Journal of Counseling Psychology
2007, Vol. 54, No. 3, 247–258

Copyright 2007 by the American Psychological Association
0022-0167/07/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.247

Prolegomena for the Connotation of Construct Use in the Measurement of Ethnic and Racial Identity

Joseph E. Trimble
Western Washington University

There is considerable confusion about ethnic and racial identity, multicultural constructs, and the tools available to assess them. The conceptualization and measurement of the constructs in the field also are complicated by the increasing observation that human beings have multiple, intertwined identities that influence one another in ways that are not fully understood. Measurement problems are compounded by the growing popularity of identity to the extent that theory, construct clarity, and appropriate statistical analyses are ignored. The problems could influence counselors who are confronted with their client's identity distortions and confusions. To work through a client's uncertainty about his or her identity, counselors should understand the origins of identity constructs and how the client frames his or her identity problems and confusion. Given the state of pandemonium in ethnic and racial identity, it is essential that considerations are given to the historical developments of the constructs and what they mean for contemporary research and development.

Keywords: identity, ethnic, race, culture, measurement and cultural equivalence

> The trick is to get them [societies] to illuminate one another and reveal what identity is. And what it is not. To do this—to connect local landscapes, full of detail and incident, to the intricate topographies within which they are set—demands an alteration not only in the way in which we conceive of identity but of the way we write about it, the vocabulary we use to render it visible and measure its force.—Clifford Geertz (2000, p. 227)

One of the objectives of this special section is to focus on the inconsistencies, confusion, and meanings in the use of ethnic identity and racial constructs and terms; a related objective is to highlight how research and measurement are influenced by the constructs. In their lead articles, Janet E. Helms (2007) and Kevin Cokley (2007) emphasize that there is considerable confusion about racial and ethnic identity constructs and the tools available to assess them; other scholars in the field agree with them (Helms, 1996; Moodley & Palmer, 2006; Phinney, 1990; Pope-Davis, Coleman, Liu, & Toporek, 2003). Moreover, they emphasize that some scholars and researchers liberally change identity measures to accommodate their stylized theoretical and practical needs, thus distorting and eroding certain scales' original psychometric properties. Too often stylized and atheoretical amendments add to the pandemonium that already exists in the field. Part of the chaos originates with the reality that the multicultural counseling field is in need of solid theory built from well-defined constructs and concepts.

I express my sincere gratitude to my friends and colleagues, Melissa Tehee, Dana Jack, Maria P. P. Root, Gerald V. Mohatt, and Carla Bradshaw, for their thoughtful comments on earlier versions of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Joseph E. Trimble, Department of Psychology, Center for Cross-Cultural Research, 516 High Street, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225. E-mail: joseph.trimble@wwu.edu

The purpose of this article was to respond to the growing pandemonium where consideration must be given to the historical developments of the constructs and what they mean for contemporary research and development. If we scholars cannot come to an agreement on what the constructs mean, then we have no business developing scales to measure them. As the eminent cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz (2000) maintained, scholarly attention given to identity concepts, their meaning, and their subsequent measurement and assessment indeed "demands an alteration not only in the way in which we conceive of identity but of the way we write about it, the vocabulary we use to render it visible and measure its force" (p. 227).

Clarification of the rich and growing history of racial and ethnic identity constructs is not only crucial for theoretical and measurement developments, it is essential for counselors who are confronted with a client's identity and the problems it creates for him or her, particularly when the client is of mixed ethnic heritage. Working through a client's identity problems requires that counselors understand the origins of the constructs and how the client frames his or her problems and puzzlement (Moodley, 2003; Moodley & Palmer, 2006).

This article begins with a review of the origins and definitions of racial and ethnic identity constructs with the understanding that there is no authoritative voice that captures the core of the constructs' connotation and utilization. Following this section, the article moves to review selected ethnic and racial identity scales with an emphasis on their strengths. The article then shifts to a discussion about identity research topics that include cultural measurement equivalence, item bias, and advances in psychometric analytic procedures for improving scale validity and reliability. As one sifts through the sections of this article, Geertz's assertion should be kept uppermost in mind. He claimed that

> there are nearly as many ways in which such identities, fleeting or enduring, sweeping or intimate, cosmopolitan or closed-in, amiable or

bloody-minded, are put together as there are materials with which to put them together and reasons for doing so. (Geertz, 2000, p. 255)

Origins and Meanings of Multicultural Terms and Constructs

A computer-generated content analysis of the usage of terms and constructs in the Helms (2007) and Cokley (2007) articles revealed interesting patterns that included *identity, ethnic, ethnicity, race, racial, racial and ethnic identity, alpha(s), constructs, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure,* and *coefficients*. The terms *culture* and *cultural* are less frequently found in their articles, yet these constructs are at the heart of what ethnicity and race typically entail. In most cases, the terms are not defined and thus appear to be used as though the reader fully comprehends their meaning. Using the dominant terms produced by the analysis as a structural outline, let us review their various meanings, use, and implications. Following this, the discussion is devoted to selected measurement approaches used to tap into the identity components and the way in which measures typically are statistically constructed and analyzed.

Culture

On the surface, the construct culture needs little explanation. Almost everyone seems to know what it means, yet it may be easily the most misunderstood construct in the field. Lonner and Malpass (1994) indicated there are about 175 definitions of culture that can be found in the social and behavioral science literature; their count was considerably more than the 79 features of culture generated by Murdock, Ford, and Hudson (1971). In an interesting study, Matsumoto, Kasri, Milligan, Singh, and The (1997) created 17 higher order categories from definitions provided them by 340 university undergraduates; respondents most often used the categories of expressions, history, and beliefs to define the construct. Identity also was one of the categories generated by the various definitions.

In an effort to capture the essence of the construct's meaning, other scholars generated broad inclusive categories. Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) and Berry, Poortinga, Segall, and Dasen (1992) grouped the construct into six broad categories based on its use in daily conversations as follows: descriptive, historical, normative, psychological, structural, and genetic. Using simpler categories, Triandis (1980) organized the construct into physical and subjective features, whereas Poortinga (1990) opted to classify culture according to the external or internal, and proximal or distal, constraints that it places on people. And after carefully reviewing various definitions of the construct, Matsumoto (2000) identified its key components to include the following categories: dynamic; system of rules; groups and units; assurance of survival; attitudes, values, beliefs, norms, and behaviors; shared by a group; harbored differently by each specific cultural unit; communicated across generations with relative stability; and with the potential to change across time.

At one level of usage, the construct's definition and conceptualization is as uneven as its meaning is wide-ranging and extensive. At another level, scholars appear to agree that it is a social construction that encompasses certain common features and characterizations that enable others to understand it. "What is culture if it is not consensus?" asked Geertz (2000, p. 224). Although people may be able to achieve a modicum of consensus on what culture is in general, the agreement seems to fall apart when scholars attempt to break down its meaning into some reasonably well-defined components. Unfortunately, use of the construct also breaks down when people rely on it as a label to describe similarities and differences between and among ethnocultural populations. Lonner and Malpass (1994) emphasized that

> using a label as an explanation doesn't help our understanding very much . . . and what is meant generally is that the nature or importance of the difference can be found in one of the many differences suggested by the term, culture. In other words, a more specific inquiry is usually needed to understand the difference. (p. 7)

Lonner and Malpass (1994) pinpointed the problem as one in which the construct often is used too casually for descriptions of the human condition. Poortinga, van de Vijver, Joe, and van de Koppel (1987) suggested that "culture is a summary label, a catchword for all limits of behavioral differences between groups, but within itself of virtually no explanatory value. In our approach culture is taken as concept without a core" (p. 22). From Poortinga et al.'s perspective, scholars should dig in and "peel off cross-cultural differences" (p. 22) until in the end they have disappeared; scholars also should probe for the deep meaning of a population's differences and similarities and at the same time agree on what it is they are describing and measuring. With some 79, 175, or however many different definitions of culture that exist in the literature, consensus and compromise may be difficult to achieve.

