The way Latinos develop their ethnic identities is remarkable for several reasons. First, Latinos must develop an identification and a sense of identity in the context of stigmatization and oppression. In an important way, their development is unlike that described by Piaget for nonminority populations. Piaget conceived of children going through a gradual process of decentering, in which they realize that they are not the center of the world (Inhelder & Piaget, 1958). Children become less egocentric as they realize their views are not more privileged than others’ views. In contrast, for Latinos and other minority groups, children’s decentering is accelerated. They learn that their group is not just one group among others—they also learn that their group is less privileged and is considered inferior relative to another group. Consequently, any naïve ethnocentrism necessarily dissipates for Latino children as awareness grows of their group’s stigmatized social status (see Quintana, 1994). Like Piaget’s, most long-standing theories of development did not consider the decentering process for children who belong to stigmatized groups.

Second, Latinos’ development of ethnic identity is fascinating because it reflects the sociocultural context of Latinos, which involves rich and diverse origins and complex sociological processes (also see Padilla, 2006). Latinos’ sociocultural contexts include diverse cultural, national, linguistic, and racial origins. Historically, one defining feature of Latinos, relative to other ethnic groups in the United States, is their mixed heritage. Having mixtures of European and indigenous heritages, as well as connections to Africa, creates a complex confluence of cultural, ethnic, and racial origins. Moreover, Latinos share features of other ethnic groups who are recent immigrants to the United States, such as Asian Americans; yet, they also share some aspects of a diaspora for racial minorities in the United States, such as African Americans and American Indians. Maintaining claims to some European heritage, Latinos are sometimes reluctant to consider themselves a racial minority. Nonetheless, from a sociological perspective, there are clear indicators that the social distance between them and Anglos is often equivalent to the social distance between African and White Americans. Given these cross-currents in Latinos’ sociocultural contexts, it is intriguing how Latinos make sense out of the sometimes quixotic, sometimes gritty realities that constitute the complex sociocultural contexts of Latinos. Children’s ability to make sense of the social status of Latinos and the children’s own connection to Latino people is further complicated by the tendency for parents to ethnically socialize their children in indirect...
ways. In short, Latinos, especially Latino children, develop ethnic identifications and identities under challenging circumstances.

**SOCIOLOGICAL, SOCIAL, AND DEVELOPMENTAL INFLUENCES OF ETHNIC IDENTITY**

To understand Latinos’ ethnic identity requires an appreciation of sociological, social psychological, and developmental processes. Sociologists have described acculturation and enculturation processes that involve, respectively, (a) the transformations and adaptations that occur when two or more cultural, ethnic, or racial groups come into contact with each other and (b) the maintenance of cultural traditions and heritage, either in reaction to cross-cultural contact or independently of cross-cultural contact (for review, see Padilla & Perez, 2003). Acculturation processes involve the adoption of new cultural patterns in reaction to contact with another cultural group. Often, the contact involves a cultural minority or immigrant group’s contact with a majority and/or host culture. Adaptation in response to this cultural contact can occur in both dominant and minority groups, but attention is usually focused on the acquisition of the host culture by the minority or immigrant cultural group. The indices of acculturation and enculturation processes include language usage, cultural practices (e.g., religious practices, cultural traditions), social connection to and distance from cultural groups (e.g., intermarriage, neighborhood segregation), and identification with cultural or ethnic labels. Markers of enculturation reflect the degree to which culture-of-origin practices, language, and identification are maintained or passed from one generation to another. It is worth noting that acculturation can come at the cost of enculturation practices, such as the loss of culture-of-origin language, but groups can and often do develop new cultural practices without displacing culture-of-origin practices. At a general level, stronger identification with Anglo cultural and ethnic groups is promoted through acculturation processes, usually in schools and through interactions with members of the dominant group. Conversely, identification with Latino culture is maintained through enculturation processes, usually promoted by parents and the larger Latino community. Importantly, contact between two cultural groups can result in the creation of novel cultural characteristics that do not necessarily reflect the traditions of either cultural group but result from attempts to cope with the cultural contact and conflict. Primary cultural characteristics are those patterns that reflect the culture of origin, whereas secondary cultural characteristics reflect those novel cultural characteristics that are secondary to, or occur in response to, the cultural contact (Ogbu, 1994). For example, the formation of gangs can be a secondary cultural characteristic in response to ethnic-group stigmatization, particularly when the group has not been allowed to assimilate to dominant group norms and where the group’s ties to its cultural of origin have loosened over several generations (ibid.).

Analogously, social psychological theories help us understand Latino ethnic identity. Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978) describes the psychological sequelae of identification with a social group. Even when the group membership is artificially manufactured, people have strong psychological responses to identifying with a social group (Tajfel & Turner, 1978). For example, individuals will often perceive more similarity with other members of their own social group than with members of other social groups. Characteristics of a social group, such as its standing in society, will influence the psychological sequelae of identifying with the group. When identifying with a stigmatized minority social group, individuals will adopt particular attitudes and orientations as ways of maintaining esteem in the face of stigmatization as a member of that group (Tajfel, 1978). Consequently, to understand Latino ethnic identity requires an appreciation of the psychological consequences of identifying with a stigmatized minority group. In short, Latino identity will reflect the sociological processes associated with acculturation and enculturation, as well as the psychological principles associated with social identity and other social psychological theories.

For children and youth, Latino identity develops from nascent ethnic self-labeling (Bernal, Knight, Garza, Ocampo, & Cota, 1990) into more mature forms of ethnic identity (Quintana, 1998). Consequently, there are developmental principles associated with the development of ethnic identity for Latino
children and adolescents. For example, Mexican American children's cognitive or social cognitive development was believed to influence the development of their ethnic identities (Bernal et al., 1990; Quintana, 1994). Current theory on adult development has not been applied to understanding Latino ethnic identity, although this would seem to be a promising area for future theory and research. To recap, Latino ethnic identity will be influenced by acculturation and enculturation processes, psychological principles associated with social identity theory, and for Latino children and adolescents, developmental theory associated with identity development.

