The transition between childhood and full adulthood is a critical developmental period shaped by individual, familial, social, and historical circumstances. The central task of this age period is nearly universal: to become ready to assume the major roles played by mature members of the social group (Larson, Wilson, Brown, Furstenberg, & Verma, 2002). Typically, after some period of “adolescence,” “youth,” or a new term, “emerging adulthood” (Arnett, 2000), the individual is expected to contribute to society by fulfilling adult roles. In some cultural groups and societies, the transition to adulthood is fixed and relatively predictable, whereas in other societies, this transition can be ambiguous and lengthy.

For many individuals—specifically in modern, industrialized societies—this transition involves, among other things, working to establish a sense of a sense of identity or self. Identity development can be guided by an individualist perspective (e.g., “I am”) or by a collectivist perspective (e.g., “We are”). In this chapter, we present an overview of research on the different ways in which identity development unfolds from adolescence into adulthood, and describe the known correlates of identity development and related outcomes, with particular attention given to personality and well-being.

**THE TRANSITION TO ADULTHOOD AND THE CONCEPT OF EMERGING ADULTHOOD**

“Who am I? What am I doing with my life? What does this all mean anyway?” Many of us have heard these questions from our siblings, our children, or our students—and perhaps we have even asked these questions ourselves. Questions of identity can arise at many points during the life span, but these issues come up most commonly (and intensely) during the adolescent and early adult years (Whitbourne, Sneed, & Sayer, 2009). Indeed, these are the times of life that have traditionally been “set aside”
for identity development (Arnett, 2000; Erikson, 1968). The advent of formal operational thought and abstract thinking in adolescence permits people to imagine what the future could be like—and indeed to begin to ask questions about what they would like the future to be (Moshman, 2011a). In turn, these advanced cognitive abilities allow for consideration of future “possible identities” that one might wish to become—or to avoid becoming (Oyserman & James, 2011).

In Erikson’s time—the mid-20th century—young people were expected to enter the workforce, and into a stable, committed relationship, shortly after completing high school (Côté & Allahar, 1994). The “start in the mailroom and work your way up to president of the company” approach to workforce entry was available to many individuals who were willing to put in the necessary effort. Most people remained in a single line of work for much of their working lives (Kalleberg, 2009). The majority of individuals did not receive postsecondary education; with the exception of professional occupations such as law and medicine, most careers could be “learned on the job.” Thus, there was a limited range of options that one needed to consider in adolescence prior to deciding on a career path. Similarly, the average age of marriage in the United States in 1950 was 22.8 years for men and 20.3 years for women (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001), and divorce was quite rare (Cherlin, 2004). As such, these statistics suggest that most young people had decided on a marriage partner not long after finishing their formal schooling, and that they most often stayed with that person for life.

The state of the labor force in the early 21st century is quite different from that of the mid-20th century. Many entry-level jobs have been mechanized, outsourced, or otherwise made obsolete (Kalleberg, 2009). Young people are now being encouraged to prepare themselves for work in a number of different fields, rather than identifying themselves with any specific corporation (Smith, 2010). More and more occupations require at least a bachelor’s degree—if not more—as a prerequisite for employment. Not coincidentally, young people began to attend colleges and universities in increasing numbers during the second half of the 20th century and into the 21st century. In 1959, approximately 2.4 million American students attended university full time; by 2010, that number had jumped to 12.7 million (National Center on Education Statistics, 2010). This 430% increase is nearly six times the 72% increase in the total U.S. population during that same time span (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Statistics on committed partnership reflect a similar shift in social roles. In many Northern European countries, for example, young people often cohabitate before (or instead of) getting married (Wiik, 2009), and an increasing number of individuals are choosing to remain single permanently (Dykstra & Poortman, 2010). The transition from adolescence to adulthood has become far more extended, precarious, and difficult than was the case 50 or 60 years ago. Although much of this shift is due to larger social and economic changes (Côté & Bynner, 2008), it has profound implications for how young people make the transition to adulthood (Arnett, 2007). This transition has become increasingly individualized, such that young people must largely define for themselves, and live up to, what it means to be an adult. The responsibility for making the transition to adulthood, therefore, rests largely on the shoulders of today’s youth.

Changes in the labor market and the social structure in modern, industrialized cultures, along with the feeling of being somewhere in between adolescence and adulthood (see Arnett, 2000), have all played a key role in extending the transition into adulthood for many individuals living in these societies. These conditions prompted Arnett (2000) to argue for a new developmental period called “emerging adulthood” that captures the period of time from roughly 18 to 25 years of age. Emerging adulthood refers to a time when individuals attend explicitly to issues related to identity (among other things) and are given the freedom to focus on their own self-development. The concept of emerging adulthood is not without controversy, as we discuss later in this chapter. Nonetheless, with an exponential increase in the amount of consideration that young people must give to their future plans for love, work, and parenthood, a premium has been placed on figuring out who one is and where one’s life is headed. The constant availability of information over the Internet, through instant messaging, and through emerging technologies has provided many young people with a wide array of life options—many of which their parents and grandparents could never have imagined.

Therefore, in essence, just as the task of developing a sense of identity has become increasingly important, it has also become more challenging to navigate. Whereas individuals in the mid-20th century could develop their identity within well-defined roles of worker and partner, today’s youth often address identity issues prior to entering the workforce and committed partnerships. Indeed, the expanded transition to adulthood, where many young people attend college prior to beginning their professional careers, provides more opportunities for identity exploration—but there has been a marked decrease in
the extent of support and guidelines for how this identity development should proceed (Côté, 2000).

The destructuring of Western societies, and the resulting expectations for young people to find their own way to adulthood, has placed a premium on agency, or self-direction (Côté & Levine, 2002; Schwartz, 2000). Simply put, individuals who are able to decide for themselves which options are “right” for them, to sort through these options largely on their own, to “change course” when their original plans are blocked, and to follow their efforts through to completion are at a distinct advantage compared to their peers who are less self-directed and agentic (Schwartz, Côté, & Arnett, 2005). As a result, the relatively unstructured transition to adulthood in Westernized countries provides unprecedented opportunities for those who are able to capitalize on them, but this transition can be extremely difficult, distressing, and frustrating for those who are unable or unwilling to exercise agency at this point in the life span (Arnett, 2007).

