Americans" are the most easily incorporated into the American mainstream

culture.

An immigrant who falls into the other quadrant is the direct opposite – here the more

dissimilar the cultures and the more the newcomer resembles a "foreigner" or "outsider" because of

their phenotype, the greater the social stigma and the more difficult will be assimilation for this

individual regardless of their level of acculturation. Unfortunately, Keefe and I did not collect data

on skin coloration or phenotype characteristics of our respondents. So we have no way to confirm

our general impression that those respondents who appeared more "Mexican" in their physical

appearance also scored higher on our perceived discrimination index. However, such data do exist

in a similar study of Mexican American ethnicity. In this study Arce, Murguia and Frisbie (1987)

hypothesized that Mexican Americans with a European physical appearance (phenotype) will have

more enhanced life opportunities as measured by socioeconomic status than Mexican Americans

with an indigenous Native American phenotype. To test their hypothesis, Arce et al. analyzed

phenotype information that was gathered on a national survey of nearly1000 respondents of Mexican

heritage. In this face-to-face survey, the interviewer recorded the skin coloration and the physical

features of their informants at the conclusion of the formal interview. The hypothesis was supported

when observed phenotype was examined against indicators of socioeconomic status. Respondents

and their parents who were classified as light skinned and European in phenotype had more total

years of education, higher income, and a lower perception of past discrimination than did

respondents classified as dark skinned and Indian in phenotype. Arce et al. noted that the darker and more Indian the phenotype of the respondents the more likely they were to report incidents of discrimination from the majority group against them directly or toward other Mexican Americans. Importantly, these individuals also reported that they were more aligned socially and politically with their Mexican heritage, regardless of their generation.

In a more recent study, Vasquez, Vasquez, Bauman, and Sierra (1997) investigated the effects of skin color on acculturation. The participants in their study were 102 Mexican American undergraduate students at a southwestern university. Results indicated that students with the darkest skin (as *self-reported*) had significantly lower levels of acculturation (on the heritage-culture/mainstream culture continuum) than those with lighter skin. The authors suggested that if one experiences social discrimination, the incentives to master the dominant language and the opportunities to interact with members of the majority group may be limited. Interestingly, among the Mexican-oriented students, those with the darker skin were more interested in the Latino community, while the darker skinned Anglo-oriented students showed the least interest in the Latino community. Vazquez et al. interpreted these findings to mean that individuals who identify with the mainstream society and whose physical appearance is dissimilar from the mainstream group may need to ensure their assimilation into the dominant society by exhibiting few other traits (such as adherence to the Latino culture) that could mark them as outsiders.

Gómez (2000) analyzed data from the Boston Social Survey Data of Urban Inequality, conducted in 1993 and 1994. Of the total 1,820 respondents, this study focused on the 353 Latino respondents who were also part of the labor force. As in the Arce et al. (1987) study,

interviewer rated the skin color of their interviewees. Gomez found that lighter skinned Latinos had more education, were more likely to own their homes, were more likely to be married, and used Spanish more often as a language for communication than their darker skinned counterparts. However, the only statistically significant variable was hourly wage. This difference was still significant after controlling for other human capital variables. Thus, the results from the Gómez study suggest that skin color matters in the life chances of Latinos in the United States, with darker skin color negatively impacting hourly wages.

To summarize, the available research on the impact of skin color on the life chances of Latinos indicates that, even after controlling for background variables such us parents' education, age, and language ability, possession of a darker skin and more Indian-looking phenotype has a negative effect on the educational and economic attainment of Latinos. These research findings support the contention made by Portes and Rumbaut (2001) that newcomers pay a penalty for being immigrants or later generation ethnics who differ in phenotype from the host society, and even a greater penalty for being darker and more Indian-looking (or Asian or African) in phenotype. The cost is both *psychological* and *economic* – psychological in the sense of the discomfort of being stigmatized as different and economic because the greater the stigma the lower the human capital that the person is able to acquire that can then be translated into social mobility in the American context of structural assimilation.

We are left to speculate about the effects of discrimination and stigma in the case of ethnic socialization because of the lack of a body of research literature. However, we can gain some useful hints from the literature on racial socialization with African Americans and on the few studies that do exist on cultural transmission and ethnic socialization. First, the literature on racial socialization

(e.g., Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Spencer, 1983; Thornton, 1997) shows that African American parents transmit to children the types of racial socialization messages that they received as children. Moreover, if parents have experienced overt racism and it they also felt that their children had been treated unfairly because of their race, they were significantly more likely to engage in cultural transmissions about race group history and heritage, while also teaching about prejudice and discrimination – a form of preparation for racism (Hughes & Jackson, 2001).

In a similar fashion, Phinney and Chavira (1995) report that Mexican American, African American, and Japanese American parents stated that in their ethnic socialization of their children they felt compelled to instill pride in their heritage while also having conversations with them about ethnic discrimination that they might confront in the future. In another study of 45 dyads of Mexican American English speaking mothers and their 6 to10 year old children, mothers reported that they discussed with their children issues of ethnic discrimination and prejudice (Knight et al., 1993). However, the way in which these cultural and discrimination focused message occurred was not straightforward, but was very much connected to a bundle of variables associated with the mothers' cultural and familial circumstance. Specifically, mothers who were more comfortable with their Mexican cultural background and less comfortable with the majority culture, and whose husbands' families had resided in the United States for fewer generations, where more likely to instill Mexican culture in their children while also transmitting more messages about ethnic pride and discrimination in their young children. As for the children in these dyads, Knight et al. found that children whose mothers were comfortable with their Mexican background used more ethnic labels to describe themselves and importantly knew more about their culture, reported engaging in ethnic behaviors, and were more likely to prefer ethnic foods, friends, and social activities.

In a study that followed the Knight et al. paradigm, but with somewhat older children (7 to year olds) Quintana and Vera (1999) found that their older children had developed a more sophisticated understanding of the ethnic prejudice they faced. This in turn was associated with higher levels of ethnic knowledge and ethnic identification on the part of the older children. Parental ethnic socialization was not predictive of understanding prejudice in this study, but it did relate significantly with ethnic knowledge. Thus, the developmental process suggested is that children learn about their cultural heritage from their parents and as they advance cognitively they are increasingly able to understand the meaning of prejudice and how their ethnic group is targeted for discrimination. The result of this process is that the young person emerges with a sense of his ethnic identity that is sharpened by a continuous flow of ethnic-related socializing experiences with parents, family members, peers, etc.

Studies with older informants are needed to see how ethnic knowledge, understanding of the dynamics of prejudice, and the evolution of ethnic identity proceeds through adolescence and young adulthood. To illustrate I will turn to an autobiographical account of a 19 year old Chinese American female university student by the name of Diane. In her own words Diane states:

"I am both the second and the third generation to be born in the United States. My

paternal grandparents were born and raised in China; however, my maternal grandparents

were born in the United States…My family's knowledge of Chinese language and culture

has gradually dissipated throughout the generations. Although both of my parents grew up

in households where Chinese was spoken, they also grew up in an English speaking

community. Because of this, they focused more on the English language than Chinese. They

have both retained enough knowledge of the language to be able to understand it, although

neither of them can speak it very well."