**Essentialism and Generalizing Across Latino Subgroups**

Research reviewed in this chapter spans several Latino subgroups, including Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans, as well as recent immigrants from Latin America. These subgroups share many features, such as connections to the Spanish language and to cultural values, but there are important demographic differences across Latino subgroups. These differences are based on regions of origin (i.e., Caribbean and North, Central, and South America), reasons for and context of immigration (e.g., political asylum, financial motivations), and sociocultural histories in the United States. The considerable heterogeneity across and within Latino subpopulations undermines attempts to identify homogenous subgroups of Latinos (Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2001). Researchers of Latino populations identify demographic characteristics of their participants, typically including country of ancestral origin, social class, generation of immigration, and language characteristics, often implying that study results could be generalized to the subpopulation defined by these demographic characteristics. Unfortunately, because random sampling is rarely used, study results cannot be generalized based on these sample characteristics. On the other hand, study results may be applicable to some populations that were not sampled. For example, there are parallels in the effect of discrimination on youth across Black and Latino youth, and these parallels exist even though the two groups have different ethnic and racial heritages (see Quintana, 2007, for review). Consequently, it is difficult to know how widely or how narrowly results of a study can be generalized when even a conservative level of generalization based on sample demographics is not supported by statistical theory and, in other cases, more liberal generalizations of results to nonsampled populations may be justified. These dilemmas represent challenges to constructing a science of Latino psychology.

Quintana and colleagues (Quintana et al., 2000; Quintana, Troyano, & Taylor, 2001) proposed principles for cultural validity as well as heuristics for responding to these dilemmas. Generalization across demographically defined populations can be facilitated by understanding that demographic characteristics are associated with psychological processes. Quintana and colleagues’ position suggests that differences between two demographic groups (e.g., Mexican American and Puerto Rican) are due to the psychological differences associated with the demographic differences rather than to some essential differences between the populations. On the other hand, an essentialist approach to cultural differences presumes that members of a cultural group share a unique essence and that differences between groups should be attributed to the essential difference between the cultural groups. We reject the essentialist view and suggest that cultural groups are made up of complex combinations of psychological characteristics and that demographic differences are associated with different combinations of psychological characteristics rather than differences in essences. A Latino psychology, therefore, could be constructed based on an understanding of the interplay among psychological processes (i.e., psychological theory) and identification of the psychological characteristics associated with various demographic characteristics (Quintana et al., 2001). Hence, our assumptions are that, all things being equal, psychological principles can be generalized across demographic groups, and differences in psychological processes across demographic groups could be accounted for by an understanding of the psychological implications of the various demographic characteristics. To illustrate, Fuligni, Kiang, Wikow, and Baldegommar (2008) found no differences in academic achievement based on ethnic self-identification (e.g., Mexican vs. Mexican American vs. Hispanic), but there were differences in academic achievement based on adolescents’ psychological investment in the ethnic labels with
which they identified. In this example, any demographic differences between subgroups of Latinos based on ethnic label clearly were unimportant, but the psychological investment in the various labels was important in predicting achievement. Hence, the psychological principles associated with psychological investment could be generalized across demographic groups. Similarly, differences between Puerto Rican and Mexican American children, we believe, are due not to some differences in the essence of being Puerto Rican or Mexican American but to psychological characteristics associated with demographic differences between these groups.

Consequently, our approach to reviewing the literature and proposing theoretical principles associated with Latino ethnic identity is to identify broad theoretical principles that have been found to be associated with ethnic identity development. However, before these principles are applied to a specific Latino subgroup, we encourage the reader to consider how the demographic characteristics associated with the specific group might be associated with psychological characteristics that might interact in complex ways with the psychological principles described in this chapter.

To explain, the three broad influences of ethnic identity that we identified previously—sociological processes, social psychological processes associated with social identity theory, and developmental processes—seem to be generalizable across demographic contexts, but to understand how ethnic identity might form or develop in a specific sociocultural context requires an understanding of how the contextual features might influence these psychological processes.

### Dimensions of Ethnic Identification and Identity

We recognize that there are many different forms of identity throughout the life span, particularly for Latinos. Quintana (1998) argues that ethnic labels such as Latino, Hispanic, Spanish, and Mexican American, for example, have very different meanings depending on the age of the person being labeled. Some young children have no concept of what these terms mean but only a notion of being “brown skinned.” As children mature, they have more adult-like understandings, but these ethnic terms have different connotations depending on age (Quintana, 1994). Consequently, we depart somewhat from previous literature by using the term *ethnic identification*, not *ethnic identity*, to refer to the ethnic labels with which a person chooses to identify. We reserve *ethnic identity* to refer to the broader psychological processes associated with the psychological and social meaning invested in these ethnic identifications. Hence, despite both having the same ethnic identification (e.g., Mexican American), a 7-year-old will not have the same ethnic identity as a 17-year-old, because the 17-year-old will have the benefit of more complex maturational resources and a longer history of interethnic and intraethnic interactions. Quintana, Segura-Herrera, and Nelson (in press) differentiate ethnic self-concepts, such as ethnic identifications, from ethnic identity, with the latter referring to a process similar to Erikson’s (1968) description of ego identity. In short, although ethnic identity is often used more colloquially to refer to a broad range of ethnic self-concepts and identifications, we restrict its use to its more Eriksonian connotations.

