
Bicultural Social Development

Amado M. Padilla
Stanford University

Hispanic Journal of
Behavioral Sciences
Volume 28 Number 4
November 2006 467-497
© 2006 Sage Publications
10.1177/0739986306294255
<http://hjb.sagepub.com>
hosted at
<http://online.sagepub.com>

The conditions that result in bicultural social development among Latino children and adolescents represent the central focus of this article. The literature surrounding bicultural development is reviewed from four perspectives: (a) immigrant children and adolescents, (b) second generation Latinos or the offspring of immigrants, (c) later generation ethnic children and adolescents, and (d) mixed ethnic and racial heritage individuals. Each of these situations presents different socialization contexts and challenges for parents and children in the transmission of culture across generations and for the development of bicultural competence. The concepts of acculturation, marginality, and biculturalism are examined for the assumptions inherent in each of these constructs. An important assumption in the analysis is that maintenance of ethnic identity and bicultural orientation may be imposed on Latinos depending on their phenotype, which marks them as "outsiders" to the dominant social group. Thus, ethnic loyalty and biculturalism may serve as positive coping responses in a racialized society.

Keywords: *social development; biculturalism; bicultural development; children; adolescence*

Social theorists are pointing to emerging "minority-majority" populations in large immigrant states such as California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, and New Jersey. Because the newcomers are a youthful population, schools are the social institutions most dramatically affected by the population shift and the new minority-majority (Olsen, 1988, 1997). Furthermore, there is concern that the newcomers are not being absorbed (i.e., assimilated) into mainstream society as rapidly as immigrants have at other times in this country's history. This has generated considerable debate having to do with why these "newcomers" are not assimilating into the mainstream. One side of the debate has centered on the issue of absorption into mainstream culture and has presented data to show that absorption of immigrants has never been easy and that recent immigrant groups are becoming Americanized at

approximately the same rate as earlier immigrants. Others acknowledge the slow absorption of recent immigrants into mainstream society and explain the slow assimilation through an analysis of social barriers and racism that prevent more rapid absorption (Padilla & Perez, 2003; Segal, 2002; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001). Still others argue that some immigrant groups, especially Mexicans, do not want to assimilate and that this is wrecking havoc with the American way of life (Buchanan, 2002; Hanson, 2003).

One common index of social absorption is intermarriage and there have been marked changes in intermarriage patterns in the past three decades (Root, 2001). Although intermarriage has been seen as a sign of reduced social distance between groups, sociologists are pointing to the acceleration of intermarriage as another factor contributing to the current demographic shift taking place in this country. According to this view, cultural assimilation of ethnic minority individuals results in an increase in intermarriage through the working of two mechanisms: a weakening of ethnic attachments and the resulting increase in contact with potential mates of other groups (Lieberson & Waters, 1988).

In retrospect, it is possible to identify the changing demography of the United States and the Civil Rights Movement, both of which can be traced to the decade of the 1960s with the political impetus for the rise in the call for multiculturalism that is now at the center of much debate in our schools, workplaces, and communities. However, this was also the period in which ethnic parents became more conscious of the need to pass on their ethnic cultures to their children. **In many respects, the intergenerational transmission of ethnic heritage cultures is due to important macrolevel changes that have transpired in the United States over the past four decades.** Interestingly, how these macrolevel changes have altered the socialization practices of an increasing diverse population have largely gone unnoticed in mainstream psychology but not among ethnic psychologists (e.g., Bernal & Knight, 1993; Padilla & Perez, 2003; Ramirez & Castaneda, 1974; Sue & Morishima, 1982).

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

Bicultural Socialization and Biculturalism: Asset or Liability?

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

In an early paper, Park (1928) put forth the idea of the “marginal” man to describe the person who found himself or herself between and betwixt two cultures. Stonequist (1937) extended the conditions leading to marginality and the consequences of marginality by arguing that

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

Here we see that Stonequist was primarily referring to situations that cause the individual to leave one cultural orientation for another and to do so unwittingly. Furthermore, if the person is unable to adjust to the new culture then the person becomes marginalized from both cultures. This analysis is important because it varies to a considerable extent from the contemporary analysis of the motivation, context, and outcome of dual-culture socialization. For example, it places the responsibility for assimilation on the individual who leaves one cultural group for another without also addressing the host group’s responsibility for accepting and assisting in the assimilation process.

The marginal-person model advanced by Park (1928) and Stonequist (1937) was the generally accepted view for nearly half a century. Despite repeated criticisms about the lack of scientific evidence for marginality and the vagueness of the concept (e.g., Green, 1947; Mann, 1973), the ideas emanating from the concept of marginality are still present in current models of acculturation (Berry, 2003). However, in their critique of the construct of marginality and whether the construct has scientific validity, Del Pilar and Udasco (2004) concluded that

marginality has endured because it seems logical and reasonable and makes common sense. This may explain the resistance in the field to contrary evidence about marginality’s validity. We found whole lines of investigation that are

anchored by slender threads of theory. Being caught between cultures frequently does result in difficulties and adjustment problems. The marginality investigators failed to note that these difficulties and adjustment problems can take as many negative forms as are discussed in the voluminous diagnostic manual of psychiatric problems or as many positive forms as are reflected in the biographies of successful immigrants. Despite the wishes of the marginality researchers, one concept cannot hope to cover all these variables. (p. 11)

Importantly, that a new concept began to emerge in the literature when making reference to individuals who seem to manage two cultures successfully. Psychologists began to make reference to biculturalism in their descriptions of individuals who, by virtue of the socialization they received from their primary caretakers, were competent in two cultures (e.g., LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Ramirez & Castaneda, 1974). According to this more contemporary view, it is possible to be a competent member of two cultures without being in serious psychological conflict about either. In this bicultural perspective, the person does not favor one culture over the other, and more often than not the dual transmission of cultural information from parents and other caretakers is quite deliberate and both cultures are presented positively.

This newer view of dual-culture transmission has enriched sociologists' thinking about socialization processes and how individuals participate as members of two cultural groups. Research in this area is exemplified in the work of numerous investigators (e.g., Bernal, Knight, Garza, Ocampo, & Cota, 1990; Hurtado & Gurin, 1987; Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000; Quintana, Castaneda-English, & Ybarra, 1999; Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004). These researchers have examined topics germane to ethnic socialization, ethnic identification, and biculturalism.