DIMENSIONS OF IDENTITY: PERSONAL AND CULTURAL

Thus far, we have highlighted several reasons as to why identity is important during adolescence and the transition to adulthood. However, what exactly is identity, how does it work, and how does it develop?

The term identity has been used to refer to many different phenomena, including people’s goals, values, and beliefs; group memberships; and roles played in the larger society (Vignoles, Schwartz, & Luyckx, 2011). The meaning of “identity” has become so unclear that some writers (e.g., Brubaker & Cooper, 2000; Rattansi & Phoenix, 2005) have advocated for discontinuing the use of the term altogether. In this chapter, we adopt the position that the diversity of meanings assigned to “identity” is a virtue. Social-psychological (e.g., Brown, 2000; Spears, 2011) and sociological (e.g., Hitlin, 2003; Stryker, 2003) perspectives hold that individuals have multiple identities—for example, one can be Black, American, and planning to be a doctor in the future. These various aspects of identity come together to define who one is—although, of course, certain group memberships (e.g., gender, ethnicity, nationality) can increase or decrease the chances that one will be able to attain certain personal goals. For example, Roberts, Settles, and Jellison (2008) have studied stereotypes regarding women in science as well as African Americans in the medical profession, arguing that these gender and ethnic group memberships can sometimes be viewed as incompatible with specific careers.

We will also explore various dimensions of identity—especially personal and cultural—and how these dimensions of identity intersect with, and guide, personality and emotional development. In particular, we will focus on how specific personality configurations are linked with certain personal and cultural identity trajectories, and on how identity processes are associated with positive and negative psychosocial and health outcomes.

It is important to define some of the key identity terms that we will use in this chapter. Personal identity refers to one’s goals, values, and beliefs (Schwartz, 2001). Personal identity is often studied in content domains such as political preference (Schildkraut, 2005), occupational choice (Porfeli & Skorikov, 2010), moral standards (Hardy & Carlo, 2005), sexual and dating styles (Worthington, Navarro, Savoy, & Hampton, 2008), and family relationships (Scabini & Manzi, 2011). Research has indicated that individuals can be more invested in some of these content domains than in others (cf. Grotevant, 1987), suggesting that not all domains are equally important for all individuals.

On the other hand, cultural/ethnic identity refers to the extent to which an individual has considered the personal significance of and feels a sense of solidarity with his or her ethnic or cultural group (Phinney & Ong, 2007; Umaña-Taylor, 2011). Individuals within a given ethnic or cultural group are likely to differ in terms of how important the group membership is to their overall sense of identity, and this importance has been shown to be associated with the person’s psychosocial adjustment (e.g., self-esteem, anxiety, depression; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007; Umaña-Taylor, Vargas-Chanes, Garcia, & Gonzales-Backen, 2008). Moreover, ethnic identity is generally more strongly endorsed by ethnic minority group members than by individuals from the ethnic majority group (Roberts et al., 1999). In short, in regions such as North America, Oceania, and much of Western Europe, ethnic identity helps ethnic or cultural minority group members make sense of themselves both within their minority group and within the larger society in which that group is embedded.

PERSONAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT IN ADOLESCENCE AND EMERGING ADULTHOOD: EARLY CONCEPTUALIZATIONS

The majority of developmentally based personal identity research has relied on Erikson’s (1950, 1968) psychosocial
theory of identity, and on Marcia’s (1966, 1980) empirical operationalization of Erikson’s concepts. Erikson based his work within what he termed the “epigenetic principle” that development unfolds through a predetermined set of stages. The fifth stage was explicitly focused on identity; Erikson proposed that adolescence is characterized by a dynamic between identity synthesis and identity confusion. Individuals with a stronger sense of who they are and where their lives are headed would be more likely to engage in mature interpersonal relationships and to successfully assume adult roles (Beyers & Seiffge-Krenke, 2010; Côté, 2002). In contrast, individuals who are unclear about their identity would be more likely to experience distress, engage in destructive behavior, and experience difficulties maintaining healthy relationships with others (Schwartz, Beyers, et al., 2011; Schwartz, Klimstra, et al., 2011; Schwartz, Mason, et al., 2009).

Although Erikson’s writings were rich in clinical description, he did not operationalize his concepts in a way that would have easily permitted direct empirical measurement. Marcia (1966) extracted from Erikson’s writings the assumedly independent dimensions of exploration and commitment. Exploration refers to the consideration of various potential alternative sets of goals, values, and beliefs, whereas commitment refers to adhering to one of more of these alternatives. Marcia bifurcated exploration and commitment into “high” and “low” levels and crossed these two dimensions to derive four “identity statuses.” Achievement represents enacting a set of commitments following a period of exploration. Moratorium represents actively exploring a set of identity alternatives without strong current commitments. Foreclosure represents enacting a set of commitments without much prior exploration. Diffusion represents an inability to systematically explore or to make commitments, or a lack of regard for identity issues altogether.

In a number of cross-sectional and longitudinal studies, these four statuses have been associated with distinct sets of personality, adjustment, and cognitive variables (see Kroger & Marcia, 2011, for a review). Achievement has been related to balanced thinking (Krettenauer, 2005) and mature interpersonal relationships (Beyers & Seiffge-Krenke, 2010). Moratorium has been associated not only with openness to experience (Luyckx, Goossens, Soenens, Beyers, & Vansteenkiste, 2005) but also with anxiety, depression, and low self-worth (Meeus, Iedema, Helsen, & Vollebergh, 1999; Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, & Rodriguez, 2009). Foreclosure has been associated with rigidity and authoritarianism (Marcia, 1967), but with high degrees of self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological well-being (Schwartz, Beyers, et al., 2011). Diffusion has been linked with the poorest psychosocial functioning, including lack of meaning and direction (Waterman, 2007), drug and alcohol abuse (Bishop, Weisgram, Holleque, Lund, & Wheeler-Anderson, 2005), and social and academic maladjustment (Luyckx et al., 2005).

