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Abstract

How one understands their bicultural identity has implications for how one psychologically reacts to discrimination. The three major goals of this thesis were to explore 1) how young adult, bicultural, ethnic minorities understand their cultural identities; 2) how the individual’s understanding of his or her bicultural identity was associated with reactions to real or imagined experiences of discrimination; and 3) the value of the blended/alternating bicultural distinction in understanding bicultural identity and how that might relate to the association between discrimination and well-being. Young adult undergraduates attending a diverse university campus, mainly of East and South Asian background, were interviewed, asked to complete written questionnaires, or asked to participate in an experimental study concerning cultural identity. Results from the three studies of the thesis suggest common themes in participant descriptions of bicultural identity. Results also demonstrate the direct negative effect of discrimination on mood, and suggest that the distinction between understanding one’s bicultural identity as a stable, cohesive blend of two cultures (Blended Biculturalism) vs. as one that
switches between two cultural selves (Alternating Biculturalism), may have implications for
differential effects of discrimination on psychological well-being. Alternating biculturals in the
discrimination condition reported experiencing more negative mood than alternating biculturals
in the non-discrimination condition. Blended biculturals did not show this difference. Alternating
biculturals in the discrimination condition also reported experiencing more approach thoughts
toward their group than alternating biculturals in the non discrimination condition; blended
biculturals did not show this difference either, but rather had high levels of approach thoughts in
both conditions. Possible explanations for these results are discussed.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Roughly one out of every five people in Canada, or between 19% and 23% (6.3 million to 8.5 million people) of the nation's population, will be a member of a visible minority group by 2017, according to ethno-cultural population projections by Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada, 2005). Forty-seven percent of residents currently living in Toronto, one of Canada’s most urban and populous cities, are members of a visible minority group. Canada, reputed to be a multicultural mosaic, is known to be one of the most welcoming countries in the world to people of all cultures and ethnicities (Van Oudenhoven, 2006). Modern trends in globalization however, extend well beyond Canada, and immigration has become a worldwide phenomenon. As a result, cultural identities are becoming mixed, complex, and increasingly important. Individuals who leave one culture and migrate to another may hold on to aspects of their home country but also seek to incorporate aspects of their host country into their identity. One of the main goals of this thesis is to examine bicultural identity and investigate what subjective meaning bicultural identity holds for such an individual.

Identity development is critical and salient among adolescents and young adults (Erikson, 1968). The participants included in the samples of the thesis therefore are young adults who are at this sensitive stage of identity development. Also, Toronto is one of the most diverse cities in the world. Therefore, unlike most college samples of convenience, the undergraduate samples at the University of Toronto afford the opportunity to investigate how young ethnic minorities educated at a prestigious public institution in Canada, presumably graduating into upper Canadian society and therefore on the cusp of privilege, understand their cultural identity. Many young adults who are immigrants or children of immigrants, and attend a valued Canadian
institution in a diverse environment, may feel they are bicultural. For them, identity may be infused with strong ties to information and perspectives from two different cultural worlds. They are informed by exposure to and awareness of their ancestral culture and way of life, yet exist and interact in Canadian society every day. The studies of this thesis therefore are uniquely positioned to include a number of bicultural individuals from a diverse range of ancestral backgrounds and environments.

This thesis will investigate bicultural identity by exploring the way in which individuals understand and describe their cultural identity, and by exploring the associations between bicultural identity and external situations that attack that identity – experiences of discrimination. Others’ evaluations can influence one’s self concept. Perceived discrimination based on race or ethnicity, can feel like a rejection or devaluation of one’s ancestral cultural part of self. It can also feel as though the perpetrator is negating the individual’s Canadian part of self. Victims of discrimination may feel that they are being perceived by the external world quite differently than they internally feel. How then do bicultural individuals react to the clash between interpretations of acts from perpetrators of discrimination and conceptualizations of one’s own cultural identity? How do biculturals cope in these instances? The way biculturals feel and attach meaning to their cultural identities may impact their experiences in this regard. There is research suggesting that ethnic identity affects the association between discrimination and well-being. This literature will be discussed later but is quite unclear as many findings contradict or fail to support each other. It is possible that the construct of cultural identity (one’s orientation toward both ancestral and host cultures) may reveal clearer effects on the association between discrimination and well-being. A main goal of this thesis therefore is to investigate how bicultural identity is associated with reacting to and coping with experiences of racial or ethnic discrimination.
For individuals who recognize both their ancestral and host cultures as salient and important, a bicultural identity and true internalization of different cultural worlds emerges. While some may feel their bicultural identity is a blended cohesive and singular mix of information from both cultures, others may feel like they switch or alternate between two separate cultural identities or information frames in response to the environment or situation. LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) as well as Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) have suggested these, among other, ways of being bicultural. Though the blended/alternating distinction in being bicultural is interesting, not much work has explored the value of applying this framework to individual’s descriptions of their bicultural identity, or understanding the effects of cultural identity on the association between discrimination and well-being. A main goal of this thesis is to explore the value of the blended/alternating bicultural distinction in this regard.

The thesis then has three major goals: 1) to understand how young adult, bicultural, ethnic minorities on a diverse campus at a valued Canadian institution understand their cultural identities; 2) to explore how the individual’s understanding of their bicultural identity is associated with reactions to real or imagined experiences of discrimination; and 3) to explore the value of the blended/alternating bicultural distinction in understanding bicultural identity and the effects of bicultural identity on the association between discrimination and well-being.

Chapter 2
The Cultural Identity Discussion

Much work has been done in the field of identity research. Erikson (1968) stated that establishing one’s identity was of main focus in adolescence as well as emerging adulthood. Marcia (1980) proposed four categories or “statuses” concerning exploration and achievement.
Individuals who had explored their identity and committed to who they felt they were after such reflection were considered to be identity achieved. If they had not explored, but merely committed to an identity passed on to them by family perhaps, they were considered to be foreclosed; if they had explored and reflected on their identity but had not committed or felt they did not know who they were just yet, they were considered to be in moratorium. And, if they had neither explored nor committed to a particular identity, they were considered to be in a state of identity diffusion. Phinney (1989) acknowledged that identity was quite complex for young adults, but perhaps was even more complex for ethnic minorities of that age. She proposed that part of resolving identity included developing a sense of ethnic identity as well. She applied Marcia’s framework to ethnic identity and found that individuals who had explored and committed to their ethnic identity seemed to show higher levels of well-being (Phinney, 1991; Phinney & Chavira, 1992). LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) also stated that developing both personal and cultural identity is important for bicultural competence (more about this later).

Cultural identity, then, is a very important construct for ethnic minorities, particularly adolescents and young adults such as the individuals that comprise the sample of this thesis. However, while there is much research that has attempted to describe and understand differences between cultures (e.g. Markus & Kitayama, 1991), and much research that has looked at particular cultural groups (e.g. Doi, 1992; Hsu, Chen, Wang & Sun, 2008), not as much psychological research has investigated cultural identity.

Old ideas conflated culture with supposedly biological constructs such as race. New ideas of culture are more dynamic and recognize the interaction and influence of many parts of the
world on each other, and the effect processes like migration can have on cultural identity. Much analysis of the term *culture* comes from the fields of anthropology and area studies. Arjun Appadurai (1996) for instance, suggests that culture is not usefully understood as a substance or fixed property. Instead, it should be understood as a dimension of phenomena that reflects situated and embodied differences. Appiah (2005) extends this idea to cultural identity and suggests that often cultural identities are born out of recognized difference from others. He discusses Sherif and colleagues’ (1961) Robbers Cave study in which two groups of White, middle class, Protestant boys were placed in a camp environment, each initially unaware of the presence of the other group. Appiah notes that the groups did not arrive with names; nor did it occur to group members that they needed a name, until they learned about the presence of the other group on the campgrounds. As the two groups began to compete against each other, distinct cultures and identities within the groups (pious, clean-cut ethics among the “Eagles”, and brash, tough ethics among the “Rattlers”) emerged. Of course the camp study is a far removed environment where two groups who initially presumably had similar identities developed different ones. In modern, urban, multicultural environments, people arrive or are born into locations containing multitudes of people who have different cultural identities. Appiah suggests that every collective identity has the following structure: 1) there is a *social conception* of the group, i.e. an availability of terms in public discourse that are used to pick out the bearers of the identity by way of a criteria of ascription, so that some people are recognized as members of the group; 2) those labels are internalized as part of the individual identities of at least some of those who bear the label, i.e. identification as a group member means thinking of yourself in ways that make a difference, e.g. in shaping your feelings or actions; and 3) there is an existence of patterns of behavior toward group members. Appiah’s last criterion hits on the important idea
(see Taylor, 1992) that the responses of other people play a large role in shaping one’s sense of who one is. Sociologists have emphasized the importance of "reflected appraisals" or the "looking-glass self” in the development of the self-concept (Cooley, 1956; Mead, 1934). According to this view, the self-concept develops through interactions with others and is a reflection of those others' appraisals of oneself. This suggests that the self-concept is a product of both one's awareness of how others evaluate the self and the adoption of those others' views. However, for many visible minorities who have developed a bicultural sense of self that values both ancestral and host culture contributions, experiences of discrimination that indicate external appraisals of self quite different from internal appraisals of self, can create an uncomfortable dissonance. This may result in adverse effects to psychological well-being. Therefore, this thesis seeks to study cultural identity in regard to identification with one’s ancestral and host culture, how that identification is understood by the individual, and the association between that identification and the individual’s psychological well-being in the face of discrimination.

The term cultural identity is used differently in many empirical studies in the psychological literature. Phinney largely discusses ethnic identity in her work. Many researchers (e.g. Moss & Faux, 2006; Rieckmann, Wadsworth & Deyhle, 2004) use the terms cultural identity and ethnic identity interchangeably. They use both ethnic and cultural identity to refer to a sense of belonging to, and having values from, an ethnic group outside of the host culture. Toomey et al. (2000) contrast cultural identity with ethnic identity and use the term cultural identity or “cultural identity salience” to refer to the importance the individual places on the host culture. The term cultural identity is used in this thesis to reflect the individual’s identity as it relates to both the individual’s ancestral and host culture. The individual’s cultural identity specifically reflects how ethnic (with regard to their ancestral culture) and how Canadian (with
regard to their host culture) the individual feels and how the individual sees these cultural aspects of self interacting (if at all) to produce their identity. This thesis is particularly interested in the bicultural form of cultural identity and focuses on models of bicultural identity that fall out of Berry’s bidirectional, orthogonal approach to acculturation. The thesis focuses on alternating and blended models of being bicultural but emphasizes Birman’s (1994) perspective that there are many different ways of being bicultural.

2.1 Models of Bicultural Identity

Biculturalism models (largely due to the influence of Berry’s work) see acculturation as a two-dimensional process (e.g. Berry, Trimble, & Olmedo, 1986; for a discussion and investigation of an alternate variation of the bi-dimensional approach, see Phan & Breton, 2009). One dimension concerns acculturation to the host culture while the other dimension concerns the culture of origin. Combinations of positions on each dimension result in four possible acculturative styles – assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration (or biculturalism). Assimilation results from a rejection of one’s ancestral culture and complete acceptance of the majority culture. Separation results from a rejection of the majority culture and an isolated envelopment of one’s ancestral culture. Marginalization occurs when one is neither a member of the majority culture nor one’s ancestral culture. Integration, or biculturalism, occurs when one is a member of both the majority and ancestral cultures. This last style is of particular interest to this thesis.

There appear to be two major domains of models in regard to bicultural identification, discussed in detail below. Racial identification models by Cross (1971), and Sellers and colleagues (Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997) emphasize the African American
historical cultural experience in particular, and other ethnic groups more generally. Ethnic identity models by Phinney and colleagues (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997) and models of biculturalism by LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton (1993) apply more to groups that have comparatively recently immigrated to their host countries. While these models target particular broad groups, it should be noted that the ethnic experiences are different for every ethnic group, and to a certain extent for every person within a given ethnic group. That being said, there is value in assertions and evidence provided within the context of these models.

**Racial Identity Models.** Researchers that focus on the Black identity experience have argued that cultural identity is a complex phenomenon that must be understood in relation to the specific history, culture, and salient issues of the particular population. Black models of racial identity from researchers like Cross, Sellers, and colleagues, focus on the uniquely Black experience. Like Phinney’s model in which individuals may progress from a foreclosed or diffuse identity status to an achieved status, Cross’ (1991) model of Nigrescence is developmental; individuals progress from a Pre-Encounter stage in which individuals are said to operate from an “assimilation-integration” paradigm where pro-White/anti-Black identity has been internalized. Black people in this stage show low racial salience and instead identify American as their reference group. Continuing through the Immersion-Emersion stage includes intense Black involvement and the formation of positive attitudes toward Afrocentric culture and negative attitudes toward Eurocentric culture. Internalization is the final stage in Cross’ model; here he uses the term “Black self-actualization” to describe racial identity. This involves turning away from the stereotypical anti-Black or pro-Black attitudes that were previously held, and being comfortable and free with one’s racial identity. Cross (1991) delineates three ideologies that internalized individuals may ascribe to: Black Nationalism, characterized by a focus on Black
empowerment and heightened awareness of Black history and culture; Bicultural Identity, characterized by the acceptance of the positive characteristics of being both Black and American; or Multicultural Identity, characterized by an identity in which at least two other identity categories (e.g. gender, occupation) are given equal status to race. Sellers’ Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997) focuses on beliefs concerning race in relation to how one defines oneself and the qualitative meaning that is ascribed to one’s racial group. Racial identity is categorized according to 4 dimensions: salience, centrality, ideology, and regard; i.e. the extent to which one’s race is relevant to one’s self-concept at any given time, the extent to which race is a core part of an individual’s self-concept, attitudes regarding how African American people should interact in society, and public and private regard referring to how a person feels others view African Americans, and how a person privately feels toward African Americans and their membership in that group.

Black history is unlike the history of any other ethnic group; the ancestors of many Black Americans were relocated by force as slaves in America, whereas the ancestors of many other ethnic Americans or Canadians came to the West, in many cases fairly recently by their own initiative, whether as a result of fleeing the unbearable circumstances of their home country or searching for opportunity and a better life. These two approaches to understanding bicultural identity are therefore quite different and trying to collapse these models together to try and manufacture a false universalistic model of biculturalism would not be useful. Given that the population that is of concern in this thesis largely consists of first or second generation immigrants, ethnic identity models are relevant and are discussed in further detail.
Ethnic Identity Models. J.S. Phinney has contributed much to the discussion of ethnic identity, both theoretically and empirically; many researchers have built on her work. Phinney (1991) suggests that key elements of ethnic identity include “self-identification as a group member; attitudes and evaluations relative to one’s group; attitudes about oneself as a group member; ethnic knowledge and commitment; and ethnic behaviors and practices” (p. 194). High ethnic identity then is conceptualized as identifying oneself as a member of one’s ethnic group, holding favourable attitudes towards one’s ethnic group, possessing a considerable amount of knowledge about one’s ethnic group, being committed to the group, and participating in ethnic activities and traditions. Phinney suggests that these components vary somewhat independently. For example, one can identify oneself as a member of an ethnic group but not participate in ethnic activities or know much about ethnic culture. While Phinney’s model is applicable to many ethnic groups, the racial identity models mainly concern Black identity. However, certain aspects of Phinney’s and Sellers’ models overlap. Sellers’ concept of centrality, for example, is akin to Phinney’s emphasis on self-identification as a group member and attitude towards being a member of the group. Sellers’ concept of private regard also overlaps with Phinney’s concept of evaluation of, and attitudes toward, one’s group. It is helpful to note these conceptual similarities when evaluating findings from the research concerning ethnic identity and well-being that stem from separate models of ethnic identity. This literature will be discussed later in the thesis.

Phinney does not specifically solely investigate bicultural identity, but she is among a small group of researchers who have examined alternating and blended ways of being bicultural (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). However Phinney’s work, and most work in the literature on cultural identity (e.g. Farver, Narang & Bhadha, 2002; Kim & Chao, 2009; Vedder & Virta, 2005; Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004), is mainly concerned with the individual’s orientation toward
their ethnic culture, often measured by her widely used Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992).

Exposure to one’s ancestral or ethnic way of life as well as one’s host country often results in the mixing of different worlds. There are a number of ways that individuals may mix their cultural information resulting in a wide array of potential cultural identities. When individuals feel that both their ancestral and host cultures are important contributors to their self-concept, a bicultural identity emerges. This bicultural identity can feel like a stable mix of information from both cultures, or it may feel like two separate cultural identities that one has to switch between in response to the environment or situation. As mentioned earlier, LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) have suggested these, among other, ways of being bicultural. However, an extensive investigation of how individuals describe and understand their own cultural identity in these ways is lacking. Very little work in the field (see Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997 and Smith, Stewart & Winter, 2004 for exceptions) has focused on investigating how Blended ways of being bicultural, i.e. feeling that one has a cohesive identity made up of elements from both cultures, or Alternating ways of being bicultural, i.e. feeling that one has an identity that switches between two cultural frames, are articulated or understood by bicultural individuals. Please see chapter 4 for a detailed description of alternating and blended models of biculturalism.

2.2 Asian Bicultural Identity

Statistical projections by the government of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2010) suggest that by 2031 between 29% and 32% of the population of Canada, and 63% of the population of Toronto, could belong to a visible minority group. The South Asian population is projected to be
the largest visible minority group in Canada, growing to between 3.2 and 4.1 million, while the Chinese population is projected to constitute the second largest visible minority population at between 2.4 and 3 million, by 2031. Noels and Berry (2006) estimate that two thirds of the immigrants that come to Canada each year are from Asia. Mirroring these reports, the majority of individuals that comprise the sample in the studies of this thesis are ethnic minority members from South and East Asia. The large communities comprised of members from these Asian cultures in Canada (Tsang, Irving, Alaggia, Chau, & Benjamin, 2003) suggest an environment that may foster the development and maintenance of a strong ethnic identity. Also, living and functioning in Canadian society may foster the development and maintenance of a strong Canadian identity. It is probable then that many of the members of the sample of the present thesis will be bicultural.

Most research with East Asians has specifically concerned Chinese individuals. A review of the literature on ethnic identity among individuals of Chinese background in Canada indicates that being Chinese is a central part of the cultural identity of many of these individuals (Costigan, Su, & Hua, 2009). Research also suggests that feeling strongly Chinese doesn’t necessarily diminish the capability to feel strongly Canadian. Costigan and Su (2004) investigated the identification of youth in British Columbia from immigrant families as Chinese and Canadian. For youth born outside of Canada, there was no correlation between Chinese and Canadian identities, supporting the theory of independence of each identity. For youth born in Canada however, higher reports of Chinese identity were associated with higher reports of Canadian identity, suggesting to the authors that the second-generation Chinese youth in particular were likely to develop bicultural identities. Costigan, Su and Hua (2009) note that Noels, Pon and Clement (1996) also evaluated the association between Chinese and Canadian
identities but found a strong negative association. Chinese university students in Ottawa were asked to rate how Chinese and how Canadian they felt during 22 everyday situations like listening to music for example. Noels, Pon, and Clement found that in specific everyday situations, the majority of participants were more strongly identified with one or the other identity instead of reporting an integrated feeling, which resulted in an overall negative correlation between this operationalization of measuring Chinese and Canadian identities. Costigan, Su and Hua note that this work highlights situational variation in cultural identity, but they make a distinction between situation-specific cultural identity and overall cultural identity. They note that identifying as Chinese may not compete with identifying as Canadian in one’s overall identity, but may do so in specific situations.

Research concerning the identities of South Asian individuals has included many studies that apply a more qualitative approach (Malhi, Boon & Rogers, 2009; Sundar, 2008; Warikoo, 2005). These interview studies attempt to understand how South Asian individuals in host countries describe themselves. Many of these individuals have been found to articulate a bicultural identity (Malhi, Boon & Rogers, 2009; Sundar, 2008; Warikoo, 2005). Sundar (2008) finds that most participants see themselves as both Canadian and South Asian. She notes “Youth identify strongly as Canadian, and describe subscribing to the shared set of values and beliefs that characterize this nation. Further, an important part of what makes them Canadian is the fact that they can simultaneously ‘be Canadian’ while ‘being South Asian’” (p.262). However, she notes that these identities are complex and acknowledges situational differences in feelings of cultural identity by discussing an individual who reports that he feels more Canadian when he’s abroad but more South Asian while in Canada. Sundar also finds bicultural identity in South Asian Canadian youth to be fluid and at times strategically manipulated as one participant in the
study terms by “browning it up” or ”bringing down the brown” to meet the goals of the situation. For example, individuals describe an attempt to dress in cultural clothes and behave in a more reserved way at cultural events or dress in a more Canadian way and articulate oneself in a more Canadian way in situations like job interviews. While the situation specific ethnic cueing may seem like the alternation approach to being bicultural, there is a strategic, conscious element to these descriptions. Individuals who feel that they are a very blended mix of the two cultures in terms of their own understanding or representation of their cultural identity may still behave in perceived culturally congruent ways in order to benefit or achieve certain goals.