Diane continues with her story:

> *"Because my parents were raised in an American society, the American culture naturally became dominant over the Chinese culture. Both families grew accustomed to the American way of life, but they also managed to keep enough of the Chinese culture to remind them of their roots. Most of the Chinese customs, such as the celebration of Chinese New Year, were kept intact, however, the families also learned to celebrate traditional American holidays…As I grew up, I was raised in a household which the followed American culture. Although I knew that I was Chinese, I didn't think that there was any difference between myself and my friends. I never learned the Chinese language, and although I was taught some Chinese customs at an early age, it took me a few years before I understood them."*

Diane then relates how she came to better understand her ethnicity and her place in America:

> *"Personally, I have never denied that I am Chinese. However, like any young child, I didn't want to believe that I was any different than all of my friends. Since I was raised in an American society, I didn't really associate myself as being Chinese. I didn't acknowledge my cultural difference because I didn't think that it was important. I wanted to believe that I was just like everyone else, because I wanted to fit in. Due to the innocence of childhood, my friends and I didn't recognize the fact that we were from separate ethnic backgrounds. It didn't seem to matter to us then. The first time that I realized that I was part of an ethnic minority was when I entered elementary school. I noticed that there were only a few Asian students in the entire school. It struck me then that I was different, and I didn't like that feeling."*

"When I was in the first grade, I remember doing an exercise that was intended to teach us how to graph. We took an in-class poll on our hair color. When the teacher tallied the results, I realized that I was the only person in the entire class who had black hair. Although this fact may seem very trivial now, it was the first time that I felt that I wasn't like everyone else. I felt segregated, and I remember wishing that I weren't Chinese so that I could have brown or blond hair like the rest of the class."

To this point we see that Diane's parents had culturally socialized her to be both Chinese and American. Accordingly, she felt herself a part of both worlds. However, in elementary school the realization of difference emerged when she recognized herself as different in phenotype from her classmates. We see the importance of this discovery and its lingering effects for Diane when she continues with her autobiography.

"I am currently working at a bank as a teller. I have been working at the same branch for over a year now, and I have come in contact with many different people. During this time, I have noticed that it is very common for a customer to inquire about my nationality. This happens quite frequently … After they know that I am Chinese, some people ask me if I speak the language. When I answer that question, they often ask me if I was born in this country. Sometimes, they ask where my parents were born, and even where my grandparents were born and raised. At first, I did not mind … these questions. I figured that some of them were trying to strike up a conversation and others were genuinely interested in my background. However, I become irritated at times because I feel as if people are trying to find out too much about my personal life, which has nothing to do with the reason why they are at the bank. It becomes annoying when some customers lecture me

by telling me that I should be ashamed because I do not know my own culture's language."

"I would like to point out that the customers who ask these questions are not mostly Asians, as one might assume. I have had many customers of other nationalities who have also inquired. There are times when they acknowledge my ethnic difference without talking directly to me. I heard someone in the branch once who looked at the teller line and stated, "What is this, The United Nations?" This man was not only referring to me, but also to another teller who is Filipino. Although he may not have meant to offend me, he did so by making me feel … different."

Diane's experiences as related here are not unique. Many ethnic people can relate very similar experiences. Further, it is experiences of this type that raise the consciousness of ethnic people and which motivates them to become more aware of the culture of their parents and grandparents. For instance, Diane discusses her own movement toward Chinese culture.

"As I have grown older I have come to realize how important my culture is to me. I am saddened that I have a great grandmother who I have known all of my life who I have never been able to hold a conversation with because of our language barrier. There are times that I wish that I would have learned the language at an early age so that I could understand and communicate with my relatives."

Diane continues by explaining how she is trying to learn more about her culture and language:

"I am trying to learn more about my culture now. I dance with a Chinese group and study Chinese history. Although some people might call me a banana - yellow on the outside, and white on the inside - this is not true at all. I am as Chinese as I can be considering I was born in this country, as were my parents. I enjoy most things that are

Chinese just as I do things American. Being Chinese and American at the same time makes me feel special, but it still bothers me when people ask me where I am from or make me feel different."

In these passages, we hear Diane bemoaning the fact that her knowledge of her Chinese culture is incomplete and that she has missed out on the opportunity to have a conversation with her great grandmother because of the language barrier that separates them. Imagine the rich cultural information that Diane's grandmother could have shared with her had they been able to communicate in Chinese. To compensate for the loss of Chinese across the generations, Diane has become interested in Chinese history and has joined a Chinese dance group. These cultural activities provide her with the ethnic protection and social support she needs to maintain the integration of her identity as a person who is stigmatized as witnessed by the frequent inquiries she gets about her background from strangers at her place of employment.

Diane's autobiographical account illustrates several very important facts regarding the difficulty that some later generation ethnic Americans have as they move both culturally and socially toward full Americanization. Diane is culturally assimilated, but stigmatized because of her Asian phenotype. Although feeling no discomfort with her Chinese background, it was clear that she was socialized by her parents and teachers to be an American. Yet in her social contexts first at school and now in her place of work she is seen as different from white Americans which caused her discomfort. To minimize this discomfort she found solace in a re-affirmation of her Chinese ethnic heritage.

In a moving account Mura (1991) takes a different approach to re-connecting with his Japanese culture. Mura a third-generation Japanese American who was born and raised in

Minnesota describes his life in Japan on a U.S./Japan Creative Artist Exchange Fellowship. In Minnesota as he explains in this autobiographical account, he never felt completely 100% American because the images he saw in the media and the history he learned in school never included people who looked like him. However, in Japan wherever he turned he saw his face, but he couldn't speak Japanese and all his mannerisms were American. Caught between his American socialization and Japanese heritage, Mura describes the process he went through in learning about the culture of his grandparents and why they left Japan. Slowly and sometimes painfully Mura was able to gain an insight into the decisions that his parents and grandparents made in their own attempt at Americanization and what they did and did not transmit to him about his Japanese culture. Eventually, Mura understood that he was American, but that he had lost something important to him because of the struggles of his Japanese grandparents to fit into America at a time when Asians, especially Japanese, were stigmatized and where negative stereotypes toward Japanese and other Asians were abundant.

In todays post September 11 climate, there is much suspicion and negative stereotyping against Arab Americans (Shyrock, 2002) in much the same fashion as was present during World War II toward anyone who looked Asian. Today, David Mura's grandparents are no longer seen as a threat to this country's security; however, Arab Americans have taken their place. How this impacts the long term cultural transmission from Arab Americans parents to their children is still unknown. Will they follow the same path as other stigmatized groups before and try to Americanize as quickly as possible?