The cultural construct is the foundation of research and development in the multicultural field, thus a worthwhile and useful definition should be offered to serve as a channel and guide. Geertz's (1973) definition provides a path that is reasonably inclusive of all of its elements when maintaining that it "is an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes towards life" (p. 89). In offering his definition, Geertz cautiously reminded readers that

> the trouble is that no one is quite sure what culture is. Not only is it an essentially contested concept . . . it is fugitive, unsteady, encyclopedic, and normatively charged, and there are those . . . who think it vacuous altogether, or even dangerous, and would ban it from the serious discourse of serious persons. (Geertz, 2000, p. 11)

Ethnic, Ethnicity, and Ethnic Group

Within the past three decades or so, interest in ethnicity and related topics slowly and maybe even painfully has been eased into psychology. A careful examination of the psychological literature reveals that there is considerable debate about the terms *ethnic*, *ethnicity*, and *ethnic groups* (Moodley & Palmer, 2006). Unfortunately, much of the research that occurs around an ethnic construct is devoid of the richness of the debates—many researchers are almost too casual and carefree about their use and knowledge as they cite few if any articles concerning controversies and theoretical opinions. A summary of the opinions about the concepts may help substantiate their depth and complexity.

Several sociologists, anthropologists, and historians have written extensively on the topic (see Steinberg, 1981; Thompson,

1989; and van den Berghe, 1981 for reviews). Theoretical positions range from those that are lodged in one's experiences and worldview to those formed from a sociobiological perspective. Barth's perspective represents the former, in which it is the native's worldview that defines relationships, boundaries, lifestyle, and thoughtways (Barth, 1969). The sociobiological perspective is most fervently represented by van den Berghe (1981), who maintained that "ethnic and racial sentiments are extensions of kinship sentiments" (p. 18) and that "descent . . . is the central feature of ethnicity" (p. 27). To support his argument, van den Berghe claimed that "there exists a general predisposition, in our species as in many others, to react favorably toward other organisms to the extent that those organisms are biologically related to the actor" (p. 19).

Similar to the cultural construct, a review of the various treatises written about ethnicity leads one to the inevitable conclusion that it is complex. In its broadest form, it refers to "any differentiation based on nationality, race, religion, or language" (Greeley, 1974, p. 9). At a slightly more precise level, some theorists prefer the definition in which ethnicity is viewed as "a collectivity within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood" (Schermmerhorn, 1969, p. 123). Using this definition, Greeley claimed that individuals can be classified "into groups on the basis of shared, observable traits to include shared physical characteristics, shared historical experiences, and shared religious identities" (p. 188). Greeley placed an emphasis on using traits to classify individuals and individuals who use traits to classify and identify themselves with a preferred ethnic group; his suggestion set the groundwork for the creation of stereotypes and other ethnic group generalizations.

Yinger (1986) pointed out that

> ethnicity has come to refer to anything from a sub-societal group that clearly shows a common descent and cultural background . . . to persons who share a former citizenship although diverse culturally . . . to pan-cultural groups of persons of widely different cultural and societal backgrounds who . . . can be identified as "similar" on the basis of language, race or religion mixed with broadly similar statuses. (p. 23)

Yinger's conceptualization was inclusive and comprehensive, as he preferred to distinguish between groups by appealing to their unique social and biological characteristics. To form a more concise understanding of the influences of the two characteristics, scholars must find a shared generic cohort of descendants who share recognizable and acknowledged geopolitical boundaries. As suggested by Steinberg (1981), Saharso (1989), and Sollors (1989), changes in affiliation, identification, and related changes in the ethnic core can produce *pseudo-ethnicity*, that is, affiliation with an ethnic group that is an amalgam of various ethnocultural groups that is not recognized by scholars and demographers in the field. Also, an ethnic core may be exaggerated and contrived to form *imagined ethnicity*, wherein the relationship between the primordial ethnic core and the emergent form is blended to fit an individual's self-defined level of identity. Some understanding of the complexity can be found in defining ethnic group, yet another elusive concept.

Instead of serving as a modifier, adding *group* to *ethnic* imparts substance to the complexities of multicultural definitional problems largely because ethnicity is a complicated and tricky concept. Yinger (1986) preferred to use the term *ethnie* instead of *ethnic group*. For an *ethnie* to exist, Yinger maintained that the following three conditions must be present: (a) A segment of a larger society must be viewed by others as sharing and demonstrating a distinct language, religious preference, and ancestral homeland; (b) group members must concur with their designation and shared common characteristics; and (c) members must participate in the events, ceremonies, and activities embedded in their cultural lifeways and thoughtways.

Others have offered similar definitions. An ethnic group, maintained Feagin (1978), is one that is "socially distinguished or set apart, by others and/or by itself, primarily on the basis of cultural or nationality characteristics" (p. 9). Thompson (1989) viewed an ethnic group as a culturally distinct population that can be set apart from other groups. Such groups, Thompson pointed out, engage in behaviors "based on cultural or physical criteria in a social context in which these criteria are relevant" (p. 11). Barth (1969) argued that

> the term ethnic group is generally understood in anthropological literature to designate a population which: 1). Is largely biologically self-perpetuating; 2). Shares fundamental cultural values, realized in overt unity in cultural forms; 3). Makes up a field of communication and interaction; and 4). Has a membership which identifies itself, and is clarified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order. (p. 296)

Reliance on self and other attributions in an ethnic context presents convoluted problems. Greeley (1974) suggested that identification might not reflect one's ethnic origins because one could claim ancestry but not identify with the group. Greeley posed questions that were more complex:

> How do those of mixed ethnic origins determine which identification they are going to choose? [And] to what extent does such a choice lead to attitudes and behavior that the chooser defines as being pertinent to the identification he has given himself? (Greeley, 1974, p. 310)

In summary, ethnic origin, ethnic culture, ethnic identity, and ethnic group membership (ethnic reference group) are common dimensions of ethnicity, yet each is distinctly unique—there are interrelated contextual facets, too, that define a component of ethnicity. Simply put, origins refer to heritage and ancestral history, ethnic culture consists of lifeways and thoughtways passed on from one generation to the next, and ethnic identity and group membership are interrelated individual and social categorizations. Ethnic and racial identity have the most relevance and pointed value for social and behavioral scientists, as discussed in Helms's (2007) and Cokley's (2007) articles.

Race

Use of race as a construct to classify humans into groups also generates considerable controversy. As Henry Louis Gates (1986), the noted African American historian and literature scholar, pointed out:

> Race, as a meaningful criterion within the biological sciences, has long been recognized to be a fiction. When we speak of "the white race" or "the Black race," "the Jewish race" or "the Aryan race," we speak in biological misnomers and, more generally, in metaphors. (p. 4)

Ethnicity, culture, or *ethnic group* often are used to refer to classifications of people, but these constructs are less controversial and seem to spark less virulent discussions than the use of race. To illustrate this point, Helms (1994) asserted that "ethnicity is often used as a euphemism for race" (p. 297), and consequently the exchange often softens the contentiousness associated with the use of race. Helms (1994) added, "Neither culture nor ethnicity necessarily have anything to do with race as the term is typically used in U.S. society or psychology" (p. 292). Nonetheless, many scholars use race and ethnicity interchangeably to imply the sameness of a band or nation of people who share common customs and traditions often marked by common physiognomic features, skin pigmentation, hair textures, and ancestral heritages. For example, Perlmann and Waters (2002), in writing about the use of race in U.S. census forms, indicated that "races are usually discussed, in demographic terms, as a special subset of ethnicity, in that race relates to classifications of ancestral origins for groups treated in especially distinct ways in the American past" (pp. 1–2). Although interchangeable constructs, they vary in meaning and implication. The history of the variations in meaning and use can provide wonderful material for discussion and illustration of the human condition because these variations refer to how people appraise, characterize, judge, categorize, label, abuse, oppress, exclude, assess, and respond to themselves and others.