The South Asian and East Asian identity literature concerning these individuals in their host countries seem to indicate a large segment of bicultural individuals who may alternate between cultural scripts in certain situations but who have complex representations of their own cultural identity. The studies of this thesis will examine how the individuals from the sample, largely of Asian background, understand their cultural identity and the implication that has in reacting to or coping with rejection based on a wholly different identity that is ascribed to them by the perpetrators of discrimination.

Chapter 3
Reacting to Racial or Ethnic Discrimination - The Associations between Cultural Identity, Discrimination, and Well-being

As mentioned earlier in the thesis, research has indicated that ethnic identity may be directly associated with both psychological and physical well-being. Some research suggests that ethnic identity is also indirectly associated with well-being by buffering the negative impact of experiences of discrimination on the target’s well-being. The research literature on ethnic identity and well-being is murky however, and there is evidence for multiple arguments and
perspectives in each domain. This thesis proposes that conceptualizing ethnic identity in terms of
cultural identity (as laid out conceptually earlier in the thesis) may clarify or add to the
discussion concerning both the direct and indirect roles of cultural identity in relation to well-
being. Understanding cultural identity as it is laid out in this thesis also adds a finer level of
analysis to what it means to feel bicultural and distinguishes between blended and alternating
forms of biculturalism. These subtle contrasts may indicate meaningful differences in how
bicultural members of minority groups react to racial or ethnic discrimination.

3.1 Ethnic Identity and Well-being

The prospect of a link between ethnic identity and psychological well-being has spurred
empirical work; some studies find a positive association between aspects of ethnic identity and
well-being (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Lee, 2003; Mossakowski, 2003; Phinney &
Chavira, 1992; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Umana-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007; Verkuyten & Brug,
2002), and some do not (Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006; Sellers & Shelton,
2003; Thompson, 1996).

It is important to note that not all of these studies conceptualize ethnic identity in the
same way (or are looking at the same aspects of well-being for that matter), and keeping this in
mind may provide clarity within the analysis of findings in the literature.

3.1.1 Evidence For the Link between Ethnic Identity and Well-being

Mossakowski (2003) conceptualized ethnic identity as Phinney had, and assessed it with
Phinney’s MEIM (see earlier description of Phinney’s model and the MEIM). Mossakowski
found a clear negative association between ethnic identification and depressive symptoms,
suggesting that having a sense of ethnic pride, involvement with ethnic practices, and cultural commitment to one’s ethnic group were associated with better mental health among the Filipino participants she tested. Lee (2003) used the MEIM to assess ethnic identity with Asian American participants, and found a positive association between ethnic identity and self-esteem. Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey (1999) used the MEIM in their study of African American participants, and again found a positive association between minority group identification and self-esteem, as well as a negative association between minority group identification and the frequency of experiencing negative emotions. Romero and Roberts (2003) also used the MEIM in their study of Mexican American adolescents, and found that ethnic identity was associated with higher self-esteem.

Romero and Roberts then conceptually split ethnic identity into ethnic exploration and affirmation and tested the association of these component constructs to well-being. Ethnic exploration, the degree to which individuals are actively investigating their cultural heritage, was not associated with self-esteem. However, ethnic affirmation, the feeling of pride and belonging to one’s ethnic group, was associated with well-being such that adolescents reporting high levels of ethnic affirmation also reported high levels of self-esteem. Ethnic affirmation is an integral part of Phinney’s final stage of ethnic identity achievement. In their longitudinal study of the association between ethnic identity and self-esteem in Asian American, Black, and Hispanic adolescents, Phinney and Chavira (1992) found ethnic identity stage to be significantly correlated to self-esteem at both tested time periods. Umana-Taylor and Updegraff (2006) used path analysis to show that higher levels of ethnic identity exploration and resolution predicted higher levels of self-esteem in their sample of Latino adolescents. Verkuyten and Brug (2002) tested this association with the Surinamese minority population in the Netherlands and found that
ethnic identity achievement was positively correlated to self-esteem, providing evidence for this association outside of the United States.

3.1.2 Evidence Against the Link between Ethnic Identity and Well-being

Studies that have not found a significant association when testing the association between ethnic identity and well-being, largely seem to come from the African American or Black racial identity model perspective outlined by Sellers and colleagues, as well as by Cross. For instance, Thompson (1996) assessed racial identification with the Multi-dimensional Racial Identification Scale that she had developed in a previous study (Thompson Sanders, 1991). This scale consists of 4 subscales tapping psychological identity, socio-political identity, physical identity, and culture, and is very different from Phinney’s MEIM. There is some substantive overlap (some of the items in the psychological identity subscale concern group membership and pride; some of the items in the culture subscale concern knowledge and awareness of African American traditions) but much of Thompson’s scale is different (the socio-political subscale consists of items concerning attitudes toward social and economic issues; the physical identity subscale consists of items concerning the features associated with African Americans). Well-being was also tested somewhat differently in Thompson’s study; she measured avoidance and intrusion symptoms in relation to events of reported racism. Thompson found that racial identification was not associated with avoidance or intrusion scores. Thompson herself states that it is possible that an alternate measure of racial identification may have led to different results.

Sellers and Shelton (2003) as well as Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, and Lewis (2006), use Sellers’ multidimensional model of racial identity as a conceptual base for their work; racial centrality, ideology, and regard were assessed using the Multidimensional Inventory
of Black Identity (MIBI) (Sellers et al., 1997). Regression analyses conducted by Sellers and Shelton in their 2003 longitudinal study of African American college students indicated that none of the racial identification variables were significant predictors of depressive symptoms, perceived stress, anxiety, or psychological distress. Sellers and colleagues (Sellers et al., 2006) also found no association between race centrality, ideology, and public regard, in relation to depressive symptoms, perceived stress, and psychological well-being. Interestingly, private regard was found to be associated with all 3 psychological functioning variables; more positive attitudes toward African Americans were related to lower levels of depressive symptoms, lower levels of perceived stress, and higher levels of psychological well-being.

The overall evidence from the above two sub-sections suggests a positive link between ethnic identity (at least as conceptualized in Phinney’s model) and well-being. Sellers et al.’s (2006) private regard findings add support to this argument as private regard very much resembles the ethnic evaluation component of Phinney’s ethnic identity model.

3.2 Discrimination and Well-being

The negative association between discrimination and well-being is somewhat clearer than the association between ethnic identity and well-being in the empirical literature. Researchers have suggested that feeling like a target of discrimination or prejudice is a psychosocial stressor. Dion, Dion, and Pak (1992) suggest that victims of prejudice see themselves as deliberate targets of their perpetrators, who are ascribed stable and malevolent motives. Dion (2003) also notes that prejudice and discrimination are often unpredictable, therefore exacting greater costs on well-being. Ken Dion was among the first researchers to experimentally show the association between attributions of prejudice and psychological well-being (Dion, 1975; Dion & Earn, 1975; Dion,
Earn, & Yee, 1978). Dion and Earn (1975) invited Jewish male participants into the lab and placed them in experimentally manipulated failure or non failure conditions based on feedback from either Gentiles who were aware of the participant’s Jewish background or from individuals of unknown religious affiliation who were not aware of the participant’s Jewish background. Participants who attributed their failure to religious discrimination reported feeling more aggression, sadness, and anxiety than those who could not attribute their failure to anti-Semitism. Dion, Dion, and Banerjee (2009) also found a negative association between experiencing discrimination and well-being. Well-being was examined using three indicators: social inclusion, trust in others, and overall life satisfaction. Having experienced discrimination was found to be negatively associated with all three indicators.

Much research has shown that perceptions of group discrimination are associated with poorer mental health and general health status (Barry & Grilo, 2003; Lahti, Liebkind, & Perhoniemi, 2006; Roberts, Swanson, & Murphy, 2004). Perceived discrimination predicts depression (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006; Mossakowski, 2003; Noh, Beiser, Kaspar, Hou, & Rummens, 1999; Sellers et al., 2006; Umana-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007), psychological distress (Sellers & Shelton, 2003), and lower levels of both life satisfaction (Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000) and self-esteem (Barry & Grilo, 2003; Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Umana-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007) in various ethnic groups. The impact of perceived discrimination remains strong in the second generation population as well as the first, and this is particularly true for members of visible minority groups (Reitz & Banerjee, 2009).
3.3 Effects of Ethnic Identity on the Association between Discrimination and Well-being

There have been a number of studies in the last decade or so that have empirically tested the effects of ethnic identity on the negative relation between discrimination and well-being. This literature is quite a bit murkier than that of the preceding discussion. Some researchers have found ethnic identity to buffer the relation by dampening the negative association between discrimination and well-being (Branscombe et al., 1999; Greene et al., 2006; Mossakowski, 2003; Noh et al., 1999; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Sellers et al., 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Umana-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007; Verkuyten & Brug, 2002); some researchers have found ethnic identity to exacerbate the relation between discrimination and well-being (Greene et al., 2006; Noh et al., 1999; McCoy & Major, 2003; Operario & Fiske, 2001; Sellers et al., 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003); and a few have reported no effects (Lee, 2003; Thompson, 1996).

3.3.1 The Liberating Effects of Ethnic Identity

In her sample of Filipino Americans, Mossakowski (2003) reported that ethnic identity buffers the stress of perceiving having experienced discrimination linked to depressive symptoms. Other researchers have found similar outcomes and have proposed and tested models of ethnic identity as a mediator or moderator of the association between discrimination and well-being. Branscombe and colleagues (Branscombe et al., 1999) provide results from structural equation modelling that suggest support for the rejection-identification model that includes minority group identification as the mediator of the association between attributions to prejudice and psychological well-being (see Figure 1) for African Americans. Attributions to stable, global
views of prejudice were positively associated with higher levels of minority group identification, and minority group identification was in turn positively associated with psychological well-being (higher self-esteem and lower frequency of negative emotions). Dion, Dion, and Banerjee (2009) also found that discrimination had an indirect positive effect (though weak) on well-being through increased ethnic group identification. To address the direction of the association between attributions to prejudice and minority group identification, Branscombe and colleagues tested a model that allowed for bidirectionality between attributions to prejudice and minority group identification; the model was significant but did not fit as well as the original rejection-identification model. They also tested a “discounting model” that predicted that attributions to prejudice protected self-esteem, as well as a “maladjustment model” that predicted that low levels of well-being were responsible for pervasive perceptions of prejudice (i.e. people who are depressed or have low self-esteem feel that the world is out to get them); their analyses disconfirmed these models.

Aspects of ethnic identity have been identified as moderators of the stress of discrimination in other empirical work. Romero and Roberts (2003) tested the rejection-identification model with multiple dimensions of ethnic identity. They reported an interaction between ethnic affirmation and discrimination such that adolescents with high ethnic affirmation reported high self-esteem in the high discrimination category, compared to adolescents with low ethnic affirmation. Ethnic identity exploration was also examined but no interaction with discrimination was found. Further supporting this pattern of findings, Greene and colleagues (Greene et al., 2006) found that ethnic affirmation moderated the association between perceived discrimination by peers and changes in self-esteem; increases in perceived discrimination were
associated with greater declines in self-esteem for adolescents who were low in ethnic affirmation compared to those high in ethnic affirmation.

Sellers and colleagues (Sellers et al., 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003) tested aspects of racial identity and found public regard to moderate the impact of racial discrimination on psychological functioning. Sellers and colleagues (Sellers et al., 2006) found that the negative impact of racial discrimination on depressive symptoms, perceived stress, and lower psychological well-being was heightened for adolescents who believed that other groups hold more positive attitudes toward African Americans. Sellers and Shelton (2003) found that holding beliefs that other groups have negative attitudes toward Black people buffered the impact of racial discrimination on the extent to which Black college students were bothered by discrimination. Sellers and Shelton also found that racial ideology buffered the effects of racial discrimination; the association between perceived discrimination and psychological distress was found to be weaker among those who more strongly endorsed a Black nationalist ideology. They argue their findings suggest that what makes people appear to be vigilant for racial discrimination might also protect them from negative consequences.

Studies by Noh and colleagues (Noh et al., 1999) as well as Umana-Taylor and Updegraff (2007) do not find ethnic identity to directly dampen the association between discrimination and well-being, but rather find ethnic identity to moderate or be associated with other variables that act as moderators or mediators of the relationship. Noh and colleagues have found forbearance (a culturally congruent coping style) to moderate and buffer the association between perceived discrimination and depression in Asian Canadian refugees; however, ethnic identity enhanced the moderating effect of the forbearance response (i.e. forbearance decreased the levels of depression related to discrimination much more in highly ethnically identified participants than in lowly
ethnically identified participants). Umana-Taylor and Updegraff conceptualized self-esteem as a mediator and found that it partially mediated the association between discrimination and depression. Ethnic identity was found to moderate self-esteem such that when boys reported low but not high levels of enculturation, there was a significant negative association between discrimination and self-esteem.

3.3.2 The Exacerbating Effects of Ethnic Identity

While there is evidence that aspects of ethnic identity may buffer the association between perceived discrimination and lower levels of well-being, some of the studies cited in support of this conclusion have also found certain aspects of ethnic identity to exacerbate this association. For instance, as mentioned earlier, Greene and colleagues (Greene et al., 2006) found that ethnic affirmation acted as a buffer. They also found however, that ethnic identity achievement acted as a moderator in the opposite direction from what was laid out in their hypotheses. For adolescents who had reported higher levels of ethnic identity achievement, increases in perceived discrimination by peers were actually associated with larger decreases in self-esteem compared to adolescents who had reported lower levels of ethnic identity achievement. Also as mentioned earlier, Noh and colleagues (Noh et al., 1999) found that ethnic identity moderated the effect of forbearance, the culturally congruent coping style, which in turn was a moderator of discrimination on depression. However, Noh and colleagues found ethnic identity actually intensified the link between discrimination and depression, such that when Asian refugees had higher ethnic identity, they were most vulnerable to the psychological consequences of perceived racial discrimination if they did not use the forbearance coping style. The authors suggest that perhaps strong ethnic identity may increase the likelihood of recalling experiences of ethnic or
racial discrimination. It should be noted here that Noh and colleagues used their own 9 item scale and coding system to evaluate ethnic identity, which does not seem to be tied to any particular established model of ethnic identity (although conceptual components of different models are represented in certain items). However, Noh and colleagues add the culturally congruent aspect to the discussion of the impact of discrimination. It may well be that culturally congruent coping styles, and the role that ethnic identity plays in conjunction with these coping styles, are of sizeable importance in dampening the effects of discrimination.

McCoy and Major (2003) measure group identification instead of Phinney’s conceptualization of ethnic identity. They define group identification as the importance of the group in self-concept, much like the centrality aspect of the multidimensional model of racial identity. McCoy and Major found that when Latino-American college students read an article about prejudice towards their ethnic group, those higher in group identification reported significantly more depressed emotion than those lower in group identification. Again, it should be noted that McCoy and Major used a different scale than their colleagues to measure group identification; the 4 item Importance to Identity subscale of Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992 as cited in McCoy & Major, 2003) Collective Self-Esteem Scale, worded with ethnicity as the group in mind. McCoy and Major argue their findings illustrate that maintaining low group identification is a self-protective strategy to distance oneself from appraisals of threat targeted to one’s group. They also cite the work of Operario and Fiske (2001) in support of their argument. Operario and Fiske examined ethnic identity and the personal-group discrepancy (PGD). Much empirical work has demonstrated the occurrence of the PGD (see Dion, 2003 for brief discussion, and Dion & Kawakami, 1996 for a more detailed discussion), in which minority members have a tendency to affirm that their group is a target of prejudice but deny that...
prejudice affects them personally. Operario and Fiske reported that highly identified minorities reported increased vulnerability to discrimination and less PGD, whereas less identified minorities conformed more to the PGD phenomenon (i.e. felt less vulnerable personally to the effects of discrimination).

3.3.3 The Null Effects of Ethnic Identity

A couple of studies have found neither liberating nor exacerbating effects, but rather that ethnic identity has no effect on the association between discrimination and well-being (Lee, 2003; Thompson, 1996).

3.4 Factors Adding to the Confusion in Current Literature

Many researchers seem to be employing different conceptual models to measure ethnic identity. Those who are using Phinney’s model seem to be meeting with some success across populations in establishing links between ethnic identity and well-being, and providing evidence for ethnic identity (or at least aspects of ethnic identity) as a buffer for the negative effects of discrimination (an exception to this statement can be found in the work of Lee, 2003, which did not find ethnic identity, as measured by the MEIM, to moderate or mediate the effects of discrimination). Those who are using models of racial identity that are conceived to uniquely explain the Black experience do not find support for these associations (with the exception of the work of Sellers and colleagues, discussed earlier, who have found some association with the private regard component; it was suggested earlier, however, that this component strongly resembles certain components from Phinney’s model). Studies with racial identity models also seem to be using varied measures to assess aspects of racial identity.
The problem of directionality is also of key importance. Many studies employ cross-sectional designs, resulting in the inability to make direct causal inferences about associations between variables. While we may assume, for theoretical reasons, that pride and affirmation of one’s ethnic membership, knowledge about and commitment to one’s ethnic group, and overall positive feelings towards one’s ethnic group may lead to increased self-esteem and well-being, or dampen the negative effects of discrimination, it is also possible that lower levels of self-esteem or well-being in general may lead to more negative outlooks on life and aspects of self, including ethnic identity. Branscombe’s work (Branscombe et al., 1999), mentioned earlier, is one of the only studies that tests alternative models and is able to disconfirm them.

Chapter 4
Alternating and Blended Ways of Being Bicultural

Ethnic and Racial Identity models have been used as the theoretical background for almost all the work that has been described to this point. However, as mentioned earlier, individuals can feel bicultural in different ways. There are, for instance, Blended ways of being bicultural, i.e. feeling that one has a cohesive identity made up of elements from both cultures, or Alternating ways of being bicultural, i.e. feeling that one has an identity that switches between two cultural frames. Very little work in the field (see Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997 and Smith, Stewart & Winter, 2004 for exceptions) has focused on these particular ways of feeling bicultural. If the distinction between blended and alternating biculturalism occurs naturally in the bicultural population, and is associated with different cognitions or behaviors, it may be useful in understanding bicultural identity and predicting correlates of that identity, especially in regard to reacting to discrimination.
Though not many researchers have looked specifically at the blended/alternating bicultural distinction, Benet-Martinez and her colleagues (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005) have investigated how alternating between cultures or “frame-switching” occurs and have proposed a process to account for this phenomenon. The work of Benet-Martinez and her colleagues is part of what they’ve titled a dynamic constructivist analysis approach to understanding the cognitive aspects of biculturalism (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). Hong and colleagues (2000) describe their model as an “approach to culture and cognition which focuses on the dynamics through which specific pieces of cultural knowledge (implicit theories) become operative in guiding construction of meaning from a stimulus” (p. 709). Internalized culture is modeled as a network of discrete constructs that guide cognition when they are activated. Whether a construct comes to the fore of an individual’s mind depends on how accessible it is as a result of recent exposure and consequent activation (Higgins, 1996). Frame switching occurs when “the individual shifts between interpretive frames rooted in different cultures in response to cues in the social environment” (Hong et al., 2000, p. 709). The dynamic constructivist approach to biculturalism is based on the following two premises: (1) “a culture is not internalized in the form of an integrated and highly general structure, such as an overall mentality, worldview, or value orientation – rather culture is internalized in the form of a loose network of domain-specific knowledge structures such as categories and implicit theories” (Hong et al., 2000, p. 710) and (2) individuals can acquire more than one cultural meaning system even if these systems contain conflicting theories, but these systems cannot simultaneously guide cognition. Hong and colleagues (2000) conducted a priming experiment with biculturals to model the frame
switching phenomenon experimentally. They used classical and well-known Chinese and American icons (such as flags and characters) to prime Chinese cultural frames and American cultural frames respectively. Fundamental Attribution Theory was used to see what effect the primes had on attributions accorded to ambiguous stimuli. Morris and Peng (1994) have shown that in ambiguous situations American participants accord more weight to internal dispositions, whereas Chinese participants accord more weight to the social context. Hong and colleagues used the same experimental manipulation that Morris and Peng had used to ascertain which cultural frame was active. Participants viewed short animated films in which a lone fish was swimming on the right side of the screen, and a group of fish was swimming on the left side of the screen; all fish were swimming in the same direction. Participants were asked to interpret what was happening. Hong and colleagues found that when bicultural participants were primed with American icons, a significantly larger percent of the sample suggested that the lone fish was leading the group (internal attribution). When bicultural participants were primed with Chinese icons, a significantly larger percent of the sample suggested that the lone fish was being chased by the group (external attribution). Therefore, Hong found that after priming the American frame participants were more likely to make internal attributions, and after priming the Chinese frame participants were more likely to make external attributions. Hong and colleagues present this as evidence that two separate frames existed for their bicultural participants, however only one frame was activated at a time.