Thus, for many second and later generation individuals' *biculturalism* is a very suitable strategy for coping with discriminatory practices in society. It is a more adaptable strategy than

alienation from the society to which one belongs as a birth right, but where discrimination may occur because of ethnicity and skin color. In the literature there is recognition of cultural transmission which incorporates more than just knowledge of culture from one generation to the next, but which also prepares children for prejudice and discrimination. This corresponds to the rather extensive literature on racial socialization with African Americans, but which is still lacking in the literature of other stigmatized groups (e.g., Hispanics and Asian Americans). In a study that examined the role of ethnic and social perspective taking abilities and parental ethnic socialization, Quintana, Castaneda-English, and Ybarra (1999) found that parental ethnic socialization was positively correlated with ethnic identity achievement among a population of mostly third and later generation Mexican American adolescents. However, the ability to take a different perspective was linked developmentally to cognitive processes, and not to ethnic socialization. Quintana et al. (1999) speculate that higher levels of ethnic perspective taking reflect cognitive processes and that these are related to self-protective properties found among stigmatized groups. Specifically, adolescents with a high level of ethnic perspective taking understand that negative feedback about their ethnicity or ethnic group is likely due to ethnic prejudice not to some internal characteristic or behavior. How an adolescent's higher cognitive processing and not ethnic socialization comes to offer this self-protective function is not understood and requires more research.

I will now turn to the final the category which has the potential for dual culture socialization. This is the situation of mixed ethnic and/or racial children. In the case of mixed heritage children cultural transmission is no less complex, but often there is a different dynamic because in the situations that I have discussed to this point ethnic and cultural knowledge was communicated by parents who shared the same cultural knowledge. Here the situation is different because the two

parents represent different ethnic, racial, or cultural traditions and each contribute to the transmission of knowledge according to their own distinct backgrounds.

Mixed ethnic/racial heritage children

As discussed earlier, our multicultural society has given way to considerable intermarriage in the past 30 years. This is especially true in large urban centers where diverse racial, religious, and ethnic group members live and work together and where the opportunity to interact and learn about different cultures, as well as the opportunity to date and intermarry is high (Murguia, 1982; Root 1992, 1996; Winters & De Bose, 2003).

Intermarriage has been touted as the desirable end point of an open and race free society. Thus, it should be apparent why intermarriage and mixed heritage children is a topic of central importance in this review of intergenerational transmission of culture. Children of intermarried couples often acknowledge and embrace the cultural and racial identity of both their parents. Today it is commonplace to find individuals of mixed heritage backgrounds acknowledging their biculturalism and biracial origins (Obama, 1995).

The literature on mixed ethnic/racial heritage children has exploded in recent years with a large number of books and articles appearing in the last decade (e.g., Coronado, Guevarra, Moniz, & Szanto, 2003; Nash, 1999; Root, 1996, 2001; Winters & DeBosse, 2003). This literature shows that children of interracial (e.g., African American and White) marriages have received greater attention than have children of interethnic (e.g., Hispanic and non-Hispanic white) marriages (e.g., Rosenblatt, Karis, & Powell, 1995). However, offspring of interethnic marriages must also cope with complex problems, since parents differ not only in phenotype, but in culture, language, and often in religious preference as well.

Early writers on the topic of interracial unions (e.g., Gordon, 1964) argued that the offspring of mixed marriages often suffer from identity and adjustment conflicts and that these children may hold a low self-image and lack a strong social network. This is similar to Stonequist's (1937) analysis of mixed racial people and his assertion that these people were often marginalized and suffered from anomie because of their disconnection from members of their parent's social groups. For example, Vander-Sandmen (1963) suggests that children of mixed marriages develop ambivalence toward both sociocultural groups. Further, Cleveland and Longaker (1972) propose that persons exposed to two different sets of cultural values are targets for neurotic behavior if they fail to incorporate both sets of cultural values in their belief system.

Similarly, Murguia (1982) suggests that intermarriage encourages a movement away from a definite ethnic identity. He speculates that children of intermarriages are subject to more cultural diversity and if not properly handled may have difficulty in identifying with the lower status ethnic group. There is some support for these various positions. Let me illustrate by quoting from an autobiographical case study of an 18 year woman named Yolanda who rejects her Mexican ancestry in favor of an ethnic concoction that she perceives as more acceptable to her peers.

> "*The hardest thing I've ever encountered in my life was accepting my heritage. Up until this past summer, I had adamantly refused to admit that I was of Mexican descent, deciding instead to concoct an explanation which sounded like a recipe: one fourth Italian, one eighth French, and a pinch of Portuguese. For the longest time I took all precautions necessary to ensure that no suspicions ever arose about my real identity. In high school I bypassed the foreign language requirement by selecting French, cutting short my grandmother's hopes of conversing and gossiping in Spanish with me. At home, I made it*

clear that I would only   tolerate loud <u>mariachi</u> music once a week, and on the

condition that   none of my "normal" friends were within earshot. Although I knew I was giving my

family a   stiff pain in the <u>nalga</u> (ass) with my guest for life as a "gringa" (white woman),

succumbing   to the fact that I was part of the refried bean crowd seemed a fate worse than death."

"*My mother attempted to enlighten me by telling me fascinating stories about my*

relatives and their accomplishments. She may as well have been speaking Chinese. It didn't

matter to me that my ancestral uncle was a hero during the Mexican Revolution, or that my

maternal grandfather was a celebrated poet in his hometown; Mexicans, <u>all</u> Mexicans, were

voodoo in my book, and no mere legacy about their success could change my gripes towards

them."

Yolanda struggled through her adolescence with various identities primarily because she was

not fair skinned and found herself being asked by her peers about her background. Thus, she

concocted an identity that resembles a recipe for stew "*... one fourth Italian, one eighth French, and*

a pinch of Portuguese..." Further, her Mexican American mother's efforts at ethnic socialization

were continuously rebuffed. Unlike Diane discussed above, Yolanda showed no remorse in not

being able to converse with her grandmother in Spanish. Yolanda also disparaged her ethnic

heritage by disrespectfully referring to her family as "*... part of the refried bean crowd*..." and by

trying to dissociate from them.

There is a happy ending to Yolanda's story though. It was meeting a young Mexican man

that moved Yolanda to see Mexicans in a new light.

"*He was a young Mexican who didn't look like one. I remember scrutinizing him*

critically, looking for Mexican symptoms. Where was his brown skin? He spoke perfect,

flawless English. I refused steadfastly to believe his ethnic background until I introduced

him   *to my mother; the introduction took four hours, with the two of them conversing heartily in*

Spanish and me sitting on the outskirts, cursing the three years I spent taking French. We

went to Mexican parties together -- with live <u>mariachi</u> bands -- and he smiled at the people

there, enjoying their company, their life, their heritage. And for the first time in my life, I

was   *finally able to do the same."*

Today Yolanda has toned down her criticism of Mexicans and even seems to enjoy the company of

her relatives. She does not identify as Mexican, but neither is she something concocted from an

ethnic cookbook as before.