We also recognize that there are multiple dimensions of ethnic identity. Dimensions of ethnic identity include a sense of affirmation and belonging to an ethnic group (Phinney, 1992), which reflects an affective or attitudinal bond with the ethnic group. Alternatively, ethnic identity achievement and exploration are theoretical concepts borrowed from the Eriksonian (1968) theory of ego identity development. *Identity achievement* refers to the developmental process by which adolescents accomplish the complex integration of senses of selves into a coherent identity; *ethnic identity* represents the manner in which they integrate a sense of ethnic identity into a sense of self. As a point of contrast, early in childhood, ethnic identification is similar to other ways of describing the self, including, for example, one’s hair color. Later in adolescence, however, *identity exploration* represents how the adolescent explores the psychological significance of ethnic-group membership for the his or her sense of self. Ethnic identity achievement will result, for some, in the sense that the ethnic identification represents a central aspect of the self, not merely one way of describing the self. Unfortunately, researchers do not always differentiate among these dimensions or use measures that confound these dimensions. Consequently, for this review, where possible we differentiate when one of these dimensions is the focus of the measurement procedures.
Acculturation and Enculturation Influences of Ethnic Identification and Identity

Most researchers differentiate acculturation and ethnic identity. However, Keefe and Padilla (1987) and, later, Padilla and Perez (2003) defined ethnic identification as a marker of acculturation. Keefe and Padilla suggested that acculturation of Hispanics was associated with cultural awareness, reflecting the way in which culture-of-origin characteristics are maintained in the context of contact with another cultural group, and with ethnic loyalty, reflecting a psychological identification with an ethnic heritage. To Keefe and Padilla, parents' enculturation of their children into their ethnic culture represented a response to acculturation pressures. That there is a close connection between acculturation and ethnic identification is not surprising, therefore, given that some researchers considered ethnic identification to be a subcomponent of acculturation. Researchers have, however, adopted different measurement strategies to operationalize acculturation and ethnic identity, although some overlap remains.

Young children's exposure to acculturation and enculturation processes are primarily determined by their parents' lifestyle circumstances and generally reflect the sociological characteristics of the family, the family's neighborhood, and the social environments to which the parents expose the children. As mentioned above, children's ethnic identifications as Mexican American or other ethnic labels reflecting Latino heritage (e.g., Hispanic) are influenced by sociological processes of acculturation and enculturation (Bernal, Knight, Ocampo, Garza, & Cota, 1993). The more children are exposed to Latino culture and people, the more likely they are to identify with their ethnic heritage, and the more children are exposed to Anglo culture and people, the less likely they are to identify as Latino. The sociological markers of enculturation and acculturation include language preferences, ethnicity of peers, and personal identification (Cuéllar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995; Cuéllar, Siles, & Bracamontes, 2004). Research confirms that children whose parents were more closely identified with Mexico and Mexican culture were more likely to identify themselves as Mexican (Bernal et al., 1990; Bernal et al., 1993). Bernal and colleagues (1993) found that the connection between parents' level of acculturation and children's ethnic identification was mediated through parental teachings; those parents who taught their children more about their ethnic background had children who identified with their ethnicity more closely. Similarly, Quintana and Vera (1999) found that parents' levels of acculturation predicted the levels of enculturation or ethnic socialization of their children. Moreover, Quintana and Vera found that ethnic enculturation was empirically associated with dimensions of children's ethnic identifications, including their ethnic knowledge and the extent to which they manifested behaviors reflective of their ethnic culture. Research on parents suggests that those who are least acculturated to U.S. culture tend to engage in more active ethnic socialization of their children (Romero, Cuéllar, & Roberts, 2000).

Research on adolescence confirms that acculturation and enculturation factors influence ethnic labels chosen by Latino adolescents. Eschbach and Gómez (1998) investigated youths' tendency to switch from a Hispanic identification to a non-Hispanic one 2 years later. Those youth who spoke only English and those who attended school with few other Hispanic youth tended to drop their Hispanic identification over 2 years in high school. Fuligni and colleagues (2008) found that first-generation youth were more likely than second-generation youth to identify with their country of origin (e.g., Mexican) than with a pan-ethnic label (e.g., Hispanic or Latino) or with an ethnic label that is hyphenated with American (e.g., Mexican-American; see also Portes & Rambaut, 2001).

Further research on adolescence and adults indicates that acculturation and enculturation factors are associated with ethnic identity, which extends beyond simple ethnic labeling and includes the sense of affirmation and belonging that youth feel within their ethnic group (see Phinney, 1992). Schwartz, Zamboanga, and Jarvis (2007) found that youth's Hispanic orientation, but not their orientation toward U.S. culture, was associated with their ethnic identity. Although levels of parental acculturation predicted adolescents' ethnic identity, most research found more direct relationships between parental ethnic socialization and adolescent ethnic identity (e.g., Quintana, Castañeda-English, & Ybarra, 1999; Umaña-Taylor, Ruchi, & Nana, 2006). Therefore, as in research cited earlier, parental acculturation level appears to be an indirect influence on adolescent ethnic identity, and its influence is mediated through parental
ethnic socialization. More generally, research demonstrates strong empirical connections between, for example, enculturation and either ethnic identity or ethnic identifications for adults, youth, and young children (e.g., Bernal & Knight, 1997; Marin, 1993; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007). Indeed, a few items on Phinney’s ethnic identity scale reflect indices of acculturation, such as ethnic participation (Yancey, Aneshensel, & Driscoll, 2001) or ethnic behaviors (Phinney, 1992). Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, and Shin (2006) found strong connections between cultural enculturation into Latino culture and adolescents’ ethnic identity. Gene-rational status and time in the United States are associated with greater levels of ethnic identity achievement for young adults (Ontai-Grzebik & Raffaelli, 2004). As with acculturation, linguistic preferences and ability are strong predictors of ethnic identity scores, with those favoring Spanish having stronger attachments to and affiliations with Latinos. Weisskirch (2005) found that youth who engaged in language brokering (e.g., translating English for parents) tended to have higher ethnic identity scores—suggesting that these bilingual skills were sources of ethnic pride. More recent immigrants from Mexico, Puerto Rico, and other Caribbean and Latin American countries tend to have stronger affiliations to their ethnic groups, compared to those who have longer histories in the United States (Vaquera & Kao, 2006; see also Portes & Rambaut, 2001). Finally, Cuéllar, Nyberg, Maldonado, and Roberts (1997) found strong negative relationships between levels of acculturation and ethnic identity for Mexican American adults, with those scoring higher on acculturation scoring lower on several dimensions of ethnic identity.