Birman (1994) makes the distinction between bicultural models that focus on psychological identification with a culture and models that focus on behavioral participation in a culture. LaFromboise, Coleman and Gerton (1993) for instance, as mentioned earlier, have suggested different ways of acquiring a second culture, but are more concerned with the
behavioral bicultural competence, and the tangible participation in the host culture. They suggest that individuals are biculturally competent when they have knowledge of cultural beliefs and values, maintain positive attitudes toward both groups, possess bicultural efficacy or a belief that one can live effectively within two cultural groups, are competent in communication with both groups, have developed a significant role repertoire in order to adapt to different situations, and feel grounded in a social network of both cultures. Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) flesh out bicultural models proposed by LaFromboise and colleagues more in terms of psychological identification.

**Alternation model of Biculturalism** – This model proposes that an individual can identify with two different cultures and can alter his or her behavior in different cultural contexts (LaFromboise et al., 1993). In this model an individual comes to have two separate frames or scripts for understanding their two cultures. When given the appropriate cultural cue, the individual activates the appropriate cultural frame and reacts accordingly. Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) illustrate the above model in the following way:
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The left circle represents the individual’s culture of origin; the right circle represents the majority culture; the space in between represents the overlap of the two cultures. Individuals who move outside of the overlapping region are seen as alternating biculturals.

**Blended model of Biculturalism** – This model proposes that an individual can maintain a positive identity as a member of his or her culture of origin, while simultaneously developing a positive
identity by participating in the majority culture. The blended model differs from the alternation model in its emphasis on the association between the two cultures and the assumption that the two cultures are tied together within one social cognitive structure (Birman, 1994; LaFromboise et al., 1993). Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) illustrate blended biculturalism in the following way:
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An individual who occupies the area of overlap between the two cultures can be considered a blended bicultural. For Phinney, blended individuals see themselves more clearly as part of a combined culture (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997).

4.1 Literature Investigating the Alternating and Blended Ways of Being Bicultural

Much of the research in the acculturation literature has focused on Berry’s popular four-fold framework, and as such, has managed to identify biculturals (those who fall into the integration category), but has not distinguished between different ways of being bicultural.

There are only a handful of studies that have shown the existence of both alternating and blended biculturals within one sample (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997; Smith, Stewart & Winter, 2004). Using both interviews with open and closed-ended questions as well as self-report questionnaires, Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) investigated the acculturation strategies of Mexican and African American high school students in Southern California. They found three
patterns of identification that emerged from their data: blended biculturalism, alternating biculturalism, and separation. Based on their qualitative analyses, Phinney and Devich-Navarro suggest that alternating biculturals base their sense of self on strong feelings of closeness to their ethnic culture; and though they recognize their host culture identity, they seem more strongly guided by their ethnic identity. They also suggest that the blended bicultural identity is rooted in good feelings about being American accompanied by a positive sense of their ethnicity. It was noted that in many cases the ethnic culture was not highly salient or personal, but the individuals were not assimilated. Phinney and Devich-Navarro suggest that both alternating and blended biculturals have a positive sense of both cultures that make up their personal identity, however the ethnic component is more salient for the former group, while the majority culture component is more salient for the latter group.

Smith, Stewart, and Winter (2004) conducted qualitative analyses on interviews with a small sample of Latvian Americans. Like Phinney and Devich-Navarro, they were also able to categorize their participants into both alternating and blended bicultural categories, along with marginalized, separated, and assimilated categories. Smith and colleagues indicated that blended biculturals felt their Latvian and American identities overlapped whereas alternating biculturals felt their Latvian and American identities were completely separate and distinct from each other. Aside from these two studies, not much work has explored the alternating and blended ways of being bicultural.
4.2 Implications for Understanding Bicultural Identity and Differential Reactions to Discrimination

As summarized earlier, conceptualizations of bicultural identity to date center around assessing attitudes toward heritage and mainstream cultures, as well as the active engagement and competence in both cultures. Some researchers (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997; Smith et al., 2004) have suggested that the way in which these two cultures are balanced within the concept of self is also important. Given that the individual regards both ancestral and mainstream culture as important contributors to his or her cultural identity, whether these two cultures are able to mix and coexist in one stable identity or remain separate as distinct identity frames that are cued by the environment may have particular implications. For instance, do blended and alternating biculturals differ in the way they place importance on each culture? Phinney and Devich-Navarro suggest that the ethnic part of their cultural identity is more salient to alternators whereas the mainstream part is more salient to blended biculturals. Does this translate into the importance that these cultures hold for each individual, or are all biculturals likely to view the mainstream cultural component as most important to their identity as this is the culture they must negotiate every day? Perhaps alternators may engage in more ethnic activities or find themselves in more ethnic environments than blended biculturals, so their ethnic culture must be negotiated every day as well. Are there differences in the way blended and alternating biculturals understand culture and relate to their environment? Another important question is whether alternating or blended bicultural style is associated with reacting to experiences of ethnic discrimination. When constructs of cultural self are attacked, is it better for the individual’s well-being if the devalued aspect of self is integrated with the host culture sense of self rather than
being separate? This thesis seeks to explore the implications bicultural style may have on ways of understanding and articulating one’s cultural identity, the importance placed on each culture, and reacting to discrimination.

Chapter 5
Goals of the Thesis

The major goals of this thesis are to investigate how individuals understand and articulate their bicultural identity, and how this is associated with reactions to racial or ethnic discrimination. Also, this thesis seeks to explore the usefulness of the alternating/blended bicultural distinction in relation to the above mentioned research investigations.

As most of the psychological research on cultural identity has focused primarily on ethnic identity, most research by Phinney and others (e.g. Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Lee, 2003; Mossakowski, 2003; Phinney & Chavira, 1992; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Umana-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007; Verkuyten & Brug, 2002) fails to include individuals’ orientation toward their host culture when looking at associations between cultural identity and well-being for instance. While ethnic identity is a central component, omitting the host cultural component renders a less than holistic portrait of one’s cultural identity. This thesis focuses on an understanding of cultural identity that incorporates both attitudes towards one’s host culture as well as towards one’s ancestral culture. Understanding bicultural identity in this regard is key. This holistic picture of bicultural identity allows for recognition of the mutually constitutive nature of contributing cultural elements. As mentioned earlier, identities often develop out of the recognition of difference. Bicultural individuals recognize each culture in their identity in reaction to the other. Though conceptions of culture may seem isolated and separate at times, for
the bicultural individual each is always present, understood, and incorporated against the subtle backdrop of the other culture.

While representations of both ancestral and Canadian culture are present in bicultural identity, how these representations interact or combine in stable representations of the self can be complex. As described earlier, there has been some research investigating alternating and blended ways of being bicultural. Individuals have differed in understanding bicultural representations of identity in terms of *alternating biculturalism*, or feeling as though one switches between two cultural selves, and *blended biculturalism*, or feeling as though one has a coherent, stable self that is informed by both cultural representations. Though Hong, Benet-Martinez, Morris, and colleagues have used a creative task to provide evidence for the presence of alternating biculturals and a theory that accounts for this phenomenon cognitively, they do not offer any suggestions as to what this may mean for blended biculturals. Their model of frame-switching implicitly applies an alternating framework to studying bicultural identity. This precludes understanding the blended bicultural identity because by default the alternation phenomenon is being investigated. Perhaps every bicultural is capable of alternating to some degree, and the work of Benet-Martinez and colleagues creatively examines this process, but perhaps every bicultural is also capable of blending to some degree, though neither Benet-Martinez’s nor anyone else’s work has investigated this phenomena. It is also probable that while individuals may switch frames in response to certain situations, they may understand themselves as more blended in terms of worldview, approach to life, and general self-image. Individuals may then engage in the frame-switching phenomenon at the micro-level of particular situations, but may differ in whether they see themselves as alternating or blended biculturals at the macro-level of identity. Costigan, Su and Hua (2009) have made a distinction between situation-specific
cultural identity and overall cultural identity. They note that identifying as Chinese may not compete with identifying as Canadian in one’s overall identity, but may do so in specific situations. This distinction can be applied to Benet-Martínez’s work. While the mechanics of what individuals are doing in different situations is important, it does not address the questions of how individuals feel they identify with the cultures that surround them, how they understand and describe their cultural identity, or how their general approach to cultural identity affects their reaction to potentially identity toxic events like ethnic discrimination. This thesis is concerned with that macro-level of perceived cultural identity. While individuals may vary on a detailed context-dependent level, they develop a consistent image or representation of their identity as influenced by contributing cultures. It is this more abstract representation of self that is of interest here.

This thesis is not suggesting that the two explored alternating and blended bicultural identity styles are definitive, or even mutually exclusive, rather it is investigating the utility of conceptualizing bicultural identity in these two styles and exploring how they relate to a host of other variables. It is likely that many biculturals have identities that are some mix of these two ways of being, though for many there may likely be a dominant way of being bicultural. At any rate, this thesis is less concerned about cultural orientation, or what individuals are cognitively-mechanically doing (e.g. frame-switching), but rather is more interested in cultural identity, or how individuals understand and represent their cultural identity. As mentioned earlier, cultural identity involves a social conception and identification with one’s cultural groups (Appiah, 2005). It is this identification, or thinking of oneself in a particular way because one feels that one has membership in a particular group, that is explored in this thesis.
While Phinney and Devich-Navarro’s work provides a start to studying alternating and blended ways of being bicultural, supporting evidence and more in-depth investigation is needed to examine these identities. Further investigation is required to examine the association between these bicultural identities and well-being, as well as reactions to experiences of discrimination that directly challenge these identities. Though the associations between ethnic identity, discrimination, and well-being have been investigated, specific associations between bicultural style, discrimination, and well-being have not been examined in the literature prior to the studies of this thesis.

5.1 Empirical Studies of the Thesis

Study 1 explored participants’ understanding of their cultural identity through interview questions as well as written tasks. While participants were asked about their experiences with discrimination, the main goals of study 1 were to explore what meaning cultural identity held for the participant, what the modal cultural identity style was among ethnic minority members attending a diverse campus at a university in Toronto, whether blended and alternating bicultural styles were endorsed by participants, and what correlates may be associated with the bicultural styles. Once themes were identified in study 1, study 2 further investigated bicultural identity through use of the written questionnaire method with a larger sample. Findings from study 1 were investigated for replicability with greater clarity and power, minus any potential interviewer effects that may have occurred in study 1. Study 3 sought to replicate previous findings concerning bicultural identity, but focused more on the effects of bicultural identity on the association between discrimination and well-being. Study 3 employed an experimental paradigm to directly test the effects of imagined discrimination on mood, orientation towards
group, and evaluations of self and group as targets of discrimination. The associations between bicultural style and these reactions were analyzed. Together, the three studies of the thesis were designed to investigate participant articulations of cultural identity, particularly in reference to bicultural styles, and the associations between bicultural style, discrimination, and well-being, using multiple approaches.

Chapter 6
Stud 1

The goals of the initial study were to uncover how individuals understand their cultural identity styles, especially bicultural ones, and to identify psychological beliefs and experiences associated with those styles. To that end, paragraph descriptions were provided for five cultural identity styles (assimilation, blended integration, alternating integration, separation, and marginalization) and participants were asked to choose which paragraph best described themselves. Frequencies of paragraph selection were examined. Participants were also asked to fill out cultural identity questionnaire measures, and were interviewed on a variety of topics concerning their feelings toward their ancestral and Canadian cultures, inter-ethnic friendships and relationships, diversity in their everyday environment, and experiences of racial or ethnic discrimination. Associations between these topics and cultural identity style were explored. Associations between common themes arising in the interviews and cultural identity style were also examined.

Hypotheses. In line with previously reviewed literature on young adult individuals of various backgrounds in North America, the majority of participants were expected to be bicultural. Articulation of this cultural identity was to be explored. While there is not much research on alternating and blended bicultural styles, it was hypothesized that both alternators
and blended biculturals would be present in the sample. Falling out of Phinney and Devich-Navarro’s (1997) conclusions that alternators are more attuned to and guided by their ethnic culture, and blended biculturals are more attuned to mainstream culture, alternators were predicted to be more active in ethnic activities, score higher on ethnic identity measures, and surround themselves with ingroup members more than blended biculturals. Differences in experiences of discrimination faced by alternating and blended bicultural participants were explored.

6.1 Method

Participants

Data were collected from 41 participants (18 males, 23 females) ranging in age from 17 to 24 years old ($M = 18.53, SD = 1.21$) with varying ethnic backgrounds; 32% of the sample consisted of participants of East Asian origin (30% Chinese, 2% Korean), 44% were of South Asian origin (12% East Indian, 10% Pakistani, 22% Sri Lankan origin), and the remaining 24% were of mixed (1 participant had parents that had different ethnic origins) or other origins (participants were categorized as having a particular origin if both of their parents were of that same origin), see Table 1 for ethnic breakdown of sample. The majority of participants in the sample were first or second generation immigrants (14 born in Canada, 27 born outside Canada; 93% of the sample had parents who were born outside of Canada). Time spent in Canada ranged from less than 1 year to 20 years ($M = 12.29, SD = 6.00$). All participants were unmarried, and 93% had received their secondary schooling in Canada.

Procedure
Participants were recruited from the summer introductory psychology course on the Scarborough campus at the University of Toronto and received course credit for their participation. Upon arriving for the study, participants were welcomed, asked to read and sign a consent form, and subsequently provided with a cover sheet outlining the elements of the study they would be completing. The interviewer sat down with the participant, set up the audio voice recorder, and asked the participant a few introductory questions. The participant was then instructed to complete a paragraph selection task regarding cultural identity style, followed by an in-depth interview consisting of a series of open-ended questions concerning a variety of domains associated with cultural identity. Following this, the participant completed two questionnaires concerning group identity and acculturation (questionnaires were counterbalanced to avoid order effects), and was subsequently debriefed and thanked for participating.

Materials

*Cultural Identity Paragraph Selection Task.* For the purposes of the present study, this measure was created to identify cultural identity style. Participants were asked to read through five paragraphs, each describing a cultural identity style (i.e. assimilation, blended biculturalism, alternating biculturalism, separation, and marginalization), and circle the paragraph that best described themselves. Participants were then asked to rate how well the chosen paragraph described themselves on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “not at all” to “perfectly”. Finally, participants were asked to write a description of their cultural identity in their own words. Please see Appendix A for a copy of the measure.

*Cultural Identity Interview.* For the purposes of the present study, this measure was created. Participants were asked a series of open-ended questions concerning environmental,
behavioral, and psychological variables relating to the adoption of particular acculturation strategies. Interview questions were clustered according to three content domains: feelings about both the ancestral and host cultures and the compatibility between the two (Qs 1-8), inter-ethnic friendships and relationships (Qs 9 & 10), and diversity in the participant’s everyday environment (Qs 11 & 12). Question 13 ended the interview with a query about the participant’s experiences with racial/ethnic discrimination. Please see Appendix B for a copy of the interview script.

*Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure* (MEIM; Phinney, 1992). The MEIM is composed of two factors: ethnic identity search, and affirmation/belonging/commitment to one’s ethnic group. There are 12 items (5 search items, 7 affirmation items) to be rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Examples of search items include “I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership” and “I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs”. Examples of affirmation items include “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me” and “I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group”. The alpha value of .89 (search items $\alpha = .75$; affirmation items $\alpha = .89$) obtained for this scale indicated good internal consistency.

*Vancouver Index of Acculturation* (VIA; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). The VIA consists of two subscales: attitudes toward and participation in heritage culture, and mainstream culture. There are 20 items to be rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Examples of heritage culture items include “I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself” and “I believe in the values of my heritage culture”. Examples of mainstream culture items include “I enjoy social activities with Canadians
of European descent” and “I believe in mainstream Canadian values”. The alpha value of .79 (heritage subscale $\alpha = .83$; mainstream subscale $\alpha = .81$) obtained for this scale indicated adequate internal consistency.

6.2 Results

*Quantitative Data*

Table 2 shows the percentages for cultural identity style obtained from the paragraph task. Bicultural identity styles were highly favored over other cultural identity styles. Seventy-nine percent (32) of participants chose descriptions of bicultural identity to represent themselves. Of those bicultural participants, a fairly even split resulted in frequency of the two bicultural styles; 47% chose blended biculturalism while 53% chose alternating biculturalism. Ratings of how well participants’ chosen paragraphs described themselves were high ($M = 4.07$, $SD = .88$) indicating that the paragraphs describing the alternating and blended bicultural styles were tapping into meaningful descriptive constructs. Low frequencies of assimilation, separation, and marginalization cultural identity styles resulted in the exclusion of data from participants who chose these styles.

Sixty-nine percent of the bicultural sample had been born outside of Canada leaving 31% that had been born in the country. Forty-seven percent of participants who identified themselves as blended biculturals were born in Canada, whereas 18% of participants who identified themselves as alternating biculturals were born in Canada. A one-way ANOVA indicated a marginal effect for bicultural style on number of years in Canada, $F(1,30) = 3.99$, $p = .06$. Blended biculturals reported having been in Canada longer than alternating biculturals ($M = 14.02$, $SD = 5.53$ vs. $M = 9.82$, $SD = 6.26$ respectively).
Among participants who had identified themselves as alternating biculturals, 41% were of East Asian (Chinese or Korean) origin, 47% were of South Asian (East Indian, Pakistani, or Sri Lankan) origin, and the remaining 12% were of mixed or other origins. Among participants who had identified themselves as blended biculturals, 27% were of East Asian origin, 40% were of South Asian origin, and the remaining 33% were of mixed or other origins.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to study the effect of bicultural identity style on ethnic identity search & affirmation, belonging, and commitment to ethnic identity (i.e. subscales of the MEIM), and participation in both heritage and mainstream cultures (i.e. subscales of the VIA). No significant effects were found, indicating that the two bicultural identity styles map onto similar subscale scores. Interestingly, a marginal effect was found for the ethnic identity search subscale of the MEIM, $F(1,30) = 3.74, p = .06^i$. Alternating biculturals scored higher than blended biculturals ($M = 2.99, SD = .48$ vs. $M = 2.63, SD = .58$ respectively).

Two one-way ANOVAs were also conducted to study the effects of birthplace and gender on the subscale scores of the MEIM and VIA. A significant effect was found for birthplace on the VIA subscale measuring participation in the mainstream culture, $F(1,39) = 15.69, p < .001$. Participants who were born in Canada were likely to score higher on the mainstream culture subscale than participants born outside of Canada ($M = 4.13, SD = .61$ vs. $M = 3.45, SD = .47$ respectively). This is in line with the intuitive notion that participants born in Canada are more likely to be receptive and engage in mainstream culture than participants with birth ties to other countries. No significant effects were found for gender.
Qualitative Data

Crosstabulations and chi square analyses did not find significant differences for bicultural style x Canadian birth status, bicultural style x ethnicity, ethnicity x Canadian birth status, or bicultural style x gender.

Themes occurring in the interview and open-ended written tasks were identified by the author. A subset of these themes that achieved adequate inter-rater reliability will be discussed. Table 3 provides percentages of participant responses to interview questions as well as common themes that arose spontaneously in participants’ written task. The author coded for themes arising in the interview portion. A second coderii coded for themes arising in the written task portion. A third coderiii coded a randomly selected subset of one third of the interviews, to assess inter-rater reliabilities. See Appendix H for inter-rater reliabilities across themes.

Participant 22, who self-categorized as an alternating bicultural, described his cultural identity in the following way:

I am Indian. I didn’t come here when I was young, but when I was 10 or 11 so I do know my roots and background and I do follow [my ancestral culture] to a certain extent but I was raised in this country so it [is] dependent on the setting. So if I go with family [to a] temple gathering… I do hold my own culture… whereas if I am with my friends, or like at work, [or at a] party or something, my culture does change. I am more into Canadian based culture, whereas in like a temple or family gatherings like I said I am more into my own culture – Indian culture.

Participant 20, who self-categorized as a blended bicultural, described his cultural identity in the following way:
[I’m] Chinese-Canadian… I can speak Chinese…I guess it’s like a mix of both cultures, like I watch both Chinese shows and English shows, and then I do Chinese activities, like I celebrate Chinese New Year, but I do a lot of stuff here too like hockey, watch English shows, so yeah it’s a mix of the two.

The above two examples illustrate common depictions of cultural identity from participants who chose either the alternating or blended descriptive paragraphs to categorize themselves. Participant responses to interview questions indicated that many participants either did not see a relationship (whether positive or negative) between their home and host countries, or were not sure whether one existed. Alternating and blended biculturals did not significantly differ in regard to this theme.

Participants were interviewed regarding their interactions with people of other ethnicities or races. As can be seen in Table 3, participants showed varying degrees of preference towards associating with people of the same ethnicity as themselves. Many showed no preference offering up explanations like Participant 15 who stated “It [being from the same ancestral culture] just doesn’t matter so it’s not that important… what’s more important is their personality.” Other participants wavered in opinion or showed a clear preference for associating with people from the same ancestral culture citing benefits like being able to speak in the same language, having the same values and beliefs, and being able to sympathize with and understand what it’s like to deal with parents rooted in ancestral culture.