Yolanda represents an extreme example of ethnic denial and hostility. Her story is offered

here only to highlight an extreme form of identity confusion (e.g., Erikson, 1968) resulting from

mixed ethnic heritage where one parent is from a low status and stigmatized group. Yolanda thus

dealt with this by trying to "pass" as something other than a member of the low status [Mexican]

group. Generally, the findings regarding mixed heritage children are far more positive than what we

have just seen in the case of Yolanda. In a study of 63 adolescents of marriages involving one

Mexican origin and one non-Hispanic parent far more positive outcomes were found (Salgado de

Snyder, Lopez & Padilla, 1982). In this study adolescents between the ages of 12 and 18 were

interviewed to ascertain their ethnic identification and knowledge of their Mexican culture. Most of

the adolescents (70%) identified as Mexican-heritage and nearly all (89%) reported being proud of

their Mexican heritage. In addition, 40% spoke some Spanish and most were familiar with Mexican

cultural events. In these mixed marriages, when the mother was Mexican the children who more

likely to receive cultural transmissions regarding Spanish language instruction, as well as lessons on

history, traditions, holidays, and traditional foods.

Salgado de Snyder et al. asked their informants about the advantages or disadvantages of their mixed ethnic heritage. Fifty-six percent of the respondents expressed advantages in having mixed parentage. Among the most frequently mentioned advantages were: being able to learn about two different cultures, speaking two languages, and growing up without prejudices. Some respondents did report some disadvantages such as conflicting child rearing styles between their parents based on their respective cultures.

Biracial and multiracial children and families often face unique challenges. Identity development for biracial children is most strongly shaped by their respective parents' racial socialization and by the acceptance they receive from others during sensitive stages of development (Hughes and Johnson, 2001). Through their cultural transmissions parents can prepare their children for what society has to offer, however, this is not always easy. According to Reddy (1994), monoracial parents in interracial relationships have a difficult time preparing their biracial children for what they will experience in society. With experiences unique to their particular ethnic group, it is difficult to fully understand the biracial experience. Often biracial children have completely different phenotypes and cultural backgrounds than either of their parents and thus experience things that neither parent could fully appreciate, understand, or teach. Racial ambiguity and dual identity often create a number of difficult experiences, such as rejection, racism, isolation, and identity confusion. In some instances, monoracial parents are unable or unwilling to communicate these difficulties to their children. Parents of biracial children often make assumptions about the experience of growing up biracial, ignoring the complexity that surrounds the duality of their cultural identity. Reddy (1994) outlines three main

assumptions that parents and families of biracial children often forget.

The first aspect of the biracial experience that parents may not be aware of in their socialization is that biracial children do not always identify with how they look. Parents assume that biracial children identify with the race that they phenotypically resemble. Although teachers, peers, or strangers may automatically categorize them into one racial group, the biracial person may not identify with that group. The process of shaping one's identity based on societal perceptions is known as the "looking-glass self" (Padilla & Perez, 2003). Various family and social experiences cause biracial children to accept or reject the looking-glass identity. The presence or absence of similar others will often affect this identity process. A biracial child growing up in a one parent household, for example, may chose to identify with the ethnicity of that parent. Additionally, some parents encourage their children to embrace both cultural identities and avoid "choosing sides." Other more racial sensitive parents chose to socialize their children to identify with their phenotypical race in order to prepare them for societal treatment and gain acceptance into a community.

The second frequently forgotten aspect to the biracial experience is that not all biracial individuals have acceptance into a racial or ethnic group. Biracial children may also feel isolated during adolescence if there are few other biracial peers. This frequently occurs when interracial families live in a community where interracial dating is not common. This can also occur if the adolescent does not fully take on the cultural characteristics of either community. A biracial adolescent who looks black but "acts white," for example, may be rejected because of how they look by one group and because of how they act by another. Children raised in families where the cultural transmissions are as neutral with respect to race as possible may be at risk for

community rejection. This is perhaps the major reason why many parents chose to raise their children to identify with the group that they phenotypically resemble.

Third, there is usually more than one possible positive racial identity resolution, but finding these alternative solutions may be difficult. As mentioned previously a variety of social experiences can cause biracial children to identify in unexpected ways. People can identify with how they look, identify with both cultures, identify with a single culture, identify as "biracial," or create a racial identity as we saw with Yolanda earlier. These identities are not fixed either. Root (1996) mentions how biracial children can identify in one way during one period of their life or with one social group and in another way in a different time or setting. How the child identifies is largely influenced by parental/familial modes of cultural and racial transmission. Community diversity, presence or absence of significant family members, cultural and language practices, and socialization preferences largely shape the identity formation of biracial children.

Root (1996) does caution parents about cultural transmission practices that have the potential for created a "fragmented identity" (identity conflict and confusion) in their children. Identity fragmentation can be minimized through open, supportive communication between parents and children. In a guide for parents with biracial children, Jackson Nakazawa (2004) states that teaching biracial children about all of their cultures, and letting them know that it is okay (and wonderful) to be who they are and to look the way they do are very important first steps. The unconditional support of a loving family, that offers a safe haven from racial categorization, can be comforting and relieving from society's constant need to categorize, define, and treat accordingly. Home is a place where the mixed race/ethnic person can be accepted for who they are, rather than for the color of their skin or phenotype. It is also

important that parents consider and discuss the difficulties of prejudice and discrimination that their children might face. According to Jackson Nakazawa (2004) maintaining an open dialog and being supportive of their choices allows children to feel comfortable and safe when developing and discovering their identity. Additionally, living in a diverse community or having other biracial friends can help children form attachments and friendships beyond the boundaries of a racially specific social group.

Root (1996), the leading researcher on the identity development of biracial American youth, proposed a four stage model for identity development. The four stages are neither exhaustive nor exclusive. A biracial person can identify with any stage, at anytime, and in any order. Although some biracial individuals feel comfortable and secure with their identities, for many other people identity is an ever changing fluid process. Parents are a strong influencing factor for children who chose to identify with anyone of the following examples.

The first example of identification that many biracial children and families adopt is to accept the identity that society assigns.   Many families believe that it is important to socialize their biracial children in preparation for how society will see them. Phenotypic identification can often make acceptance into a dominant group easier for many young people. By socializing children to identify with the race they most closely resemble phenotypically, biracial children often chose to identify with a single race thus avoiding issues with a dual identity. Although this method seems to be a practical solution for many parents of biracial children, the process is not so concrete. Many biracial individuals identify with different groups depending on the social context. Because multiple cultural transmission is evitable, many biracial children are able to identify more easily with multiracial groups than are monoracial children (Nash, 1995).

Additionally, phenotypic ambiguity can make identity and acceptance into a monoracial group more challenging. Although parents may socialize their children to identify with a single race this does not mean that society will always do the same.

The second solution is to identify with both racial groups. Because of their parents' socialization practices some biracial children learn to embrace both cultural backgrounds equally and consequently chose to identify with both groups. Different social settings or various family settings may cause biracial children to temporarily shift their identity to one group or another depending on the context. This becomes particularly common in situations where extended family is less open to the interracial marriage. Identification with one family member can occur in social situations where one race has stronger numerical representation (Gunthrope, 1998). Zack (1993) explains that this is a social ability unique to people of biracial heritage.