This is different from the Park-Stonequist model (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937), which primarily ascribes negative personality characteristics to the marginal person (Del Pilar & Udasco, 2004). According to the Park-Stonequist model, the marginal person feels isolated and closed off from members of either the culture of origin or the culture of the host group or, worse, isolated from both. Furthermore, according to this view, the person suffers from self-hatred, low self-esteem, and feelings of inferiority. The marginal person is marked by negativity and character traits that predispose the individual to serious mental health problems.

The personality traits of the marginal person are in sharp contrast to the characteristics that have been attributed to the bicultural individual. Biculturalists see a much more positive image of the bicultural person. The bicultural person is well adjusted, open to others, and a cultural broker

between peoples of different backgrounds. The completely bicultural person is an individual who possesses two social persona and identities. The person is equally at ease with members of either culture and can easily switch from one cultural orientation to the other and does so with native-like facility. Furthermore, this comfort with two cultures extends to interactions with individuals from cultures other than those that the bicultural person has competence in. This social flexibility is viewed by the biculturalists as an advantage and one of the reasons for bicultural socialization (Aellen & Lambert, 1969; McFee, 1968).

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

I have provided a brief sketch of the idea of dual-culture personality and the more recent construct of biculturalism because there is a long-standing tradition of theory about individuals who are socialized into two cultural traditions. However, the theory of the dual-culture personality was not buttressed by empirical support. Today, empirical research on biculturalism is commonplace in the social science literature. The missing element in much of this discussion, though, is why and how people become bicultural. Before dwelling on answers to these questions, I must first put into perspective the topic of identity development and the more specific examination of ethnic identity formation.

Ethnic Identity Development

With adolescence comes the question, "Who am I?" Adolescence is a time when the crisis of identity is most paramount in the mind of the young person (Erikson, 1968). The crisis of identity experienced by adolescents may be more problematic for adolescents who find themselves in a home or school context where different values, beliefs, and behaviors are practiced. Furthermore, this may be especially true when one of the cultural orientations belongs to an ethnic group with low social prestige, as is often the case with immigrants and their children. Ethnic identification may create serious concerns for ethnic adolescents who often want to construct their own identities free of the ethnic and racial biases imposed on them by their grandparents, parents, teachers, peers, and other authority figures.

Although Erikson did not write about the crisis of identity from the perspective of an adolescent who was influenced by dual-cultural socialization, imagine the potential for crisis when an adolescent attempts to resolve issues of identity when two cultural orientations are involved. The adolescent may receive messages about one identity from his or her immediate family including grandparents, another from teachers, a third from peers, and still a fourth from the media. For example, Mexican immigrant parents often place their children in conflict when they demand that their children maintain a Mexican identity although the young person may never even have lived in Mexico. At school the same young person is told that he lives in America and should think of himself first and foremost as American. However, whenever the young person is asked to complete an official school form, he generally must choose an identity among the following: non-Hispanic White, Mexican, Mexican American, Hispanic, or Other. Often adolescents question the relevance of these ethnicity-related questions on the grounds that they seem to make assumptions about their identity that are not accurate. The confusion described by Erikson becomes salient for many adolescents, who then devise other ways to answer the "Who am I?" question. I have heard ethnic adolescents with whom I have worked say "I am me," "I am a human being," or as one adolescent said, "I ain't none of that shit. I'm not the man's thing to play with. I am who I am. That's it."

Cultural Transmission: Two Cultures Not One

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

Immigrant Children and Adolescents

Children and adolescents who immigrate to a new country must of necessity acquire the customs and behaviors of their adopted country.

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

The school and peers are the main sources of transmission of the new culture for immigrant children and adolescents while the immigrant parents continue to maintain the cultural practices of their home country. Schools now commonly have adopted programs such as newcomer centers, English-as-a-second-language classes in the content areas (e.g., sheltered American History), bilingual education programs, and heritage language classes (e.g., Spanish for native speakers). The intent of these programs is to transition immigrant students to an all-English curriculum that offers a supportive environment for the language and culture of the immigrant student. The overall objective of these efforts is Americanization or assimilation to American culture while still valuing the cultural diversity of students. Peers assist in this process via English-language role modeling and American youth culture orientation. Slowly but surely, the youthful immigrants acquire enough of the language and culture of the host group to become functioning members of the new culture. In characteristic fashion, these youth also retain varying degrees of competence in their home culture, depending on the age of immigration.

In communities populated by immigrant groups, it is not uncommon to see children serving as translators and cultural brokers for their parents and other adult family members. Frequently, young bilingual children serve as translators between their parents and teachers, physicians, shopkeepers, and so forth. For the young person, this is a situation of mandatory biculturalism because of the need to acquire competencies in the host culture to assist parents. This is an interesting twist on the way cultural transmission is commonly viewed. In this situation, the immigrant child or adolescent is bringing the new culture that they have begun to learn from teachers and peers to their parents. When this happens, they are the transmitters of the new culture they are learning and they are bringing this new information to their parents, rather than vice versa (Morales & Hanson, 2005).

This situation may be beneficial for the parents but it may have a negative side. A heavy burden is placed on the child who must serve as a cultural

and linguistic broker while still in the process of being socialized to the culture of the parents as well as to the host culture. For the parents, there is also the potential danger of surrendering too much power to their children because of their reliance on children as cultural brokers (Buriel, Perez, De Ment, Chavez, & Moran, 1998; Umana-Taylor, 2003; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).

In a study of first-, second-, and third-generation Mexican heritage students and their parents, Buriel and Cardoza (1993) found that first-generation students exhibit more cultural continuities between themselves and their parents, because both were born in Mexico and spoke Spanish as their primary language, and cultural continuity was further augmented when members of both parent and student generations shared a common educational experience in Mexico. According to Buriel and Cardoza, although the students were proficient in English (the survey was done in English), their parents were predominately Spanish speakers. Moreover, despite the students' exposure to a Euro-American cultural milieu, they still had more in common with their parents, thereby facilitating cultural transmission, than was the case with their second-generation Mexican American counterparts. These authors too reported that there was congruence between the immigrant parents and their adolescents' identity as Mexican.