An important line of research among community-based samples has examined the relationship of ethnic identity, acculturation, and discrimination among Latino adults. Research suggests that perceived discrimination among Latino adults is generally lower than among other racial and ethnic minority groups (Pérez, Fortuna, & Alegria, 2008). In general, it appears that low acculturation levels are associated with lower levels of perceived discrimination (Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Pérez et al., 2008). It may be that as Latinos assimilate and acculturate to U.S. cultural norms, they become more sensitive to acts of discrimination as compared to their less assimilated counterparts (Pérez et al., 2008). Moreover, greater proficiency with the English language may enable Latino immigrants to understand subtler, everyday forms of discrimination. Interestingly, high levels of ethnic identity appear to be protective against discrimination by equipping the adults with ways of coping with discrimination (ibid.). These protective functions have also been found with other racial and ethnic minority samples (Mossakowski, 2003). In conclusion, research evidence strongly supports the connection between (a) acculturation and the levels of enculturation and (b) ethnic identification and ethnic identity across the life span for Latinos and many Latino subgroups.

Social Identity Influences on Ethnic Identification and Identity

For the reasons just described, Latinos’ ethnic identifications and identity are influenced by acculturation and enculturation processes like those of many immigrant groups who come into contact with a dominant or host culture group. However, important social consequences are associated with identifying with Latinos, because of their status as an ethnic minority group in U.S. culture. Like other ethnic or racial minority groups, those identifying as Latino are affected by the ethnic group’s stigmatized status. There are, consequently, similarities between Latino ethnic identity and racial identity for other stigmatized groups. Latino researchers and theorists have seemed ambivalent over whether the social status and treatment of Latinos should be considered racialized in some ways. By racialization, we mean that Latinos experience significant stigmatization, discrimination, and oppression that is tantamount to the experiences of racial minorities. For example, the English-Only and anti-immigration movements tend to single out, or at least focus on, Latinos and attempt to codify into law the second-class or perceived inferior social status of Latinos that derives largely from the prejudice and discrimination against Latinos of mainstream society. Researchers look for evidence of the racialization of Latinos by looking for connections associated with racial phenotype (e.g., skin color) and find that those whose phenotypes are less Caucasian in appearance tend to have less social capital, compared to those who appear more Caucasian (Espino & Franz, 2002; Montalvo, 2004). Our focus is less on equating
race with racial phenotype and more on the sociological factors associated with racial minority populations, such as degree of social distance between racial groups and degree of antipathy toward putatively racial minority groups. 

To date, most empirical definitions of Latino ethnic identity have focused on cultural features and have paid relatively little attention to how ethnic identity is affected by racialization processes. To illustrate, the ethnic identity measures of Phinney (1992) and Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, and Bámaca-Gómez (2004) are examples, given that neither includes items specific to discrimination or racism that Latino youth experience. Qualitative research, on the other hand, has conceptualized more directly the presence of a racialized component of Latinos’ ethnic identity. For example, Holleran (2003) found that Latino youth tended to use racial terms to describe their ethnic-group membership. Similarly, Niemann, Romero, Arredondo, and Rodriguez (1999) identified an important theme in Latino adults’ interviews about ethnicity that reflected their minority status as well as the discrimination, stigmatization, and injustice that they and their group experience. Finally, Quintana, Segura-Herrera, and Nelson (in press) also found in interviews with Latino youth that some socialization processes, mostly from the Anglo community, reflected a racialization for Latinos. This qualitative research provides support for the notion that ethnic identity for Latinos includes some dimensions of racialization. For example, Phinney, Chavira, and Tate (1993) investigated the effect of ethnic threat on Hispanic adolescents’ self and ethnic esteem. The ethnic threat, represented by exposure to stigmatizing information about their ethnic group, was associated with more negative ethnic attitudes for Latino adolescents but did not reduce their level of ethnic identification. Similarly, reading about ethnic prejudice toward Latinos in another experimental design (McCoy & Major, 2003) and experiencing discrimination in a longitudinal study (Pahl & Way, 2006) were associated with increases in Latinos’ ethnic identification. Taken together, these findings suggest that experiencing threat and discrimination may positively influence the strength of ethnic identification for Latinos, but this exposure to threat also negatively influenced their attitudes toward their ethnicity. Consequently, Latinos face the dilemma of maintaining esteem in the context of discrimination and stigmatization, which increase ethnic identification with the stigmatized group but also increase the adolescents’ own negative attitudes toward their ethnic group.