Almost all participants lived in a somewhat, if not very, diverse neighborhood. They also all attended a diverse university campus. However, many reported that they did not interact with a diverse range of ethnic people at school on a daily basis. This is not surprising to the author; a
stroll through the common areas on campus reveals that though there is much diversity in general, diversity does not permeate the many ethnically homogeneous cliques present, who conduct activities largely independent of one another. Many of the participants who were employed, reported interacting with a diverse range of ethnic people on a daily basis. This may be largely due to the nature of each job and the diverse make-up of the employee pool. The above discussion is revealing in its suggestion that though many of the participants live in diverse ethnically populated neighborhoods, attend a diversely populated school, and when working, interact with people of many different ethnicities; there is a fair amount of preference for interacting within one’s ethnic culture. No significant differences were found between alternating and blended biculturals on the previously described themes.

Among themes identified by the author, participants mentioned family in their discussion of culture and identity. Education, opportunity, and conflict were mentioned as reasons for immigrating to Canada. Religion, traditions or festivals, and clothes, food, or language were mentioned in descriptions of one’s identity or discussion contrasting the two cultures. When asked to describe Canadian culture, participants mentioned Canadians as being open, extraverted, or free. Participants also characterized Canada as being diverse and multicultural.

The final part of the interview was concerned with participants’ experiences of prejudice or discrimination as a result of race or ethnicity. Sixty-eight percent of the sample had experienced some form of racial/ethnic discrimination. Ethnic jokes and teasing among friends were mentioned on the lighter end of the spectrum. When asked what effect these kinds of experiences had on participants, many dismissed them and did not take them seriously. Participant 06 for example remarks:
P: I don’t think I’ve had anything serious, but there is like jokes and stuff like, say- like saying things about… like… umm, like I haven’t been into anything serious due to my race but like, they’re, like people joke around and that kind of stuff but, saying like, just words you would associate like chink or something like that kind of stuff but, nothing serious.

I: Have you experienced that a lot?

P: No.

I: Just occasionally?

P: Yeah.

I: And how does that affect you?

P: I… don’t really mind.

Participant 7 comments:

P: …I guess people made fun of me, just like, it wasn’t like umm they were taking it seriously. We don’t take things seriously, just make fun of each other, like…

I: What do you mean?

P: Like some call me, um, Tamil tigers. There’s this one guy that called me Tamil tiger and he just said that for jokes and then…

I: Is he Tamil?
P: …no, I’m not sure what he is. But we make fun of him too, but not in the sense of calling him something like Tamil tiger or anything, we just call him like fatty (giggle) and stuff like that, so yeah it was more of a joke…

It appears to be a somewhat common occurrence, among our participants and their friends, to experience and in some cases participate in these types of racial/ethnic slurs or stereotypes in joke format. Many accept these occurrences as inevitable and report that they are not affected in any way. Instances where a slur is presented in a transparently antagonistic way are taken more seriously. Participant 7 continues her story:

P: …but then there was one time it really got serious like another student was calling us tigers and stuff and was writing on the walls and stuff and yeah…

I: This was the incident you were talking about first?

P: Yeah. That was it. And then we actually had a, I don’t know what happened but I think the principals called down the person that was responsible for it. And he uh, it didn’t go on after that though. It was just for that period of time when it was in the newspapers and stuff.

I: How did that affect you?

P: Well, I was really upset about it but I didn’t find it too upsetting in the fact that it, I thought the person was immature and he must have been really, like, retarded, but yeah, if it was someone like, that was my close friend I would have found it more effective than if it was, the person who actually did it because I knew, he didn’t really respect anyone or
anything so, I didn’t find it really effective, but I did get really upset about the whole situation that someone was actually thinking that. And it was a serious matter than a joke. Many participants reported hurtful and emotionally upsetting consequences to these kinds of mean-spirited slurs and incidences of teasing. However, participants also reported redemptive qualities that arose in their own cultural identity as a result. Backlash towards antagonistic attempts to degrade or revile the participant resulted in the strengthening of one’s own identity in order to put the attack in perspective and perhaps lessen potential damage to one’s identity. This is often done retrospectively, either after short or long periods of time have elapsed. Participant 5 illustrates this process:

P: Well, um, when I was… in school from grade 3 to 5 I went to school in Calgary, and that’s a very,… minorities, like black people there aren’t a lot of. It’s like the majority of white people in that area, and I remember, like going to school there, was like, pretty hard for me because I was one of two or three African Americans in the entire school, and I remember, like, being made fun of, like, when I went to school and things like that cause…I dunno, cause I, I guess I was one of the only, like, one of the only black girls in the school they used to make fun of me, and things like that because of my race.

I: How did that affect you?

P: Being young it did affect me very much because, at that age you just really want to fit in, you don’t want to be different and it hurts to see that, like y’know your peers are mocking you because of something you can’t change… so… in a way it made me kind of want to turn away from being like, African American because I just wanted to be accepted at that age. But then, growing up, like, in looking back on it now, I guess it
made me realize that when I’m faced with a situation like that I just need to be strong and accept the fact that I’m where I’m from and, love myself for that.

While this response is reflective of a process that is common to some responses chronicling participants’ experiences with discrimination that have really affected them, there are participants who have not gained anything positive from their experiences. Certain experiences have left an unsavory impression that can have negative consequences for how the participant sees Canadian society at large. Participant 5 discusses her recent experiences on the subway train:

P: …sometimes when I’m with a group of, of my black friends or whatever, and we’re on the train and, like, you can, when we’re on the train and we see like, some like old, white lady or something, she’s always like “yeah look at those black kids, like, y’know they’re on the train they’re being rowdy” and things like that.

I: And how does that affect you?

P: That, I guess, it’s harsh because, now when I, when I encounter that, I just brush it off. And it’s hard to realize that, like, y’know, h-, like what kind of society we live in that, if, I’m only 18 years old and I’m able to like brush off, like, cause it’s, it’s like a regular crime. And that’s, like, that’s not right.

Participant 9 discusses his experiences with discrimination and the sizeable implications they have had for his decision on whether to stay in Canada:

P: Well, this was when I was in high school and, unfortunately I got into a fight with this person, the guy was white, and both of us were sent to the office. And when we went to
the office there was this teacher, it was our American History teacher. He knew both of us, and I wasn’t, I’m not really a bad person’ll easily get into fights, but however the guy took the side of the white person telling the vice-principal to go easy on him, he’s on the soccer team, he’s a good student, and while he was talking, I didn’t even hear him make any mention of me or try to say that, all he basically talked about was the white person so, at that instance I sort of felt like… um, okay this was my teacher so, at least he should have mentioned my name or me, but he didn’t so, I sort of felt discriminated against when it came to that.

I: On the basis of your race…

P: yeah

I: …and ethnicity?

P: Yeah. Cause the principal, vice-principal, and student were all of the same background or the same race. And there’s been other times too, which is like when you’re hanging out with your friends and it appears that most of you guys are from black, black background, not mostly just black, black and brown background, like coolie – you know what I mean? Or we’re chilling and then the cops would come and “What are you guys up to?” and like nothing, we’re just having fun or whatever, but they just suspect that we’re youth and we’re chilling together in large number, up to something. Yeah.

I: What effect did these experiences have on you?

P: Well at first it makes me angry and pi- very vexed. It makes me feel like once again Canada is not my home place and... It’s not like I ever want, I ever wanted to stay here.
anyway, I’m gonna go back. But these, these reactions or these, these discrimination that occurs basically angers me and actually makes me… like want to actually go through my plan as soon as possible, like to get my education and to get out of this country as fast as possible.

Not all discrimination is propagated by members of the majority group. Some participants experience exclusion from members of their own ethnic group for failing to meet abstract criteria seen by group members as constituting true belonging to one’s culture. Participant 37 describes experiences of discrimination from both Caucasians in America, and members of her own ethnic group in India:

P: I guess in the States people look at you… Especially post 9/11 I don’t know, it’s kind of weird, ‘cause you feel really awkward (laughs).

I: So you were in Georgia after 9/11?

P: Mm-hmm

I: And people were looking at you strangely?

P: Not really looking strangely but you could kind of feel something like I don’t really belong here.

I: What effect did these kinds of experiences have on you?

P: Umm… I don’t think it was… totally negative ‘cause when you talk to people in Georgia they’re really nice people, but it was kind of weird I’d say. I definitely believe there’s a bit of racism in the South still but like when you talk to people they’re not that bad, like they’ll help you out and stuff like that in the South.
I: So… what effect did that have on you do you think, or did it not affect you in any way?

P: Uhm… it made me think yeah, there’s still racism in the South but… also there’s whole bunch of non-racist people too, so you can’t just yeah you know- you can’t just generalize ‘cause, you can’t know for sure.

I: Any other experiences of discrimination as a result of your race or ethnicity?

P: Oh, well could it be somebody by my ethnicity?

I: Sure.

P: I remember going to India and I didn’t- I was in this remote part- and I didn’t speak the language at all… it was kind of weird ‘cause people tried to talk to me and I couldn’t talk back because I didn’t speak their language and they kind of gave me weird looks and stuff like that, so I guess that’s- that’s an experience from- from- would it be the same culture I guess?

I: Sure, the experiences of ah… discrimination from an East Indian person?

P: Yeah.

I: Mm-hmm, and what effect did that experience have on you?

P: It was weird ‘cause um… when you get discrimination from like a Caucasian it’s like okay well they’re a different race, but from East-Indian for instance it’s like why (laughs) why- it’s weird so I guess it says that… just the generalization you can’t just really make one.
Participant 37 makes an interesting statement when she contrasts the acceptableness, to her, of receiving prejudiced reactions from Caucasians and members of her own ethnic group. It is somewhat startling to notice that discrimination by the members of the majority group may be acceptable or is looked at as inevitable by some participants. At the same time, due to the acceptance of these occurrences as inevitable, some participants do not seem to be as affected by these instances compared with experiences in which the discriminator is a member of their own ethnic group. Participant 39 discusses his high school experiences of trying to come to terms with his cultural identity. By grade 10 he had many Caucasian friends and liked to do what he felt were Western things. He recounts his problems with some of the friends he had that shared his ancestral background:

P: And that’s when I felt really discriminated by my own friends, my Tamil friends who were like “what are you doing? This is so un-Tamil, you can’t do this” and I really felt the whole ‘you’re so White-washed’ trr-ra… and they really said that I was. What the hell? Like c’mon dude, just respect me or you don’t respect me.

Participant 39 mentions that this bothered him quite a bit in high school and resulted in his moving away from his Tamil group of friends and preferring other South Asian and Caucasian friends who were more accepting.

While the majority of our sample has experienced racial/ethnic discrimination, their experiences have been varied in kind and impact. As was stated before, some participants were able to shrug off these experiences reporting no ill effects, whereas others had deep and complex reactions with far reaching consequences for both identity and resulting worldviews. Crosstabulations and chi-square tests for bicultural identity style and discrimination revealed the
following: bicultural style had no impact on discrimination, i.e. blended and alternating biculturals were equally likely to report having experienced racial/ethnic discrimination; however, bicultural identity style was differentially associated with whether one was affected by these experiences, \( \chi^2 (1) = 7.77, p = .005 \). Blended biculturals who had experienced discrimination were equally likely to have had some reaction or no reaction to their experiences: 5 blended biculturals reported being affected in some way and 5 reported their experiences of discrimination having no effect. By contrast, all 12 alternating biculturals that had experienced discrimination reported being affected in some way.

The sample size is small rendering it difficult to make informed arguments for differences in experiences or interpretation among participants with different bicultural styles. However, a review of participants’ accounts reveals that 3 out of the 5 blended biculturals who reported that their experiences of discrimination have not affected them, described hearing ethnic jokes; a relatively light experience made lighter by the participant’s willingness to minimize it and accept it as harmless. The fourth blended integrator seemed hesitant to attribute his experience to discrimination and pointed out that it was not fair to generalize the acts of one person to some abstract population. In contrast, 3 out of the 5 blended integrators who reported that their experiences of discrimination had affected them in some way, described more intense and prolonged experiences. They recalled taunts and exclusion from classmates in elementary school. Alternators also tended to report more intense (though not necessarily prolonged) experiences of discrimination. However, a wide range of experiences were reported by both bicultural groups. No other significant differences were observed.

Crosstabulations and chi square tests for experienced discrimination indicated that there were no significant differences between participants who had and had not experienced
discrimination on themes discussed in their written task of describing their own cultural identity, or on common themes brought up in the interview portion of the study.

The inability to make deep and convincing conclusions due to the limited power of the study arising from the use of a small sample was noted. Study 2 was conducted to address these sample size problems and further investigate bicultural identity and the association between bicultural identity style and experiences of discrimination.

Chapter 7
Study 2

As in study 1, participants were asked to complete written tasks and questionnaires concerning their cultural identity and involvement in both their ancestral and Canadian cultures. However, study 2 focused more on select questions and correlates of cultural identity. The interview procedure used in study 1 was replaced with select open-ended written tasks concerning reasons for immigration to Canada, perceived similarity and importance of ancestral and Canadian cultures, as well as experiences of racial or ethnic discrimination, and perceptions about the prevalence of this type of discrimination. The main goals of study 2 were to ensure that major findings from study 1 were replicated in a larger sample with the questionnaire method, and further investigate correlates of bicultural identity.

Hypotheses. The majority of participants were expected to be bicultural. It was hypothesized that, as in study 1, a significant percentage of participants in the sample would identify themselves with one of two possible styles: alternating or blended biculturalism. Based on marginal findings from study 1 that suggested alternating biculturals were potentially more attuned to their ancestral culture than blended biculturals, and Phinney and Devich-Navarro’s
(1997) findings that alternating biculturals find the ancestral component of identity more salient, alternating biculturals were predicted to rate their ancestral culture higher in importance. Perceived similarity between ancestral and host culture was explored. Alternators were predicted to perceive more difference between the two cultures than blended biculturals. This was predicted as biculturals may feel more of a need to alternate and less ability to mix the two cultures in one identity if less similarity between the two cultures is perceived. Differences in reaction to experiences of discrimination faced by alternating and blended bicultural participants were predicted to occur, based on findings from study 1 (i.e. alternators were expected to react more to experienced discrimination). Reasons for immigration and perceived similarity of cultures were assessed in order to explore whether goals upon coming to Canada or perceived difference between cultures relate to bicultural style.

7.1 Method

Participants

Data were collected from 155 participants (45 males, 110 females) ranging in age from 16 to 39 years old ($M = 18.59$, $SD = 2.08$) with varying ethnic backgrounds; 21% of the sample consisted of participants of East Asian origin (all were Chinese), 36% were of South Asian origin (11% East Indian, 10% Pakistani, 15% Sri Lankan), and 43% were of mixed or other origins. The majority of participants in the sample were first generation immigrants (53 born in Canada, 102 born outside Canada; more than 96% of the sample had parents who were born outside of Canada). Age when coming to Canada ranged from being born in Canada to immigrating at age 20 ($M = 6.84$, $SD = 6.66$). Almost all participants (99%) were unmarried, and 90% had received their secondary schooling in Canada.
One hundred and twenty participants chose bicultural identity styles to represent their cultural identity. Due to small frequencies of other cultural identity styles, data from non-bicultural participants were excluded from analyses. The bicultural subsample (33 males, 87 females) ranged in age from 16 to 23 years old ($M = 18.45, SD = 1.32$) with varying ethnic backgrounds; 18% of the sample consisted of participants of East Asian origin (all were Chinese), 36% were of South Asian origin (12% East Indian, 11% Pakistani, 13% Sri Lankan), and the remaining 46% were of mixed (8 participants had parents that had different ethnic origins) or other origins (participants were categorized as having a particular origin if both of their parents were of that same origin). The majority of participants in the subsample were first generation immigrants (41 born in Canada, 79 born outside Canada; more than 96% of the sample had parents who were born outside of Canada). Age when coming to Canada ranged from being born in Canada to immigrating at age 18 ($M = 6.59, SD = 6.45$). Almost all participants (99%) were unmarried, and 93% had received their secondary schooling in Canada. It should be noted that the bicultural subsample is demographically quite similar to the broader sample (this was expected as bicultural participants make up a large majority of the broader sample).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from the fall introductory psychology course on the Scarborough campus at the University of Toronto and received course credit for their participation. As in Study 1, upon arriving for the study, the participant was welcomed, asked to read and sign a consent form, and subsequently provided with a cover sheet outlining the elements of the study they would be completing. Unlike in Study 1, there was no interview component to the procedure for this study. The participant was given a questionnaire package to fill out that included the cultural identity style paragraph selection task, followed by open-ended
written task questions and Likert-type items concerning domains associated with cultural identity. The MEIM and VIA were again included and counterbalanced to avoid order effects. Upon completion of the questionnaire package, the participant was debriefed and thanked for participating.

Materials

Cultural Identity Style Paragraph Selection Task; Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) – the alpha value of .87 (search items $\alpha = .64$; affirmation items $\alpha = .88$) obtained for this scale indicates adequate internal consistency; and Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000) – the alpha value of .82 (heritage subscale $\alpha = .84$; mainstream subscale $\alpha = .82$) obtained for this scale indicates adequate internal consistency. Participants were also asked to provide written responses to a series of open-ended questions and rate a series of Likert type items based on the following topics: reason for immigration to Canada, perceived similarity of ancestral and Canadian cultures, importance of both cultures, experience of racial or ethnic discrimination, and perceived prevalence of discrimination for members of one’s ancestral culture in general and in comparison to other cultural minority groups. Please see Appendix C for a copy of these questions.

7.2 Results

Quantitative Data

Table 4 shows the percentages for cultural identity style obtained from the paragraph task. Mirroring results found in study 1, bicultural identity styles were highly favored over other cultural identity styles. Of the 77% (120) who chose descriptions of bicultural identity to
represent themselves, as in study 1, a fairly even split resulted in frequency of the two bicultural styles; 52.5% chose blended biculturalism while 47.5% chose alternating biculturalism to represent their cultural identity. Also, as found in study 1, ratings of how well participants’ chosen paragraphs described themselves were high ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .51$; 93% of the sample chose a rating of either 4 or 5) indicating that descriptive constructs employed in the paragraphs were resonating with participants.

An ANOVA was conducted with the bicultural subsample to investigate the effects of bicultural style on years in Canada. No significant differences were obtained, suggesting that alternating and blended biculturals in this sample had spent similar amounts of time in Canada (Blended biculturals reported an average length of residence in Canada of 12.70 years ($SD = 6.09$), while alternating biculturals reported an average length of residence in Canada of 10.95 years ($SD = 6.25$)).

An ANOVA was also conducted to study the effect of bicultural identity style on ethnic identity search & affirmation, belonging, and commitment to ethnic identity (i.e. subscales of the MEIM), and participation in both heritage and mainstream cultures (i.e. subscales of the VIA). No significant effects were found for the MEIM subscales or VIA mainstream culture subscale, indicating that the two bicultural styles map on to similar scores for these subscales. Interestingly, a marginal effect was found for the heritage culture subscale of the VIA, $F(1,117) = 3.87$, $p = .051^iv$. Participants who chose the alternating style to represent themselves were more likely to score higher on the heritage culture subscale of the VIA compared to participants who chose the blended bicultural style ($M = 4.35$, $SD = .59$ vs. $M = 4.04$, $SD = .59$ respectively). An ANOVA conducted with the bicultural sample to study the effect of bicultural identity style on ratings of the importance of ancestral and Canadian cultures indicated no significant effect for
the importance of Canadian culture; however, a significant effect was found for the importance of ancestral culture, $F(1, 118) = 6.69, p = .01$. Participants who chose the alternating bicultural style placed greater importance on their ancestral culture than participants who chose the blended bicultural style ($M = 4.51, SD = .63$ vs. $M = 4.16, SD = .83$ respectively). Mean ratings of importance for both cultures indicate that both alternating and blended biculturals, on average, score their ancestral culture as more important than Canadian culture. An ANOVA for the effect of bicultural identity style on the difference of importance ratings on ancestral and Canadian cultures showed significant results, $F(1, 118) = 8.55, p = .004$. Alternators tended to show a larger discrepancy in their importance ratings for the two cultures when compared with blended biculturals ($M = .91, SD = 1.04$ vs. $M = .35, SD = 1.06$ respectively).

No significant effects were found for ANOVAs conducted to investigate the effects of bicultural identity style on ratings of similarity between ancestral and Canadian cultures, prevalence of discrimination for members of one’s ancestral group in general, and prevalence of discrimination for members of one’s ancestral group in comparison with other cultural minority groups.

Three ANOVAs were also conducted to study the effects of birthplace, gender, and ethnicity (ancestral background) on the criterion variables. Mirroring results found in study 1, an effect was found for birthplace on the VIA subscale measuring participation in the mainstream culture, $F(1,117) = 4.56, p = .035$. Participants who were born in Canada were likely to score higher on the mainstream culture subscale than participants born outside of Canada ($M = 3.82, SD = .57$ vs. $M = 3.58, SD = .60$). No significant effects were found for gender or ethnicity.
Qualitative Data

Chi square analyses for bicultural style x Canadian born status, bicultural style x ethnicity, ethnicity x Canadian born status, and bicultural style x gender indicated no significant differences. Alternators and blended biculturals did not significantly differ on whether they had been born in or outside Canada, or ethnic background⁷.