In sum, although it is possible to identify the cultural conflicts, little is still known about the dynamics of cultural transmission in the immigrant generation to inform parents about ways to minimize intergenerational conflict because of the effects of acculturation from secondary sources such as school and peers. The transition to the new culture may be very difficult for immigrants of all ages but for different reasons. Immigrant parents are often involved in their own acculturation and sometimes must rely on their more rapidly acculturating children to assist them with their daily functioning. Similarly, immigrant children often are left to their own devices to make decisions about how much of their home culture they wish to retain or practice. Little support is available for immigrant parents or for the teachers of immigrant students to enable them to work cooperatively to maximize home cultural transmission while recognizing the importance of acculturation to the host culture.

Second-Generation Individuals

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

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

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

Thus, second-generation children and adolescents learn their parents' culture often in isolation and a second culture in another social context, such as from teachers and peers at first and later from pop culture reflected in their choice of dress and behavior. One adolescent addressed the conflict that this form of dual-cultural transmission created for her:

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

Like the two second-generation individuals whose quotes are presented here, some second-generation youth find themselves between a rock and a hard place. Many immigrant parents tell their offspring, "You're in America now and you must be an American!" However, at the same time, the young person is told by the parents not to forget who they are, referring to their ethnic or cultural group membership. Often parents go so far as to warn their adolescent children to steer clear of social relationships, especially intimate relationships, involving members of other ethnic groups. Pressure to conform to the home culture of the parents is often more severe for immigrant and second-generation females than for males (Olsen, 1997).

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

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

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

We know from the work of sociolinguists that shift from a non-English home language to English occurs generally within one generation (e.g., Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). If we adhere strongly to a model that assumes that home language is critical to bicultural competence, how is it possible to still talk about biculturalism with second-generation youth if they possess little or no proficiency in the language of their elders? If immigrant parents do not insist on home language proficiency in the socialization of their children, then what aspect of their culture are they interested in transmitting to their children and how is this accomplished? The question of cross-generational cultural transmission is important and is in need of considerably more research among immigrant populations.

Portes and Rumbaut (2001) studied second-generation adolescents in the San Diego, California, and Miami and Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, areas. In this longitudinal study, Portes and Rumbaut collected data from more than 5,000 adolescents and from their parents who had immigrated to the United States from 77 different countries. The second generation was defined as U.S.-born children of foreign parents or foreign-born children who were brought to the United States before adolescence. One significant finding was that there were benefits (e.g., preservation of fluent bilingualism, higher self-esteem,

higher educational and occupational expectations) of selective acculturation. According to Portes and Rumbaut from a theoretical standpoint, these relationships are not unexpected.

Children who learn the language and culture of their new country without losing those of the old have a much better understanding of their place in the world. They need not clash with their parents as often or feel embarrassed by them because they are able to bridge the gap across generations and value their elders' traditions and goals. Selective acculturation forges an intergenerational alliance for successful adaptation that is absent among youths who have severed bonds with their past in the pursuit of acceptance by their native peers. (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, p. 274)

In sum, there is still much to be learned about bicultural development of the second generation. These individuals are positioned between the culture of the parents and the dominant American culture that surrounds them. By definition, many are acculturated into the parental culture, but how extensively this is done depends entirely on the parents, the extended family, and the existence of an ethnic identity. Similarly, the second generation is exposed to American culture, and the extent to which they embrace it depends on the hold that the parents' culture places on them as well as how assimilated they are allowed to be by the majority group. More longitudinal studies similar to Portes and Rumbaut's (2001) are needed that examine the role parents, grandparents, teachers, peers, and coworkers play in the adaptation of the second generation. We need a better understanding of the developmental processes, coping responses, and competencies that individuals require to effectively straddle two cultures while developing and maintaining positive affective bonds with the culture of origin and American culture. The second generation consists of the "bridge" generation between the old and new traditions, yet still relatively little is known about the adaptation of second-generation individuals across different ethnic and cultural groups.

Third- and Later-Generation Ethnics

In this section, attention is on third- and later-generation individuals who, like their parents, were born in the United States. How parents of third- and later-generation children transmit their heritage culture to their offspring is a complicated question. Remember the discussion of the second generation and how language acculturation, parents' comfort with their own ethnic background, and the influence of grandparents in cultural transmission were all

instrumental in whether the second generation maintained an ethnic identity. Biculturalism as practiced by parents, teachers, and role models serve as the major conduit for cultural transmission to the third generation, but the process is not smooth and there is little longitudinal research. Today there is no shortage of bicultural communities everywhere in the United States. One of the interesting things about these communities is their support of immigrants while providing some heritage culture programs for the later generation. For example, an examination of Mexican Americans in the Southwest offers an excellent case study of an ethnic group that is constantly being infused by newcomers from Mexico but also having developed a specific culture of their own (Tatum, 2001). Many members of this ethnic group still trace their lineage back to 1848 when the American Southwest was colonized by the United States in an unevenly matched war with Mexico, who was still reeling from its own struggle for independence from Spain. Many of these native-born Americans of Mexican heritage continue to steadfastly identify with a form of Mexican culture and maintain many of the values, beliefs, and customs of their heritage. It is important to note that many of these later-generation ethnics are more loyal to their ethnic heritage than they are knowledgeable of its culture (e.g., history, art, literature) and the Spanish language (Keefe & Padilla, 1987).

Because of their commitment to their ethnic heritage, later-generation Mexican American parents and grandparents may practice dual-culture socialization with their children. For reasons that differ across ethnic groups, the bicultural oriented later-generation individual maintains his or her biculturalism by choice and views it often as a benefit rather than a liability. For these individuals, acceptance of their membership in an ethnic community does not imply that they are disloyal Americans. Unfortunately, with the growing ethnic diversity in the United States, some social critics have difficulty grasping the idea that biculturalism does not imply disloyalty to one side or the other, which is contrary to their argument that multiculturalism can have dire consequences for the unity of the country (e.g., Schlesinger, 1991).