Additional research suggests processes by which Latinos respond to this dilemma. Those Latinos who closely identify with their ethnicity appear to immerse themselves in their ethnic group, but those who are not strongly attached to their ethnicity seem to lessen their identification with being Latino. Support for these trends results from a variety of sources and approaches. To begin, Ethier and Deaux (1994) found that in response to being exposed to a predominantly
White university, Latinos who were strongly identified with their ethnicity became more involved in Latino cultural activities, thereby increasing their social and psychological identification with Latinos. On the other hand, those who identified less strongly engaged less in Latino cultural activities or groups, thereby lessening their social and psychological identification with their ethnicity. Research on younger adolescents also supports this tendency to respond to discrimination by becoming more immersed in the ethnic group. Brown, Herman, Hamm, and Heck (2008) found that Latino youth who experienced high levels of discrimination tended to associate with an ethnically oriented clique. The social connections found within an ethnically oriented clique appear to result in more positive attitudes toward ethnicity. Similarly, Weisskirch (2005) found that those Latino youth who reported that they departed from the “typical American” stereotype and presumably experienced more stigmatization tended to identify more strongly with their ethnicity. Moreover, research on Latino youth with mixed ethnic heritage (i.e., Anglo and Hispanic) indicates that youth who are more strongly connected to Latino peers and whose physical appearance is more stereotypically Hispanic tended to identify with being Hispanic, whereas those biethnic youth who could “pass” as Anglo tended to identify more strongly with being Anglo (Herman, 2005). These patterns, taken together, support the application of social identity theory to Latinos’ ethnic identity, with stigmatization of Latinos resulting in stronger identifications for those who already had strong identifications and weaker identifications for those who did not have strong identifications. These patterns parallel similar processes for other ethnic and racial groups, given the social consequences associated with identifying with a stigmatized social group.

Parents’ Ethnic Socialization. Parents’ ethnic socialization plays an important role in helping children prepare for the social consequences of identifying with an ethnic minority group. Hughes and colleagues’ (2008) study indicated that mothers help their children prepare for the discrimination and stigmatization they will face in society. Most Latino mothers indicated that they believed that having discussions about discrimination are important because experiencing bias and discrimination are inevitable aspects of life in the United States. These mothers prepare their children for discrimination by purposely teaching specific tools (e.g., academic achievement and taking advantage of opportunity), helping them develop proactive psychological coping mechanisms (e.g., self-confidence), and facilitating mechanisms to help protect their emotional reactions to experiences of discrimination. On the other hand, those mothers who decided against speaking with their children about discrimination did so because they worried that such discussions would cause their children to develop animosity toward other ethnic groups or because their children were not yet old enough to understand (Hughes et al., 2008). Although most mothers prepared their children for discrimination, there is some evidence that some of the same mothers also took their socialization a step further by either implicitly or explicitly communicating messages that promote mistrust toward other ethnic groups (Hughes, 2003; Hughes et al., 2008). For example, unlike messages that prepare youth for discrimination, socialization practices that promote mistrust encourage youth to be cautious of other racial/ethnic groups. These types of messages encourage youth to cultivate social relationships within their own ethnic groups and to be wary of people from other ethnic groups. Moreover, research suggests that Latina mothers who cultivated mistrust of other ethnic groups identified particularly strongly with their ethnic and cultural traditions and reported high levels of discrimination against Latinos (ibid.).

A third form of ethnic socialization that appears to respond to Latinos’ stigmatized status in society is the promotion of an egalitarian view toward all racial and ethnic groups. For example, research with Latina mothers suggests that they teach their children to respect people from all racial/ethnic groups yet discourage using race as a basis for making important life decisions (Hughes, 2003; Hughes et al., 2008). Latina mothers might encourage their children to downplay the salience of race and ethnicity because it could help ease living as a minority among racial and ethnic majority groups. Moreover, promoting egalitarianism and encouraging children to develop self-respect may be another method of preparing children to combat the deleterious effects of bias and discrimination (ibid.).
Ontological Development of Ethnic Identifications and Identity

Latinos of all ages appear to be influenced by acculturation and enculturation, as well as the social consequences of identifying with a stigmatized minority group. However, children and young adolescents are also influenced by developmental processes on their way to developing a mature, adult-like ethnic identity. How do children’s nascent ethnic identifications, such as “brown skinned,” evolve into mature understanding of the social consequences of identifying with a stigmatized ethnic group? Two main theoretical traditions have influenced theories of ethnic and racial identity, the neo-Piagetian and the Eriksonian. Neo-Piagetian theories describe the implications of cognitive and social cognitive development for the development of ethnic identifications primarily in early to middle childhood (Bernal & Knight, 1997; Quintana, 1994). Eriksonian theory, which has articulated ego identity development (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1966), has been extended to account for ethnic identity development during adolescence (Phinney, 1989). These theoretical heuristics rely on the assumption that normative development associated with other developmental domains (social cognition, ego development) can be applied to understand development specific to ethnic identity. Considerable research supports the validity of this theoretical heuristic (Phinney, 1989; Quintana, 2008).

We organize this review of the ontological development of ethnic identity using Quintana’s (1994, 1998) theory of the development of ethnic perspective-taking ability (EPTA) because it provides a framework that integrates the sociological and social psychological principles associated with ethnic identity described previously. EPTA theory articulates the development of social cognition applied to the ethnic domain across a wide developmental period from early childhood through early adulthood. This theory also identifies the cognitive foundation for ethnic identity achievement that is consistent with Phinney’s (1989) extension of Erikson’s (1968) theory of ego identity development.

To begin, Quintana (1998) has articulated the different levels of children’s understanding of ethnicity and race based on their level of social cognitive development (i.e., social perspective-taking ability). At each level, children employ a particular logic associated with their reasoning about ethnicity. Each current level of development encompasses previous levels, whereas movement to a new level is marked by the integration of a new perspective of ethnicity into the previously acquired perspectives of ethnicity. Details about Quintana’s model of EPTA as applied to Mexican American children can be found elsewhere (Quintana, 1994); what follows is only a brief review.