The third process is to identify with a single racial group. This is different from the first situation above because here it is voluntary identification, although it can still be towards the phenotypical race. Despite phenotype, social pressure, or encouragement many biracial children and adolescents develop an identity preference toward one racial group. Often however, this conscious and voluntary identification is towards the phenotypically dominant race. Monoracial identification is also more likely in single parent households in which children receive cultural transmissions that involve only one culture. This is also a likely outcome in communities with a heavy concentration of one particular racial group. Rather than a societal racial assignment, children and adolescents in this group chose their identity and racial membership. This identification strategy can be healthy unless the referent racial group still views and treats the biracial person as an outsider. This identity strategy is most easily achieved when there is a

balance between self-identification and larger group acceptance.

The fourth option of identification is to identify as a new racial group. This can best be illustrated by biracial individuals who chose to identify as "biracial," "multiracial," "multiethnic," etc. With an Asian, Native American, white and African American ancestry, golf pro Tiger Woods identifies as "cablinasian;" a word that he invented by combining the names of his backgrounds. Root recognizes this as a healthy method of socialization for interracial families. Children who identify as "biracial" often have a healthy recognition of both cultures and are able to identify very well with other "biracial" children (Root, 1992). This allows for a sense of group membership, an important aspect of adolescence and development.

As mentioned earlier, parents play a particularly crucial role in the racial socialization of children (Hughes and Johnson, 2001). Because families are the primary agents of socialization, identification cues and influences are pervasive from parents and other family members. One of the strongest determinants of the identification of biracial children is how parents view them and teach them to view themselves. Parental cues can easily promote a healthy identification, but can also increase vulnerability to fragmented or unhealthy self-constructs. Root (1996; 2001) believes that parents who fail to recognize their children's dual identities, or fail to maintain open and honest conversation about racial experiences can increase children's vulnerability to social isolation, rejection, and insecure identity development. For this reason, parents have the primary responsibility to encourage their children to embrace the diversity, beauty and unique experience of growing up as a biracial child.

Another strong social influence of identification is the peer group. As children develop socially, peers become a very important referent group. The racial composition of peer groups

can have a particularly strong impact on the way that biracial children chose to identify. Because peers increasingly become the social referent group as children get older and become young adults, opinions, beliefs, and other social cues can sway identification towards the larger cultural identification of the peer group and also influence the intergenerational transmissions that occur around themes of race, culture, and identity. Biracial children with weak parental involvement in their cultural development tend to be more susceptible to the social influences of their peers. Thus, peers can be a strong positive or negative determinant of racial identity for biracial children.

In addition to the familial and peer socializing influences, the community and its cultural messages can influence identity development. Community settings that are largely representative of a single culture and race can differentially impact the life of a biracial young person seeking to identify racially. Interracial families living in high ethnic dense communities (e.g., Latino, Asian, or black neighborhoods), for example, are more likely to be exposed to black, Latino, or Asian culture, thus influencing the socialization of biracial children.

Patterns of cultural transmission in childhood can increase vulnerabilities to social isolation and rejection. Conversely, healthy parenting styles can improve children's sense of self, improving self-esteem and increasing social acceptability among peer groups. Healthy parenting, however, does not always ensure social acceptance. Many biracial children experience a form of in-group racism, most frequently with racial groups that perceive them as not dark enough or not culturally competent in the ethnic language or culture (Streeter, 1996). Some mixed race individuals face ridicule based on their phenotypes while ironically also being pressured to identify with their phenotypic ethnic and/or racial community. Two biracial

Stanford University students summarized the dilemma well when they said:

"I felt that I had to prove myself (in high school) to some of the Asians at school because I look whiter. I used to get angry because I felt like the Asians who were making jokes about me by calling me white, were acting racist towards white people. They felt that calling me white was an insult, and I hate racism from anyone, so it upset me."

"After politely turning down an offer for a date by a Latino guy, he became angry and began saying derogatory things to me. He called me "stuck-up" and would do things like look at the ceiling when I walked by because he said I was "stuck up" there. His Latino friends began to laugh at his jokes and I felt out-cast. The more I became excluded from the group, the more they presumed my distance was because I was felt superior or something, because of my father."

These examples give us a sampling of the dilemmas that biracial students encounter from ethnic students who typically they identify with, but where the identity is made more difficult because of racist comments they experience and the defensive posture they assume to defend their parent(s). For example, the female student identified as Latina, but didn't think she needed to wear her ethnicity on her sleeve or date a particular male just because he was Latino. Yet, the rejection she felt from her peers made her question her identity as Latina.

Experiences with social rejection can have a strong influence on the identification development of many biracial individuals. Conversely, positive social experiences and social acceptance can also promote in-group identification (Nash, 1995). As previously mentioned, peers can have a particularly pervasive impact on adolescent identity development, particularly racial identification. Positive, social support can encourage children to embrace and accept their

dual cultural background and can foster self-esteem.

In an empirical study carried out in Hawaii and New Mexico on mixed ethnic heritage individuals, Stephan & Stephan (1989, 1991) identified several positive features that are possible with people who, by virtue of mixed ethnic parentage identify with two cultural styles. In this research, Stephan & Stephan assessed the psychological functioning of mixed heritage individuals to determine whether mixed heritage individuals conform to the negative characteristics predicted by the "marginalists" or whether these individuals manifested positive features as assumed by the "biculturalists". In Hawaii, the subjects were single heritage Caucasians and Asian Americans, plus a group of mixed Caucasian-Asian heritage college students. In New Mexico, the single heritage respondents were non-Hispanic whites and Hispanics, while the mixed heritage subjects were the offspring of non-Hispanic white and Hispanic unions. Subjects in both Hawaii and New Mexico were given a large battery of psychological measures. I will summarize only a few of their many findings.

On measures of "Attitudes toward Caucasians (C) and Asian-Americans/Hispanics (A-A/H)", "Contact with Cs and A-A/Hs", and "Enjoyment of C culture and A-A/H culture" the mixed heritage individuals fell midway between the single heritage comparison groups whether in Hawaii or New Mexico. Further, the mixed heritage individuals projected the image of being the perfect cultural bridge between the ethnic and mainstream groups.

In addition, on the psychological measures of anomie, intergroup anxiety, and self-esteem there were no significant differences involving the mixed heritage individuals in either Hawaii or New Mexico. In fact the only significant differences were on intergroup anxiety and self-esteem with the Hawaiian Asian group expressing greater intergroup anxiety and lower self-esteem than

either the Caucasians or the mixed heritage groups.

On a measure of psychophysiological symptoms (e.g., "Are you ever troubled with aches or pains in the head"?) there were no significant differences between any of the groups dispelling any belief that one group or the other was more prone to psychosomatic complaints.