Involvement in ethnic community activities by no means implies a rejection of American culture because prior research has shown that ethnic involvement and national identity are not strongly correlated. This is consistent with Der-Karabetian's (1980) finding among Armenian Americans and Zak's (1973) finding with Jewish Americans, and it supports the bicultural hypothesis of acculturation. Thus, participation in ethnic community affairs is associated with a stronger sense of bicultural ethnic belonging. Exposure to the dominant majority culture with eventual assimilation into

it does not need to result in the rejection of one's ethnic and cultural heritage. This is quite a different perspective from that expounded by the Park-Stonequist model (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937) that described the individual as leaving their group and joining another.

There are some important considerations that make this situation more problematic, however, than I have described it. In an early paper on acculturation (Padilla, 1980), I drew a distinction between cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty. Cultural awareness is the cognitive dimension that specifies the knowledge that a person possesses of his or her culture. In previous publications (Padilla, 1980; Keefe & Padilla, 1987), I explained that cultural knowledge consists of self-rated proficiency in Spanish and English; knowledge of the history, art, and music of both Mexico and the United States; and knowledge of current events that shape culture. In this model, a specific acculturation score is assigned to respondents based on their responses to a questionnaire. The score then locates the individual on a multidimensional space of Mexican and American cultural awareness. In this context, biculturalism refers specifically to the individual's knowledge about (or competence in) each of their two cultures. Ethnic loyalty, on the other hand, was the behavioral component of the model and was measured by assessing a respondent's preferences regarding language, other forms of cultural expression, leisure activities, and friendships. The rationale is that the affect that a person expresses toward a social group will also dictate the preferences that he or she holds toward activities and members of the group.

In using this distinction, Keefe and I (Keefe & Padilla, 1987) found that with a community sample of Mexican Americans adults it was possible to demonstrate how cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty change across generations. This is important because most work on acculturation, and subsequently biculturalism, has concentrated on only immigrants or their immediate offspring. We found that cultural awareness decreased markedly between the first and second generation and continued to decrease so that by the fourth generation our respondents possessed little knowledge of the culture of their great-grandparents. With the loss of specific cultural knowledge including a language shift to English, parents and grandparents have little heritage culture to transmit to their children and grandchildren (see earlier discussion on the role of grandparents and linguistic acculturation with second-generation grandchildren). Thus, later-generation respondents compensated by transmitting more messages about ethnic loyalty and ethnic identification and less about actual cultural content. Arbona, Flores, and Novy (1995) and Montgomery (1992) replicated this finding with Mexican American college students.

A major question of theoretical significance is, why does ethnic loyalty persist across generations in the face of decreasing or near total absence of cultural knowledge? Using a cluster analysis technique, Keefe and I (Keefe & Padilla, 1987) identified five subgroups based on their scores on cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty. We found that those respondents who scored high on ethnic loyalty reported more instances of perceived discrimination, which was one of several subscales making up the ethnic loyalty. Furthermore, regardless of how seemingly bicultural or Americanized the respondents appeared, they were still relatively insulated within their ethnic group. For example, few had intimate friends outside their ethnic group and most had only limited social contacts with non-Mexican Americans. This was true even though the more acculturated or bicultural informants were more likely to have coworkers from other ethnic groups. So whereas acculturation serves to distance the person from less acculturated family members, it does not function to have the person incorporated into a broader social network of nonethnics.

Based on these findings, it is possible to advance a model of social distance and cultural assimilation. This model can be represented as a 2-by-2 matrix. On one axis is degree of similarity between cultures, ranging from a hypothesized *very similar* to *very dissimilar*, and on the other axis is shared phenotype attributes, again ranging from *very similar* to *very dissimilar*. Arce, Murguía, and Frisbie (1987) examined such a model and hypothesized that Mexican Americans with a European physical appearance (phenotype) would have more enhanced life opportunities as measured by socioeconomic status than would Mexican Americans with an indigenous Native American phenotype. To test their hypothesis, Arce et al. analyzed phenotype information that was gathered on a national survey of nearly 1,000 respondents of Mexican heritage. In this face-to-face survey, the interviewer recorded the skin coloration and the physical features of the informants at the conclusion of the formal interview. The hypothesis was supported when observed phenotype was examined against indicators of socioeconomic status. Respondents who were classified as light skinned and European in phenotype had more total years of education, higher income, and a lower perception of past discrimination than did respondents classified as dark skinned and Indian in phenotype. Arce et al. noted that the respondents with darker and more Indian phenotypes were more likely to report incidents of discrimination from the majority group against them directly or toward other Mexican Americans. It is important that these individuals also reported that they were more aligned socially and politically with their Mexican heritage regardless of their generation.

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

Gómez (2000) analyzed data from the Boston Social Survey Data of Urban Inequality, conducted in 1993 and 1994. This study focused on the 353 Latino respondents who were also part of the labor force. As in the Arce et al. (1987) study, interviewers rated the skin color of their interviewees. Gómez found that lighter skinned Latinos had more education, were more likely to own their homes, were more likely to be married, and used Spanish more often as a language for communication than did their darker skinned counterparts. However, the only statistically significant variable was hourly wage. This difference was still significant after controlling for other human capital variables. Thus, the results from the Gómez study suggest that skin color matters in the life chances of Latinos in the United States, with darker skin color negatively affecting hourly wages.

To summarize, the available research on the impact of skin color on the life chances of Latinos indicates that, even after controlling for background variables such as parents' education, age, and language ability, possession of a darker skin and more Indian-looking phenotype has a negative effect on the educational and economic attainment of Latinos. These research findings support the contention made by Portes and Rumbaut (2001) that newcomers pay a penalty for being immigrants or later generation ethnics who differ in phenotype from the host society, and they pay even a greater penalty for being darker and more Indian looking (or Asian or African) in phenotype. The cost is both psychological and economic—psychological in the sense of the discomfort of being stigmatized as different and economic

because the greater the stigma the lower the human capital that the person is able to acquire that can then be translated into social mobility in the American context of structural assimilation. There is a lack of research literature on the effects of discrimination and stigma in the case of ethnic socialization so speculation is all that can presently be done.