As a widely used construct to refer to types of people, *race* has multiple meanings and therefore is not an easy term to define. Toomer (1996, p. 172) claimed, "It may be well to note that no serious student of race claims to know what race really is; nor do we know." In contrast, Helms (1994) suggested that "race has three types of definitions: (1) quasi-biological, (2) sociopolitical-historical, and (3) cultural. Each type may have relevance for how race becomes one of an individual's collective identities" (p. 297).

The race construct has a rich history. Physical anthropologists in the early 20th century initiated a classification system whereby humans were grouped into one of four races: Mongoloid, Negroid, Australoid, and Caucasoid. The classification system prevailed; however, in the last quarter of the 20th century the four-fold system fell from use owing to problems associated with blood–gene groupings, race mixtures, and the inability to group humans into four or more discrete categories (Yee, Fairchild, Weizmann, & Wyatt, 1993). Furthermore, speaking about the eccentricities of race, Allport (1958) emphasized that

> (1) except in remote parts of the earth very few human beings belong to a pure stock; and (2) most human characteristics ascribed to race are undoubtedly due to cultural diversity and should therefore be regarded as ethnic, not racial. (p. 111)

And Boas (1945) argued that "the existence of any pure race with special endowments is a myth, as is the belief that there are races all of whose members are foredoomed to eternal inferiority" (p. 20).

The elimination of the race construct as a classificatory system presents interesting problems. Few would seriously question that racism and all of its ugly and oppressive forms no longer exist. To eliminate the use of the race construct, thus, could obscure if not disclaim the racist experiences of millions of people who are subjected to them on a constant basis. To merely classify these experiences with the terms *prejudice* or *discrimination* takes away or obfuscates the painful sting of racism. Hence, to forcefully confront racism headlong, race must be kept at the forefront of our vocabulary when discussing intergroup and interpersonal relations (Jones, 2003).

Similar to culture, race is a social construction, and although it has little if any use in classifying humans from a biological or anthropometrical perspective, it does have use as a social–political category (Root, 1998, 1999, 2000). Helms and Cook (1999) underscored the significance of the continued use of race because "we want to encourage consideration of the differential environmental significance of the various racial classifications as communicated through powerful societal socialization messages" (p. 30). Helms (2001) also firmly maintained that "racial identity theories do not suppose that racial groups in the United States are biologically distinct but rather suppose that they have endured different conditions of domination or oppression" (p. 181).

The U.S. Census Bureau has developed its own criteria for defining racial heritage; in fact, the Bureau has been assessing racial backgrounds in some form or another since as far back as 1790. In 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau asked individuals to indicate all of the *races* of which they considered themselves a part. An individual could choose to indicate one race alone or could mark other races along with the single race category. Results from the survey showed that 2.4% of the U.S. population identified with two or more racial groups (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004).

Use of the new multiracial item created an array of contentious debates and problems for all who rely on the use of census outcomes (Perlmann & Waters, 2002). The addition of the multiracial category presented complex tabulation and reporting problems for health care professionals, economists, demographers, social and behavioral scientists, and others who used racial categories for their work. In the research domain, if an investigator is interested in attributing an outcome to something about the deep culture of a racial or ethnic group, the multiracial or multiethnic category presents formidable attribution problems. For example, if a respondent claims he or she is of American Indian, Asian American, and African American background, what cultural or ethnic group is most influential in forming and shaping this person's affective, behavior, and cognition styles? Prewitt (2002) pointed out that the addition of the multiracial category represented a

> turning point in the measurement of race . . . and that the arrival of a multiple-race option in the census classification will so blur racial distinctions in the political and legal spheres and perhaps also in the public consciousness that race classification will gradually disappear. (p. 360)

Ethnic Self-Identification and Self-Labeling

Although often viewed as psychological processes, ethnic self-identification and ethnic self-labeling are constructs that are often used interchangeably to measure identity; in fact, these constructs can be found in most surveys in which capturing demographic information is important. Ethnic self-identification "refers to the

description of oneself in terms of a critical ethnic attribute; that is, an attribute that defines more than merely describes the ethnic group" (Aboud, 1987, p. 33). Vaughn (1987) viewed self-identification as a form of personal identity and differentiated the two from social identity. Personal identity "derives from a sense of self based on interpersonal comparisons" and social identity "from group membership" (p. 74). Rosenthal (1987) and Phinney (1990) viewed subjective identity as a starting point that eventually leads to the development of a social identity based on ethnic group membership. But Rosenthal added that "ethnic identity arises in interaction and is a function not only of the individual and his or her relation to the ethnic group but of the group's place in the wider social setting" (p. 160).

Weinreich believed that identity refers to different states in which different social contexts influence the identity state and one's actions. He suggested that

> one's identity as situated in a specific social context is defined as that part of the totality of one's self-construal in which how one construes oneself in the situated present expresses the continuity between how one construes oneself as one was in the past and how one construes oneself as one aspires to be in the future. (Weinreich, 1986, p. 299)

For Weinreich, ethnic self-identity was not a static process but one that changed and varied according to particular social contexts. Following his standards, use of labels to identify one's ethnic identity obscures the richness and depth of one's ethnic understanding of one's self.

Labeling involves the use of tags or markers to refer to and categorize groups and their members. Both in-group and out-group members can use the same or variations of the same labels to refer to a specific ethnic group. For example, Buriel (1987) claimed that numerous labels exist to refer to the population of Mexican descent in the United States: *Mexican*, *Mexicano*, *Mexican American*, *Mestizo*, and *Chicano* comprise most of the labels. Indeed, over the years, outgroup members have coined a few pejorative and offensive labels to refer to those of Mexican descent, most of which are lodged in stereotypical, prejudicial, and racist thoughts. In fact, such belittling and deprecatory labels exist for all ethnic groups, and all are unequivocally rejected.

In selecting ethnic-specific samples for behavioral and social science research, researchers often rely on ethnic labels to describe, identify, and differentiate their respondent groups. By following this practice, researchers unwittingly assume that respondents share a common modal understanding of their ethnic and nationalistic *lifeways* (ethnocultural-group-specific ways of living and being) and *thoughtways* (ethnocultural-group-specific ways of thought). Researchers who solely rely on an ethnic gloss to describe ethnic groups actually ignore the richness and depth of cultural variations within these groups and the numerous subgroups characterized by distinct lifeways and thoughtways (Trimble, 1995; Trimble & Dickson, 2005).

Use of a broad ethnic gloss to describe an ethnic group in a research venture is not recommended. Apart from the fact that glosses are gross misrepresentations, their use violates certain principles concerning external validity; indeed, use of the gloss fosters stereotypy. One of the most widely used ethnic glosses is *White*, or more technically, *Caucasian*. *White* is not a distinct cultural or ethnic group but rather a label typically used to refer to people of European ancestry; a close examination of this group's skin pigmentation and admixtures reveals that members would range from buff to dark brown. James Baldwin, the noted African American novelist and essayist, pointed out that there is no "white culture, religion, or language; there are many cultural ways of being white" (as cited in Rochmes & Griffin, 2006, p. 78). Rochmes and Griffin concurred with Baldwin and added that "Whiteness . . . does not effectively describe a race, ethnicity, culture, or skin color" (p. 77). Given these assertions, why is the term used to refer to a collection of people as though they represent a modal ethnocultural group?