The identity status model has represented an important starting point in research on personal identity development in adolescence and emerging adulthood (Schwartz, 2001, 2005). However, during the latter part of the 20th century and into the beginning of the 21st century, the model was heavily criticized on several fronts. First, much of the first three decades of identity status research focused on comparing the statuses on external variables (e.g., self-esteem, coping styles; Schwartz, 2001). This approach created a “static” view of identity centered on classifying individuals into categories rather than examining the dynamic tension between synthesis and confusion that Erikson (1950, 1968) proposed. Second, the casting of exploration as the process underlying identity development (Grotevant, 1987), and of commitment as an outcome of that process (Marcia, 1988), appeared to carry the assumption that identity was somehow “finalized” during adolescence or emerging adulthood (van Hoof, 1999). Third, although identity achievement is similar to Erikson’s concept of identity synthesis, and although diffusion is similar to identity confusion (Côté & Schwartz, 2002; Schwartz, Beyers, et al., 2011), it is unclear how foreclosure and moratorium fit into Erikson’s theorizing. Until recently, foreclosure and achievement have been largely indistinguishable in terms of adjustment indices such as self-esteem and symptoms of anxiety and depression—perhaps creating the impression that enacting commitments without exploration would be just as likely to lead to identity synthesis as would commitments established following a deliberate period of exploration. The characterization of moratorium as the “route” to achievement did not appear consistent with the finding that individuals in moratorium were often as poorly adjusted as those in diffusion (Côté & Levine, 1988; Schwartz, 2001). Côté and Schwartz (2002, p. 582) summed up this concern by stating that “the transition from moratorium to achievement may require a massive personality reconfiguration that may or may not be successfully negotiated.” These issues

1To be clear, Marcia emphasized that identity development is a lifelong process (Stephen, Fraser, & Marcia, 1992); and identity status–based research has been conducted on adult populations (e.g., Kroger & Haslett, 1988).
have begun to be addressed in more recent identity research, as we review below.

**Personal Identity Status: Recent Advances**

In the years since these criticisms were presented, the personal identity literature has advanced considerably. Largely in response to these criticisms, theorists have proposed new identity processes and/or subdivided exploration and commitment into more finely grained dimensions. Luyckx, Goossens, Soenens, and Beyers (2006), for example, subdivided exploration and commitment into two processes apiece. Exploration was partitioned into *exploration in breadth* (Marcia’s original dimension) and *exploration in depth* (careful consideration of commitments that one has already made). Commitment was partitioned into commitment making (Marcia’s original dimension) and identifi- cation with commitment (integration of one’s commitments into one’s overall sense of self, following a period of exploration in depth). Luyckx and colleagues demonstrated that the two exploration processes and the two commitment processes were empirically distinguishable, and their model specified both exploration and commitment as process variables. In a longitudinal analysis, Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, and colleagues (2008) illustrated that these four processes change at different rates across time.

Following the introduction of their original model, Luyckx and colleagues (Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, et al., 2008) proposed a third type of exploration, *ruminative exploration*. Ruminative exploration refers to an obsessive concern about making the “correct” choice, such that the person often does not make any choice at all and remains “stuck” in the exploration process. Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, et al. (2008) demonstrated that the paradoxical association of exploration with both distress and openness to new experiences was actually due to the simultaneous occurrence of multiple exploration processes. Specifically, exploration in breadth and in depth appeared to be associated with openness, whereas ruminative exploration appeared to be associated with distress.

Using data from three longitudinal studies on high school and college students, Luyckx, Duriez, Klimstra, Van Petegem, and Beyers (2011) demonstrated that these identity dimensions also play different roles within the person’s sense of self at different times during the transition to adulthood. In adolescence, exploration appeared to predict self-esteem, with exploration in breadth positively predicting, and ruminative exploration negatively predicting, changes in self-esteem. In emerging adulthood, however, the associations between identity and self-esteem became reciprocal in nature; identification with commitment predicts self-esteem, and self-esteem predicts commitment making and identification with commitment. With increasing age, the self-system appears to become more consolidated, with identity and self-esteem functioning as an integrated self-system (Schwartz, Klimstra, Luyckx, Hale, & Meeus, in press). Such a stable self-system may provide an important resource for addressing the challenging transition to adulthood and the many psychosocial tasks with which young people are confronted (Côté, 2002; Côté & Levine, 2002; Montgomery & Côté, 2003). In other words, whereas in adolescence the search for a personalized identity (provided that it is conducted in a proactive rather than a ruminative fashion) appears to be beneficial over time, emerging adults need to commit, and to identify with these commitments, to experience increases in self-esteem.

Another extension of the identity status framework was proposed by Crocetti, Meeus, and their colleagues (e.g., Crocetti, Rubini, & Meeus, 2008; Meeus, van de Schoot, Keijsers, Schwartz, & Branje, 2010). Their model included three processes: *commitment* (similar to Marcia’s dimension), *exploration in depth* (similar to Luyckx et al.’s dimension), and *reconsideration of commitment* (dissatisfaction with one’s current commitments and a desire to change them). Meeus and colleagues did not include exploration in breadth in their model, instead arguing that individuals enter adolescence with a set of foreclosed commitments internalized from parents, and that these commitments can be reconsidered as part of the identity development process. Reconsideration, like exploration in breadth, has been associated with symptoms of anxiety and depression (Crocetti, Rubini, & Meeus, 2008; Schwartz, Klimstra, et al., 2011).

In some ways, both ruminative exploration and reconsideration of commitment are conceptually similar to Erikson’s (1968) construct of identity confusion. With regard to both ruminative exploration and reconsideration, the person becomes immobilized by a lack of clarity regarding the direction that she or he should follow. Specifically, ruminative exploration appears to interfere with well-being (Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, et al., 2008) and with the establishment of autonomy, a sense of competence, and mature interpersonal relationships (Luyckx, Vansteenkiste, Goossens, & Duriez, 2009). Reconsideration, especially when it fluctuates rapidly over short periods of time (i.e., from one day to the next), leads to heightened levels of anxiety and depression (Schwartz, Klimstra, et al., 2011). Similar findings have emerged for identity confusion—that is, it is associated with low
well-being and with symptoms of anxiety and depression (Schwartz et al., 2009). Therefore, reconsidering and ruminating about identity appear to be problematic for social adjustment.