Themes emerging from written descriptions of cultural identity, reason for immigration to Canada, reflections on the similarity and importance of ancestral and Canadian cultures, and experiences of discrimination, in the participants’ own words, were identified by the author. A coder⁸ coded for these themes and a second coder⁹ coded a randomly selected subset of one third of the interviews, to assess inter-rater reliabilities. Table 5 provides percentages of participants who mentioned common themes that arose spontaneously in their written descriptions. See Appendix H for inter-rater reliabilities across themes. Those themes that obtained adequate inter-rater reliability will be discussed.

When analyzing participants’ written descriptions of cultural identity, no significant differences were found between alternating and blended biculturals regarding expressions of religion or birthplace. Alternators were however more likely than blended biculturals to mention family when writing about their cultural identity, χ²(1) = 4.88, p = .027. For instance, one participant writes “both my parents have taught me the customs and rituals of the Indian heritage at a young age,” while another participant writes “my family roots are in there [South Korean culture].”

Blended and Alternating Biculturals Share Many Characteristics. Many of the themes charted in Table 5 were commonly found in the descriptions of bicultural participants. When analyzing participants’ written descriptions of reasons why they or their family immigrated to Canada,
many biculturals reported increased job opportunities, educational opportunities, or suggestions from family that had already settled in Canada. No significant differences were found between alternators and blended biculturals on themes of migration.

When analyzing participants’ written discussion of the contrasts between their ancestral and Canadian culture, many biculturals mentioned food, language, or clothing. No significant differences were found between alternators and blended biculturals regarding discussion of differences.

When analyzing participants’ written discussion of the importance of their ancestral culture, many biculturals mentioned the importance of family members and passing the ancestral culture on to future generations, or the relevance of ancestral culture to one’s identity (e.g. “knowing your culture means knowing who you are” or “my ethnic background makes me unique”). No significant differences were found between alternators and blended biculturals regarding their description of the importance of their ancestral culture. When analyzing participants’ written discussion of the importance of Canadian culture, biculturals mentioned the importance of the multiculturalism of Canada. No significant differences were found between alternators and blended biculturals regarding their description of the importance of Canadian culture.

When analyzing participants’ written descriptions of experienced discrimination, many biculturals mentioned reactions that included appreciation for or pride in their ethnic group (e.g. “got me more involved in cultural events so I could teach others about my culture” and “it made me upset at first but it also strengthened my faith in my culture”), distancing oneself from their ethnic group (e.g. “it made me hostile towards some members of my own culture” and “it made
me feel bad about being part of my ethnic group at first”), or fitting in with mainstream Canadian culture (e.g. “it affected me in a way that now whenever I go outside of house, I try to have more of a Canadian look in dressing”). No significant differences were found between alternators and blended biculturals regarding these themes.

A large proportion of our broad sample (43%) and our bicultural subsample (also 43%) had experienced racial or ethnic discrimination. As was found in study 1, crosstabulations and chi-square tests on the bicultural subsample for bicultural identity style and discrimination revealed that bicultural identity style had no impact on having experienced discrimination, i.e. blended and alternating biculturals were equally likely to experience racial/ethnic discrimination. Unlike in study 1, no differential effects were found for bicultural style on whether one was affected by these experiences. However, out of the 52 participants that had experienced discrimination in our sample, 81% reported being affected in some way. No significant effects were found for chi-square tests assessing the effect of ethnicity on having experienced discrimination or having been affected by those experiences. Chi square analyses for having experienced discrimination x Canadian born status were significant, $\chi^2(1) = 5.86$, $p = .02$. Contrary to what is often assumed, a greater proportion of participants born in Canada (59%) compared to those born outside of Canada (36%) were found to report having experienced discrimination.

Crosstabulations and chi square tests were conducted to investigate the association between having experienced ethnic discrimination and common themes on the cultural identity written task, reasons for immigrating to Canada, the importance of ancestral culture to the participant, and the importance of Canadian culture to the participant. Significant differences were found across bicultural styles for citing educational opportunities as a reason for
immigrating to Canada, $\chi^2(1) = 4.89$, $p = .027$, and for mentioning family and passing the ancestral culture on to future generations as important, $\chi^2(1) = 7.64$, $p = .006$, see Table 6. Significant differences found across bicultural styles were investigated further in the blended bicultural and alternating bicultural subsamples.

Among blended biculturals, no significant differences were found between participants who had and had not experienced discrimination, on the above mentioned common themes occurring on the written tasks. It is among alternating biculturals that significant differences were found for citing educational opportunities as a reason for immigrating to Canada, $\chi^2(1) = 3.96$, $p = .047$, and for mentioning family and passing the ancestral culture on to future generations as important, $\chi^2(1,57) = 4.77$, $p = .029$. Alternators who had experienced discrimination were significantly more likely than alternators who had not experienced discrimination to mention family and passing on ancestral culture to future generations as important, and were less likely than alternators who had not experienced discrimination to cite educational opportunities as a reason for immigrating to Canada. Perhaps the challenge of reconciling one’s bicultural identity with the feeling of being judged and dismissed based on one’s ethnic heritage serves as a stimulus for further reflection and affirmation of the ethnic part of one’s cultural identity. Alternators, who place importance on their ancestral culture to begin with, are stimulated to reaffirm the value of their ancestral culture and propose that it should be praised and taught to future generations such that the ancestral culture is further valued in response to the episode of discrimination. No other significant differences were observed.

To summarize, the results of study 2, like those of study 1, indicate that the majority of individuals felt they were bicultural. Furthermore, a reasonably even split between those who represented their bicultural identity in the blended form and those who represented their
biculural identity in the alternating form occurred in both studies. Scores on the heritage subscale of the VIA, importance ratings, and themes included in written responses suggested that while both blended and alternating biculturals place a considerable emphasis on their ancestral culture, alternators seem to place added importance to this component of their cultural identity. Also, as in study 1, a large number of individuals reported having experienced ethnic discrimination. Although study 1 indicated that blended and alternating individuals were differently affected by their experiences of discrimination, this was not corroborated in study 2. However, a large majority of the individuals in study 2 reported being affected by their experiences of discrimination, in some cases in ways that changed their worldview or general approach to their cultural group.

The high number of recounted experiences of discrimination and importance placed on these narratives by participants in both studies 1 and 2 suggest that experiencing ethnic discrimination may have the potential to evoke a broad range of reaction and reflection on an individual’s cultural identity and how one feels about themselves. Likely this is actually a bidirectional association in which the way an individual understands their cultural identity may also influence how that individual reacts to an experience of discrimination. Study 3 explores the association between bicultural identity, imagined discrimination, and resulting mood.

Chapter 8
Study 3

Study 3 was designed to investigate the nature of the associations between cultural identity style, discrimination, and well-being. Participants imagined one of two scenarios: a situation in which discrimination was likely to have occurred to them, or a situation in which discrimination was not likely to have occurred to them. Psychological well-being in the form of
positive and negative mood was measured in response to the imagined scenario. The last study of the thesis examined the following questions. Given that ethnic discrimination is a rejection of one’s perceived background culture and attempted exclusion of the individual from the majority culture, do individuals who have experienced discrimination based on their race or ethnicity, as literature suggests, show lower levels of well-being? How is ethnic identity related to well-being? How is ethnic identity associated with the relation between experienced discrimination and well-being? Among bicultural individuals who have experienced discrimination, do blended and alternating biculturals show differing levels of well-being? Finally, among bicultural individuals who have experienced discrimination, do alternators and blended biculturals differ in how they make meaning of these experiences (i.e. differences in positive or negative mood, or approach or avoidance thoughts in reaction to the episode), or how pervasive they feel discrimination is?

Hypotheses. It was expected that the majority of the sample in study 3 would be bicultural, and that a significant percentage of the sample would feel they were alternating or blended biculturals. As prior research discussed earlier has shown the negative effects of discrimination on well-being, participants who imagined experiences of discrimination were predicted to show lower levels of positive mood and higher levels of negative mood compared to participants who imagined experiences of the success of another member of one’s ethnic group. Also as prior research discussed earlier has indicated that participants with differing levels of ethnic identity may be more or less affected by discrimination, significant differences in positive and negative mood were predicted between participants with differing MEIM scores in the discrimination condition.
In line with findings from earlier studies of the thesis, alternating and blended biculturals were not expected to report differences in whether they had or had not experienced ethnic discrimination. They were however predicted to show differences in how they cognitively reacted to or made meaning of these experiences based on results from study 1 of the thesis. In study 3, alternators were predicted to show stronger reactions than blended biculturals in the form of higher levels of positive and negative mood after being exposed to the discrimination manipulation. Predictions for higher levels of positive and negative mood were made based on findings from study 1 that suggested that alternators reacted more, in both the positive and negative directions, than blended biculturals, to reported experiences of discrimination. Blended biculturals were found to be more likely to report experienced discrimination not having any effect, while alternating biculturals reported both negative thoughts such as feeling hurt or angry, and positive thoughts such as feeling proud of their ethnic group. Though blended and alternating bicultural participants were not found to have described differentially reacting to their experiences of discrimination in their written task in study 2, the intriguing effects from interview responses of study 1 suggested pursuing these hypotheses further using yet another methodological, in this case experimental, approach. Alternators were also predicted to have more approach thoughts towards their ethnic group than blended biculturals after being exposed to the discrimination manipulation, as studies 1 and 2 of the thesis suggested that alternators, when compared with blended biculturals, might be more ethnically identified, and prior research has suggested that greater feelings of ethnic threat lead to greater group identification or approach among individuals with higher levels of ethnic identity.

Analyses were conducted to observe whether alternating and blended individuals differed overall or between experimental conditions in their levels of avoidance thoughts toward their
groups, and their ratings of the likelihood of themselves and members of their ethnic group to be targets of ethnic discrimination. The Personal-Group-Discrepancy (PGD) phenomenon, in which minority members have a tendency to affirm that their group is a target of prejudice but deny that prejudice affects them personally, was also examined. Operario and Fiske reported that highly identified minorities reported increased vulnerability to discrimination and less PGD, whereas less identified minorities conformed more to the PGD phenomenon (i.e. felt less vulnerable personally to the effects of discrimination). Therefore, participants with higher ethnic identity scores were expected to show higher levels of PGD. Since alternating biculturals were found to score higher on ethnic identity measures in study 1 and 2 of the thesis, they were expected be more likely to feel personally vulnerable to discrimination and therefore show less PGD.

Ethnicity and Canadian birth status were not found to predict differences in bicultural style in previous studies of the thesis, hence these variables were not included in analytical models of the thesis up to this point. Ethnicity and Canadian birth status were expected to be independent of bicultural style in study 3 as well.

8.1 Method

Participants

One hundred and seventy participants from the introductory psychology course at the University of Toronto’s Scarborough campus were administered a series of questionnaires and received partial course credit for their participation. The sample was two thirds female (N = 114)/one third male (N = 56) and ranged in age from 17 to 26 years of age (91% of the sample was between 17 & 20 years of age). Almost all participants were either in their 1st (74%) or 2nd
(19%) year of university, and were unmarried (99%). Most had received their high school education in Canada (89%). The ethnic distribution of the sample included individuals of varying ethnic backgrounds; 35% of the sample were of East Asian origin (32% Chinese, 3% Korean), 33% were of South Asian origin (5% Bengali, 11% East Indian, 5% Pakistani, 15% Sri Lankan), and 32% were of mixed (4 participants had parents that had different ethnic origins) or other origins (see Tables 7 & 8 for ethnic breakdown of the sample by parents’ ethnicity; participants were categorized as having a particular origin if both of their parents were of that same origin). While many of the individuals in the sample were born outside of Canada (61%), almost all had mothers (95%) and fathers (96%) that were born outside of Canada.

Procedure

The main goals of study 3 of the thesis were to establish a negative association between imagined discrimination and well-being, as well as to identify whether blended and alternating biculturals differentially respond to imagined scenarios of discrimination or success of another member of one’s ethnic group over oneself. The experimental nature of study 3 allows for a deep level of investigation into associations between imagined discrimination and mood ratings. Since random assignment was used to separate participants into the discrimination and non-discrimination conditions, differences in criterion variables are likely attributed to the experimental manipulation. As mentioned earlier, blended biculturals in study 1 of the thesis were more likely to report less intense/prolonged experiences of discrimination when compared with alternators. To rule out the nature of the experience of discrimination as a determining variable in study 3, an imagined scenario paradigm was used such that all participants were reacting to the same imagined experience of discrimination.
In order to investigate the hypothesized associations, participants were divided into two experimental conditions. The first condition was the “ethnic discrimination condition”; in this condition the participant was asked to read and imagine themselves in a scenario depicting ethnic discrimination in the context of interviewing for a job - a white employer hires a white candidate that is less experienced and less qualified for the position over the participant. The second condition was the “success of ethnic other condition”; in this condition the participant was asked to read and imagine themselves in a scenario depicting a situation in which the white employer hires a more experienced and qualified candidate who is a member of the participant’s ethnic group. Both conditions consisted of exposure to scenarios in which the participant is not awarded a job following what they perceive to be a good interview. The key features of these conditions include imagining failing to get a job due to ethnic discrimination in the ethnic discrimination condition, and imagining failing to get a job due to a more qualified similarly ethnic other in the non discrimination condition. The rationale for these conditions was to provide a scenario in which one could logically attribute one’s failure to discrimination in the first condition but couldn’t logically attribute one’s failure to discrimination in the second condition.

Before receiving the experimental manipulation, participants were asked to fill out a variety of measures (see Materials section). The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and the Center for Epidemiology Studies Depression Scale were questionnaires that assessed the well-being of the participant at the outset of the study. These scales were administered in order to note any pre-experimental differences in global measures of psychological well-being by condition, or bicultural style. These two measures were counterbalanced to avoid order effects. Participants were then asked to fill out the Cultural Identity Paragraph Task, and Phinney’s Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure in order to provide a picture of their cultural and ethnic identity.
Following this the experimental manipulation was applied, with half of the participants randomly assigned to the ethnic discrimination condition and the other half randomly assigned to the success of ethnic other condition. After reading the scenario, participants were asked to take 5 minutes to reflect on the scenario and their feelings in response to the scenario. Participants were then asked to rate items on a Mood Rating Scale consisting of positive emotions (happy, relaxed, thoughtful/reflective, and encouraged) and negative emotions (angry, disappointed, sad, and anxious) on a likert scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely), based on how the imagined scenario made them feel. Participants were subsequently asked to take a few minutes to write down any thoughts or feelings that came to mind concerning the scenario they had read. Following this, participants completed a thought checklist that asked them to check off any thoughts listed that had occurred to them during the imagined scenario task. Participants then completed a series of likert scale items asking them to rate the prevalence of ethnic discrimination towards themselves and their ethnic group on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). Participants were then asked to circle yes or no in response to whether they had ever experienced ethnic discrimination, and if yes to describe in written format their experience(s). Lastly, participants were asked to fill out demographic measures.

All of the items described above were presented in a questionnaire package in the order delineated above and participants were instructed to make sure that all forms were completed in order. Participants were verbally instructed to refrain from flipping forward or backward through the package at all times. Following completion of the questionnaire package, participants were debriefed and thanked for participating.

Materials
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965) – This is a ten item Likert scale with items answered on a 4-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, showing good internal consistency (α = .88). Sample items include “At times I am no good at all” and “I take a positive attitude towards myself”.

Center for Epidemiology Studies Depression Scale (CES-D; NIMH, 1977) – This is a 20 item scale with items checked off according to 4 categories of occurrence during the past week: rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day), some or a little of the time (1 to 2 days), occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3 to 4 days), and most or all of the time (5 to 7 days). This scale showed good internal consistency (α = .86). Sample items include “I felt depressed” and “I felt hopeful about the future”.

Cultural Identity Style Paragraph Task – This task was developed to categorize participant cultural identity styles for the purposes of this thesis and was also administered in studies 1 and 2. Please see earlier sections of the thesis for a detailed description of the measure.

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) – This is the same scale that was administered in studies 1 and 2 to assess level of ethnic identity in terms of ethnic identity search and affirmation. This scale showed good internal consistency (α = .86). See earlier sections for a detailed description of the measure.

Job Interview Vignette – Two vignettes were developed for the purposes of this study’s experimental manipulation. Participants in the test condition read vignette A, while participants in the control condition read vignette B. Both vignettes concern themselves with a scenario in which the participant has a job interview with a White employer. Vignette A represents a situation that may be taken to contain ethnic discrimination, due to the participant failing to get
the job despite being more qualified and experienced. Instead the White employer has hired a less qualified, less experienced White other. Vignette B represents a situation that may not logically be taken to contain ethnic discrimination, due to the participant failing to get the job as a result of being less qualified and less experienced. Instead the White employer has hired a more qualified, more experienced similarly ethnic other (see Appendix D for the full vignettes).

*Mood Rating Scale* – This task was developed for the purposes of assessing positive and negative mood reactions to the experimental manipulation in this study. Participants were asked to rate how they felt after the vignette task according to 8 likert scale items answered on a 5-point scale from not at all to extremely, see Appendix E. This scale was designed to capture immediate state changes in well-being, represented by positive and negative mood scores, which result directly from the imagined scenario, and shows sufficient internal consistency (\(\alpha = .75\)). The positive mood subscale initially included the Happy, Relaxed, Thoughtful/Reflective, and Encouraged item scores. The Cronbach alpha of this subscale indicated insufficient reliability (\(\alpha = .60\)) and upon closer inspection of the inter-item and item-total correlations, it was apparent that the Thoughtful/Reflective item was not contributing to the scale. Conceptually, a thoughtful or reflective mood does not necessarily imply or follow from a positive or upbeat mood, therefore it seemed appropriate to discard this item score from the subscale. The revised positive mood subscale included the Happy, Relaxed, and Encouraged items scores, and indicated increased but marginal reliability (\(\alpha = .65\)). Discarding the Encouraged item score would have raised the alpha to .72, but conceptually, the feeling of being encouraged fits with positive mood, therefore this item score was retained in the subscale. Lower scores on this subscale represent lower levels of positive mood, whereas higher scores represent higher levels of positive mood. The negative mood subscale included the Angry, Disappointed, Sad, and Anxious item scores, and indicated
adequate reliability ($\alpha = .78$). Lower scores on this subscale represent lower levels of negative mood, whereas higher scores represent higher levels of negative mood.

**Thought Checklist** – This task was developed for the purposes of identifying cognitive reactions to the experimental manipulation in this study. Participants were asked to take a few minutes to write down any thoughts or feelings that came to mind regarding the scenario that they had just imagined after reading their vignette. Participants were then asked to check off the thoughts that occurred to them on the thought checklist (see Appendix F). Thoughts on the checklist were categorized as either approach (1, 4, 5, 8, 9) or avoidance thoughts (2, 3, 6, 7, 10) towards one’s ethnic group. Approach and avoidance subscale scores were represented by the number of respective thoughts checked off from each domain. The approach subscale included the following items: I am more ethnic than other members of my group, I feel more close to my ethnic group, I am proud to be a member of my ethnic group, ethnicity is an important part of who I am, and this experience makes me want to stand up for my ethnic group. Lower scores on this subscale represent a lower likelihood of having approach thoughts towards one’s ethnic group, whereas higher scores on this subscale represent a higher likelihood of having these thoughts. The avoidance subscale included the following items: I am less ethnic than other members of my group, I feel less close to my ethnic group, I am not proud to be a member of my ethnic group, ethnicity is not an important part of who I am, and this experience makes me want to distance myself from my ethnic group. Lower scores on this subscale represent a lower likelihood of having avoidance thoughts toward one’s ethnic group, whereas higher scores represent a higher likelihood of having these thoughts.

**Prevalence of Discrimination Scale** – This task was developed for the purposes of assessing the level to which participants see themselves and their ethnic group as a target of ethnic
Participants were asked to answer 11 questions concerning the likelihood of their imagined vignette, and the prevalence of discrimination for themselves personally as well as their group. Questions were answered on a 5-point likert scale (see Appendix G). The scale Cronbach alpha indicated good reliability (α = .87). The individual as target subscale included the following items: How often do you think discrimination occurs to you? To what extent are you personally a target of discrimination because of your race or ethnicity? In the past, to what extent have you personally been a target of discrimination because of your race or ethnicity? And in the future, how much do you think you will personally be a target of discrimination because of your race or ethnicity? The Cronbach alpha for this subscale indicated good reliability (α = .82). Lower scores on this subscale represent a lower likelihood of seeing oneself as a common target of discrimination, whereas higher scores represent a higher likelihood of having this attitude. The group as target subscale included the following items: How often do you think discrimination occurs to members of your ethnic group? To what extent is your racial or ethnic group a target of discrimination? In the past, to what extent has your racial or ethnic group been a target of discrimination? In the future, how much do you think your racial or ethnic group will be a target of discrimination? The Cronbach alpha for this subscale also indicated good reliability (α = .84). Lower scores on this subscale represent a lower likelihood of seeing one’s ethnic group as a common target for discrimination, whereas higher scores represent a higher likelihood of having this attitude. A principal components analysis with varimax rotation extracted a 2 factor solution corresponding to the 2 subscales.