In a similar fashion, Phinney and Chavira (1995) reported that Mexican American, African American, and Japanese American parents stated that in their ethnic socialization of their children they felt compelled to instill pride in their heritage while having conversations with them about ethnic discrimination that they might confront in the future. In another study of 45 dyads of Mexican American English-speaking mothers and their 6- to 10-year-old children, mothers reported that they discussed with their children issues of ethnic discrimination and prejudice (Knight, Bernal, Cota, Garza, & Ocampo, 1993). However, the way in which these cultural and discrimination-focused messages were sent was not straightforward but was very much connected to a bundle of variables associated with the mothers' cultural and familial circumstances. Specifically, mothers who were more comfortable with their Mexican cultural background and less comfortable with the majority culture, and whose husbands' families had resided in the United States for fewer generations, were more likely to instill Mexican culture in their children while transmitting more messages about ethnic pride and discrimination in their young children. As for the children in these dyads, Knight et al. found that children whose mothers were comfortable with their Mexican background used more ethnic labels to describe themselves and knew more about their culture reported engaging in ethnic behaviors and were more likely to prefer ethnic foods, friends, and social activities.

In a study that followed the Knight et al. (1993) paradigm but with somewhat older children (7 to 13 years old), Quintana and Vera (1999) found that older children had developed a more sophisticated understanding of the ethnic prejudice they faced. This in turn was associated with higher levels of ethnic knowledge and ethnic identification on the part of the older children. Parental ethnic socialization was not predictive of understanding prejudice in this study but it did relate significantly to ethnic knowledge. Thus, the developmental process suggested is that children learn about their cultural heritage from their parents and as they advance cognitively they are increasingly able to understand the meaning of prejudice and how their ethnic group is targeted for discrimination. The result of this process is that the young person emerges with a sense of his ethnic identity that is sharpened by a continuous flow of ethnicity-related socializing experiences with parents, family members, and peers.

Thus, for many second- and later-generation individuals, biculturalism is a very suitable strategy for coping with discriminatory practices in society. It is a more adaptable strategy than alienation from the society to which one belongs as a birthright but where discrimination may occur because of ethnicity and skin color. In the literature there is recognition of cultural transmission that incorporates more than just knowledge of culture from one generation to the next but also prepares children for prejudice and discrimination. In a study that examined the role of ethnic and social perspective-taking abilities and parental ethnic socialization, Quintana, Castaneda-English, and Ybarra (1999) found that parental ethnic socialization was positively correlated with ethnic identity achievement among a population of mostly third- and later-generation Mexican American adolescents. However, the ability to take a different perspective was linked developmentally to cognitive processes and not to ethnic socialization. Quintana et al. speculated that higher levels of ethnic perspective taking reflect cognitive processes and that these are related to self-protective properties found among stigmatized groups. Specifically, adolescents with a high level of ethnic perspective taking understand that negative feedback about their ethnicity or ethnic group is likely because of ethnic prejudice and not some internal characteristic or behavior. How an adolescent's higher cognitive processing and not ethnic socialization comes to offer this self-protective function is not understood and requires more research.

I turn now to mixed ethnic and racial children. In the case of mixed-heritage children, cultural transmission is no less complex, but there is often a different dynamic because in the situations that I have discussed to this point, ethnic and cultural knowledge was communicated by parents who shared the same cultural knowledge. Here the situation is different because the two parents represent different ethnic, racial, or cultural traditions and each contribute to the transmission of knowledge according to their own distinct backgrounds.

Mixed Ethnic and Racial Heritage Children

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

Intermarriage has been touted as the desirable endpoint of an open and race-free society. Thus, it should be apparent why intermarriage and mixed heritage

children is a topic of central importance in this review of intergenerational transmission of culture. Children of intermarried couples often acknowledge and embrace the cultural and racial identities of both their parents. Today it is commonplace to find individuals of mixed heritage backgrounds acknowledging their biculturalism and biracial origins (Obama, 1995).

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

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

Murguía (1982) speculated that children of intermarriages experience more cultural diversity and, if not properly handled, may have difficulty in identifying with the lower status ethnic group. There is some support for this position. Let me illustrate by quoting from an autobiographical case study of an 18-year-old woman named Yolanda who rejected her Mexican ancestry in favor of an ethnic concoction that she perceived as more acceptable to her peers:

The hardest thing I've ever encountered in my life was accepting my heritage. Up until this past summer, I had adamantly refused to admit that I was of Mexican descent, deciding instead to concoct an explanation which sounded like a recipe: one fourth Italian, one eighth French, and a pinch of Portuguese. For the longest time I took all precautions necessary to ensure that no suspicions

ever arose about my *real* identity. In high school I bypassed the foreign language requirement by selecting French, cutting short my grandmother's hopes of conversing and gossiping in Spanish with me. At home, I made it clear that I would only tolerate loud *mariachi* music once a week, and on the condition that none of my "normal" friends were within earshot. Although I knew I was giving my family a stiff pain in the *nalga* [ass] with my quest for life as a *gringa* [White woman], succumbing to the fact that I was part of the refried bean crowd seemed a fate worse than death.

Yolanda struggled through her adolescence with various identities primarily because she was not fair skinned and found herself being asked by her peers about her background. Thus, she concocted an identity that resembles a recipe for stew: "one fourth Italian, one eighth French, and a pinch of Portuguese." Furthermore, her Mexican American mother's efforts at ethnic socialization were continuously rebuffed. Yolanda showed no remorse in not being able to converse with her grandmother in Spanish. Yolanda also disparaged her ethnic heritage by disrespectfully referring to her family as "part of the refried bean crowd" and by trying to dissociate from them. As Yolanda has matured she has toned down her criticism of Mexicans and, even though she does not openly identify as Mexican, she no longer concocts an identity that resembles a recipe from an American ethnic cookbook.