Physical Perspective of Ethnicity. In early childhood (up to 6–8 years of age), Latino children associate ethnic and racial status with physical phenotype, such as skin, hair, and eye coloration. Ethnic and racial status are conceived as being only skin deep in the sense that young children equate racial status with external appearances, especially racial phenotype, and if these appearances change, then racial status is thought to change (Aboud, 1987). Quintana (1994) has noted that some children may confuse linguistic with racial status, such that a person is Spanish when speaking Spanish and English when speaking English. These nascent confusions illustrate children’s reliance on observations in forming conceptions of ethnic status. Bernal and colleagues (1993) pointed out that because the physical appearances between Latino and Anglo children were subtler than differences between races (e.g., White and Black children), Latino children’s awareness of their ethnic status would develop later, as compared to awareness of race. Bernal and Knight found that Mexican American children younger than 5 years of age were unaware of their ethnic status, but between 5 and 10 years, children were accurate in their ethnic identification and could apply the correct ethnic label to themselves and their peers. Quintana’s (1994) interviews further supported Bernal and colleagues’ (1990) sequencing of racial and ethnic awareness: Second-grade children interviewed knew they were not Black, but a few were unaware that they were Mexican American. Interestingly, many of the children considered themselves White and identified as being White and Mexican American. Bernal and colleagues (1990) also suggested that young children would be unaware of the constancy of their ethnic status and would believe that change in ethnic status is possible concomitantly with other changes, such
as growing up or changing one’s physical appearance. These descriptions have been supported by Bernal and her colleagues’ investigation of young Mexican American children between 4 and 8 years of age (see Bernal et al., 1990; Bernal et al., 1993; Knight, Bernal, Garza, & Cota, 1993; Ocampo, Knight, & Bernal, 1997).

Literal Perspective of Ethnicity. Early in elementary school (approximately second through fourth or fifth grades), Mexican American children show important changes in their understanding of ethnicity. Quintana (1994, 1998) describes these as changes from a physical perspective of ethnicity to a more literal one. Instead of equating ethnic status with physical or observable features, children in early elementary school understand nonobservable aspects of their ethnicity. They understand, for example, that ethnic status is determined by familial ancestry, not phenotype per se. In an important way, children demonstrate awareness of the sociological components of acculturation and enculturation in understanding their ethnicity.

Their growing social cognitive abilities allow children to enhance their understanding of ethnicity by associating ethnic status with a host of features that are labeled as ethnic (e.g., Mexican food, speaking Spanish, having Mexican heritage), instead of perceiving these cultural features as being coincidental with their skin coloration. This development toward a more literal understanding of ethnicity has been demonstrated for Latino children (Quintana et al., 1999), as has its correspondence to social cognitive development (Quintana et al., 2001). Bernal and colleagues’ (1990) model identified other markers of development in Latino children’s understanding of and identification with their ethnicity. These milestones include increased knowledge about their ethnic group, accuracy of ethnic identification, and development of ethnic constancy. Note that Bernal and Knight’s milestones tend to focus on the more literal or objective aspects of ethnicity, or what is generally defined as being associated with Latino or Mexican American ethnic status, suggesting convergence between Quintana’s theory of development and that of Bernal and colleagues. Indeed, most research and theory on Latinos’ ethnic identifications during early to middle childhood are focused on assessing the accuracy of children’s ethnic cognitions and identifications. At this age, children are able to correctly choose ethnic terms that apply to themselves and reject terms for other ethnic groups. By middle childhood, Mexican American and other Latino children have acquired an understanding that matches standard denotations of ethnicity (Quintana, 1998).

Social Perspective of Ethnicity. From middle to late childhood, children’s awareness of ethnicity expands to understanding the social implications of ethnic-group membership (Quintana, 1994), or the components of ethnicity associated with social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978). Their understanding includes the implications of such ethnic attitudes as prejudice in their experience of ethnicity and ethnic self-concepts. During this developmental period, children are able to understand how others perceive them based on ethnic-group status. How their ethnic status is perceived by other ethnic groups becomes more central in Latino children’s understanding of ethnicity and the role of ethnic status in social relationships (Brown et al., 2008; Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Vaquera & Kao, 2006). During middle to late childhood, children have many of the social cognitive abilities requisite to perceiving and detecting ethnic discrimination against them and their ethnic group (Brown & Bigler, 2005). Whereas younger children’s notions of ethnicity were limited to those literal features that were obviously connected to their ethnic-group membership (e.g., Central American heritage, speaking Spanish, eating Mexican food), older children extend their notions of ethnic group to include more subtle correlates of ethnic-group status, such as the disparity in social class associated with ethnic-group membership. In a sense, at this age children act like lay sociologists, using their social observations, rather than merely what they been taught, to expand their notions of the implications for ethnic-group membership. Additionally, children at this level of development more readily associate other interpersonal implications for ethnic-group membership. They recognize, for example, that intraethnic friendships may be more easily formed than interethnic friendships, due to the presumed social similarities among members of the same ethnic group. To reiterate, the social perspective is associated with children’s abilities to understand
social consequences, sociological factors, and interpersonal dynamics associated with ethnic-group membership. Quintana and colleagues’ (1999) research supports the description and emergence of this level of development. Moreover, basic research on children's social and ethnic cognitions supports the growing awareness of social and sociological processes in children’s associations with ethnicity (Brown et al., 2008; McGlothlin, Edmonds, & Killen, 2008).

Group Perspective of Ethnicity. During late childhood and early adolescence, Latino youth develop an ethnic-group consciousness that allows them to expand further their notions of ethnic-group membership. Quintana (1994, 1998) described two main advances for adolescents. First, younger children tended to view discrimination as isolated events, whereas adolescents can generalize across discrete events and abstract patterns to discrimination and societal attitudes. Additionally, younger children tended to focus on the obvious interpersonal components of discrimination, whereas adolescents become more aware of systematic forms of racism, such as institutional and societal discrimination. In these developments, adolescents are better able to group together isolated events and to group together members of institutions and societies into coherent units that in some cases have intentionality. Using these skills, Mexican American adolescents can generalize across isolated historical events reflecting discrimination against their own ethnic group and make connections with contemporary events. Similarly, they can become aware of societal forms of discrimination that have not only influenced them directly but more often have affected their ethnic group.