Participants were also asked to indicate and describe whether they had ever experienced discrimination as a result of their race or ethnicity, and filled out demographic information. Upon completion of the study, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.
8.1.1 Independent/Predictor Variables

*Experimental Condition.* As stated earlier, participants were randomly assigned to either the “ethnic discrimination condition” in which they imagined themselves in a scenario depicting ethnic discrimination in the context of interviewing for a job, or the “success of ethnic other condition” in which they imagined themselves in a scenario depicting another member of their ethnic group having success over them in the context of interviewing for a job.

*Cultural Identity Style.* As described earlier, participants selected a paragraph in the cultural identity style paragraph task that best corresponded to how they understand their cultural identity style. Participants were asked to choose from 5 paragraphs corresponding to the Assimilating, Blended Bicultural, Alternating Bicultural, Separating, and Marginalizing cultural identity styles. Seventy-five percent of participants chose one of the bicultural styles. As data from participants who chose the alternating or blended bicultural styles are most relevant to this thesis, data from these participants will be discussed in detail.

*Experienced Discrimination.* As mentioned earlier, prior to completion of the study participants were asked to indicate whether they had ever experienced discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity. Participants were asked to circle either yes or no.

*Ethnicity.* As the majority of the sample was from the Asian continent, participant ethnicity was grouped into one of three categories: “East Asian”, “South Asian”, or “Other”; see Table 8. The East Asian category included participants from Chinese, Japanese, or Korean backgrounds. The South Asian category included participants from Bengali, East Indian, Pakistani, or Sri Lankan backgrounds. The Other category included all other participants in the sample.
Canadian Birth Status. As mentioned earlier, participants were asked whether they had been born in Canada, as part of the demographic information collected. Participants indicated yes or no in response.

8.1.2 Dependent/Criterion Variables

Positive Mood. As mentioned earlier, participant positive mood scores were obtained by summing their responses on a 5-point likert scale to items regarding their levels of happy, relaxed, and encouraged feelings in response to their imagined scenario task.

Negative Mood. Also as mentioned earlier, participant negative mood scores were obtained by summing their responses on a 5-point likert scale to items regarding their levels of angry, disappointed, sad, and anxious feelings in response to their imagined scenario task.

Approach Thoughts. As mentioned earlier, the level of approach towards one’s ethnic group in response to the imagined scenario task was indicated by the number of approach thoughts checked off on the approach items of the thought checklist.

Avoidance Thoughts. Also as mentioned earlier, the level of avoidance towards one’s ethnic group in response to the imagined scenario task was indicated by the number of avoidance thoughts checked off on the avoidance items of the thought checklist.

Self as Target. As mentioned earlier, the extent to which participants felt they personally were a target of ethnic discrimination was assessed by summing their responses on a 5-point likert scale to items regarding feeling like a target in the past, present and future.

Group as Target. Also as mentioned earlier, the extent to which participants felt their ethnic group was a target of ethnic discrimination was assessed by summing their responses on a
5-point likert scale to items regarding the extent to which participants felt their ethnic group to be a target in the past, present and future.

*Personal Group Discrepancy Scores.* PGD scores were calculated by subtracting participants’ ratings of prevalence of discrimination against themselves personally from their ratings of prevalence of discrimination against the group.

### 8.2 Results

Results from the cultural identity style paragraph task indicated that, as in studies 1 and 2, and consistent with predictions, the majority of the participants in the sample were bicultural. See Table 9 for a breakdown of participants by cultural identity style. No significant differences in self-esteem and depressive symptoms were found between participants across bicultural styles, experimental conditions, or ethnicities. Though pre-manipulation mood measures were not assessed, disallowing the measurement of mood change in each participant, related constructs of self-esteem and depressive symptoms are relevant. Since there were no differences in global measures of psychological well-being, differences in state measures of well being (positive and negative mood) between groups or conditions were more confidently associated with the experimental manipulation. Contrary to expectations based on earlier findings of the thesis, differences in Canadian born status were found between bicultural styles. Chi square analyses for bicultural style x Canadian birth status indicated that alternating biculturals (30% born in Canada, 70% born outside of Canada) were less likely to be born in Canada than were blended biculturals (56% born in Canada, 44% born outside Canada), $\chi^2(1) = 8.63, p = .003$. Also contrary to predictions based on earlier findings of the thesis, ethnic differences were found between bicultural styles, $\chi^2(2) = 9.93, p = .007$; East and South Asian participants were more
likely to identify themselves as alternating biculturals whereas other (i.e. non-Chinese/Korean/Bengali/East Indian/Pakistani; see Table 7) participants were more likely to identify themselves as blended biculturals. See Table 10 for a breakdown of bicultural styles according to broad-level ethnicity. As a result of these findings, ethnicity and Canadian birth status were included in subsequent analytical models. No significant differences were found for chi square analyses of ethnicity x Canadian born status or bicultural style x gender. Differences between responses by blended and alternating biculturals to the experimental manipulation were explored.

Quantitative Findings

Cultural Identity and Well-Being Pre-Manipulation. As discussed earlier, some researchers have found a positive relation between ethnic identity and well-being (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Lee, 2003; Mossakowski, 2003; Phinney & Chavira, 1992; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Umana-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007; Verkuyten & Brug, 2002). In line with this literature, higher levels of ethnic identity indicated by higher scores on the MEIM were found to be correlated with higher levels of self-esteem \((r = .31, \ p < .01)\) and lower levels of depressive symptoms \((r = -.23, \ p < .01)\). Like in Romero and Roberts’ 2003 study, the component parts of ethnic identity – ethnic exploration and affirmation – and their association with well-being were analyzed. Both ethnic identity search and affirmation scores were positively correlated with self-esteem \((r = .24, \ p < .01; \ r = .31, \ p < .01)\) and negatively correlated with depressive symptoms \((r = -.21, \ p < .01; r = -.21, \ p < .01)\) respectively. These findings suggest that participants who actively investigate their ethnic heritage and take pride in their ethnicity feel better about themselves and are less likely to show symptoms of depression. A set of 2 (alternating versus blended bicultural style) X 3 (recoded ethnicity) X 2 (Canadian birth status) ANOVAs conducted
on self esteem and depression scores across conditions for participants who reported having experienced discrimination indicated no significant differences.

**Positive and Negative Mood.** Correlational analyses were employed to look at the relation between participant ethnic identity scores on the MEIM and positive and negative mood scores after imagining the discrimination scenario. Contrary to predictions, no significant relation was found between level of ethnic identity and reaction to imagined discrimination for participants in the bicultural subsample, or all participants in the sample as a whole. Interestingly, there were significant correlations between MEIM and mood scores for participants in the control condition who were asked to imagine themselves in a scenario where a more qualified candidate from their ethnic group received a job that the participant was being interviewed for. Those participants in the control condition who had higher average overall MEIM scores and higher ethnic identity search scores respectively, tended to have higher positive mood scores ($r = .23, p < .05; r = .30, p < .01$) after imagining their scenario.

A set of 2 (alternating versus blended bicultural identity style) X 2 (discrimination versus success of ethnic other experimental condition) X 3 (recoded ethnicity) ANOVAs were conducted on positive and negative mood scores. Canadian birth status and ethnicity were not included together in models due to the decrease in power the additional variable would cause. Subsequent analyses that removed ethnicity and included Canadian birth status will be discussed. A significant main effect for experimental condition on positive mood was found, $F(1,116) = 13.74, p < .001$; as expected, participants in the discrimination condition ($M = 5.02, SD = .30$) showed lower levels of positive mood than participants in the success of ethnic other condition ($M = 6.69, SD = .33$). No other main or interaction effects for positive mood were found to be significant. A significant main effect for experimental condition was also found for negative
mood, $F(1,116) = 5.85, p = .017$; as expected, participants in the discrimination condition ($M = 12.40, SD = .46$) showed higher levels of negative mood than participants in the success of ethnic other condition ($M = 10.76, SD = .50$). A significant 3-way interaction was also found for negative mood, $F(1,116) = 3.53, p = .032$, see Figure 2; East Asian and Other participants did not show significant differences between conditions or between participants with different bicultural styles. However, South Asian participants showed both of these differences; South Asian alternators showed higher levels of negative mood in the discrimination condition ($M = 14.80, SD = 1.10$) than in the success of ethnic other condition ($M = 8.96, SD = .72$), $F(1,31) = 27.07, p < .001$. South Asian alternators in the discrimination condition also showed higher levels of negative mood than South Asian blended biculturals ($M = 11.43, SD = 1.31$) in the discrimination condition, $F(1,15) = 7.21, p = .017$, but South Asian alternators ($M = 8.96, SD = .72$) showed lower levels of negative mood than South Asian blended biculturals ($M = 13.13, SD = 1.23$) in the success of ethnic other condition, $F(1,29) = 9.91, p = .004$. This suggests that differences for South Asian alternators and blended biculturals between conditions are not simply due to stable differences between the two groups on chronic mood, but rather that these two groups react differently to discrimination and to the success of an ethnic other.

A set of 2 (alternating versus blended bicultural identity style) X 2 (discrimination versus success of ethnic other experimental condition) X 2 (Canadian birth status) ANOVAs were conducted on positive and negative mood scores. As with the previous analyses, there was a significant main effect for condition on positive mood score, $F(1,128) = 9.29, p = .003$. No other effects were observed for positive mood. Also, as with the previous analyses, there was a significant effect for condition on negative mood score, $F(1,128) = 8.95, p = .003$. These associations showed the same patterns as in previous models. However, the three-way interaction
was not significant, but a significant bicultural style x condition interaction occurred, $F(1,128) = 7.02, p = .009$. Pairwise comparisons indicated that alternators felt more negative mood in the discrimination condition ($M = 13.92, SD = 3.50$) than in the success of ethnic other condition ($M = 12.90, SD = 3.86$), $F(1,73) = 19.00, p < .001$. Blended biculturals did not show this difference, see Figure 3vi.

**Approach and Avoidance Thoughts.** Correlational analyses were employed to look at the relation between participant ethnic identity scores on the MEIM and levels of approach and avoidance thoughts after imagining the discrimination scenario. Total scores as well as ethnic identity search and affirmation subscale scores of the MEIM were positively correlated with levels of approach thoughts, and total scores as well as ethnic identity affirmation subscale scores of the MEIM were negatively correlated with levels of avoidance thoughts for participants in the imagined discrimination condition, see Table 11.

A set of 2 (bicultural style) X 2 (condition) X 3 (ethnicity) ANOVAs were conducted on approach and avoidance composite thought measures. A significant bicultural style X condition interaction was found for approach thoughts, $F(1,116) = 4.98, p < .05$; As predicted, alternating biculturals in the discrimination condition ($M = 2.65, SD = .27$) showed significantly higher levels of approach thoughts towards their ethnic group when compared with alternators in the success of ethnic other group ($M = 1.70, SD = .25$), $F(1,72) = 7.50, p < .01$. However, blended biculturals show no significant difference in approach thoughts between conditions, see Figure 4. Blended biculturals ($M = 2.67, SD = .33$) showed significantly higher levels of approach thoughts toward their ethnic group compared to alternators in the success of ethnic other condition, $F(1,60) = 3.89, p = .05$. No other significant main or interaction effects were found for approach thoughts. A significant ethnicity X condition interaction effect was found for avoidance
thoughts, $F(2,116) = 6.09, p < .01$; South Asian participants actually had higher levels of avoidance thoughts in the discrimination condition compared to the success of ethnic other condition, whereas East Asian and Other participants did not show significant differences in composite measures of avoidance thoughts between conditions, see Table 12 and Figure 5. A set of 2 (bicultural style) X 2 (condition) X 2 (Canadian birth status) ANOVAs were conducted on approach and avoidance composite thought measures. No significant results were found.

**Self and Group as a Target of Discrimination.** Correlational analyses were employed to look at the association between participant ethnic identity scores on the MEIM and prevalence ratings of one’s self as well as one’s group as targets of ethnic discrimination. No significant associations were found. A set of 2 (bicultural style) X 2 (condition) X 3 (ethnicity) ANOVAs were conducted on prevalence rating composite scores for the group and the individual as a target of ethnic discrimination. No significant main or interaction effects were found for ratings of the self as a target for ethnic discrimination. However, a significant main effect for experimental condition was found on ratings of the group as a target of discrimination, $F(1,116) = 5.80, p < .05$; participants in the discrimination condition ($M = 3.34, SD = .12$) rated their group as more of a target than did participants in the success of ethnic other condition ($M = 2.92, SD = .13$). No other main or interaction effects were found for ratings of the group as a target for ethnic discrimination. A set of 2 (bicultural style) X 2 (condition) X 2 (Canadian birth status) ANOVAs were conducted on prevalence rating composite scores for the group and the individual as a target of ethnic discrimination. The previously described pattern of findings occurred.

These results interestingly suggest that the experimental manipulation changed participants’ views concerning the prevalence of discrimination against their group. Even the
mere exposure of imagining a scenario of discrimination based on a group variable may alter one’s anchors for the prevalence of this discrimination in the real world. It is easy to see from these findings how actually experiencing ethnic discrimination relates to assumptions of prevalence of discrimination towards one’s ethnic group. Furthering this assertion, a one-way ANOVA indicated that bicultural participants who had experienced discrimination ($M = 3.37$, $SD = .90$) showed higher ratings on the prevalence of discrimination against their ethnic group when compared with participants who had not experienced discrimination ($M = 2.93$, $SD = .89$), $F(1,126) = 7.64$, $p < .01$. A one-way ANOVA also indicated that participants who had experienced discrimination ($M = 2.78$, $SD = .92$) showed higher ratings on the prevalence of discrimination against themselves personally when compared with participants who had not experienced discrimination ($M = 2.10$, $SD = .83$), $F(1,126) = 19.04$, $p < .001$.

As discussed earlier, researchers have found a negative association between perceptions of group discrimination and well-being (Banks & Kohn-Wood, 2007; Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006; Mossakowski, 2003; Noh, Beiser, Kaspar, Hou, & Rummens, 1999; Sellers et al., 2006; Umana-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007). While seeing one’s self personally as a target of discrimination in general ($r_{SE} = -.18$, $p < .05$; $r_{D} = .15$, $p < .05$), in the past ($r_{SE} = -.21$, $p < .01$; $r_{D} = .23$, $p < .01$), or in the future ($r_{SE} = -.21$, $p < .01$; $r_{D} = .19$, $p < .05$) was found to be negatively correlated with self-esteem and positively correlated with depression, no significant associations were found between perceiving one’s group to be a target of discrimination in general, to have been a target in the past, or to be a target in the future, and levels of well-being.

**Personal-Group Discrepancy.** This sample was found to show PGD; participants tended to rate a lower prevalence of ethnic discrimination against one’s self and a higher prevalence of
ethnic discrimination against one’s ethnic group, $t(169) = 13.45, p < .001$. Further corroborating this pattern, participants also tended to rate a lower likelihood of personally being a target of discrimination and higher likelihood of their ethnic group being a target of discrimination in general, $t(169) = 9.87, p < .001$, in the past, $t(169) = 15.93, p < .001$, and in the future, $t(169) = 4.26, p < .001$.

A 2 (bicultural style) X 2 (condition) X 3 (ethnicity) ANOVA was conducted for PGD scores regarding the extent to which participants felt their group was more of a target of discrimination than themselves personally. No significant main or interaction effects were found. A 2 (bicultural style) X 2 (condition) X 2 (Canadian birth status) ANOVA conducted for PGD scores similarly showed no significant effects. Correlational analyses were employed to test the relation between average Ethnic Identity and subscale scores of the MEIM, and PGD scores. Contrary to predictions based on previous findings in the literature, no significant correlation between level of ethnic identity and PGD was found for participants in the bicultural subsample or for participants in the sample as a whole.

**Qualitative Findings**

Loglinear analyses were conducted to analyze associations between the predictor variables (bicultural style, ethnicity, Canadian birth status, experimental condition, and whether or not the individual had experienced discrimination in their lives) and the criterion variables (coded themes from participants’ written descriptions of their cultural identity. Themes identified by the author regarding written reactions to the imagined scenario manipulation did not achieve adequate inter-rater reliability, and will not be discussed further). See Appendix H for inter-rater reliabilities across themes.
Since participants were asked to describe their cultural identity in written form before the experimental manipulation, 2 (bicultural style) x 3 (ethnicity) x 2 (whether or not participant had experienced discrimination) and 2 (bicultural style) x 2 (Canadian birth status) x 2 (experienced discrimination) loglinear analyses were conducted for all themes in the cultural identity description written task. Low cell frequencies in the resulting contingency tables indicated there was not enough power to perform these analyses. Therefore 2 (bicultural style) x 3 (ethnicity) loglinear analyses were conducted for the themes of the cultural identity written task to investigate whether participants with a particular bicultural style and/or from a particular ethnic background were more likely to mention certain themes when describing their cultural identity. Resulting contingency tables indicated there was sufficient power to conduct analyses on the following themes: ancestral background, birthplace, family, and language. Significant effects were found for themes of ancestral background. Also, 2 (bicultural style) x 2 (Canadian birth status) loglinear analyses were conducted for the themes of the cultural identity written task. Resulting contingency tables indicated there was sufficient power to conduct analyses on the following themes: religion, ancestral background, birthplace, family, language, food/clothes, and ethnic activities. Significant effects were found for themes of ancestral background and family.

**Bicultural Style x Ethnicity Loglinear Analyses.** The 3-way loglinear analysis for mention of ancestral background produced a final model that retained the BiCI Style x Ethnicity and BiCI Style x Ancestral Background interactions. The likelihood ratio of this model was $\chi^2(4) = 4.13$, $p = .39$. The BiCI Style x Ancestral Background interaction was significant, $\chi^2(1) = 5.29$, $p = .022$. The predicted odds of mentioning ancestral background were 2.31 times greater for blended than for alternating biculturals, see figure 6.
**Bicultural Style x Canadian Birth Status Loglinear analyses.** The 3-way loglinear analysis for mention of ancestral background produced a final model that retained the BiCI Style x Birth Status and BiCI Style x Ancestral Background interactions. The likelihood ratio of this model was $\chi^2(2) = .566, p = .76$. As evident in the previous set of loglinear analyses, the association between bicultural style and mentioning ancestral background was significant.

The 3-way loglinear analysis for mentioning family produced a final model that retained the BiCI Style x Birth Status and Birth Status x Family interactions. The likelihood ratio of this model was $\chi^2(2) = 1.34, p = .51$. The Birth Status x Family interaction was significant, $\chi^2(1) = 9.27, p = .002$. The predicted odds of mentioning family were 1.93 times greater for participants born in Canada than for those born outside of Canada, see figure 7.

While loglinear analyses enable the researcher to investigate complex associations among more than two categorical variables, the lack of power resulted in an inability to investigate the association between predictor variables and some of the expressed themes. Therefore, chi-square analyses were conducted to look at singular effects between each predictor variable and the coded themes.

**Bicultural Identity Style.** Crosstabulations were conducted for bicultural identity style on many variables related to the participants’ descriptions of their cultural identity in their own written words. Blended biculturals, as predicted and shown earlier in loglinear analyses, were more likely than alternators to mention their ancestral background in their description of the cultural identity. There were no significant differences between bicultural style for the following identified themes, however these themes were common among both blended and alternating
bicultural participants: religion, family, language, food/clothes, ethnic activities, or attempting to learn about one’s ancestral culture.

Crosstabulations were also conducted for bicultural identity style on variables related to participants’ written descriptions of personal experiences of discrimination. In agreement with predictions based on earlier studies of the thesis, no significant difference between bicultural styles was found for the likelihood to have reported experiencing ethnic discrimination. However, differences between bicultural style in the environments in which discrimination took place were reported, $\chi^2(3) = 9.21, p < .027$. Alternators were more likely than blended biculturals to have experienced discrimination in school and from friends whereas blended biculturals were more likely than alternators to have experienced discrimination from strangers, see Table 13.

**Ethnicity.** Crosstabulations were conducted for ethnicity on many variables related to the participants’ descriptions of their cultural identity in their own written words. East Asians were least likely to mention religion, $\chi^2(2) = 6.33, p = .042$, and least likely to mention food or clothes, $\chi^2(2) = 7.35, p = .025$; whereas South Asians were most likely to mention religion and food or clothes in their descriptions of their own cultural identities, see Table 14.

**Canadian Birth Status.** Crosstabulations were conducted to explore significant differences between participants who had been born in and outside Canada, in common themes arising on the cultural identity written task. Participants who were born in Canada, as shown earlier in loglinear analyses, were more likely than participants born outside of Canada to mention family in their written task, $\chi^2(1) = 9.27, p = .002$. Among participants who discussed family, 56% were born in Canada, compared with 29% born outside of Canada. No other significant differences were found.
Experienced Discrimination. Crosstabulations were conducted to explore significant differences, between participants who had and had not experienced real ethnic discrimination in their lives, in common themes arising on the cultural identity written task. No significant differences were found.