Following the recommendations of Schwartz (2001, 2005) and others (e.g., Côté & Levine, 1988; van Hoof, 1999), both Luyckx and colleagues (2005; see also Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, et al., 2008), and Crocetti, Rubini, Luyckx, and Meeus (2008) focused on processes rather than status categories and demonstrated that the statuses could be empirically derived from the component processes. Using cluster-analytic procedures (rather than the median-split techniques that were originally used to place participants into status categories), these authors found evidence for all of Marcia’s original statuses, as well as for some new statuses. These newer statuses have been extracted from populations as diverse as high school students, college students, employed emerging and young adults, and individuals with chronic illnesses such as Type 1 diabetes (Luyckx, Duriez, Klimstra, & De Witte, 2010; Luyckx, Seiffge-Krenke, et al., 2008). These findings lend additional construct validity to the identity status model and help to address the concern that the statuses do not represent the process of identity development. Meeus and colleagues’ (2010) finding that identity status classifications are largely stable through adolescence supports the possibility that the statuses may serve as developmental trajectories as well as changes of character types.

The additional statuses obtained by Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, et al. (2008) and by Crocetti et al., (2008) may help to expand the identity status model. These new statuses included additional variants of diffusion and moratorium, as well as an “undifferentiated” status consisting of individuals who could not be safely categorized into one of the other statuses. Luyckx and colleagues found that the diffused status could be subdivided into *diffused diffusion*, referring to individuals who were attempting to develop a sense of identity but were unable to engage in any sort of systematic exploration or to maintain any lasting commitments; and *carefree diffusion*, referring to individuals with little or no interest in identity work. These two diffused statuses correspond to Erikson’s (1950) two characterizations of identity confusion—feeling “mixed up” or being largely uninterested in identity issues. Crocetti and colleagues found two types of moratorium—*classical moratorium*, referring to Marcia’s original moratorium status; and *searching moratorium*, where individuals are able to explore new alternatives without necessarily relinquishing their existing commitments.

The introduction of the searching moratorium status helps to clarify the casting of moratorium as a transitional status. Not surprisingly, in their longitudinal study of identity status transitions, Meeus and colleagues (2010) found that individuals in searching moratorium were more likely than those in the classical moratorium status to transition into achievement. Specifically, 19% of searching moratoriums, compared to 9% of classical moratoriums, were classified as achieved one year later. The corresponding numbers over a 4-year period were 32% versus 22%.

The findings reported by Luyckx, Crocetti, Meeus, and their colleagues left unanswered at least one important question, however. Although North America and Western Europe can both be characterized as “Western” cultural contexts (Hofstede, 2001), there are also important differences between North America—especially the United States—and European countries in terms of the amount of structure that they provide for young people making the transition to adulthood. Specifically, although the emerging adult life stage has been identified in many different European countries, including Belgium (Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, & Pollock, 2008), Italy (Lanz & Tagliabue, 2007), Germany (Buhl, 2007), Finland (Fadjukoff, Kokko, & Pulkkinnen, 2007), and the Czech Republic (Macek, Bejček, & Vaníčková, 2007), most European countries’ economic systems offer a “safety net” for individuals who cannot find work. Given the embeddedness of identity development within larger social, cultural, and historical contexts and forces (Baumeister & Muraven, 1996; Burkitt, 2011), it is important to investigate the extent to which the task of developing a sense of identity takes similar forms between American and European contexts (cf. Waterman, 1999a). The transition to adulthood may be less stressful and unstructured in societies that provide a “safety net” and greater degrees of guidance and structure for young people (Côté & Levine, 2002).

Schwartz, Beyers, and colleagues (2011) conducted a large-scale evaluation of Luyckx, Goossens, Soenens, and Beyers (2006; Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, et al., 2008) model in the United States. In a sample of nearly 10,000 emerging-adult college students from 20 U.S. states, Schwartz, Beyers, and colleagues (2011) extracted the same cluster solution identified by Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, and colleagues (2008). They also found that the statuses differed as expected on measures of identity synthesis and confusion—achieved individuals scored highest on identity synthesis, whereas diffused-diffused individuals scored highest on identity confusion. Further, whereas prior studies had been unable to distinguish foreclosed and
achieved individuals on indices of positive and negative psychosocial functioning (Waterman, 1999b). Schwartz, Beyers, et al. (2011) found that indices of growth and purpose—such as meaning in life and having discovered one’s innate potentials—were endorsed more strongly by achieved than foreclosure individuals (see also Luyckx et al., 2009). Schwartz, Beyers, and colleagues (2011) concluded that being committed to a set of goals, values, and beliefs was sufficient to facilitate happiness and satisfaction with one’s life, but that engagement in an agentic, self-directed period of exploration prior to making commitments was most likely to facilitate feelings of personal meaning, purpose, and direction.

Beyond Identity Status: Additional Perspectives on Identity in Adolescence and Emerging Adulthood, and a Return to Erikson

Although the identity status model is among the most prominent approaches to examining the development of identity in young people, it is by no means the only approach. Indeed, a number of writers (e.g., Côté & Levine, 1987, 1988, 2002; Schwartz, 2001, 2005) have called for a return to Erikson’s original ideas on identity, and a number of perspectives other than identity status have drawn on Erikson’s thinking (see Vignoles et al., 2011, for a review). First, Erikson’s notions of identity synthesis and confusion—that is, knowing who one is and where one is headed, versus feeling lost and “mixed up”—has been found to predict a number of psychological and behavioral outcomes. Using a sample of Hispanic adolescents and five assessment waves between ages 13 and 16, Schwartz, Mason, Pantin, and Szapocznik (2008, 2009) found that increases in identity confusion over time were associated with heightened risk for initiating use of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and hard drugs, as well as for initiating unprotected sexual activity. Rose, Rodgers, and Small (2006) found that, among American high school students, sexual identity confusion was related to depressive symptoms, substance use, delinquent behavior, and running away from home. Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, and Rodriguez (2009) found that among an ethnically diverse sample of American emerging adults, identity confusion was associated with low self-worth, anxiety, and depressive symptoms, and endorsement of deviant and antisocial activities. Wheeler, Wintré, and Polivy (2004) found that, among Canadian college women, identity confusion was related to risks for disordered eating. In summary, consistent with Erikson’s ideas, a confused sense of identity is linked with a host of negative outcomes both for the individual and for others.