An important finding that emerged from these studies was that in Hawaii the mixed heritage respondents were more likely to identify as Japanese than were the respondents in New Mexico who showed more resistance to identify as Mexican-origin. This may be due to the higher social status of Japanese in Hawaii and the much lower social status of Mexican in a border region like New Mexico. More research is necessary to examine the role of social status in the dual cultural identity of mixed heritage individuals.

Although there is still much we need to know about mixed ethnic/racial marriages and cultural transmission practices within such households, the findings indicate that biracial individuals are well adjusted and socially competent in their two cultures. If there are problems that biracial individuals experience, they are due more to societal racism that affects majority and minority groups alike than to any failings in the biracial individuals themselves. Research findings tell us that biracial individuals who are integrated into their dual cultural heritage and who are open and positive about their background have life experiences that are rich and full. What is needed though are more developmental-oriented studies that bring mixed race individuals into greater focus in discussions of how both parents socialize their children to be responsive to their dual cultural and racial/ethnic heritage as well as in how to manage discrimination directed toward them because of their biracial heritage. Finally, the crossing of color and cultural boundaries is no longer perceived with the same negative lens of earlier times. Mixed race couples and their children are adding a new vitality to

America (Obama, 1995).

Conclusion

In conclusion, I have shown that there are important development reasons for a closer examination of dual culture transmission in the context of the United States. Dramatic demographic shifts in the United States in the past 30 years are altering how we need to think about socialization practices and the transmission cultures across successive generations. The traditional melting pot view of America may never have been a reality for all immigrants and today this is even more apparent with large numbers of immigrants coming from Latin America and Asian countries. These newer immigrants are changing the face, literally of America, from white to various shades of brown. Furthermore, immigrant parents are more inclined now than at other times to pass their traditional culture to their children and grandchildren. This does not imply that the bounds that bind us together as Americans are endangered as the opponents of multiculturalism argue; rather, biculturalism is seen as the wave of the future and a strength to be embraced.

Individuals who are socialized into the traditions and practices of two cultures are far more numerous than what our professional literature suggests. Further, because of significant immigration especially from Latin America and Asia coupled with significant increases in exogamy (inter-marriage) over the last 30 years, there is even more reason for focusing our attention on bicultural transmission.

Although the focus here has been primarily on the bicultural intergenerational transmission in Hispanics and Asian American families, it is important to recognize that many of the same conditions and mechanisms that operate in cultural transmission between the generations in these two groups are likely to be found with many other immigrant groups, second and later generation

ethnic Americans, and mixed heritage individuals of many different backgrounds. More research is needed to fully comprehend dual culture socialization processes and their outcomes for children and adolescents. Unless bicultural socialization is recognized as an important developmental area of study we will have an incomplete understanding of how many children balance the cultural practices of the home and the large social context in which they live.

The psychological models that are used to study cultural transmission and biculturalism must also step aside from older models of "marginality" and examine new possibilities in the evaluation of life styles, syntheses of cultures, and psychological adaptation. In this chapter, I have tried to show that socialization in two cultures can be an unpleasant experience on occasion for some children and adolescents. One aspect of this is due in large measure to stigmatization and negative stereotypes based on skin color and phenotype that convey discriminatory messages of inferiority and of being an outsider. However, I argue here that stigma and perceived discrimination are having effects that are different from what we might have anticipated. Immigrants and ethnic people are not shedding their culture and trying to become "American." Instead, perceived discrimination is serving to motivate ethnic group members to transmit their heritage knowledge from one generation to the next while also adopting English and the behavioral competencies necessary to become functioning members of an American culture to which they also belong.

I call for developmental psychologists to give ethnicity and culture more importance in understanding how children and their parents resolve issues of race and culture in their everyday life. We need to incorporate strategies for obtaining information about our respondents' ethnic and cultural backgrounds and how these get translated into their behavior. Simple questionnaires that force an individual to select from racial/ethnic categories such as: white, Asian, African American,

Hispanic, and American Indian are too simplistic. These categories do not give us the developmental perspective we need to assess the multiracial, ethnic, and cultural identities that individuals possess and which may be used differentially depending upon the multitude of situational contexts they encounter everyday with peers, neighbors, and strangers.

In sum, because of the rapid demographic changes that have taken place in the United States in the last 30 years, it is important to acknowledge that earlier developmental models of socialization are not universal and that generational status in the United States along with information about home language and culture and important in understanding psychosocial development. These considerations add complexity to our research, but important information is often lacking when ethnic heritage cultures are not given due consideration. Our effort to get a handle on these complex and sensitive topics may seem overly difficult and burdensome. However, the payoff is worth the effort if we are able to better understand the meaning of cultural transmission in families and societal contexts that are guided daily by more than a single culture. This approach acknowledges too that biculturalism creates new ways of envisioning developmental processes.

References

Aellen, C., & Lambert, W. (1969). Ethnic identification and personality adjustment of Canadian adolescents of mixed English-French parentage. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1,* 69 - 86.

Arce, C. H., Murguia, E., & Frisbie, W. P. (1987). Phenotype and life chances among Chicanos. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 19 - 23.

Bernal, G., Trimble, J., Burlew, A. K., & Leong, F. T. (Eds.) (2003). *Handbook of Racial and Ethnic Minority Psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bernal, M. E., & Knight, G. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Ethnic Identity: Formation and Transmission Among Hispanics and Other Minorities.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bernal, M. E., Knight, G. P., Garza, C. A., Ocampo, K. A., & Cota, M. K. (1990). The development of ethnic identity in Mexican-American children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 12,* 3 – 24.

Berry, J. W (1980). Acculturation as varieties of acculturation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, Models, and Some New Findings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual Approaches to Acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 17 – 37). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Buchanan, P. J. (2002). *The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Buriel, R., & Cardoza, D. (1993). Mexican American ethnic labeling: An intrafamilial and inter-generational analysis. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic Identity; Formation and Transmission among Hispanics and Other Minorities.* (pp. 197 – 210). Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York.

Buriel, R., Perez, W., De Ment, T. L., Chavez, D. V., & Moran, V. R. (1998). The relationship of language brokering to academic performance, biculturalism, and self-efficacy among Latino adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 20,* 283-297.

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding
        Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development, 65,* 1111 –
        1120.

Chao, R. K. (1996). Chinese and European-American mothers' beliefs about the role of

parenting   in children's school success. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27,* 403 –

423.

Chao, R. K (2000). Cultural explanations for the role of parenting in the school success of

Asian- American children. In R. D. Taylor & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *Resilience across Contexts:*
        Family, Work, Culture, and Community (pp. 333 -363). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence
        Erlbaum Associates.

Child, I. (1943). *Italian or American? The second generation in conflict*. New Haven: Yale

        University Press.

Cleveland, E. J., & Longaker, W. D. (1972). Neurotic patterns in the family. In g. Handel (Ed.),

        The *Psychosocial interior of the Family.* Chicago: Aldine, pp. 159 - 185.