The second major advance in developing a group perspective of ethnicity for adolescents is what Cross (1995) described as a merging of personal and reference group identities. Earlier in development, children's ethnic identifications were made in terms of personal characteristics, much like brown eyes or skin are personal attributes, but they lacked the esprit de corps characteristic of adolescents’ conceptions of ethnic-group membership. In other words, young children may classify themselves as belonging to a particular ethnic heritage but lack the psychological connections associated with group membership. Indeed, adolescents are cognizant of the psychological and social connection among members of ethnic groups such that the actions of one person reflect upon the larger ethnic group. Moreover, adolescents across ethnic and racial groups have the enhanced sense of group membership that is often associated with peer cliques and often involves some merging of personal identity with a group identity, sacrificing personal individuality by conforming to group norms. Latinos and other members of minority ethnic groups apply these tendencies to their ethnic-group identity and membership (Quintana, 1998).

The combination of these social cognitive, social, and peer-group dynamics, as well as the increasing importance of ethnicity in friendships and other interpersonal relationships during adolescence, coalesce to increase the psychological significance of ethnicity and ethnic-group membership during adolescence. Phinney (1989) described the sequencing of three stages of ethnic identity formation: from ethnic identity diffusion to exploration and then ethnic identity achievement. Phinney (1992) also articulated two main components of ethnic identity: (a) a sense of affirmation and belonging to an ethnic group and (b) exploration of the meaning of ethnic identity for adolescents.

Much of the empirical work on developmental processes associated with Latino adolescents’ ethnic identity supports Quintana’s (1994, 1998) notions of adolescent development of a group perspective of ethnicity and Phinney’s (1989) notions of the identity searching and exploration that occur during adolescence. Recent longitudinal research confirms that there is an acceleration of identity exploration during early adolescence, but somewhat surprising was a deceleration of exploration during middle and late adolescence for both Latino and African Americans (e.g., Pahl & Way, 2006). Other research also suggested identity searching, as evidenced by adolescents changing the ethnic terms with which they were identifying (Fuligni et al., 2008). That is, Fuligni and colleagues found that nearly half their sample changed the ethnic labels they used to describe themselves over their high school years. Interestingly, further evidence suggests that the experience of discrimination catalyzed identity searching (Pahl & Way, 2006), which suggests that developmental and social identity theories need to be integrated if we are to more fully understand adolescent ethnic identity.
Psychological Benefits of Latinos’ Ethnic Identity

Considerable support exists for the connection between strong ethnic identification and adjustment for Latino adolescents. In most cases, strong ethnic identification allows youth to draw from the social and psychological resources from their ethnic-group membership and demonstrate psychological adjustment (e.g., Altschul, Oyserman, & Bybee, 2006; Bracey, Bámaca, & Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Roberts et al., 1999). In one particularly interesting research finding, Kiang, Yip, Gonzales-Backen, Witkow, and Fuligni (2006) found that stronger regard for their ethnic group buffered youth against stress such that the connection between stress and psychological distress was neutralized in the context of Latinos’ strong ethnic identifications. This last research finding goes beyond previous research in finding that strong ethnic identity commitments are associated with dealing effectively with ethnicity-related stress, but Kiang and colleagues (2006) research suggests that strong ethnic identity commitments are also associated with managing stress that is independent of ethnic status. Umaña-Taylor and colleagues investigated connections between self concept and ethnic identity. In several cross-sectional analyses (Bracey et al., 2004; Umaña-Taylor, Vargas-Chanes, Garcia, & Gonzales-Backen, 2008; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007), they found strong relationships between self and ethnic concept but not in longitudinal analyses (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2008). However, Umaña-Taylor and colleagues (2008) found that ethnic identity was associated with proactive coping. Taken together, this research suggests important benefits for adaptation for the ethnic identity of Latino adolescents. In a few cases, specifically those situations in which there were high levels of discrimination, strong ethnic-group connections were either not associated with psychological adjustment or at times were inversely associated with adjustment (e.g., Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006).

Emerging Domains of Ethnic Identity

Attitudes Toward Other Ethnic Groups

Most conceptions of ethnic identity focus on intragroup relations, but ethnic identity also involves adolescents’ attitudes and orientation toward other ethnic groups, particularly the dominant group. Indeed, research suggests that frequency of interactions with members of other ethnic groups whereby Latinos are afforded opportunities to reflectively contemplate the importance of their own ethnicity and ethnic identity (i.e., exploration) is associated with ethnic identity development (Phinney, 1989, 1992).

Research also finds that Latinos’ attitudes toward other groups predict their adjustment in some contexts (Gloria & Hird, 1999; Guzmán, Santiago-Rivera, & Hasse, 2005). That is, these contexts appear to be predominantly White contexts, such as predominantly White universities (PWIs) or some public schools. It makes intuitive sense that when another ethnic group controls much of the social capital in a context, adjustment is predicted by Latinos’ attitudes toward the dominant social group, such that those who are more open to the dominant ethnic group tend to reflect better adjustment in the context that favors the dominant group.