Results from the 2000 U.S. Census survey revealed that many people who could classify themselves as White or Caucasian actually preferred to identify with their ethnic, nationalistic, or ancestral origins so much so that one wonders what is being measured by scales that purport to tap into *White* as a single ethnic identifier. One of the questions in the 2000 form asked, "What is this person's ancestry or ethnic origin?" In response, 80% of the respondents specified their ancestry: 58% provided a single ancestry, and 22% provided multiple ancestries (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). The specific ancestral or ethnic groups listed reveals an interesting and illuminating pattern, as 42.8 million considered themselves to be of German ancestral background; the figure represented more than 15% of the total responses. Groups mentioned with more than 15 million reporting included Irish (30.5 million), African American (24.9 million), English (24.5 million), American (20.2 million), Mexican (18.4 million), and Italian (15.6 million). Overall, the census item generated some 92 different ancestries with 100,000 or more people; the census item actually generated some 500 different ancestral listings (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). What is interesting about the ancestral or ethnic listings is that only 0.7% (1,799,711 million) listed *White*; *Caucasian* was not one of the listings found in the group with 100,000 or more people.

The U.S. Census Bureau defines ancestry "as a person's ethnic origin, heritage, descent, or 'roots,' which may reflect their place of birth, place of birth of parents or ancestors, and ethnic identities that evolved within the United States" (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004, p. 1). Moreover, the U.S. Census Bureau maintains that the "broad concept can mean different things to different people: it can be described alternatively as where their ancestors are from, where they or their parents originated, or simply how they see themselves" (p. 1). After examining the 2000 U.S. Census results, one wonders why the distinct 500 or more ancestral and ethnic groups are not given serious attention in the measurement of identity. The results also strongly suggest that *White* should be eliminated from discussions about ethnic identity, as it is a hollow and inadequate measurement construct.

Assessment and Measurement Approaches and Techniques

Some theoreticians and writers believe that the measurement of ethnicity and race should be abandoned because the meanings of the constructs are elusive and have pejorative, racist origins and implications (McKenney & Bennett, 1994; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Universalistic-oriented scholars like Sollors (1989) maintain that ethnicity is an invention and that its continued use and measurement are divisive, as most Americans have more similarities with one another than differences. Gans (1996) added that in

measuring ethnicity, attitude studies tend to overemphasize the importance ascribed to the construct; ethnic groups may have more in common with one another than distinct differences, but that small difference may be exaggerated because of the emotional importance placed on it by researchers and their participants. Although the criticisms are few in number, currently there are scales and techniques that fit the best practices of measurement theory, and a few of them are discussed in this section for illustrative purposes.

Whatever measurement approach or technique one chooses to develop or use, Trimble (2000) and Trimble, Helms, and Root (2002) suggested that the following four domains be addressed: (a) natality, which includes one's ancestral genealogy and those of the parents, siblings, and grandparents; (b) subjective identification whereby the respondent provides a declaration of his or her own ethnic or racial identity; (c) behavioral expressions of identity, in which the respondent indicates his or her preferences for activities relevant to the ethnic affiliation; and (d) situational or contextual influences, for which the respondent indicates the situations that call for a deliberate expression of the ethnic affiliation. The four domains were compiled from the major components provided in the various definitions of culture, ethnicity, ethnic group, and race. Well-developed identity measures also must be grounded in theory; use operational definitions for the constructs; and meet rigorous psychometric standards, including cultural measurement equivalence and the minimization of item bias.

There are numerous scales and measures in the literature designed for use with a limited number of ethnic and racial populations. Cross (1991), for example, summarized a number of measures to assess Negro, Black, or African American identity. Additionally, one will find measures that tap into multiracial, cross-racial, multicultural, multidimensional, and bicultural identity in their literature search. Upon further examination of the scales, one will note that most of them are of the paper-and-pencil type, for which respondents are asked to respond to forced-choice Likert-type scale alternatives (Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Trimble, 1991). Ethnic and racial identity scales vary from use of nominal to multiple-item ethnic and racial identity measures. Item content, presentation format, and length also vary considerably. What follows is a brief summary of selected identity measures that follow the best practices of scale and measurement development.

Nominal Measurement Approaches

Self-identification often is a nominal procedure that is grounded in a form of subjective criteria to decide which ethnic, racial, or ancestral category to choose. With this procedure, typically, respondents are asked to place a checkmark after an ethnic or racial category with which they most identify; in essence, they name or identify the ethnic or racial group provided them and if it is not there, they fill in a blank space usually labeled *Other.*

Use of simple nominal ethnic and racial procedures for declaring affiliation and membership have limited use. Waters (1990) indicated that the technique indeed affirms one's ethnic identity,

> but one cannot tell what this identity means to an individual; how and why people choose a particular ethnic identity from a range of possible choices; how often and in what ways that ethnic identity is used in everyday life; and how ethnic identity is intergenerationally transferred within families. (p. 11)

To assess the deep meaning of ethnic identity, Waters (1990) developed an interview schedule containing more than 100 pointed questions designed to explore the nature and meaning of ethnicity. Items were generated from extensive, time-consuming, and comprehensive interviews with respondents from specific ethnic groups. Waters suggested that "one constructs an ethnic identification using knowledge about ancestries in one's background" and that "this information is selectively used in the social construction of ethnic identification within the prevailing historical, structural, and personal constraints" (p. 19). Although not a scale in the strict sense of the term, Waters's lengthy and orderly array of items allows an investigator to probe deeply into the meaning of a person's initial designation of his or her ancestry. More important, Waters's approach lays a foundation for how to properly develop a technique to assess ethnic identity.

Waters's results demonstrated that identity is multifaceted and that different motives are salient for different forms of identity; ethnic identification may serve a different function than an identity with another facet of one's life, and thus serve different needs. Her method showed that the sole use of a nominal ethnic declaration is woefully insufficient for understanding the functions of a label for the individual and group.

Multiple-Item Ethnic Identity Measures

Ethnic and racial identity scales assume that people can readily identify with a group or even prefer to do so. In this instance, use of an item that asks respondents to check, list, or write in the group with which they identify is a good starting point. In fact, many multiple-item identity scales start with this question but subsequently add items to explore elements of the four domains mentioned previously. Built on Tajfel's social identity theory and the developmental stages advocated by Erik Erikson, Phinney's (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure asks respondents to indicate their ethnic affiliation twice in the 15-item scale; respondents check off one of seven ethnic categories, one of which is an *Other* category. Her widely used and well-known scale assesses ethnic self-identification through two dimensions derived from principal components rotated factor analysis, ethnic identity, and other group orientation. The scale can be used to obtain a global overview measure of ethnic identity; additionally, one can obtain separate scores from the subscales.

Multiple-Item Racial Identity Measures

The beginnings of racial identity scales can be traced to Burlew and Smith (1991), who identified four ways that measures of racial identity could be classified to include (a) developmental, (b) Africentric, (c) group-based, and (d) racial stereotypes. Based on the development of several subsequent scales, Burlew and her colleagues revised these categories to include (a) identity formation, (b) cultural connectedness, and (c) multicultural experiences that permit a more accurate grouping of a majority of the measures intended to tap racial identity (Burlew, Bellow, & Lovett, 2000). The scales and theoretical perspectives presented in the next section reflect the themes of the classifications.

In 1991, Cross published a landmark book on African American identity in which he laid out his theory of Nigrescence (Cross, 1991). Along with providing a useful review of the research and

commentary on African American identity, Cross provided data on three stages of a multistage Nigrescence model: (a) pre-encounter, (b) immersion–emersion, and (c) internalization (see Cross, Parham, & Helms, 1991). In 1991, Cross developed a 54-item scale that captured the essence of the three stages and permitted him to empirically demonstrate that African American identity progresses through stages and that this identity development could be tracked accurately. His scale and multistage approach to assessing African American identity influenced the subsequent development of important and thought-provoking racial identity measures (see Burlew et al., 2000).