Coronado, M., Guevarra, R. P., Moniz, J., & Szanto, L. F. (Eds.) (2003). *Crossing Lines: Race and*

        Mixed Race Across the Geohistorical Divide. Santa Barbara, CA: Multiethnic Student

        Outreach, University of California.

Del Pilar, J. A., & Udasco, J. O. (2004). Marginality Theory: The Lack of Construct Validity.

        Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 26 (1), 3 -15.

Der-Karabetian, A. (1980). Two cultural identities of Armenian-Americans. *Psychological*

Reports,   *47*, 123 - 128.

Detzner, D. F. (1996). No place without a home: Southeast Asian grandparents in refugee families.

        Generations, 20, 45 – 48.

Domino, M., & Acosta, A. (1987). The relation of acculturation and values in Mexican Americans.

        Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9, 131 - 150.

D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal Education: The politics of race and sex on campus*. New York: The

Free Press.

Erikson, H. E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1968.

Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley,

Mass.: Newbury House.

Ghaffarian, S. (1987). The acculturation of Iranians in the United States. *The Journal of Social*

Psychology, 127, 565 - 571.

Gómez, C. (2000). The continual significance of skin color: An exploratory study of Latinos in

the Northeast. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 22*(1), 94-103 .

Gordon. A. (1964). *Intermarriage: Interethnic, Interracial, Interfaith*. Boston: Beacon.

Green, A. W. (1947). A re-examination of the marginal man concept. *Social Forces, 26,* 167 – 171.

Gunthrope, W. W. (1998). *Skin Color Recognition, Preference and Identification in Interracial*

Children. New York: University Press of America.

Hall, C. C. I. (1980). *The ethnic identity of racial mixed people: A study of Black-Japanese*.

Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.

Hall, C. N., & Okazaki, S. (Eds.) (2002). *Asian American Psychology*. Washington D. C.:

American Psychological Association.

Haritatos, J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2002). Bicultural identities: The interface of cultural,

personality, and socio-cognitive processes. *Journal of Research in Personality, 6*, 598 –

606.

Hanson, V. D. (2003). *Mexifornia: A State of Becoming*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.

Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial

socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63,* 981 – 995.

Hurtado, A., & Gurin, P. (1987). Ethnic identity and bilingualism attitudes. *Hispanic Journal of*

Behavioral Sciences, 9, 1 - 18.

Jackson Nakazawa, D. (2004). *Does Anybody Else Look Like Me? A Parent's Guide to Raising*

Multiracial Children. New York: Da Capo Press.

Keefe, S. E., & Padilla, A. M. (1987). <u>Chicano Ethnicity</u>. Albuquerque, N. M.: University of New

Mexico Press.

Knight, G. P., Bernal, M. E., Cota, M. K., Garza, C. A., & Ocampo, K. A. (1993). Family

Socialization and Mexican American identity and behavior. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight

(Eds.), *Ethnic Identity: Formation and Transmission among Hispanics and Other*

Minorities.   (pp. 105 – 129). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism:

Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114 (3),* 395 – 412.

Lambert, W. E. (1977). The effects of bilingualism on the individual: Cognitive and sociocultural

consequences. In P. A. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, social, and educational*

implications. New York: Academic Press, Inc. Pp. 15 - 27.

Lieberson, S., & Waters, M. C. (1988). *From many strands: Ethnic and racial groups in*

contemporary America. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lopez, D. E. (1978). Chicano language loyalty in an urban setting. *Sociology and Social Research,*

62, 267 - 278.

Lopez, D. E. (1982*). Language Maintenance and Shift in the United States today: The basic*

patterns and their social implications. Volume III: Hispanics and Portuguese. Los

Alamitos: National Center for Bilingual Research. Pp. 135.

Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting and its effect on children: On reading and misreading behavior genetics. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51,* 1 – 27.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook *of Child Psychology. Vol. IV: Socialization, Personality, and Social Development*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Pp. 1 - 101.

Mann, J. W. (1973). Status: The marginal reaction – Mixed-bloods and Jews. In P. Watson (Ed.). *Psychology and Race* (pp. 213 – 223). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Penguin Education.

McFee, M. (1968). The 150% man, a product of Blackfeet acculturation. *The American Psychologist, 70,* 1096 - 1107.

Mena, F. J., Padilla, A. M. & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 207-225.

Minuchin, P. P., & Shapiro, E. K. (1983). The school as a context for social development. In P. H. Mussen (Ed*.), Handbook for Child Psychology. Vol. IV: Socialization, Personality, and Social Development*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Pp. 197 - 274.

Montgomery, G. T. (1992). Comfort with acculturation status among students from South Texas. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 14, 201 - 223.

Mura, D. (1991). *Turning Japanese: Memoirs of a Sensei.* New York: Anchor Books.

Murguia, E. (1982). *Chicano Intermarriage: A Theoretical and Empirical Study*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.

Nash, G. B. (1999). *Forbidden Love: The Secret History of Mixed-Race America.* New York:

Henry   Holt and Co.

Nash, Renea. (1995). *Coping as a Biracial Biethnic Teen*. New York: Rosen Publishing.

Nauck, B. (in press). Intergenerational transmission, social capital and interethnic contact in

immigrant   families. In U. Schonpflug (Ed.). *Perspectives on Cultural Transmission.*

Cambridge,   England: Oxford University Press.

Obama, B. (1995). *Dreams from my father: A story of race and inheritance.* New York: Times

Books.

Olsen, L. (1988*). Crossing the Schoolhouse Border: Immigrant Students and the California Public

Schools.* San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America: Immigrant Students in Our Public Schools.* New York: The

New Press.

Padilla, A. M. (1980). The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation. In A. M.

Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings*. Boulder, CO:

Westview Press, pp. 47 - 84.

Padilla, A. M. *Educational Resilience and Academic Invulnerability Among Hispanic Students*.

Winter Roundtable on Cross-Cultural Psychology and Education. Teachers College, New

York City, Feb. 14, 1997.

Padilla, A. M. (2003). *Becoming American: Acculturation, Assimilation, and

Banishment.* Invited presentation to the Developmental Psychology Colloquium,

University of California, Santa Cruz. November 17, 2003.

Padilla, A. M., & Lindholm, K. J. (1992). *What Do We Know About Culturally Diverse Children?*

Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Psychological Association, August

14, Washington, D. C.

Padilla, A. M., & Perez, W. (2003). Acculturation, social identify, and social cognition: A new

perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 25*, 35-55.

Park, R. E. (1928). Migration and the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology, 5,* 881 - 893.

Phinney, J. S., & Chavira, V. (1995). Parental ethnic socialization and adolescent coping with

problems related to ethnicity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 5,* 31 – 53.

Phinney, J. S., Ong, A., & Madden, T. (2000). Cultural values and intergenerational value

discrepancies in immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Child Development, 71,* 528 – 539.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1990). Immigrant *America: A portrait*. Berkeley, CA: The

University   of California Press.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.*

Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Quintana, S. M., & Vera, E. M. (1999). Mexican American children's ethnic identity, understanding

of   ethnic prejudice, and parental ethnic socialization. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences,*

21, 387 – 404.