It is important to note, however, that identity confusion is not necessarily undesirable. Erikson (1950, 1968) stated that adolescence was characterized by an “identity crisis”2 during which the person was expected to work toward developing a coherent and synthesized sense of identity. In the years since Erikson’s writings, this identity crisis has been extended into emerging adulthood (Côté, 2006; Côté & Allahar, 1994). From an identity status perspective, exploring various identity roles sometimes requires relinquishing existing commitments in order to consider and adopt new ones. This exploration process can, in turn, give rise to a sense of confusion and disequilibrium. Relinquishing one’s commitments, in turn, gives rise to a sense of confusion and disequilibrium (Schwartz et al., 2009), and the process of developing a sense of identity is likely to involve at least some ruminative exploration (Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, et al., 2008). In turn, this confusion is likely to be associated with symptoms of anxiety, depression, and other forms of distress, as well as with increased likelihood of antisocial and risk-taking behavior (Schwartz, Beyers, et al., 2011; Schwartz, et al., 2008, 2009). Establishing commitments signifies the end of the “crisis” period (Bosma & Kunnen, 2001)—and likely the end of the freedoms involved in the relatively unstructured emerging adult life stage (Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, & Pollock, 2008). As a result, a distinction must be made between “temporary” (and developmentally normative) identity confusion associated with exploration in breadth and more “chronic” forms of identity confusion that may require intervention. Contemporary identity research is therefore both returning to its Eriksonian roots and generating new insights to move the field forward.

Levels of Individuality and Personality in Personal Identity Development

Now that we have reviewed the structure of personal identity, we will turn to an exposition of the intrapersonal factors that can play a role in shaping it. Identity development is shaped profoundly by macro-level factors such as culture (Taylor & Oskay, 1995), gender roles (Lewis,
The set of basic dispositional attributes that capture broad tendencies of temperament characterizes McAdams’s first level of individuality. These attributes reflect (in broad terms) an individual’s emotional tendencies, general approach to the social world, and dispositional levels of self-control. The Big Five personality traits—extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and openness to experience—may represent some of these dispositional tendencies (cf. John et al., 2008). Extraversion reflects the individual’s level of energy and motivation to approach the social world. Agreeableness captures empathy and prosocial tendencies. Conscientiousness refers to impulse control, following rules, and the ability to successfully pursue relatively long-term plans and goals. Neuroticism refers to differences in susceptibility to negative emotions such as feelings of anxiety, tension, and sadness. Last, Openness to experience captures differences in curiosity and preferences for artistic and intellectual stimuli.

The next level of individuality is referred to as characteristic adaptations and includes constructs such as goals, life plans, and cognitive-affective schemas of the self in relation to others, such as attachment styles. This third level in McAdams’s framework captures the individual’s evolving life story that provides for a “semblance of unity, purpose, and meaning” (McAdams & Olson, 2010, p. 527). McAdams posits that this personally constructed narrative of self is layered on top of dispositional traits and characteristic adaptations such that a “narrative identity gives individual lives their unique and culturally anchored meanings” (McAdams & Olson, 2010, p. 527). The following sections explore each of these levels of individuality in which identity is situated.

### The Development of the Big Five Dispositions from Childhood to Adulthood

Researchers who study the development of core personality dispositions typically focus on two conceptually and statistically distinct types of stability and change: mean-level and rank-order (or differential) change (see, e.g., Donnellan & Robins, 2009; Klimstra, Waal, & Vos, 2006). Mean-level studies focus on average levels of dispositional constructs and provide answers to questions such as whether average levels of emotional stability are higher in adulthood than in early adolescence. Rank-order studies investigate the degree of consistency in the relative positioning of individuals over time. These studies answer questions such as whether individuals who are especially emotionally stable as early adolescents mature into emerging adults who are also relatively emotionally stable in comparison to their peers.

Mean-level changes in the Big Five from early adolescence through adulthood broadly follow a generalization referred to as the maturity principle (Caspi et al., 2005). The basic idea is that age differences in average levels of these attributes seem to be in the direction of changes that facilitate the fulfillment of adult roles in terms of serving as a productive member of society (Caspi et al., 2005). In general, average levels of conscientiousness, emotional stability, and agreeableness tend to increase from adolescence to middle adulthood (e.g., Caspi et al., 2005; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006). Results for extraversion are complex, such that attributes linked with social dominance tend to show mean-level increases from adolescence to adulthood, whereas attributes associated with sociability show average increases during the transition to adulthood but then show fairly limited amounts of change in adulthood (Roberts et al., 2006). Average levels of openness also tend to increase during the transition to adulthood and then remain fairly stable during adulthood (Roberts et al., 2006). These changes in openness may allow for identity exploration—especially exploration in breadth. As it stands, the evidence regarding mean-level changes in the Big Five traits during adolescence itself is somewhat mixed, given that relatively few studies have evaluated this question (e.g., DeFruyt et al., 2006; Klimstra et al., 2009; McCrae et al., 2002). There are indications that agreeableness and emotional stability increase robustly in adolescence (e.g., Klimstra et al., 2009). Again, the age differences from early to late adolescence tend to follow the maturity principle (see, e.g., Klimstra et al., 2009).
The pattern of rank-order consistency follows a characteristic pattern of increasing stability coefficients with age for all Big Five attributes, at least until middle adulthood (Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000). A consistent finding is that dispositional attributes become more stable during the transition to adulthood. For example, 1-year stability coefficients for extraversion for boys started at .35 in early adolescence and increased to .75 by late adolescence (Klimstra et al., 2009). Klimstra and colleagues (2009) found that girls tended to have higher stability coefficients than boys, but these coefficients increased across the adolescent years for both genders. One possible explanation for this pattern of increasing differential stability with age is that individuals are granted increasing autonomy during the transition to adulthood—autonomy that also allows for exploration of identity alternatives. This increasing freedom allows individuals to seek out contexts that are compatible with their core dispositions, such that one’s sense of self can be developed within a (reasonably) self-chosen social context. The ability to seek out environments that are compatible with one’s core personality is known as the corresponsive principle of personality development (Caspi et al., 2005), and this matching of the individual and the attributes of the social context tends to promote consistency. Dispositions evoke predictable responses from the social contexts, such that disagreeable individuals draw out hostility from others. Likewise, dispositions may shape how individuals perceive their social contexts, such that individuals higher in emotional stability are less distressed by novelty and challenge than are more neurotic individuals. In short, the development of one’s sense of self may occur in a supportive environment for those who are emotionally stable, extroverted, and open to experience, for example—but in a hostile environment for those who are neurotic, introverted, disagreeable, and closed-minded.