In 1995, Cross revised his theory and developed the Cross Racial Identity Scale (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). The development of the scale occurred over a 5-year period and involved the assistance of multicultural experts and samples of African American college students. The full scale consists of 40 items, with 30 of them targeted to assess six subscales that comprise the main features of Cross's revised Nigrescence theory; each of the subscales contains five items accompanied with a seven-choice alternative rating scale. The six subscales are reasonably independent of one another, thus one is encouraged to aggregate scores for each subscale but interpret outcomes in the context of the full set of subscales.

In 2001, Cross revised his theory and approach to assess "identity as operations, functions, negotiations, enactments or activities" (Cross, Smith, & Payne, 2002, p. 93). Using a variant of Vygotsky's activity theory, Cross and his associates constructed situation-based case studies from narratives grounded in everyday transactions. Analyses of the narrative protocols from a sample of African Americans revealed that certain distinct "situation identity" patterns emerged to include

> (a) identity protection transactions, or buffering; (b) an identity "on/off" switch, called *code switching*, that allows movement in and out of Black and non-Black cultural settings; (c) identity connectivity enactments that make transracial friendship possible; (d) identity belonging activities that promote a sense of bonding and attachment to the Black experience; and (e) identity individuation activities that sustain the boundaries of a person's individuality. (Cross et al., 2002, p. 105)

Cross is one of a few identity researchers to fully factor in situational domains in the measurement of racial identification.

The foremost and most often cited racial identity scales center on the seminal and thought-provoking research of psychologist Janet E. Helms. As emphasized in her article for this issue (Helms, 2007), Helms and her associates developed their scales according to the five developmental stages model proposed by Cross and his associates; later Helms modified her model to focus on statuses in lieu of stages because "statuses give rise to schemata, which are behavioral manifestations of the underlying statuses. It is schemata rather than the statuses per se that paper-and-pencil racial identity attitude inventories presumably assess" (Helms, 2001, p. 184; see Carter, 1996; Helms, 1996). Currently, the Helms Racial Identity measures 11 statuses in one form or another.

The Helms Racial Identity measures are grounded in the following themes:

> (a) one's racial identity develops in comparison to one's "contrast" racial group; (b) healthy identity development involves the abandonment of societal impositions of racial-self in favor of one's own personality relevant self-definition; (c) members of socioracial groups develop racial identity by means of a sequential process in which increasingly more sophisticated differentiations of the ego evolve from earlier less mature statuses; and (d) qualitative differences in *expression* of racial identity statuses can be measured, but development must be inferred from responses top measures. (Helms, 1996, p. 155)

The 50-item White Racial Identity Attitude Scale extended Helms's theoretical perspectives to White racial identity (Carter, 1996; Helms, 1996; Helms & Carter, 1990). She argued that as Whites become more racially conscious, they will progress through two phases: abandonment of racism and defining a nonracist White identity. Each of these phases contains stages/statuses that include contact, disintegration, reintegration, pseudoindependence, immersion–emersion, and autonomy.

Some researchers urge that users of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale must proceed with caution (Fischer & Moradi, 2001; Swanson, Tokar, & Davis, 1994). In defense of her scale and psychometric analyses, Helms (1996) argued that a scale can generate variable reliability coefficients because (a) researchers may not have sampled adequately; (b) alpha coefficients are estimates of the interrelationship between items and factor dimensions and not measures of homogeneity; and (c) reliability coefficients may underestimate the relationships in part because of the influence of situational variables. Helms effectively elaborates on these points in her article in this issue (Helms, 2007).

Waters (1990) and Phinney (1992) measured a variant of ethnicity, and thus there was considerable overlap in their item content. Cross (1991) and Helms (1994), on the other hand, developed scales to assess a specific form of racial identity for which Helms made it quite clear that her scales did not assess ethnicity but racial identity and not race. All of the researchers defined their constructs appropriately and thus captured their core elements. Nonetheless, their scale developments could benefit from a refinement of their constructs by carefully synthesizing the core elements of the definitions; their efforts could move the field closer to a consensus in how the constructs are defined.

Multiple Identity Measures

Until recently most of the published identity measures have tapped the major ethnic group identity of the respondent; that is, the respondent typically is asked to state or list one ethnic affiliation. However, as emphasized earlier, many respondents have more than one ethnic identity and some actually prefer to state their declarations with ethnic groups that are most salient for them.

In the 1980s, Weinreich put forth his theory and measurement technique explicating identity structure analysis (ISA), a complex, highly sophisticated approach to assessing ethnic identity as well as people's identities with other facets of their lives (Weinreich, 1986; Weinreich & Saunderson, 2003). Weinreich's scale and approach allows one to identify with more than one ethnic or racial group. ISA is grounded in psychodynamic developmental theory, personal construct psychology, appraisal theory, social constructionism, cognitive–affective consistency theories, and symbolic interactionist theoretical perspectives. Weinreich (2003) indicated, "ISA conceptualizes one's appraisal of social situations as involving one's interpretation of their significance to self's identity from moment to moment. Appraisal provides and records experiences of

situations and events" (Weinreich, 2003, p. 20). ISA can be custom-designed to measure identity in an idiographic or nomothetic framework through use of bipolar constructs, thus the approach can be tailored for an individual as well as for groups. Indices can be constructed to measure such constructs as self-image (past, current, and ideal), values, role models, reference groups, empathetic identification, identification conflicts, evaluation of others, and a few other related identity domains.

The scales summarized in this section and those described in the literature are not without criticism. Indeed, several researchers and scholars have subjected many of the measures and their corresponding theories to extensive scrutiny. For example, Root (2000) argued that "the current models do not account for a range of ways in which people construct their core identities and determine the importance of race in them" (p. 214). Moreover, Root (2000) noted that "researchers have found no reliable method of extrapolating the core or breadth of one's identity from one context of identity or from a response to one question" (p. 212). She provided some thoughtful suggestions to accommodate several criticisms by focusing on the ecological influences on racial development that deal with inherited influences, traits, and social interactions with communities. Thus, it must be stated that before any of the ethnic and racial identity scales and theories are considered for use, one should carefully review the literature and factor in the observations and criticisms.

In the main, the fashionable mode of ethnic and racial identity scale and measure development relies on use of self-report procedures and variants of a forced-choice response alternative following Likert-type formats. A few assessment and measurement approaches use interview schedule and protocols such as those developed by Waters (1990) and Root (1999, 2000). Reliance on these formats can lead to the assessment of measurement equivalence and item bias problems; these topics are discussed in the next section.

Cultural Equivalence, Item Bias, and Measurement Considerations

In their lead articles, Helms (2007) and Cokley (2007) maintain that there are several problems with the way ethnic and racial identity scales are analyzed. They do not take their arguments far enough, though, as they do not include discussions about cultural measurement equivalence and item bias properties of measures, and alternative statistical algorithms to capture respondent response patterns. For example, ethnic and racial group comparative research using identity measures may be fraught with problems of incomparability and thus may lead researchers to draw conclusions about a finding that may not be valid or justified. Indeed, with some exceptions, most of the ethnic and racial identity measures cited in the literature have not factored in cultural equivalence and item bias procedures to determine if there is cross-ethnic and racial congruence in the meanings of items. At this point, then, I move away from discussion of identity constructs and measures to a discussion of research and analytic procedures and principles essential to ethnic and cultural psychological identity scale development.