Quintana, S. M., Castaneda-English, P., & Ybarra, V. C. (1999). Role of perspective-taking abilities

and ethnic socialization in development of adolescent ethnic identity. *Journal of Research*

on   Adolescence, 9, 161 – 184.

Ramirez, III, M., & Castaneda, A. (1983). *Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development and*

Education. New York: Academic Press.

Reddy, M. (1994). Crossing *the Color Line: Race, Parenting, and Culture.* New Brunswick, N.J.:

Rutgers University Press.

Rosenblatt, P. C., Karis, T. A., & Powell, R. D. (1995). *Multiracial Couples: Black & White Voices.*

  Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Root, M. P. (Ed.) (1992). *Racially Mixed People in America.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Publications.

Root, M. P. (Ed.) (1996) *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier.*

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Root, M. P. (2001). *Love's Revolution: Interracial Marriages.* Philadelphia: Temple University

  Press.

Salgado de Snyder, N., Lopez, C. M., & Padilla, A. M. (1982). Ethnic identity and cultural

awareness among the offspring of Mexican interethnic marriages. *Journal of Early*

Adolescence, 2, 277 -   282.

Schlesinger, A. M. Jr. (1991). *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society.*

  New York: W. W. Norton.

Schmidt, A., & Padilla, A. M. (1983). Grandparent-grandchild interaction in a Mexican American

  group. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 5*, 181 - 198.

Segal, U. A. (2002). *A Framework for Immigration: Asians in the United States.* New York:

  Columbia University Press.

Shyrock, A. J. (2002). New images of Arab Detroit: Seeing otherness and identity through the lens

of September 11. *American Anthropologist, 104 (3)*, 917 – 922.

Silverstein, M., & Chen, X. (1999). The impact of acculturation in Mexican American families on

the quality of adult grandchild-grandparent relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,*

61, 188-198.

Spencer, M. B. (1983). Children's cultural values and parental child rearing strategies. *Developmental Review, 3,* 351 – 370.

Streeter, C. A. (1996). Ambiguous bodies: Locating Black/White women in cultural representations. In M. P. Root (Ed.). *The Multicultural Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier* (pp. 305 – 320. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (1989). After intermarriage: Ethnic identity among mixed Japanese- American and Hispanics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 507 - 519.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1991). Intermarriage: Effects on personality, adjustment, and intergroup relations in two samples of students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 241 - 250.

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

Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of Immigration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sue, S., & Morishima, J. (1982). *The Mental Health of Asian Americans.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sung, B. L. (1985). Bicultural conflicts in Chinese immigrant children. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 16,* 255 - 269.

Sung, B. L. (1990). *Chinese American Intermarriage.* New York: Center for Migration Studies.

Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W., & Fernandez, T. (1980). Biculturalism and adjustment among Hispanic youths. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 4*, 353 - 375.

Szapocznik, J., Santisteban, D., Kurtines, W., Perez-Vidal, A., & Hervis, O. (1984). Bicultural

effectiveness training: A treatment intervention for enhancing intercultural adjustment in Cuban American families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 6*, 317 - 344.

Tatum, C. M. (2001). *Chicano Popular Culture: Que Hable el Pueblo.* Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.

Thornton, M. C. (1997). Strategies of racial socialization among Black parents: Mainstream minority, and cultural messages. In R. J. Taylor, J. S. Jackson, & L. M. Chatters (Eds.), *Family Life in Black America* (pp. 201 – 215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tseng, V. & Fuligni, A. J. (2000). Parent-adolescent language use and relationships among immigrant families with East Asian, Filipino, and Latin American backgrounds. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*, 465 – 476.

Umana-Taylor, A. J., & Fine, M. A. (2004). Examining ethnic identity among Mexican-origin adolescents living in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 26,* 36 – 59.

U.S. Bureau of Census, March 2001, Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin. (www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/race.html).

Weinstein-Shr, G., & Henkin, N. (1991). Continuity and change: Intergenerational relations in Southeast Asian refugee families. *Marriang and Family Review, 16,* 351 – 367.

Weisskirch, R. S., & Alatorre Alva, S. (2002). Language brokering and the acculturation of Latino Children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24(3),* 369 – 378.

Winters, L. I., & De Bose, H. L. (Eds.) (2003). *New Faces in a Changing America: Multiracial Identity in the 21st Century.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Vander-Zander, J. V. (1963). American *Minority Relations*. New York: Ronald, 1963.

Vasquez, L. A., Garcia-Vazquez, E., Bauman, S. A., Sierra, A. S. (1997). Skin color, acculturation, and community interest among Mexican American students: A research note. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 19*(3), 377-387.

Veltman, C. (1981). Anglicization in the United States: The importance of parental nativity and language characteristics. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 32*, 65 - 84.

Wilson, A. (1987). *Mixed race children: A study of identity*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Zack, N. (1993). *Race and Mixed Race*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Zak, I. (1973). Dimensions of Jewish-American identity. *Psychological Reports, 33*, 891 - 900.

However, I think you should include citations in your draft. Not only for the very good reasons provided in other answers, but also because it's safer. Most people will want their draft to be read by someone whose opinion they value/respect, to provide an independent opinion or suggestions. Now you could email your draft to someone and explain that you will add the. Continue Reading. I assume you're referring to a rough draft of a dissertation/thesis Katlin. Strictly speaking, a rough draft doesn't have to include citations since it will not be submitted until after undergoing edit and revision. However, it's easier to create the citations while preparing the rough draft because the source document is readily available. 154 views · View upvotes. Related Questions. Draft, not for citation. also address clearly how the issues related to technology will relate to other legal regimes such as intellectual property regimes, as well as potential connection to international investment regimes that cover intellectual property. II.2 Actions. There is significant information and data from World Bank and other studies on what kinds of actions, both regulatory and technical have been best at ensuring successful technology transfer.11 The key thing that most studies point to is that there is a necessary mix of national measures in both recipient and host countries, a... Foucault and Arendt Michael Ure Draft Only Not for Citation Abstract This paper examines Michel Foucault and Hannah Arendt's interpretation of Roman Stoicism. Arendt and Foucault develop their analysis of Stoicism in the context of a similar account of modernity. Both argue that since the eighteenth century, states have crossed the threshold of political modernity: governance has become a matter of regulating life processes rather than protecting or facilitating political freedom. Draft – Not for Citation. "The Wise, the Simple, the Pachomian Koinonia and the Apocalypse of Paul" Kirsti Copeland, Stanford University (all rights reserved). Over the last several years, the participants in this session have grappled with the question of the relationship between wisdom and apocalypticism in early Judaism and the earliest stratum of Christianity. The collective findings have produced a new paradigm in which wisdom and apocalyptic have been found to be the literary artifacts of the same groups of people. The contribution that I would like to make is to test this paradigm for L...