Yolanda represents an extreme example of ethnic denial and hostility. Her story is offered here only to highlight an extreme form of identity confusion (e.g., Erikson, 1968) resulting from a mixed ethnic heritage where one parent is from a low-status and stigmatized group. Yolanda thus dealt with this by trying to pass as something other than a member of the low-status (Mexican) group. Generally, the findings regarding mixed heritage children are far more positive than what we have just seen in the case of Yolanda. In a study of 63 adolescents of marriages involving one Mexican-origin parent and one non-Hispanic parent, far more positive outcomes were found (Salgado de Snyder, Lopez, & Padilla, 1982). In this study, adolescents between the ages of 12 and 18 were interviewed to ascertain their ethnic identification and knowledge of their Mexican culture. Most of the adolescents (70%) identified as Mexican heritage and nearly all (89%) reported being proud of their Mexican heritage. Interestingly, 40% spoke some Spanish and most were familiar with Mexican cultural events. In these mixed marriages, when the mother was Mexican the children were more likely to receive cultural transmissions regarding Spanish language instruction as well as lessons on history, traditions, holidays, and traditional foods.

Salgado de Snyder et al. (1982) asked their informants about the advantages or disadvantages of their mixed-ethnic heritage. Of the respondents, 56% expressed advantages in having mixed parentage. Among the most frequently mentioned advantages were being able to learn about two different cultures, speaking two languages, and growing up without prejudices. Some respondents did report some disadvantages such as conflicting child rearing styles between their parents based on their respective cultures.

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

According to Reddy (1994), parents often assume that biracial children identify with the race that they phenotypically resemble. Although teachers, peers, or strangers may automatically categorize them into one racial group, the biracial person may not identify with that group. The process of shaping one's identity based on societal perceptions is known as the "looking-glass self" (Padilla & Perez, 2003). Various family and social experiences cause biracial children to accept or reject the looking-glass identity, as the case of Yolanda illustrates. The presence or absence of similar others will often affect this identity process. A biracial child growing up in a one-parent household, for example, may choose to identify with the ethnicity of that parent. Additionally, some parents encourage their children to embrace both cultural identities and avoid "choosing sides." Other more racially sensitive parents choose to socialize their children to identify with their phenotypical race to prepare them for societal treatment and to gain acceptance into a community.

Root (1996) extended caution about cultural transmission practices that have the potential for creating a “fragmented identity” (identity conflict and confusion) in the adolescent. Identity fragmentation can be minimized through open, supportive communication between parents and children. In a guide for parents with biracial children, Jackson Nakazawa (2004) stated that teaching biracial children about their cultures and letting them know that it is okay to be who they are and to look the way they do are very important. In addition, it is important that parents consider and discuss the difficulties of prejudice and discrimination that their children might face. Additionally, living in a diverse community or having other biracial friends can help children form attachments and friendships beyond the boundaries of a racially specific social group.

According to Root (1996), there are four ways mixed-ethnic individuals may resolve concerns of identity. The first example of identification that many biracial children and families adopt is to accept the identity that society assigns. Many families believe that it is important to socialize their biracial children in preparation for how society will see them. Phenotypic identification can often make acceptance into a dominant group easier for many young people. By socializing children to identify with the race they most closely resemble phenotypically, biracial children often chose to identify with a single race, thus avoiding issues with a dual identity. Although this method seems to be a practical solution for many parents of biracial children, the process is not so concrete. Many biracial individuals identify with different groups depending on the social context. Because multiple cultural transmissions are evitable, many biracial children are able to identify more easily with multiracial groups than are monoracial children (R. Nash, 1995). Additionally, phenotypic ambiguity can make identity and acceptance into a monoracial group more challenging. Although parents may socialize their children to identify with a single race, this does not mean that society will accept such an identity.

Another option is for the mixed-heritage person to identify with both racial groups. Because of their parents’ socialization practices, children may embrace both cultural backgrounds equally and consequently chose to identify with both groups. Different social settings or various family settings may cause biracial children to temporarily shift their identity to one group or another depending on the context. This becomes particularly common in situations wherein the extended family is less open to the interracial marriage. Identification with one family member can occur in social situations wherein one race has stronger numerical representation

(Gunthrope, 1998). Zack (1993) explained that this is a social ability unique to people of biracial heritage.

A third way that mixed-race individuals come to resolve their identity is to ignore phenotype and social pressure and to develop an identity preference toward one racial group. Often, however, this conscious and voluntary identification is toward the phenotypically dominant race. Monoracial identification is also more likely in single-parent households in which children receive cultural transmissions primarily from the single mother. This is also a likely outcome in communities with a heavy concentration of one particular racial group. Rather than a societal racial assignment, here the person chooses his or her identity and racial membership. This identification strategy can be healthy unless the referent racial group still views and treats the biracial person as an outsider. This identity strategy is most easily achieved when there is a balance between self-identification and larger group acceptance.

A final option and one that has grown in popularity in recent years is to identify as a new racial group. Biracial individuals who chose to identify as biracial, multiracial, or multiethnic can best illustrate this. With Asian, Native American, White, and African American ancestry, golf pro Tiger Woods identifies as *cablinasian*, a word that he invented by combining the names of his backgrounds. Root (1992) recognized this as a healthy method of socialization for interracial families. Children who identify as biracial often have a healthy recognition of both cultures and are able to identify very well with other biracial children. This allows for a sense of group membership, an important aspect of adolescence and development.

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

The peer group also plays an important positive or negative role in identity development during adolescence. As children develop socially, peers become a very important referent group. The racial composition of peer groups can have a particularly strong impact on the way biracial children

chose to identify. Because peers increasingly become the social referent group as adolescence progress into adulthood, opinions, beliefs, and other social cues can sway identification toward the larger cultural identification of the peer group and also influence the intergenerational transmissions that occur around themes of race, culture, and identity. Biracial children with weak parental involvement in their cultural development tend to be more susceptible to the social influences of their peers.

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

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

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

In an empirical study carried out in Hawaii and New Mexico on mixed-ethnic-heritage individuals, Stephan and Stephan (1989, 1991) identified several positive features that are possible with people who, by virtue of mixed-ethnic parentage, identify with two cultural styles. In this research, Stephan and Stephan assessed the psychological functioning of mixed-heritage individuals to determine whether they conform to the negative characteristics predicted by the marginalists or manifested positive features as assumed by the biculturalists. In Hawaii, the participants were single-heritage Caucasians and Asian

Americans plus a group of mixed Caucasian-Asian heritage college students. In New Mexico, the single-heritage respondents were non-Hispanic Whites and Hispanics and the mixed-heritage subjects were the offspring of non-Hispanic White and Hispanic unions. Participants in both Hawaii and New Mexico were given a large battery of psychological measures. On measures of attitudes toward Caucasians and Asian-Americans/Hispanics, contact with Caucasians and Asian-Americans/Hispanics, and enjoyment of Caucasian culture and Asian-American/Hispanic culture, the mixed-heritage individuals fell midway between the single-heritage comparison groups whether in Hawaii or New Mexico. Furthermore, the mixed-heritage individuals projected the image of being the perfect cultural bridge between the ethnic and main-stream groups.