Cultural Equivalence and Item Bias

Cultural equivalence refers "to the problem of whether, on the basis of measurements and observations, inferences in terms of some common psychological dimension can be made in different groups of subjects" (Poortinga, 1983, p. 238). Although five types of cultural equivalence are used to discuss the concept, in an exhaustive review of the literature on equivalence, Johnson (1998) identified 52 types; subsequently, he classified the types into interpretive and procedural summary categories. On his findings, Johnson concluded, "In no other field of inquiry . . . has this seemingly elementary concept been assigned as many alternative meanings and disaggregated into as many components as in the field of cross-cultural research" (p. 2). Nonetheless, if researchers develop scales to measure ethnic and racial identity from individuals representing single or multiple ethnocultural groups, it is reasonable to assume that their constructs and items meet the test of measurement equivalence; to date, few have provided sufficient attention to identity measure development that meet equivalence and item bias standards.

Cultural equivalence is similar to item bias. Item bias deals with the similarity or dissimilarity of scale outcomes across ethnic populations and thus is concerned with "the presence or absence of validity-threatening factors" (Van de Vijver, 2000, p. 89). In drawing a distinction between the two constructs, Van de Vijver and Poortinga (1997) asserted that item bias is associated with construct, instrument, and method bias; item bias differs from cultural equivalence in part because the latter deals more with the outcomes than the factors that influence validity (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997). Put in simpler terms, according to Byrne and Watkins (2003), "Bias refers to the presence of nuisance factors [and] equivalence refers to the implication of bias on score comparability" (p. 174).

Assessing Cultural Equivalence, Item Bias, and Invariance

In recent years, a few cross-cultural researchers have put forth a variety of interesting statistical algorithms for assessing the presence of forms of cultural equivalence and culturally bound item bias (see Allen & Walsh, 2000). To assess metric equivalence, for example, some researchers have analyzed the scales or instruments with principal components or factor analysis. If the structural dimensions of instruments resemble one another, then presumably the scales are equivalent across groups. Strength of the factor-based scales for the respective groups serves as partial criteria. Factor solutions have been expanded to include congruence coefficients and related manipulations to isolate the nature of the equivalence. Scales developed by Helms (1994) and Phinney (1992) rely heavily on factor structure analyses.

Use of factor analysis in psychometric research and testing equivalence is not without criticism (Carter, 1996; Helms, 1996; Kline, 1983). The range of arguments is multifold and, in some instances, compelling; they will not be included in this article. Nonetheless, three critical points should be made: (a) Factor solutions rarely fit the data completely in cultural-comparative research due, for the most part, to nonrandom measurement and translation error and unspecified conceptual contributions to the obtained weights; (b) factor solutions are suggestive; and (c) data should be, at a minimum, at the interval level.

Most identity scales and inventories use binary or ordinal-level response categories with presumed equality of numerical distances between the choice alternatives; distortions can exist, thus eroding the strength of the correlation coefficients. Kim and Mueller (1978) discovered that variables with limited categories are not compatible with factor analytic models. Additionally, according to Schumaker and Linacre (1996), "Factor analysis is confused by ordinal variables and highly correlated factors" (p. 470). Most forceful of the critics, though, has been Duncan (1984), who considered factor analysis as a failure in the measurement field because, among other points, "we . . . see nothing more than a 'correlational' science of 'inexact constructs'" (p. 207).

A few cross-cultural researchers recommend use of covariance structural modeling (e.g., LISREL, AMOS, EQS) or variants of confirmatory factor analysis to test for equivalence (Poortinga, 1983; Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). There are limitations associated with the use of exploratory factor models; the advances in confirmatory factor modeling, however, appear to overcome these limitations. For example, in testing for measurement equivalence, Prelow, Tein, Roosa, and Wood (2000) and Spini (2003) used confirmatory factor analysis algorithms and found that many of their scales and corresponding items were unstable across different cultural groups.

A growing number of researchers recommend a form of latent trait analysis (item response theory or IRT), especially when the scale contains binary and ordinal scores. There is no indication that the scales reviewed in this article used IRT or Rasch modeling; if that is the case, then they should, as do the fixed-choice alternative scales, conveniently lend themselves to latent trait analyses. The Rasch (1980) one-parameter model can be used, too. However, Irvine and Carroll (1980) reminded scholars that the model should be used "along-side traditional models as part of another method of looking at the same data" (p. 210). Rasch modeling is a powerful alternative to factor analysis and analysis of variance in assessing the properties of tests and psychosocial scales. It provides a fit for each respondent to the model as well as plots respondents and items on the same real number line (scale) so that one can visualize whether the cases have higher or lower values than the items are capable of finding.

Implications for Counseling Psychology

At the beginning of this article, it was pointed out that counselors who deal with a client's ethnic and racial identity problems must have a deep understanding of the origins of the constructs and how the client frames his or her identity problems. Unfortunately, counselors cannot rely on the emerging field of multicultural counseling for direction, as it is devoid of a well-grounded theory (Helms & Cook, 1999; Moodley & Palmer, 2006). Although the field is filled with the use of the major constructs discussed in this article, they are not well defined when one carefully examines the literature. When there are definitions, they vary from one article or chapter to another, so no one can be quite certain which one is preferred. Counselors, therefore, are encouraged to study the origins of the constructs, their varied meanings and usage, how clients define them and what they mean to clients in terms of their life experiences, and how they are measured with the current set of scales and procedures. References cited in this article can serve as resources, especially Sollors's (1989) excellent collection of essays.

A generalized use of the constructs discussed in this article can influence use of ethnic stereotypical characterizations. Moodley and Palmer (2006) cautiously reminded readers that adhering "to a rigid understanding of these terms may offer psychotherapists cognitive, emotional and professional security but may lead them to indulge in stereotyping clients negatively with dire consequences for a vulnerable client" (p. 19). Unexamined use of the constructs also can lead to generalizations about a client's worldview and thus to erroneous distortions of values, beliefs, behaviors, and emotional expressions. If this pattern holds sway, then counselors run the risk of tailoring and simplifying their approach to accommodate what they believe to be a generalized ethnic-specific modal personality; in effect, they are prone to the influences of the ethnic gloss phenomenon and thus perceive ethnic homogeneity when in fact it does not exist.

To avoid the use of stereotypes and ethnic gloss generalizations, counselors must provide clients with opportunities to express their thoughts about the deep meaning of ethnicity, ethnic group affiliation, racism, ethnic and racial identity, among others. In describing the meaning of the constructs, clients likely would include narrative descriptions of their life experiences as well as their understanding of historical events that influenced their worldviews. When this procedure is used with ethnic-specific clients, often they will shift to a unique narrative style particular to the group with which they most identify; sociolinguists refer to this as *code switching*, that is, the shift from using one speech pattern to another that closely resembles that of a group in which one is enculturated.

With the rapid advances in the multicultural counseling field and the emergence of cultural counseling competencies, counselors who dig into the deep meanings of these constructs with their clients stand to contribute valuable case study information. Many of the multicultural competencies are untested and therefore lack evidence for their efficacy, validity, and reliability (see Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 2001). Additionally, a careful study of the constructs along with their use can influence the development of new forms of counseling and thus promote the value, significance, and importance of multicultural counseling competencies (Pope-Davis et al., 2003).

Summary and Conclusions

We have come to the end of the synopsis of constructs and measures associated with the measurement of ethnic and racial identity. The synopsis began with Geertz's (2000, p. 227) observation that the study of identity "demands an alteration not only in the way in which we conceive of identity but of the way we write about it, the vocabulary we use to render it visible and measure its force." Although his keen observation was not the central theme of this article, it set the tone that the conceptualization and measurement of racial and ethnic identity is complicated and filled with many problems; one of them is that human beings have multiple, intertwined identities that influence one another in ways that are not fully understood. Measurement problems are compounded by the growing popularity of identity and the effect it has on its meaning. "As identity became more and more a cliché," maintained Gleason (1983), "its meaning grew progressively more

diffuse, thereby encouraging increasingly loose and irresponsible usage" (p. 931).