Chapter 9
Discussion

9.1 How do People Understand their Bicultural Identity?

The majority of participants in all three studies of the thesis saw themselves as bicultural. Both ancestral and Canadian cultures were important and salient in their cultural identity, though these elements were mixed and drawn upon in different ways. Biculturals differed in how they described important elements of culture. Some described characteristics attached to relatives in their ancestral country, as compared to characteristics seen by the participants as more Canadian (e.g. conservative vs. progressive, traditional vs. modern, family-oriented vs. independent, etc.) and discussed how these values have influenced their identity. Others described concrete expressions of culture like movies, television shows, songs, or the types of restaurants they frequented to explain the importance attached to each culture. Still others employed more abstract arguments, explaining the effect of both ancestral as well as Canadian environmental forces that have shaped their identity. Biculturals understand culture and its impact on one’s identity in a multitude of different ways.

When asked to describe their cultural identity in the written task, certain common themes arose in these descriptions from all three studies of the thesis. Biculturals often mentioned where they had been born, or their ancestral background. They mentioned the religion they practiced,
the languages they spoke, the food they ate, the clothes they wore, or the traditions and festivals they participated in. They mentioned the degree to which they were involved in each culture, the cultural activities in which they participated, and at times indicated a preference for one culture over the other. Many biculturals also mentioned the importance of family in their written descriptions of cultural identity. Family was referred to in reference to the common desire of many parents to ensure that their children were aware of their ancestral roots. Many biculturals recognized this as important to their parents, and therefore information about their ancestral culture and an ancestral cultural sense of self, passed down from their parents, had become an important part of their identity. Many biculturals also discussed the importance of passing this ancestral cultural identity on to future generations.

Likert item ratings concerning importance of ancestral and Canadian culture in study 2 of the thesis indicated that biculturals feel both cultures are important. Interestingly, biculturals, on average, find their ancestral culture to be more important than Canadian culture. Perhaps this is because Canadian culture is present and available quite readily to participants, while ancestral culture is available from far fewer sources; ancestral culture can be thought of as the limiting reagent in one’s bicultural identity solution. This special aspect of one’s self may feel threatened more than the Canadian aspect of one’s self that is common and available to all citizens of the host country. Ancestral culture then is protected and held closer to the self, and therefore is regarded as more important. Also, it is likely that many biculturals in this study, being first or one and a half generation immigrants, have received a great proportion of their sense of self from their parents and their direct experiences with ancestral culture (i.e. being born and having lived in the ancestral country). As future generations settle in Canada, and perhaps become further removed from their ancestral country, the differing importance placed on ancestral and Canadian
cultures might be expected to fade. However, if threat to the unique minority cultural aspect of self promotes a greater grip on or movement toward that identity, it is possible that future generations may actually place even more importance on their ancestral culture compared to Canadian culture. Longitudinal studies employing both qualitative and quantitative methods to assess important themes in cultural identity and changes to the importance placed on these themes over time, would provide a window into understanding cultural identity processes and their contributing factors.

Biculturals selected 1 of 2 paragraphs, describing the blended and alternating styles, to represent their bicultural identity. Both styles were chosen by a large proportion of the sample in all three studies of the thesis. Ratings of how well the participant’s chosen paragraph described themselves were high (on average above 4 on a 5-point scale) across all 3 studies of the thesis. These results indicate that the majority of young adult biculturals feel that descriptions of alternating between two cultural selves or being a mix or blend of both cultures capture how they understand their bicultural identity.

9.2 How do Biculturals React when their Identity is Attacked?

In line with previously discussed research, participants, in study 3 of the thesis, who had higher levels of ethnic identity (measured by MEIM scores), were likely to have higher levels of self-esteem and lower levels of depressive symptoms. Further to Romero and Roberts’ (2003) study, ethnic identity search scores and affirmation scores were found to be positively correlated with self-esteem scores and negatively correlated with depressive symptom scores. This suggests that people who actively investigate their ancestral heritage and take pride in their ethnicity, feel better about themselves, and show fewer symptoms of depression.
What happens when those constructions of self are attacked or devalued? Results from study 3 of the thesis showed that imagining an experience of ethnic discrimination immediately impacted psychological well-being. Participants in the discrimination condition had significantly lower levels of positive mood, and significantly higher levels of negative mood, than participants in the success of ethnic other condition, after imagining their scenario. Results from study 3 of the thesis also indicated that perceiving one’s self to be a target of discrimination was significantly negatively correlated with self-esteem and significantly positively correlated with depressive symptoms. In line with previously discussed research, these findings suggest that discrimination is a psychosocial stressor that has a direct negative impact on one’s psychological well-being.

It is important to note that experiencing discrimination relates to a perception of a greater prevalence of discrimination in one’s surroundings. Participants in the discrimination condition of study 3 rated their group as more of a target of discrimination than participants in the other condition had. These results suggest that merely imagining a scenario of discrimination based on a group variable can perhaps change or sponsor the reporting of increased prevalence of ethnic discrimination. It is easy to predict from these findings that actually experiencing discrimination leads to assumptions of increased prevalence of discrimination against one’s group. This was supported with findings from study 3 that indicated participants who had reported having experienced discrimination showed higher ratings of prevalence for discrimination, when compared with participants who had reported not having experienced discrimination, against both their group and themselves.

Interestingly, participants in study 3 of the thesis showed the personal-group discrepancy, i.e. participants tended to rate the prevalence of ethnic discrimination against one’s self lower
than the prevalence of ethnic discrimination against one’s group. Participants also tended to rate a lower likelihood of personally being a target of discrimination and higher likelihood of their ethnic group being a target of discrimination in general, in the past, and in the future. Though perceiving one’s self to be a target of discrimination was correlated with self-esteem and depressive symptoms, perceiving one’s group to be a target of discrimination was not correlated with self-esteem or depressive symptoms. These results might have suggested some support for McCoy and Major’s (2003) suggestion that maintaining low group identification would act as a self-protective strategy to distance the self from the threat of discrimination. However, McCoy and Major would predict that participants with high group identification would show less PGD and feel the effects of discrimination more, whereas participants with low group identification would show more PGD and show fewer effects of discrimination on well-being. These predictions were not supported in study 3 of the thesis. While MEIM scores were positively correlated with approach thoughts and negatively correlated with avoidance scores for participants in the discrimination condition, PGD scores were uncorrelated with MEIM scores, and MEIM scores were not associated with positive or negative mood scores for participants in the discrimination condition.

There were, however, significant correlations between MEIM and mood scores for participants in the success of ethnic other condition who were asked to imagine themselves in a scenario where a more qualified candidate from their ethnic group received a job that the participant was being interviewed for. Participants in the success of ethnic other condition who had higher MEIM scores and higher ethnic identity search subscale scores, tended to have higher positive mood scores after imagining their scenario. It would seem that while it is disappointing to be rejected for a job, participants who feel a strong sense of ethnic identity and have searched
for that identity may also feel positive about a member from their ethnic group succeeding. This effect may occur as a result of a heightened sense of camaraderie or affiliation with members of one’s ethnic group among participants with high levels of ethnic identity, or perhaps this successful member of one’s ethnic group serves as an image of a successful future self. Perhaps the mere assurance that a similarly ethnic person got the job was enough to make highly ethnically identified individuals feel positive. Though a pre-manipulation measure of mood was not taken, and therefore it is not really possible to conclude increases in positive mood actually occurred, these potential effects are intriguing and warrant further investigation in future research.

Though MEIM scores were not associated with mood scores in the discrimination condition, blended and alternating bicultural styles showed differential results for negative mood after imagining an experience of discrimination (see next section for a more detailed discussion). This suggests that more than simply looking at ethnic identity, the way in which biculturals understand and balance both ancestral and Canadian aspects of identity affects well-being in reaction to discrimination.

As previously discussed results suggest, experiencing discrimination can have detrimental effects on psychological well-being. This is further illustrated in the reoccurring themes through all 3 studies of the thesis that colored participants’ descriptions of their reactions to experienced discrimination. Many participants mentioned negative emotions, or feelings of wanting to distance one’s self from the group. However there were biculturals who expressed positive or redemptive themes in response to these experiences. Some common positive themes included expressing positive emotions, and expressing that these experiences cause appreciation
for or pride in one’s ancestral group. As earlier participant descriptions illustrate, experiences of discrimination can result in a strengthening of the bond that is under threat.

9.3 The Usefulness of the Blended/Alternating Bicultural Distinction

Many participants chose the blended or alternating bicultural paragraph descriptions to represent their cultural identity. Since this was a forced choice task, participants were also asked to rate how well they felt their chosen paragraph described themselves on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (perfectly). Across all three studies of the thesis, ratings remained high (mean > 4). Participants identified with these descriptions of either feeling like one’s identity is a cohesive mix or blend of the two cultures, or feeling like one switches between two different and separate cultural selves. While results from study 1 of the thesis indicated that the blended/alternating bicultural distinction did not hold predictive merit for differences in environmental surroundings or preference for ethnically similar social interactions, results across all 3 studies of the thesis suggest that the blended/alternating bicultural distinction is a valid one for illustrating how participants understand and represent their bicultural identity.

Results from studies 1 and 2 of the thesis suggest empirical support for Phinney and Devich-Navarro’s (1997) suggestion that the ancestral component of their identity is more salient for alternating biculturals. Alternating biculturals were found to score higher, than blended biculturals, on the ethnic identity search scale of the MEIM in study 1 and the heritage culture subscale of the VIA in study 2. Alternating biculturals also placed greater importance on their ancestral culture in study 2 than blended biculturals did. And while both Canadian culture and ancestral culture were regarded as important by all biculturals, the discrepancy between importance ratings for ancestral and Canadian culture was greater for alternating than blended
bicultrals. Results from studies 1 and 3 of the thesis suggested that alternating bicultrals are also likely to have spent longer outside of Canada than blended bicultrals, and results from study 3 of the thesis suggest that alternating bicultrals are more likely than blended bicultrals to have been born outside of Canada. While these findings were not consistent across all 3 studies, taken together they suggest that alternating bicultrals may have spent and experienced comparatively more of their life in their ancestral country than blended bicultrals. Alternating bicultrals therefore may be more likely to have been intimately engaged with their ethnic culture, contributing to the development of a strong sense of ethnic self. Participation in the search for increased knowledge and connection to their roots may be reassuring as they negotiate their newer host culture and develop a bicultural identity. Perhaps alternators are more likely to switch between two cultural selves because the importance placed on their ancestral culture, and the effort put into maintaining that culture in one’s life, enhances a sense of ethnic self that is strong enough to be unique and stand alone. Individuals who have grown up in their ancestral culture develop a cultural identity that is unaware of ties to Canada. Once they are living and continuing the development of their identity in Canadian society, they develop those ties, but may not always be able to reconcile their developing Canadian identity with their previously established ethnic identity. Perhaps this ethnic self is resistant to being blended into a homogeneously mixed identity. For blended bicultrals however, the development of one’s ethnic and Canadian identity is more likely to occur over the same period of time, and this may favor a greater ability to mix and form a cohesively blended cultural identity.

Perhaps the most interesting difference that blended and alternating bicultrals exhibit lies in their reaction to discrimination; results from studies 1 and 3 of the thesis indicate the usefulness of the blended/alternating bicultural distinction in this domain. Though blended and
alternating biculturals were equally likely to report having experienced racial or ethnic discrimination, blended biculturals showed significantly less reaction to these experiences when compared with alternating biculturals. Experimental results from study 3 of the thesis indicated that alternating biculturals showed more negative mood in the discrimination condition than in the success of ethnic other condition; blended biculturals did not show this difference. Alternating biculturals also showed more approach thoughts toward their group in the discrimination condition than in the success of ethnic other condition; blended biculturals did not show this difference either, but rather had high levels of approach thoughts in both conditions.

As discussed earlier, prior research has shown a connection between attributions to discrimination and higher minority group identification (e.g. Chavira & Phinney, 1991; Dion & Earn, 1975). Increases in thoughts regarding approaching one’s group as a reaction to imagining an episode of ethnic discrimination are therefore expected. While alternators in the discrimination condition showed higher levels of approach thoughts than alternators in the non-discrimination condition, blended biculturals did not. Blended biculturals actually showed higher levels of approach thoughts than alternators in the success of ethnic other condition. It is possible that blended biculturals show high levels of approach thoughts in threat conditions (like alternators), and show even higher levels of approach thoughts in particular conditions where members of their ethnic group are succeeding. It is important to note that only two imagined scenarios have been tested here – a discrimination situation and a situation that is not neutral, but rather is a situation in which a member of one’s group succeeds. Perhaps blended biculturals are more likely to associate themselves with their group in order to receive the benefits of approaching a successful similar other. In order to evaluate this possibility, reactions of blended and alternating biculturals should be examined in a variety of situations in which discrimination,
personal success and failure, and success and failure of a member of one’s ethnic group are manipulated.

But why do alternating and blended biculturals show differences in how their psychological well-being is affected after imagining experiencing discrimination? Why do blended biculturals seem more resistant to the negative effects of discrimination? Perhaps when mixed, an attack on one aspect of cultural identity is absorbed by the other, i.e. the host component of self acts almost as a buffer to maintain well-being in blended biculturals. However, when separate, the ethnic aspect of self is left vulnerable to attack, i.e. discrimination may cause a negative effect on well-being in alternators. An alternate explanation includes the idea that blended biculturals create an identity that, while incorporating components from both cultures, evolves to become a new identity. This identity is more than a mixture of parts, rather it becomes something thought of separately from each cultural conceptualization. When their ethnic culture is devalued or attacked in an episode of discrimination, blended biculturals feel removed, and protected from blows to their well-being, because they feel it less personally than alternators. For blendeds, conceptualization of their identity has not been attacked, rather it is conceptualization of the value of their cultural background that has come under fire. However, for alternators who understand their bicultural identity as the compartmentalization of two different cultural selves, one of these selves is coming under direct attack, and therefore results in an immediate negative impact on psychological well-being. Empirical tests of these different hypotheses are warranted.

In summary, the blended/alternating bicultural distinction is useful in understanding how biculturals represent their cultural identity, as well as understanding how biculturals react to
experiences of discrimination. It is important, however, to be aware of ethnic differences in these associations. Results from study 3 of the thesis suggest that East and South Asian participants were more likely to represent themselves as alternating biculturals, while all other participants were more likely to represent themselves as blended biculturals. Ethnicity was not associated with Canadian birth status, so it is not simply a matter of having been born or having spent more time in Canada. One explanation for these discrepant ethnic findings centers around the degree of difference between ancestral and Canadian cultures. For East and South Asians, that difference is quite large, and occurs across many domains (e.g. behavioral practices, values, etc.). This may make blending ancestral and Canadian cultures into a cohesive mix quite difficult. The difference between cultures may necessitate acquiring two separate cultural scripts to employ in reference to the cultural situation, thus diminishing any conflict felt between attempting to engage both cultural ways of being simultaneously.

While East and South Asians differ from other participants in how they balance both cultural representations, East and South Asians differ from each other in response to discrimination. For East Asian and other (non South Asian) participants, no differences occurred in mood in reaction to the imagined scenario by condition or bicultural style. However, South Asian participants showed both of these differences. South Asian alternating biculturals in the discrimination condition showed significantly more negative mood than South Asian alternating biculturals in the success of ethnic other condition. For South Asians in the discrimination condition, alternating biculturals showed more negative mood than blended biculturals; and for South Asians in the success of ethnic other condition, alternating biculturals showed less negative mood than blended biculturals. Similarly, no differences were found for East Asian or other (non South Asian) participants in approach or avoidance thoughts in response to the
imagined scenario. Interestingly and unexpectedly, South Asians showed more avoidance thoughts in the discrimination condition than in the success of ethnic other condition. Post-hoc explanations of these findings may hinge on many characteristic differences between ethnic groups. Perhaps South Asian participants are more stigma-weary and therefore are more likely to avoid their group when members are stigmatized. It is possible that South Asian participants are more sensitive to the negative effects of ethnic discrimination. Recent Tamil immigrants, for example, may have faced a series of consequences stemming from ethnic discrimination in the context of civil war tensions in their ancestral country of Sri Lanka. Perhaps the salient and negative cognitions of the consequences of discrimination, and the knowledge that banding together as Tamils in the Sri Lankan political context led to increased danger, suggest that these individuals cope by distancing themselves from rather than approaching the target group. Many of the groups included under the broader South Asian category are ones which face political or civil strife in their ancestral countries. They also perceive greater discrimination across more domains than many other visible minority groups in Toronto (Dion & Kawakami, 1996). South Asians were less likely to avoid the group when the group was associated with success.

It is important to note that South Asian and East Asian participants show a different pattern of results. Often Asian participants are grouped together in single broad research categories, but the previously discussed results suggest that these two broad groups – South and East Asians - are reacting very differently to the imagined situations, reinforcing the danger of grouping ethnic categories of people together merely due to geography. It is clear that East and South Asians may be more different comparatively than they are with participants from backgrounds that are geographically much farther away, in some of the ways they conceptualize cultural identity, as well as react to particular types of situations.
Chapter 10
Conclusion

10.1 Contributions

This thesis demonstrates the power discrimination can exact on its targets, but also demonstrates that this negative effect is differentially associated with bicultural identity. The studies of this thesis have examined the relationship between bicultural identity, discrimination, and psychological well-being in a way that, to the best of this author’s knowledge, no one else has done to date. Very little work in the field (see Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997 and Smith, Stewart & Winter, 2004 for exceptions) had focused on investigating how participants endorsed blended ways of being bicultural, i.e. feeling that one has a cohesive identity made up of elements from both cultures, or alternating ways of being bicultural, i.e. feeling that one has an identity that switches between two cultural frames. This thesis fleshed out the relevance of these theoretical constructs to individuals’ understanding of their bicultural identity, and was the first to show and propose explanations for why blended and alternating bicultural identities are differentially related to reactions to discrimination. Though many studies had focused on ethnic identity, this thesis emphasized the importance of examining the holistic picture of cultural identity that allows for recognition of the complicated and intertwined nature of contributing elements of ancestral and host culture to one’s bicultural identity. In doing so, this thesis has demonstrated the importance of applying this holistic picture of cultural identity to its relation with variables such as discrimination and psychological well-being.

This thesis has also uncovered themes that were commonly employed by participants when describing their cultural identity, and has further added empirical support to the literature for positive associations between ethnic identity and psychological well-being. Importantly, this
thesis demonstrates the danger of grouping ethnic categories such as East and South Asian together. Observed differences for East and South Asians’ reactions to imagined experiences of discrimination, point to the necessity to avoid false universalistic claims about the nature of associations between identity and other variables. The particular ancestral background of the individual is important to recognize, and plays a large part in governing how the individual is able to form a bicultural identity, and how the resulting identity is related to variables such as reactions to discrimination.

The studies of this thesis included a number of bicultural individuals from a variety of different backgrounds, and used multiple methodological approaches (interviews, questionnaires, and experimental approaches) to assess associations between key variables. It is this author’s sincere hope that this thesis marks the start of many more studies on the nature and correlates of a rich and detailed understanding of bicultural identity.

10.2 Limitations

The studies of this thesis have employed mixed methods as well as qualitative and quantitative analyses to investigate bicultural identity, discrimination, and well-being. The ability to focus on different aspects of each construct and converge on associations from different angles can be invaluable. However, some of the qualitative analyses were restricted by inadequate power to fully investigate potential effects or undertake analyses examining the concerted effect of multiple predictor variables. The interview method used in study 1 provided rich, in-depth information from each participant, but the small sample size limited the ability to draw conclusions or conduct complex analyses. Research that employs qualitative methods (specifically interviews) across larger samples will be of great benefit in the future.
While qualitative research can provide rich data, interpretation of that data can be subjective. The author identified many themes that arose in participant descriptions of their cultural identity or reactions to their tasks. However, some of these themes did not achieve adequate inter-rater reliability and therefore were not discussed. The unstructured nature of the interview portion of study 1 allowed the interviewer to pursue topics that were more important to the participant, but may have been more open to subjective interpretations of themes by multiple coders. These limitations highlight the value of having mixed method designs. Future studies may employ other types of qualitative analysis such as discourse analysis that allows the investigator to delve into the interview material and suggest themes that he or she identifies in a detailed way, while acknowledging the researcher’s perspective and potential bias. Rich, qualitative investigation may better be able to uncover what factors contribute to differential associations between bicultural style and reaction to discrimination. Themes identified by the author that approached but did not achieve inter-rater reliability such as mentioning negative emotion (kappa = .52), feelings of helplessness (kappa = .65), and feelings of pessimism toward society or the inevitability of discrimination (kappa = .57), in response to the imagined scenario of discrimination, are proposed for further investigation in the future.