In addition, researchers have suggested that identity processes may contribute to increasing personality consistency with age (Caspi et al., 2005). According to these suggestions, identity provides a framework for interpreting life events and making life choices. Likewise, identity helps to define and solidify an individual’s reputation in the eyes of other members of a social group (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). Collectively, these processes would tend to promote increasing consistency with age. Thus, there are important conceptual reasons to study the development of individuality at multiple levels in the McAdams framework.

Indeed, it is also important to emphasize that individual characteristics are likely reciprocally associated with identity—that is, these characteristics affect, and are affected by, the course of identity development (e.g., Luycx et al., 2011). For example, Côté (1997) has proposed that certain psychological and personality attributes can serve as crucial assets for individuals making the developmental transition to adulthood in postindustrial societies. His concept of agentic personality—which includes items focused on concepts including self-esteem, life purpose, internal locus of control, and ego strength—has been found to be positively associated with identity exploration and commitment, and negatively with avoidance (Schwartz et al., 2005). Likewise, characteristics such as sensation seeking (preference for new and exciting stimuli; Zuckerman, 2007) and perceived invulnerability (Lapsley, 1993) may also serve to promote identity exploration. Unlike the view of invincibility as a form of cognitively based adolescent egocentrism (Elkind, 1967), Lapsley (1993) argues that feelings of invulnerability play a role in managing the process of moving away from a childhood self as part of the separation-individuation process. If channeled toward positive and prosocial ends, desires for novel stimuli and an inclination to take risks might lead one to explore identity alternatives that one otherwise might not have considered. For example, pursuing creativity or athletic success may involve risking rejection and embarrassment—and some form of sensation seeking and perceived invulnerability might help individuals to take the necessary “risks” without becoming overly hesitant or self-conscious.

Motivation and Identity Development

In contrast to disposition or temperament, intentionality and goal-directed behavior emerge more gradually and represent a second level where individuality occurs (McAdams & Olson, 2010). Among the primary variables at work at this level are the extent to which identity activity is purposeful and freely chosen, or whether it is undertaken as a way of meeting or satisfying expectations established by others. For example, Smits, Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Luycx, and Goossens (2010) found that adolescents and emerging adults may utilize specific identity development strategies either out of choice or out of coercion—and the same strategies may be utilized for either reason. Ryan and Deci (2000) have proposed that autonomous or freely chosen life paths might be experienced as exciting and interesting, whereas the same life path might be viewed as aversive if it is pursued out of obligation or coercion (see also Waterman, Schwartz, & Conti, 2008). Therefore, the specific motivation underlying identity activities is important to consider.
Different motivations may underlie certain exploratory behaviors during different phases of the life span. For example, emerging adults may undertake purposeful experimentation and exploration as a way to find out who they are, to test their beliefs and limits, and to see what would happen (Dworkin, 2005). Indeed, Arnett (2000) proposed that some degree of risk behavior seen during emerging adulthood might reflect a desire to have a wide range of experiences before settling into adult responsibilities. Ravert (2009) explored this possibility among a sample of emerging-adult college students by asking about behaviors in which they currently engage because they will no longer be able to do so once they enact full adult commitments. A majority of respondents reported engaging in such “now or never” behaviors, with the most common behaviors being travel, social events (e.g., “going out”), substance use (e.g., “drinking heavily”), and exploring relationships. Although many of the behaviors reported would be considered risky, a number of them might be considered functional in addressing the developmental tasks of emerging adulthood (e.g., widening one’s perspective on the world; Arnett, 2005, 2007). Still others (e.g., road trips, dating a lot of new people) may hold potential for generating either health-compromising or growth-oriented outcomes, depending on how (e.g., recklessly vs. carefully) and why (e.g., pursuing personal life meaning vs. engaging in “now or never” behaviors) one engages in these activities.

McAdams and Olson (2010) propose that layered on top of individual dispositions and adaptations is the narrative, or life story, that an individual develops to “make sense of it all.” This narrative provides a sense of cohesion, purpose, and meaning to one’s life. Indeed, the coherence of the narrative that one constructs, and one’s ability to derive an overall theme or lesson from the narrative, might be taken as an index of the coherence or functionality of one’s sense of identity (McAdams, 2011). This conceptualization of identity is consistent with Erikson’s (1950, 1968) view of identity synthesis, in which one’s various life roles and commitments fit well together and tell a coherent story.

THE ROLE OF AGENCY IN PERSONAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT

One of Erikson’s central propositions regarding personal identity development is that it is a largely self-directed process (see Côté, 1993, 2000, for comprehensive reviews). The person must transact with (i.e., purposefully act within the constraints of) the social environment if she or he is to create an identity that is strong and synthesized, yet flexible enough to respond to the rapidly changing nature of postindustrial society.

To be able to transact purposefully with society, one must possess a sense of agency. Agency has been defined in a number of ways within sociological (e.g., Emirbayer & Mische, 1998) and psychological (e.g., Bandura, 1989) theories. Most relevant to identity development are descriptions offered by Côté (2000; Côté & Levine, 2002) and Lerner and colleagues (e.g., Gestsdóttir & Lerner, 2007; Lerner, Freund, DeStefanis, & Habermas, 2001). Côté proposed a set of personality characteristics that are most consistent with agency, whereas Lerner and colleagues proposed a series of steps that young people follow as part of the exercise of agency. In terms of personality characteristics, Côté (1997) identified self-esteem, life purpose, an internal locus of control, and ego strength (patience and resilience) as dimensions of agency. Self-esteem is important, because young people must possess enough faith and belief in themselves to continue transacting with the environment, even when the initial response is not favorable. Life purpose is essential because the person must know what type of goals she or he is striving for, so that her or his efforts can be directed toward these goals. An internal locus of control increases the likelihood that the person will assume responsibility for her or his actions and their consequences—rather than passing the blame onto other people or circumstances. Ego strength is critical, because it facilitates perseverance in the face of failure and disappointment (cf. Masten, 2001).