Identification With Other Ethnic Groups and Culture

Interesting research has investigated the implications of Latinos incorporating identification with Whites or as Americans into their ethnic identity. Much of this research focused on the identification labels chosen and whether these labels include American, such as Mexican American. Not surprisingly, acculturation level influences the tendency to identify as American, with those more acculturated including American in their self-identifications. Third-generation Latinos are more like to identify with hyphenated ethnic descriptors that include American, such as Dominican-American, instead of unhyphenated ones, such as Dominican (Fuligni et al., 2008). Fuligni and colleagues (2008) also found that lower levels of proficiency in Spanish were associated with greater tendency to include American in self-identifications among Latinos. In related fashion, Phinney has investigated Latinos’ willingness to identify with being American. Phinney, Cantu, and Kurtz (1997) found that the more Latinos identified as American, the higher their grade-point averages, but high levels of identification as American were not
correlated with higher levels of self-esteem. (Interestingly, there were also positive relationships among ethnic identity, grade-point average, and self-esteem.) Hence, identifying at least in part as American tends to be associated with some forms of adjustment in traditionally dominant contexts such as schools and planning for college (Phinney et al., 1997; Zarate, Bhimji, & Reese, 2005), but across several studies, identification with their ethnic group and with being American were independent, as indicated by nonsignificant relationships (e.g., Phinney et al., 1997).

A second innovative line of research investigating consequences of identifications with other ethnic groups has been research with biracial youth. Herman (2008) used a large data set to examine those youth who had partial Hispanic heritage combined with either White or another minority heritage; she then compared them with youth of monoracial/monoethnic heritage. For example, she compared part-White and part-Hispanic youth with only-White and only-Hispanic youth. Not surprisingly, those who were biracial/biethnic with part-Hispanic heritage were midway on a number of characteristics, compared to those who were only White or only Hispanic. To illustrate, monoracial Whites had higher GPAs but less exposure to discrimination than biracial White/Hispanic, who in turn had higher GPAs and lower exposure to discrimination than monoracial Hispanic youth (Herman, 2008). In an interesting extension of this work, Herman examined differences when youth were forced to choose either White or Hispanic but not both, even though they were biracial. She compared those biracial youth who identified as White to those who identified as Hispanic. Compared to those White/Hispanic youth who identified as White, those who identified as Hispanic tended to have lower GPAs, greater valuing of ethnic heritage, and lower levels of conduct problems in school. Interestingly, there was a significant relationship between the number of Whites in the school and the tendency for White-Hispanic youth to identify more strongly with their Hispanic heritage rather than with their White heritage (Herman, 2005).

A challenge with this research is that it is difficult to know whether there are sequelae associated with identifying more strongly as White or Hispanic or the ethnic identification is a function of acculturation/enculturation features, and whether all the correlates associated with a particular ethnic identification are caused by acculturation/enculturation processes or some specific effects are associated with how a person identifies, independent of their acculturation level. Clearly, more research needs to be completed that examines not only intraethnic orientations but also Latinos’ attitudes toward other ethnic groups as well as other mixed forms of ethnic identifications.

**Adult Expression of Ethnic Identity Through Parental Socialization**

Not only is ethnic socialization meaningful for children, but it is also a way for adults to express their own ethnic identity. Research suggests that ethnic minority parents in general (i.e., Black and Chinese) and Latinos in particular tend to believe that ethnic socialization is “somewhat” important. Latina/o parents in Hughes and colleagues’ (2008) study reportedly placed greater importance on ethnic socialization than did their Chinese and White counterparts. In fact, ethnic minority parents in general who report greater connections to their own ethnic groups appear to engage in more cultural socialization practices (Hughes, 2003). Parents who feel connected to their own ethnic group may be more involved with particular community groups (e.g., religious organizations) and may engage in ethnic practices at home (e.g., speaking Spanish, observing ethnic celebrations and holidays, serving ethnic foods, and listening to ethnic music). In so doing, parents send both implicit and explicit messages to their children about the salience of their ethnic identity. Latina/o parents engage in ethnic socialization practices as a way of communicating self-pride, pride in their ethnic background, and pride in their ability to overcome barriers they have encountered in the United States. Ethnic minority parents in general (including Latinos) who have personally experienced discrimination more commonly report preparing their children for bias (Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes et al., 2008). Ultimately, for Latino parents, ethnic socialization practices might help them feel reassured that aspects of their own ethnic identity will be passed down from generation to generation in a generative fashion.
SUMMARY AND GENERAL EVALUATION OF EXTANT RESEARCH

To understand Latinos’ ethnic identity requires an appreciation of sociological, social psychological, and developmental factors. The nature of Latinos’ ethnic identity represents an intersection of these factors. In some ways, ethnic identity is a reflection of and marker for acculturation processes; in other ways, ethnic identity functions as a protection against the social consequences of identifying with a stigmatized ethnic group; and in still other ways, ethnic identity represents the culmination of a remarkable developmental process. Extant quantitative measures of Latinos’ ethnic identity ignore the ways in which Latinos function and are treated like a stigmatized racial group. The heterogeneity of Latinos makes generalizations of research findings and theories challenging. Nonetheless, this chapter has identified some broad trends that appear applicable across some subgroups. However, more information is needed if we are to understand how some sociological factors influence psychological processes, which in turn influence ethnic identity for Latinos. There are some shortcomings in the extant literature. There is disproportionate research on Latino university students relative to their representation among Latinos. The research on children and youth seems more representative across social class but does seem disproportionately focused on Latinos acculturated enough to respond to English-based questionnaires. Much of the research was conducted on Mexican Americans, and representation of other Latino subgroups was small and usually combined into a more general Latino group. Nonetheless, there are intriguing parallels between Latinos and other ethnic or racial minority children. Moreover, the developmental factors associated with ethnic identity development seem to overlap with more general maturational factors associated with how children from a variety of ethnic or racial backgrounds understand their social worlds and how adolescents develop identities across domains of social category. Some interesting emerging areas of research include biracial children, which provide an interesting perspective on the process of ethnic identification and ethnic identity. More research should be devoted to conceptualizing the ways in which Latino adults’ ethnic identity continues to grow and evolve. More research could also be devoted to the intersection of a variety of social identities, such as gender, social class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, to reflect even more heterogeneity within the Latino communities.
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