In this article, sections were devoted to a summary of theoretical perspectives on ethnicity and race. Although there are several compelling definitions of the constructs, ethnicity and race are not without controversy. Most scholars agree that the constructs are social constructions. Some view them as inventions, synonyms for identity, symbolic, political, fictional, imagined, and pseudo or contrived. Ethnicity and race are linked to identity; however, the linkage is not straightforward as there are varying opinions on what is more salient and in need of emphasis to understand identity formation and development—ethnic identity or racial identity. Several scholars insist that the concept of the self must be factored into the discussions and theory building. Viewing the self as the core of the identity process is central to counseling theory and practice.

Following the construct explanations, the article turned to a review of some approaches and techniques for the measurement of ethnic and racial identity. The section started with a review of nominal approaches to self-identification such as those used recently by the U.S. Census Bureau. Here again, use of nominal approaches to capture one's race and ethnicity is not without controversy. Flowing from that section, a few illustrative measures were summarized, illustrating various approaches to measuring distinct multiple ethnic and racial identities.

Several important conclusions became apparent from that section. First, valid and reliable measures of ethnic and racial identity must be grounded in theory or, at a minimum, on several fundamental psychological propositions. Second, scholars must acknowledge the conclusion that the measurement of ethnicity is no small task, especially given the debate surrounding its theoretical foundations and its usefulness. Researchers must consider the "various cultural and structural dimensions of ethnicity" (Cheung, 1989, p. 72) and "distinguish between general aspects of ethnic identity that apply across groups and specific aspects that distinguish groups" (Phinney, 1990, p. 508). To accomplish this, researchers must move away from viewing ethnic groups as homogeneous entities. In fact, there may be more heterogeneity within certain ethnic and racial groups than for the dominant groups in North American society (Trimble, 1991; Trimble & Dickson, 2005).

The article closed with a summary of the methodological and measurement problems inherent in the development and use of measures for ethnic and racial populations. Aspects of cultural equivalence and item bias were presented along with an assortment of statistical techniques that can be used to assess invariance and nonequivalence. Studies have suggested that sole reliance on conventional and traditional psychometric approaches for establishing a measure's reliability and validity is insufficient and incomplete, given advances in the use of latent structure analyses. Helms (1996) reminded scholars that "this closed-minded perspective frequently has led them [those who use alpha coefficients, inter-item correlations, and factor analysis] to discount their own findings in support of racial identity theory" (p. 186).

Uncertainty and ambiguity emerge from the synopsis. There is an uncertainty about the meanings of culture, ethnicity, race, and ethnic group as well as their usefulness in describing the U.S. population. There is an uncertainty about how a person appraises the world and its meaning as an expression of self-identity. There is a lack of clarity about what theory best explains identity dynamics, components, and processes. There is an uncertainty as to why ethnicity and race are given so much prominence in North America and in other parts of the world. Most important, there is skepticism about the applicability of the findings generated by the incongruent and inconsistent measures, especially for the psychological practitioner.

The inconsistencies and incongruities suggest that the field of ethnic and racial identity is in a condition of disorder and confusion. Weinreich and Saunderson (2003) summarized the confusion best when they asserted that it was "a kaleidoscope set of conceptualizations [where] methods of assessment of parameters of identity, deriving from disparate conceptualizations of self and identity, are often unrelated" (p. 361).

The inconsistencies, incongruities, and confusion in the field should not deter or dissuade the scholar, scientist, and counselor from conducting further inquiry into the topic. Quite the contrary, the field is in desperate need of structure and order. To accomplish orderliness and structure, scholars and practitioners are challenged and encouraged to probe deeper into the topic to sort out and smooth over the discrepancies and incongruities. A good starting point for an inquiry is the emergence of a multiracial or multiethnic classification category. What deep or surface cultural attributes will a multiethnic category permit? If researchers and practitioners are interested in discovering deep cultural or ethnic contributions to a personality style, for example, how will the contributions be disentangled from one's multiethnic worldview or orientation? As we scholars probe deeper into the structure and meaning of ethnic identity, according to Devereux (1996) we must be mindful of the proposition that "identity is the absolute uniqueness of the individual" (p. 385) and that it "must be enunciable and enunciated by a self-ethnographer" (p. 391).

References

Aboud, F. E. (1987). The development of ethnic self-identification and attitudes. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 32–55). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Allen, J., & Walsh, J. A. (2000). A construct-based approach to equivalence: Methodologies for cross-cultural /multicultural personality assessment research. In R. H. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of cross-cultural and multicultural personality assessment* (pp. 63–85). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Allport, G. W. (1958). *The nature of prejudice*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.

Barth, F. (Ed.). (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Berry, J., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Boas, F. (1945). *Race and democratic society*. New York: Augustin.

Buriel, R. (1987). Ethnic labeling and identity among Mexican Americans. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 134–152). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Burlew, A. K., Bellow, S., & Lovett, M. (2000). Racial identity measures: A review and classification system. In R. H. Dana (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of cross cultural and multicultural personality assessment: Personality and clinical psychology series* (pp. 173–196). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Burlew, A. K., & Smith, L. R. (1991). Measures of racial identity: An

overview and proposed framework. *Journal of Black Psychology, 17,* 53–71.

Byrne, B. M., & Watkins, D. (2003). The issue of measurement invariance revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 155–175.

Carter, R. T. (1996). Exploring the complexity of racial identity attitude measures. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 193–223). Lincoln: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements at the University of Nebraska.

Cheung, Y. W. (1989). Making sense of ethnicity and drug use: A review and suggestions for future research. *Social Pharmacology, 3*(1/2), 55–82.

Cokley, K. (2007). Critical issues in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity: A referendum on the state of the field. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 224–234.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African American identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cross, W. E., Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1991). The stages of Black identity development: Nigrescence models. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Black psychology* (pp. 319–338). Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Cross, W. E., Smith, L., & Payne, Y. (2002). Black identity: A repertoire of daily enactments. In P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures* (5th ed., pp. 93–107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, W. E., Jr., & Vandiver, B. J. (2001). Nigrescence theory and measurement: Introducing the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS). In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 371–393). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Devereux, G. (1996). Ethnic identity: Its logical foundations and its dysfunctions. In W. Sollors (Ed.), *Theories of ethnicity: A classical reader* (pp. 385–414). New York: New York University Press.

Duncan, O. D. (1984). *Notes on social measurement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Feagin, J. R. (1978). *Racial and ethnic relations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fischer, A. R., & Moradi, B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed. pp. 341–370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gans, H. J. (1996). Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and cultures in America. In W. Sollors (Ed.), *Theories of ethnicity: A classical reader* (pp. 425–459). New York: New York University Press.

Gates, H. L. (1986). Race as the trope of the world. In H. L. Gates (Ed.), *"Race," writing, and difference* (pp. 4–13). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (2000). *Available light: Anthropological reflections on philosophical topics.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gleason, P. (1983). Identifying identity: A semantic history. *Journal of American History, 69,* 910–931.

Greeley, A. M. (1974). *Ethnicity in the United States.* New York: Wiley.

Helms, J. E. (1994). The conceptualization of racial identity. In E. Trickett, R. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 285–311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 143–192). Lincoln: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements at the University of Nebraska.

Helms, J. E. (2001). An update of Helm's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181–198). London: Sage.

Helms, J. E. (2007). Some better practices for measuring racial and ethnic identity constructs. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 235–246.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 67–80). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process.* Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Irvine, S., & Carroll, W. (1980). Testing and assessment across cultures: Issues in methodology and theory. In H. Triandis & J. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Methodology* (pp. 181–244). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnson, T. P. (1998). Approaches to equivalence in cross-cultural and cross-national research. In J. A. Harkness (Ed.), *Zuma-nachrichten spezial* [Social survey research center news special] (pp. 1–40). Mannheim, Germany: ZUMA.