In explaining agency as a series of steps, Lerner et al. (2001) drew from a model originally developed to explain self-regulation in older adults (P. Baltes & Baltes, 1990). According to this approach, intentional self-regulation (which is analogous to agency) consists of three steps: (1) selection — choosing opportunities that correspond to one’s talents, potentials, or sense of self; (2) optimization — refining one’s skills so that one can be more successful in pursuing the opportunity in question; and (3) compensation — being able to “change course” in the event that one’s original plans or wishes are blocked or otherwise unavailable. Loss-based selection (Gestsdóttir, Bowers, von Eye, Napolitano, & Lerner, 2010) refers to choosing another goal when one’s original option is no longer available. Côté’s and Lerner and colleagues’ operationalizations of agency are fully compatible with one another: Gestsdóttir and Lerner (2007) and Gestsdóttir, Lewin-Bizan, von Eye, Lerner, and Lerner (2009) found that selection, optimization, and compensation were predictive of self-esteem, competence, and purpose across grades 7 to 10. This work is consistent with the idea that the
adaptive self-regulation processes underlying agency are more likely to be displayed by individuals who possess an agentic-oriented personality.

This pattern of findings further suggests that achievement represents the “optimal” resolution to the identity stage within Erikson’s theory and that a foreclosed identity structure is likely to function less well. Although foreclosure and achievement have both been found to be associated with life satisfaction and self-esteem (Waterman, 1999b), the greater association of achievement with indices of purpose, direction, agency, and discovery (Schwartz, Beyers, et al., 2011) suggests that individuals who have “taken ownership” over their own identity development process may be better able to respond to rapidly and unexpectedly changing circumstances (Schwartz, in press). For example, as noted above, more and more young people are choosing cohabitation instead of marriage (Manning & Smock, 2002; Wiik, 2009)—such that it is much easier to leave the relationship on a moment’s notice (Osborne, Manning, & Smock, 2010). For another example, as reviewed at the beginning of this chapter, due to outsourcing, layoffs, and other larger economic forces, many individuals’ career trajectories have shifted from long-term affiliations with a single company or line of work, to a scenario where companies and even whole industries are making wholesale changes, and sometimes becoming quickly obsolete (Kalleberg, 2009). The need to be fast on one’s feet and to be ready to switch courses quickly is essential for thriving in today’s economic context. As such, achieved commitments, which are generally flexible because they were developed using agentic and self-directed strategies, are likely to support adaptability and an ability to make decisions quickly when necessary. This may be less true of rigidly held, passively created foreclosed commitments. As Erikson foreshadowed more than 60 years ago, an agentic orientation characterized by openness, self-direction, and flexibility, is essential to developing an identity that can withstand the pressures, decisions, and changes of adulthood in Western societies (Côté, 1993; Côté & Levine, 2002).

The Social Context of Agency as a Vehicle for Identity Development

In addition to being shaped by dispositions, motivations, and individual experiences, the process of identity development can be influenced by the social and cultural environment. Thus, the exercise of agency should not be taken to imply that individuals can make any choice they want. Côté and Levine (2002) reviewed the structure-agency debate within contemporary sociology, and they concluded that agency is exercised within constraints imposed by contextual forces. An individual can explore and commit to a given set of identity alternatives, but this does not necessarily mean that all of these alternatives can and will be implemented. For example, socioeconomic barriers can prevent young people from realizing the goals that they have set for themselves (Phillips & Pittman, 2003). These barriers can include lack of financial resources, the absence of necessary mentorship and encouragement, or discriminatory practices that limit the range of options that one can pursue (Yoder, 2000). However, agency in the form of persistence, resilience, and a well-articulated plan for success can (in some cases) help the person overcome some of these barriers (Oyserman, Bybee, & Terry, 2006). Put another way, a “possible self” is most likely to be actualized when the individual agentially pursues it, and then recognizes and addresses the barriers that could potentially preclude its realization (Oyserman, Bybee, & Terry, 2006).

It is critical to note that social structures and cultural factors place limits on agency as well as on the conceptualization of the individual as an independent agent or as an interdependent member of a larger group. Accordingly, the role of agency in the development of identity must be examined within a social, cultural, and historical context. Personal agency, defined as purposeful and goal-directed choices made deliberately and intentionally by a self-guided individual, is most important—and appropriate—in postindustrial Western contexts where the individual person is responsible for her or his own life course. In non-Western cultural contexts, the self is expected to be fluid and changing across situations, and there may not be a permanent “I” that is consistent across time and place (Cross, Gore, & Morris, 2003; Dwairy, 2002). As a result, agency is more likely to be perceived as operating at the collective or group level (Menon, Morris, Chiu, & Hong, 1999). Indeed, in a study of the structure of identity exploration (assumedly an agentic process) across Eastern and Western cultural contexts, Berman, Yu, Schwartz, Teo, and Mochizuki (2011) found that identity exploration emerged as a coherent empirical construct in American emerging adults, but not in their Taiwanese, Mainland Chinese, or Japanese counterparts. This finding suggests that Erikson’s concept of personal agency, as an individualistic construct, may be most strongly applicable within cultural contexts that emphasize individual choice, and less so in contexts that emphasize subjugation of the individual self to the wants, needs, and priorities of the group (cf. Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995).
As such, we and others (e.g., Adams & Marshall, 1996; Bosma & Kunnen, 2001) contend that the identity status model and other conceptualizations that rely heavily on notions of individual decision-making and problem solving, are best applied to adolescence and emerging adulthood in postindustrial, Western contexts where young people are faced with finding their own way into adult roles and responsibilities. Indeed, Marcia (1966, 1980) himself has acknowledged explicitly that identity status was conceived as applying to North America, Western Europe, Australia, and other areas where Western influences have strongly taken hold. Personal identity development in non-Western contexts may be framed more around clearly prescribed social roles and responsibilities than around individually chosen goals, values, and beliefs.

Personal identity therefore develops within a social and cultural context—and, indeed, scholars have increasingly begun to attend to the impacts of cultural forces and processes on developmental processes (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Smith, 2011). Cultural processes themselves have, at least at the level of the individual person, been recognized as identity processes (e.g., Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000; Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). It is for this reason, as well as others, that we now turn to an exploration of cultural identity in adolescence and emerging adulthood.