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

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

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

earlier times. Mixed-race couples and their children are adding a new vitality to America (Obama, 1995).

Conclusion

I have shown that there are important developmental reasons for a closer examination of dual-culture transmission. The traditional melting pot view of America may never have been a reality for all immigrants and today this is even more apparent with large numbers of immigrants coming from Latin America and Asian countries. These newer immigrants are changing the face, literally, of America from white to various shades of brown. Furthermore, immigrant parents are more inclined now than at other times to pass their traditional culture to their children and grandchildren. This does not imply that the links that bind us together as Americans are endangered as the opponents of multiculturalism argue; rather, biculturalism is seen as the wave of the future and a strength to be embraced.

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

Although the focus here has been on the bicultural intergenerational transmission in Hispanics, it is important that many of the same conditions and mechanisms that operate in cultural transmission between the generations among Latinos are found with many other immigrant groups, second- and later-generation ethnic Americans, and mixed-heritage individuals of many different backgrounds. More research is needed to fully comprehend dual-culture socialization processes and their outcomes for children and adolescents. Unless bicultural socialization is recognized as an important developmental area of study, researchers will have an incomplete understanding of how a growing number of children balance the cultural practices of their home and the larger social context in which they live.

The psychological models used to study cultural transmission and biculturalism must include new forms of psychological adaptation. I have shown that socialization in two cultures can be an unpleasant experience on occasion for some children and adolescents. This is due in large measure to stigmatization and negative stereotypes based on phenotype that convey

discriminatory messages of inferiority and of being an outsider. However, I argue here that stigma and perceived discrimination are having effects that are different from what we might have anticipated. Immigrants and ethnic people are not shedding their culture and trying to become American. Instead, perceived discrimination is serving to motivate ethnic group members to transmit their heritage knowledge from one generation to the next while acculturating to American culture.

Developmental psychologists need to give ethnicity and culture more importance in understanding how children and their parents resolve issues of race and culture in their everyday lives. They need to incorporate strategies for obtaining information about respondents' ethnic and cultural backgrounds and how these are translated into behavior. Surveys that force people to select from racial or ethnic categories such as White, Asian, African American, Hispanic, and American Indian are too simplistic. Such categories do not give the developmental perspective needed to assess the multiracial, multiethnic, and multicultural identities that individuals possess and that may be used differentially depending on the multitude of situational contexts the individuals encounter every day with peers, neighbors, and strangers.

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

References

- Aellen, C., & Lambert, W. (1969). Ethnic identification and personality adjustment of Canadian adolescents of mixed English-French parentage. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1*, 69-86.
- Arbona, C., Flores, C. L., & Novy, D. (1995). Cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty: Dimensions of cultural variability among Mexican American college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 610-614.

- Arce, C. H., Murguía, E., & Frisbie, W. P. (1987). Phenotype and life chances among Chicanos. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 19-23.
- Bernal, G., Trimble, J., Burlew, A. K., & Leong, F. T. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of racial and ethnic minority psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bernal, M. E., & Knight, G. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bernal, M. E., Knight, G. P., Garza, C. A., Ocampo, K. A., & Cota, M. K. (1990). The development of ethnic identity in Mexican-American children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 3-24.
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Buchanan, P. J. (2002). *The death of the West: How dying populations and immigrant invasions imperil our country and civilization*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Buriel, R., & Cardoza, D. (1993). Mexican American ethnic labeling: An intrafamilial and inter-generational analysis. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 197-210). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Buriel, R., Perez, W., De Ment, T. L., Chavez, D. V., & Moran, V. R. (1998). The relationship of language brokering to academic performance, biculturalism, and self-efficacy among Latino adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 20, 283-297.
- Chun, K. M., Organista, P. B., & Marin, G. (2002). *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cleveland, E. J., & Longaker, W. D. (1972). Neurotic patterns in the family. In G. Handel (Ed.), *The psychosocial interior of the family* (pp. 159-185). Chicago: Aldine.
- Coronado, M., Guevarra, R. P., Moniz, J., & Szanto, L. F. (Eds.). (2003). *Crossing lines: Race and mixed race across the geohistorical divide*. Santa Barbara, CA: Multiethnic Student Outreach, University of California.
- Del Pilar, J. A., & Udasco, J. O. (2004). Marginality theory: The lack of construct validity. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26(1), 3-15.
- Der-Karabetian, A. (1980). Two cultural identities of Armenian-Americans. *Psychological Reports*, 47, 123-128.
- Erikson, H. E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Gómez, C. (2000). The continual significance of skin color: An exploratory study of Latinos in the Northeast. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 22(1), 94-103.
- Gordon, A. (1964). *Intermarriage: Interethnic, interracial, interfaith*. Boston: Beacon.
- Green, A. W. (1947). A re-examination of the marginal man concept. *Social Forces*, 26, 167-171.
- Gunthroe, W. W. (1998). *Skin color recognition, preference and identification in interracial children*. New York: University Press of America.
- Hall, C. N., & Okazaki, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Asian American psychology*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Hanson, V. D. (2003). *Mexifornia: A state of becoming*. San Francisco, CA: Encounter Books.
- Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 981-995.
- Hurtado, A., & Gurin, P. (1987). Ethnic identity and bilingualism attitudes. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1-18.
- Jackson Nakazawa, D. (2004). *Does anybody else look like me? A parent's guide to raising multiracial children*. New York: Da Capo.