Studies 1 and 2 of the thesis were largely correlational in nature. Study 3 employed an experimental task to allow a direct comparison between the discrimination and non-discrimination conditions for mood and thought scores. Integrated methods studies that use both in-depth interview methods and controlled experimental methods provide an ability to understand what one is investigating while also allowing a greater degree of confidence in interpretations of events. Though comparison between groups is effective, observing baseline measures of mood before the manipulation would have allowed for the observation of changes
within each participant in response to the manipulation. Since random assignment was not possible for a variable such as bicultural identity style, the differences between alternating and blended biculturals may be attributed to chronic differences in mood rather than differences in reaction to the discrimination vignette. Alternating and blended biculturals were not found to differ on pre-manipulation measures of self-esteem and depressive symptoms, however these constructs, while related, are not identical to pre-manipulation measures of mood.

Imagined discrimination tasks in study 3 were used for obvious ethical reasons. However, an imagined task cannot hold as much realism as an actual experience, and cannot ensure that participants are actually exposed to the manipulation to the preferred degree. The researcher is not able to control the details of the imagined scenario that unfold in the participant’s mind, or even be sure that the participant is imagining what they are asked to imagine. Despite these potential problems, there is support for this method (McCoy & Major, 2003; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002) from studies that have used imagined or reading tasks and obtained a predicted pattern of findings. Results indicate that the imagined scenario task was also effective in study 3.

Participants in the studies of this thesis were a very privileged and educated sample of young ethnic adults living in one of the most diverse and multicultural cities in the world. While globalization and increased immigration patterns may point to an increasingly multicultural world, the generalizability of these results to, for example, a young South Asian in a small town in Alberta, or perhaps the American South, who works a blue collar job, may be far from realistic. The environmental impact and cultural experiences that this individual encounters greatly differ from those encountered by the participants in the studies of this thesis. Also, participants were ethnically distributed mainly from East and South Asia and therefore results of
this thesis may not generalize widely to other ethnic groups, as each group has a particular history and a number of cultural factors that inform their way of understanding their cultural identity and reacting to discrimination. A more in-depth examination of bicultural identity among the members of each particular ethnic group may better inform a broader understanding of the complexities of negotiating cultural identity and the distinct and unique challenges that face individuals from particular groups.

10.3 Future Directions

Results from the thesis illustrate the immediate negative relation between imagined discrimination and mood, and indicate that alternators can have more negative mood than blended biculturals after imagining discrimination. Alternators also show more approach thoughts toward their group than blended biculturals do after experiencing ethnic threat. What was not examined in this thesis however, was the potential change in mood or well-being in biculturals after being given a substantial amount of time to process and reflect on the scenario and make meaning of it. Might we predict differences for alternators and blended biculturals? Findings from interviews with participants in study 1 of the thesis suggest that alternators are more likely to reflect on their experiences of discrimination and articulate redemptive themes like becoming more aware or prouder of one’s background as a later response to an episode of discrimination. Future research would benefit from being able to test these associations at different time intervals after the discrimination manipulation. Perhaps the initial elevated negative mood finding for alternators would recede in response to reflection after the episode of discrimination had occurred. It would be interesting to see if these predicted patterns occur for alternators and blended biculturals.
The associations between the nature of experiences of discrimination and cultural identity styles should continue to be explored. Directionality of these associations should also be explored. While cultural identity is investigated here in the context of impacting the effect of ethnic or racial discrimination on well-being, it is quite plausible that discrimination can impact and help form cultural identity. One may logically argue that an individual will psychologically react to attacks upon his or her cultural identity. There is literature suggesting that discrimination leads to greater identification with one’s group (e.g. Dion, 1975; Dion & Phan, 2009). Results from study 3 of the thesis indicated that this occurred for alternating biculturals. Research that tests the causal effects of discrimination on cultural identity representations is warranted.

Specific factors contributing to the experience of discrimination should also be examined. For instance, the occurrence of discrimination in the current host culture, or by an individual who appears to be a prototypical representative of the host culture, may have more impact on the ability to coherently mix host and ancestral culture to form one’s cultural identity than if discrimination had occurred in another country, or if the perpetrator was also a member of a visible minority group. As discussed earlier in the thesis, findings from study 3 indicated that alternators were more likely to experience discrimination in school and from friends, whereas blended biculturals were more likely to have experienced discrimination from strangers. While the negative effects of outbursts from strangers may be easier to write-off, discrimination from valued perpetrators like friends, or in respected institutions like school, may have deeper consequences for the ability to form an ethnic identity that can blend identities from multiple cultures. As well, discrimination can occur from members of the host culture who identify the ethnic nature of the target, but discrimination can also occur from one’s own group members who judge the target to either be too ethnic (and pressure one to be more Canadian) or too
“white” (and pressure one to be more ethnic). The complex associations between the nature and direction of experienced discrimination and culture identity style, as well as the effects of perpetrator and environmental variables on these associations require examination.

It is also important to contextualize experiences of discrimination and identity by looking at how these variables intersect with factors such as gender and socioeconomic status (Mahalingam, 2008). As mentioned earlier in the thesis, the self is not an isolated entity. Rather, a reflection of one’s self derives from the effects of many contextual variables interacting with each other. In order to achieve a holistic picture of identity, these intersections must be attended to and incorporated into ways of thinking about and investigating identity. For example, it is likely that first generation parents from certain ethnic groups are likely to socialize and monitor their daughters and sons differently with respect to expectations of cultural attachment and culturally normative behavior (Dion, 2006; Dion & Dion, 2004). These intersections between family, gender, and ethnic socialization produce interactions that likely influence the construction and reflection of cultural identity.

Finally, future work that contrasts bicultural identity style with other cultural identity styles may be beneficial to further understanding the adaptive elements of biculturalism. We may predict that assimilators may suffer much greater negative effects of discrimination than biculturals across well-being outcome domains since discrimination for assimilators may signal a rejection by the very culture that is most central to their own identity. Furthermore, the association between cultural identity style and experienced discrimination on a host of outcome variables such as other markers of psychological well-being, how prevalent one sees discrimination in society, and general attitudes toward discrimination and opportunities for visible minorities in society at large require further exploration.
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Table 1. Frequency and percentage of participants by parental ethnic background in study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Father's side</th>
<th>Mother's side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Percentage of participants who chose each cultural identity style paragraph to represent his or her cultural identity in study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Identity Style</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Integration</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating Integration</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Percentage of all biculturals, alternating biculturals, and blended biculturals, who mentioned each theme in the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>% of Biculturals mentioning theme</th>
<th>% of Alternators mentioning theme</th>
<th>% of Blendeds mentioning theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between ancestral and host countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relationship/Not sure</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationship</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for associating with people from same group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some preference</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear preference</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some diversity</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of neighbors of different backgrounds</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily interaction at school with diverse ethnicities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily interaction at work with diverse ethnicities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported effect of experiences of discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*** No effect</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected in some way</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001
Table 4. Percentage of participants who chose each cultural identity style paragraph to represent his or her cultural identity in study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Identity Style</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Integration</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating Integration</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Percentage of all biculturals, alternating biculturals, and blended biculturals who mentioned each theme in the written task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>% of Biculturals mentioning theme</th>
<th>% of Alternators mentioning theme</th>
<th>% of Blendeds mentioning theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Identity Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Migration to Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job opportunities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrasting cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in food/language/clothes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Ancestral Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members/passing on culture</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to identity</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Canadian Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Discrimination (% of participants among those who reported having experienced discrimination)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for/pride in ethnic group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distancing from ethnic group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting in with mainstream Canadian culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Table 6. Percentage of participants who have and have not experienced discrimination, expressing each theme in the written task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>% of participants who have experienced discrimination</th>
<th>% of participant who have not experienced discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Immigrating to Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Educational Opportunities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Aspects of Ancestral Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Family and passing culture on</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Immigrating to Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Educational Opportunities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Aspects of Ancestral Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Family and passing culture on</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01
Table 7. Frequency and percentage of participants by parental ethnic background in study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Father's side</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mother's side</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Frequency and percentage of participants by recoded ethnic background groups in study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Percentage of participants who chose each cultural identity style paragraph to represent his or her cultural identity in study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Identity Style</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Biculturalism</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating Biculturalism</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Frequency of blended and alternating biculturals by recoded ethnic background groups in study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Blended Biculturals (N)</th>
<th>Alternating Biculturals (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Correlations between MEIM scores and approach and avoidance scores for participants in the discrimination condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Total MEIM score</th>
<th>Average Subscale Ethnic Id Search score</th>
<th>Average Subscale Affirmation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Approach Thought Score</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Avoidance Thought Score</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01
Table 12. Descriptive statistics for the ethnicity x experimental condition interaction effect on composite avoidance thought scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success of Ethnic Other</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success of Ethnic Other</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success of Ethnic Other</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Percentage of alternating and blended biculturals who mentioned each theme in their written descriptions of experienced discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% of Alternators</th>
<th>% of Blendeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Descriptions of Experiences of Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From friends</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From strangers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Table 14. Percentage of East Asians, South Asians, and Others who mentioned each theme in their written descriptions of cultural identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% East Asians</th>
<th>% South Asians</th>
<th>% Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Descriptions of Cultural Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Religion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Food/Clothes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Figure 1. Branscombe’s Rejection-Identification Model

- Willingness to make attributions to prejudice
- Hostility toward the dominant group
- Psychological well-being
- Minority group identification

+ indicates positive relationship
- indicates negative relationship
Figure 2. Bicultural style x experimental condition x ethnicity interaction for negative mood.
Figure 3. Bicultural style x experimental condition interaction effect for negative mood.
Figure 4. Bicultural style x experimental condition interaction effect for approach thoughts.

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001
Figure 5. Experimental condition x ethnicity interaction effect for avoidance thoughts

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Figure 6. Percentages of participants who mentioned their ancestral background by bicultural style.
Figure 7. Percentages of participants who mentioned family by Canadian birth status
Appendices

Appendix A

Cultural Identity Paragraph Selection Task

The following questions concern experiences relating to cultural identity. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions that you will be asked. We’re interested in your personal views and feelings. Remember that you will be identified only by a participant number to ensure your privacy and anonymity.

PART A

Which of the following paragraphs best describes you? Please read through all of the following paragraphs before making your selection. Circle your choice.

1) I feel like I’m much more Canadian than a member of my ancestral culture. I identify more with Canadian culture and am more comfortable in Canadian settings. My sense of self is Canadian.

2) I feel like I am a member of both Canadian culture as well as my ancestral culture. I have a sense of self that is a mix or blend of both cultures and am comfortable in both Canadian and ethnic settings. I am the same person wherever I go.

3) I feel like I am a member of both Canadian culture as well as my ancestral culture. However, I often feel like I switch between two different selves – the Canadian self in Canadian settings like school or work, and the ethnic self in cultural settings like home or at cultural events.
4) I do not feel like a member of Canadian culture. I feel much more comfortable and identify more with my ancestral culture. My sense of self is ethnic.

5) I do not feel like a member of either Canadian culture or of my ancestral culture. I don’t identify with either. I am just me – neither Canadian nor anything else.

PART B

How well does your chosen paragraph describe you?

Not at all .......................... Perfectly

1 .............. 2 .................. 3 ............... 4 .................... 5

Please use the space below to describe your cultural identity in your own words.
Appendix B

Cultural Identity Interview Script

Today I’d like to ask you about your experiences relating to cultural identity. I will ask you several questions that relate to this topic. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions that I’ll be asking you. We’re interested in your personal views and feelings. Remember that you will be identified only by a participant number to ensure your privacy and anonymity.

Now I’ll be turning on the tape recorder. Your name will not be used on the tape; only your participant number. (Put tape on RECORD mode). You are participant number ___. I’d like you to tell me the date today so we can check the volume levels. (Participant should state the date). (Rewind tape and play to be sure the number and date are audible. Then place the tape in record mode and begin the interview. Keep track of the tape periodically to be sure the tape doesn’t run out during the interview).

• Okay, let’s begin. Please tell me a little about yourself (asked at the outset of the study)
  o Is there anything else you would like to add? (asked with rising inflection)

1. If I asked you what your cultural identity was, what would you say?
   a) Where were your parents born?
   b) Where were you born?

2. At what age did you come to this country?

3. How many years have you been here?

4. Why did you or your family immigrate to this country?
5. When you say you’re X, what does being X mean to you?
   a) What are the most important aspects of being X to you?

OR, if the participants is X-Canadian, THEN

When you say you’re X-Canadian, what does being X-Canadian mean to you?
   a) Do you find that there are X aspects of your identity that are important? Like what?
   b) Do you find that there are Canadian aspects of your identity that are important? Like what?

6. What characteristics do you think an X person is more likely to have? What characteristics do you think a Canadian person is more likely to have?

7. Do you see your ancestral culture and the Canadian culture as similar?
   a) To what extent?
   b) In what ways (if at all) do you see the two cultures as compatible or similar? In what ways are they not compatible with each other?

8. How would you describe the relationship between Canada and your ancestral country? Do you see any tension between the two countries?

9. How important is your ancestral culture to you?

10. How important is Canadian culture to you?

11. I’d like to talk now about friendships. What would you say is the cultural makeup of your close group of friends?
   a) Do you prefer to associate with people from the same ancestral culture as you? Why or why not?

12. What do you think of dating? (If they do not believe in dating skip this Q)
a) Would you date a person of a different ethnicity?

13. Would you marry a person of a different ethnicity?

14. Do you live in a very diverse neighborhood?
   a) What would you say is the cultural makeup of your neighborhood? Does it consist of one group? Many groups? Which groups?

15. Do you interact with a diverse range of ethnic people
   a) at school on a daily basis?
   b) at work on a daily basis?

16. Have you experienced discrimination or prejudice as a result of your race or ethnicity?
   a) Tell me about some experiences.
   b) What effect did these experiences have on you?

Are there any other things you’d like to talk about that we haven’t raised?

Thank you very much for your participation.
Appendix C

Study 2 Open-Ended Written Response Questions and Likert Type Items

PART C

6. At what age did you come to this country?

7. How many years have you been here?

8. Why did you and/or your family immigrate to this country? Please describe.

9. a. Do you see your ancestral culture and the Canadian culture as similar? Please describe.
b. Please rate how similar you feel the two cultures are. Please circle your choice.

Not at all similar
1................2................3...............4..........................5

10. a. How important is your ancestral culture to you? Please describe.

b. Please rate how important your ancestral culture is to you. Please circle your choice.

Not at all important
1................2................3...............4..........................5

11. a. How important is Canadian culture to you? Please describe.
b. Please rate how important Canadian culture is to you. Please circle your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART D

1. Have you ever experienced discrimination or prejudice as a result of your race or ethnicity?

   Please circle your choice.

   Yes                                      No

If yes, please describe.
How did this/these experience(s) affect you?

2. How prevalent do you feel discrimination in Canadian society is for members of your ancestral culture? Please circle your response.

Not at all prevalent
1. ………………2. ………………3. ………………4. ………………5

Extremely prevalent

3. Please rate the extent to which you feel that members of your ancestral culture are discriminated against in Canadian society in comparison to other cultural minority groups. Please circle your response.

Much less than other groups
1. ………………2. ………………3. ………………4. ………………5

The same as other groups
Appendix D

Study 3 Vignettes

Vignette A

You have applied for a job and have already made it past the telephone interview successfully. You are now scheduled for a face-to-face interview with your potential employer. You enter the waiting room and see another candidate seated, also waiting for an interview. The candidate is White. You have a conversation with the candidate and learn that this candidate has much less experience and is less qualified than you are for the position. You are called in for the interview by the employer who is White. You feel the interview goes well, but later find out that you did not get the job. You also find out that the candidate that you had been speaking with in the waiting room got the job.

Vignette B

You have applied for a job and have already made it past the telephone interview successfully. You are now scheduled for a face-to-face interview with your potential employer. You enter the waiting room and see another candidate seated, also waiting for an interview. The candidate is a member of your ethnic group. You have a conversation with the candidate and learn that this candidate has much more experience and is more qualified than you are for the position. You are called in for the interview by the employer who is White. You feel the interview goes well, but later find out that you did not get the job. You also find out that the candidate that you had been speaking with in the waiting room got the job.
Appendix E

Mood Rating Scale

Please rate the following statements according to how you feel at this moment. Circle a number from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely) for each statement.

The imagined scenario made me feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful/Reflective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Thought Checklist

Please check off which of the following statements (if any) you thought about during the imagined scenario task.

___ I am more ethnic than other members of my ethnic group
___ I am less ethnic than other members of my ethnic group
___ I feel less close to my ethnic group
___ I feel more close to my ethnic group
___ I am proud to be a member of my ethnic group
___ I am not proud to be a member of my ethnic group
___ Ethnicity is not an important part of who I am
___ Ethnicity is an important part of who I am
___ This experience makes me want to stand up for my ethnic group
___ This experience makes me want to distance myself from my ethnic group
___ I feel weaker because of this experience
___ I feel stronger because of this experience
Appendix G

Study 3 Likert Type Items

1) To what extent can the outcome in the imagined scenario be attributed to racism or ethnic discrimination?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>Certainly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) How likely is this scenario to happen to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) How likely is this scenario to happen to any member of your ethnic group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) How often do you think discrimination occurs to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) How often do you think discrimination occurs to members of your ethnic group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) To what extent are you personally a target of discrimination because of your race or ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) In the past, to what extent have you personally been a target of discrimination because of your race or ethnicity?

Not at all..............................................Extremely
1 ..............................................5
2 ..............................................4
3 ..............................................3
4 ..............................................2
5

8) In the future, how much do you think you will personally be a target of discrimination because of your race or ethnicity?

Not at all..............................................Extremely
1 ..............................................5
2 ..............................................4
3 ..............................................3
4 ..............................................2
5

9) To what extent is your racial or ethnic group a target of discrimination?

Not at all..............................................Extremely
1 ..............................................5
2 ..............................................4
3 ..............................................3
4 ..............................................2
5

10) In the past, to what extent has your racial or ethnic group been a target of discrimination?

Not at all..............................................Extremely
1 ..............................................5
2 ..............................................4
3 ..............................................3
4 ..............................................2
5

11) In the future, how much do you think your racial or ethnic group will be a target of discrimination?

Not at all..............................................Extremely
1 ..............................................5
2 ..............................................4
3 ..............................................3
4 ..............................................2
5
Appendix H

Coding Categories and Inter-rater Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Cohen’s kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>Relationship between ancestral and host countries</td>
<td>Bad relationship, No relationship/Not sure, Good relationship</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preference for associating with people from the same group</td>
<td>No preference, Some preference, Clear preference</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of neighborhood</td>
<td>Homogeneous, Some diversity, At least 50% of neighbors are of different background</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect of experienced discrimination</td>
<td>No effect, Affected in some way</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All themes were generated inductively from participant responses. The number of participants who used each category was recorded. Inter-rater reliabilities were calculated based on coding one third of the sample. Study protocols were selected using a random number generator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Cohen’s kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td>Cultural identity written task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preference for a culture</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for migration</td>
<td>Job opportunities</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational opportunities</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrasting cultures</td>
<td>Differences in food/language/clothes</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of ancestral culture</td>
<td>Family members/passing on culture</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to identity</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Canadian culture</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced discrimination written task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appreciation for/pride in ethnic group .82
Distancing from group .67
Fitting in with mainstream culture .65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 3</th>
<th>Cultural identity written task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancestral background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birthplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food/clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic activities (e.g. movies/music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attempt to learn about ancestral culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All themes were generated inductively from participant responses. Multiple justifications were permitted. The number of participants who used each category was recorded. Inter-rater reliabilities were calculated based on coding one third of the sample. Study protocols were selected using a random number generator.

\[ \text{When the dichotomous Canadian birth status variable is added to the model, the main effect for bicultural style becomes statistically significant, } F(1, 32)=4.42, p=.045. \]

\[ \text{The author would like to thank Suga Srikanthan for coding the written task responses from study 1 and participant responses from study 2.} \]

\[ \text{The author would like to thank Nida Mustafa for coding subsets of participant responses from all three studies of the thesis.} \]

\[ \text{When the dichotomous Canadian birth status variable is added to the model, the main effect for bicultural style becomes statistically significant, } F(1, 119)=4.00, p=.045. \]

\[ \text{Though not found to be significantly different, among participants who identified themselves as alternating biculturals, 18\% were of East Asian origin, 37\% were of South Asian origin, and the remaining 46\% were of mixed or other origin. Among participants who identified themselves as blended biculturals, 19\% were of East Asian origin, 35\% were of South Asian origin, and the remaining 46\% were of mixed or other origin. Also, though not found to be significantly different, 32\% of alternating biculturals were born in Canada, while the remaining 68\% were born outside of the country. Thirty-six percent of blended biculturals were born in Canada, while the remaining 64\% were born outside of the country.} \]

\[ \text{In spite of decreased power, when Canadian birth status was added to the model such that a 2 (bicultural style) x 2 (condition) x 3 (coded ethnicity) x 2 (birth status) ANOVA was conducted on negative mood, the main effect for condition, bicultural style x condition interaction effect, and 3 way interaction for bicultural style x condition x ethnicity remained. All indicated the same patterns as previous models.} \]