Jones, J. M. (2003). Constructing race and deconstructing racism: A cultural psychology approach. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial and ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 276–290). London: Sage.

Kim, J., & Mueller, C. (1978). *Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues* (Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07–001). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kline, P. (1983). The cross-cultural use of personality tests. In S. Irvine & J. Berry (Eds.), *Human assessment and cultural factors* (pp. 337–352). New York: Plenum.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions.* New York: Vintage.

Lonner, W. J., & Malpass, R. S. (1994). When psychology and culture meet: An introduction to cross-cultural psychology. In W. J. Lonner & R. S. Malpass (Eds.), *Psychology and culture* (pp. 1–12). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Matsumoto, D. (2000). *Culture and psychology: People around the world* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Matsumoto, D., Kasri, F., Milligan, E., Singh, U., & The, J. (1997). *Lay conceptions of culture: Do students and researchers understand culture in the same way?* Unpublished manuscript, San Francisco State University.

McKenney, N. R., & Bennett, C. E. (1994). Issues regarding data on race and ethnicity: The Census Bureau experience. *Public Health Reports, 109,* 16–25.

Moodley, R. (2003). Matrices in black and white: Implications of cultural multiplicity for research in counseling and psychotherapy. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research, 3*(2), 115–121.

Moodley, R., & Palmer, S. (2006). Race, culture and other multiple constructions: An absence in psychotherapy. In R. Moodley & S. Palmer (Eds.), *Race, culture, and psychotherapy* (pp. 11–26). London: Routledge.

Murdock, G. P., Ford, C. S., & Hudson, A. E. (1971). *Outline of cultural materials* (4th ed.). New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files.

Perlmann, J., & Waters, M. C. (Eds.). (2002). *The new race question: How the census counts multiracial individuals.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 499–514.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7,* 156–176.

Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (2001). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Poortinga, Y. (1983). Psychometric approaches to intergroup comparison:

The problem of equivalence. In S. Irvine & J. Berry (Eds.), *Human assessment and cultural factors* (pp. 237–257). New York: Plenum.

Poortinga, Y. H. (1990). *Towards a conceptualization of culture for psychology.* Unpublished manuscript, Tilburg University, The Netherlands.

Poortinga, Y. H., van de Vijver, F. J. R., Joe, R. C., & van de Koppel, J. M. H. (1987). Peeling the onion called culture: A synopsis. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), *Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 22–34). Berwyn, PA: Swets North America.

Pope-Davis, D. B., Coleman, H. L. K., Liu, W. M., & Toporek, R. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of multicultural competencies in counseling and psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Prelow, H. M., Tein, J., Roosa, M. W., & Wood, J. (2000). Do coping styles differ across sociocultural groups? The role of measurement equivalence in making this judgement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28,* 225–244.

Prewitt, K. (2002). Race in the 2000 census: A turning point. In J. Perlmann & M. C. Waters (Eds.), *The new race question: How the census counts multiracial individuals* (pp. 354–360). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rasch, G. (1980). *Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment tests.* Chicago: Mesa.

Rochmes, D. A., & Griffin, G. A. E. (2006). The cactus that must not be mistaken for a pillow: White racial formation among Latinos. *Souls, 8*(2), 77–91.

Root, M. P. (1998). Experiences and processes affecting racial identity development: Preliminary results from the biracial sibling project. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 43,* 237–247.

Root, M. P. (1999). The biracial baby boom: Understanding ecological constructions of racial identity in the 21st century. In R. H. Sheets & E. R. Hollins (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic identity in school practices: Aspects of human development* (pp. 67–89). London: Erlbaum.

Root, M. P. (2000). Rethinking racial identity development. In P. Spickard & W. J. Burroughs (Eds.), *Narrative and multiplicity in constructing ethnic identity* (pp. 205–220). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rosenthal, D. A. (1987). Ethnic identity development in adolescents. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 156–179). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Saharso, S. (1989). Ethnic identity and the paradox of equality. In J. P. Van Oudenhoven & T. M. Willemsen (Eds.), *Ethnic minorities: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 97–114). Berwyn, PA: Swets North America.

Schermmerhorn, R. A. (1969). *Comparative ethnic relations: A framework for theory and research.* New York: Random House.

Schumaker, R., & Linacre, J. (1996). Factor analysis and Rasch. *Rasch Measurement Transactions, 9,* 470.

Sollors, W. (Ed.). (1989). *The invention of ethnicity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Spini, D. (2003). Measurement equivalence of 10 value types from the Schwartz Value Survey across 21 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 3–23.

Steinberg, S. (1981). *The ethnic myth: Race, ethnicity, and class in America.* New York: Atheneum.

Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2000). The measurement of racial and ethnic identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24,* 541–552.

Swanson, L. J., Tokar, D. M., & Davis, L. E. (1994). Content and construct validity of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44,* 198–217.

Thompson, R. H. (1989). *Theories of ethnicity: A critical appraisal.* New York: Greenwood Press.

Toomer, J. (1996). Race problems and modern society. In W. Sollors (Ed.), *Theories of ethnicity: A classical reader* (pp. 168–190). New York: New York University Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1980). Introduction to handbook of cross-cultural psychology. In H. C. Triandis & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 1. Perspectives* (pp. 1–14). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Trimble, J. E. (1991). Ethnic specification, validation prospects, and the future of drug use research. *International Journal of the Addictions, 25*(2A), 149–170.

Trimble, J. (1995). Toward an understanding of ethnicity and ethnic identification and their relationship with drug use research. In G. Botvin, S. Schinke, & M. Orlandi (Eds.), *Drug abuse prevention with multiethnic youth* (pp. 3–27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Trimble, J. E. (2000). Social psychological perspectives on changing self-identification among American Indians and Alaska Natives. In R. H. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of cross-cultural and multicultural personality assessment* (pp. 197–222). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Trimble, J. E., & Dickson, R. (2005). Ethnic identity. In C. B. Fisher & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of applied developmental science* (Vol. 1, pp. 415–420). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Trimble, J., Helms, J., & Root, M. (2002). Social and psychological perspectives on ethnic and racial identity. In G. Bernal, J. Trimble, K. Burlew, & F. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial and ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 239–275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *Ancestry: 2000.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration.

Van de Vijver, F. (2000). The nature of bias. In R. H. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of cross-cultural and multicultural personality assessment* (pp. 87–106). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Van de Vijver, F., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Van de Vijver, F., & Poortinga, Y. H. (1997). Towards an integrated analysis of bias in cross-cultural assessment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 13,* 29–37.

Van de Vijver, F., & Tanzer, N. K. (1997). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 47,* 263–279.

van den Berghe, P. L. (1981). *The ethnic phenomenon.* New York: Elsevier North Holland.

Vaughn, G. M. (1987). A social psychological model of ethnic identity development. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 73–91). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weinreich, P. (1986). The operationalisation of identity theory in racial and ethnic relations. In J. Rex & D. Mason (Eds.), *Theories of race and ethnic relations* (pp. 299–320). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Weinreich, P. (2003). Identity structure analysis. In P. Weinreich & W. Saunderson (Eds.), *Analysing identity: Cross-cultural, societal and clinical contexts* (pp. 7–76). New York: Routledge.

Weinreich, P., & Saunderson, W. (Eds.). (2003). *Analysing identity: Cross-cultural, societal and clinical contexts.* New York: Routledge.

Yee, A., Fairchild, H., Weizmann, F., & Wyatt, G. (1993). Addressing psychology's problems with race. *American Psychologist, 48,* 1132–1140.

Yinger, J. M. (1986). Intersecting strands in the theorization of race and ethnic relations. In J. Rex & D. Mason (Eds.), *Theories of race and ethnic relations* (pp. 20–41). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Received November 8, 2006
Revision received March 3, 2007
Accepted March 6, 2007 ■