- Keefe, S. E., & Padilla, A. M. (1987). *Chicano Ethnicity*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Knight, G. P., Bernal, M. E., Cota, M. K., Garza, C. A., & Ocampo, K. A. (1993). Family socialization and Mexican American identity and behavior. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 105-129). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*(3), 395-412.
- Liebersohn, S., & Waters, M. C. (1988). *From many strands: Ethnic and racial groups in contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting and its effect on children: On reading and misreading behavior genetics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*, 1-27.
- Mann, J. W. (1973). Status: The marginal reaction—Mixed-bloods and Jews. In P. Watson (Ed.), *Psychology and race* (pp. 213-223). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Penguin.
- McFee, M. (1968). The 150% man, a product of Blackfeet acculturation. *The American Psychologist*, *70*, 1096-1107.
- Mena, F. J., Padilla, A. M. & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 207-225.
- Montgomery, G. T. (1992). Comfort with acculturation status among students from South Texas. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *14*, 201-223.
- Morales, A., & Hanson, W. E. (2005). Language brokering: An integrative review of the literature. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *27*, 471-503.
- Murguía, E. (1982). *Chicano intermarriage: A theoretical and empirical study*. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press.
- Nash, G. B. (1999). *Forbidden love: The secret history of mixed-race America*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Nash, R. (1995). *Coping as a biracial biethnic teen*. New York: Rosen.
- Obama, B. (1995). *Dreams from my father: A story of race and inheritance*. New York: Times Books.
- Olsen, L. (1988). *Crossing the schoolhouse border: Immigrant students and the California public schools*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow.
- Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America: Immigrant students in our public schools*. New York: The New Press.
- Padilla, A. M. (1980). The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 47-84). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Padilla, A. M. (1997, February). *Educational resilience and academic invulnerability among Hispanic students*. Paper presented at the Winter Roundtable on Cross-Cultural Psychology and Education, Teachers College, New York City.
- Padilla, A. M. (2003, November). *Becoming American: Acculturation, assimilation, and banishment*. Invited presentation to the Developmental Psychology Colloquium, University of California—Santa Cruz.
- Padilla, A. M., & Lindholm, K. J. (1992, August). *What do we know about culturally diverse children?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Padilla, A. M., & Perez, W. (2003). Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *25*, 35-55.

- Park, R. E. (1928). Migration and the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology*, 5, 881-893.
- Phinney, J. S., & Chavira, V. (1995). Parental ethnic socialization and adolescent coping with problems related to ethnicity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 5, 31-53.
- Phinney, J. S., Ong, A., & Madden, T. (2000). Cultural values and intergenerational value discrepancies in immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Child Development*, 71, 528-539.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Quintana, S. M., & Vera, E. M. (1999). Mexican American children's ethnic identity, understanding of ethnic prejudice, and parental ethnic socialization. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 21, 387-404.
- Quintana, S. M., Castaneda-English, P., & Ybarra, V. C. (1999). Role of perspective-taking abilities and ethnic socialization in development of adolescent ethnic identity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 9, 161-184.
- Ramirez, M., III, & Castaneda, A. (1974). *Cultural democracy, bicognitive development and education*. New York: Academic Press.
- Reddy, M. (1994). *Crossing the color line: Race, parenting, and culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rosenblatt, P. C., Karis, T. A., & Powell, R. D. (1995). *Multiracial couples: Black & White voices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Root, M. P. (Ed.). (1992). *Racially mixed people in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Root, M. P. (Ed.). (1996). *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Root, M. P. (2001). *Love's revolution: Interracial marriages*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Salgado de Snyder, N., Lopez, C. M., & Padilla, A. M. (1982). Ethnic identity and cultural awareness among the offspring of Mexican interethnic marriages. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 2, 277-282.
- Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Schmidt, A., & Padilla, A. M. (1983). Grandparent-grandchild interaction in a Mexican American group. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 181-198.
- Segal, U. A. (2002). *A framework for immigration: Asians in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (1989). After intermarriage: Ethnic identity among mixed Japanese-American and Hispanics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 507-519.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1991). Intermarriage: Effects on personality, adjustment, and intergroup relations in two samples of students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 241-250.
- Stonequist, E. V. (1937). *The marginal man: A study in personality and culture conflict*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Streeter, C. A. (1996). Ambiguous bodies: Locating Black/White women in cultural representations. In M. P. Root (Ed.), *The multicultural experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 305-320). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sue, S., & Morishima, J. (1982). *The mental health of Asian Americans*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Szapocznik, J., Santisteban, D., Kurtines, W., Perez-Vidal, A., & Hervis, O. (1984). Bicultural effectiveness training: A treatment intervention for enhancing intercultural adjustment in Cuban American families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 317-344.
- Tatum, C. M. (2001). *Chicano popular culture: Que hablé el pueblo*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Umana-Taylor, A. J. (2003). Language brokering as a stressor for immigrant children and their families. In M. Coleman & L. Ganong (Eds.), *Points and counterpoints: Controversial relationships and family issues in the 21st century: An anthology* (pp. 157-159). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Umana-Taylor, A. J., & Fine, M. A. (2004). Examining ethnic identity among Mexican-origin adolescents living in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26, 36-59.
- Weisskirch, R. S., & Alatorre Alva, S. (2002). Language brokering and the acculturation of Latino children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 24(3), 369-378.
- Winters, L. I., & De Bose, H. L. (Eds.). (2003). *New faces in a changing America: Multiracial identity in the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Vander-Zander, J. V. (1963). *American minority relations*. New York: Ronald.
- Vasquez, L. A., Garcia-Vazquez, E., Bauman, S. A., & Sierra, A. S. (1997). Skin color, acculturation, and community interest among Mexican American students: A research note. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 19(3), 377-387.
- Zack, N. (1993). *Race and mixed race*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Zak, I. (1973). Dimensions of Jewish-American identity. *Psychological Reports*, 33, 891-900.

Amado M. Padilla received his PhD in experimental psychology from the University of New Mexico. He is currently a professor of educational psychology and chair of the program in psychological studies in the School of Education at Stanford University. A fellow of the American Psychological Association, he has published extensively on ethnic identity, acculturation, bilingualism, and the education of immigrant students. He is the founding editor of the *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. In his leisure time, he enjoys jogging and urban hikes with his wife, Deborah.