CULTURAL IDENTITY IN ADOLESCENCE AND EMERGING ADULTHOOD

For much of recent history, culture has been taken for granted as the realities that shape, constrain, and guide those tasks and processes that are prescribed versus proscribed within a given national, cultural, ethnic, or religious group (Smith, 2011). However, with the advent of globalization—largely due to the Internet and the spread of Western culture around the world (e.g., Arnett, 2002)—and the unprecedented mass international migration that has taken place globally during the last 40–50 years (Sam & Berry, 2010; van de Vijver & Phalet, 2004), more people are exposed to cultural streams and realities other than their own (Vignoles et al., 2011). One’s cultural orientation has, therefore, been increasingly recognized as an aspect of identity rather than as a taken-for-granted reality (Vedder, Berry, Sabatier, & Sam [2009] refer to this cultural orientation as one’s “Zeitgeist”). In light of these changes, it has become possible to examine the emergence of these cultural orientations, as well as the ways in which they are associated with personality characteristics and psychosocial and health outcomes in young people.

In much extant research, cultural constructs are examined primarily in immigrant or minority groups, with “host nationals” (generally individuals from the ethnic group that comprises the cultural majority in the country or context under study) used largely as a comparison group. Indeed, cultural identity is easiest to isolate and study while it is undergoing change, and in individuals whose cultural identities are markedly different from that of the context in which they reside. This is likely one of many reasons why the acculturation literature has grown exponentially in the past 40 years (Schwartz, Unger, et al., 2010).

We should note that the majority of our points regarding cultural identity refer primarily to individuals who (or whose ancestors) migrated voluntarily, or arrived as refugees, to the country of settlement. Cultural constructs take on an entirely different meaning for involuntarily subjugated groups—whether they were conquered, colonized, or forced to migrate to another nation against their will. Examples of such groups include, but are not limited to, African Americans and Native Americans in the United States, the First Nations groups in Canada, the Scottish and Welsh in Great Britain, and the Taiwanese and Tibetans in China. These groups certainly do have cultural identities within the larger societies in which they reside (e.g., Bryant & LaFromboise, 2005; Tyler et al., 2008). However, the identities maintained by members of involuntarily subjugated groups are likely influenced by historical events characterized by acts of aggression, enslavement, or genocide perpetrated by the dominant cultural group (Baum, 2008; Moshman, 2007, 2011b). As a result, we caution that some, but not all, of the principles that we cover in this chapter are applicable to members of involuntarily subjugated groups.

Ethnic Identity

Perhaps one of the most easily understandable dimensions of cultural identity, and the one that is most similar to the personal identity constructs discussed in the first half of this chapter, is ethnic identity. Ethnic identity represents the exploration and consideration of the subjective meaning of one’s ethnic group, as well as the extent to which one has an emotional attachment to this group (Phinney, 1990; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Ethnic identity therefore brings together Eriksonian principles (e.g., exploration)
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with principles from Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) social identity theory (e.g., affirmation, belonging, and group identity; see Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bámaca-Gómez, 2004, for a more extensive review).

Ethnic identity is generally regarded as the ways in which individuals from ethnic or cultural minority groups make sense of themselves within a larger society (Umaña-Taylor, 2011). It is therefore not surprising that ethnic identity tends to be more strongly endorsed among minority or immigrant individuals than among those who belong to the dominant cultural group in a given context (e.g., Phinney, Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997; Roberts et al., 1999; Yasui, Dorham, & Dishion, 2004). For minority group members born in the larger society—such as Mexican Americans in the United States or North Africans, Middle Easterners, and South Asians in Western Europe—ethnic identity is important because it allows individuals to connect with their cultural heritage (Roysircar-Sodowsky & Maestas, 2000).

Ethnic identity may help immigrant individuals to find their place within the larger society, as well as within cultural designations that, in many cases, do not exist in the country of origin. For example, the term “Hispanic” was invented by the U.S. Census Bureau to refer to individuals of Spanish-speaking descent. Individuals from countries that have little in common—or that have experienced hostile relations with one another (such as Peru and Ecuador, Argentina and Chile, or Colombia and Venezuela)—are grouped under the same demographic category. The term “Hispanic,” along with the similar term “Latino,” is both a source of pride and a source of irritation among individuals who are grouped under these labels (Suárez-Orozco & Páez, 2002). Nonetheless, individuals migrating to the United States from Spanish-speaking countries must decide for themselves what it means to be “Hispanic” (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006; C. Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Similarly, in the United States, individuals from countries as diverse as China, the Philippines, India, and Sri Lanka are grouped under the label of “Asian American” despite not sharing a common linguistic, religious, or cultural heritage. Ethnic identity is one way in which migrants from these countries can make sense of what it means to be a member of a minority group in their new homeland.

Ethnic identity has been studied in adolescents and emerging adults from many different cultural and national backgrounds, and in a number of different receiving countries (e.g., Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006). Studies conducted in the United States have generally found gradual increases in ethnic identity exploration and affirmation during early adolescence (French, Seidman, Allen, & Aber, 2006), middle adolescence (Pahl & Way, 2006), and emerging adulthood (Syed & Azmitia, 2009). In turn, increases in ethnic identity exploration and affirmation are generally linked with increases in self-esteem (Umaña-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, & Guimond, 2009). For the most part, this suggests that young people become increasingly comfortable with their ethnicity over time—although in some cases it may also indicate a defensive response, as we will review later in this chapter.

A fairly large literature has amassed regarding the modest but consistent links between ethnic identity and indices of well-being. The link between ethnic identity and self-esteem has been examined on a number of occasions, and results generally indicate that individuals with a stronger sense of ethnic identity (i.e., those who have considered the meaning of their ethnicity and who have come to regard their ethnic group positively) generally report higher levels of self-esteem (e.g., Schwartz, Zamboanga, & Jarvis, 2007; Umaña-Taylor, 2004). Ethnic identity is associated with other positive outcomes as well—for example, Armenta, Knight, Carlo, and Jacobson (2011) found that ethnic identity affirmation was associated with engagement in several types of prosocial behaviors. Recent research has suggested that ethnic identity helps individuals to discover or identify their meaning or purpose in life, which in turn can lead to stronger self-esteem (Kiang & Fuligni, 2010). This last finding lends additional credence to the notion that ethnic identity can play a role in helping minority group individuals find their place within the larger society within which they reside and function.

Ethnic identity—especially ethnic identity affirmation and belonging—can also help protect immigrant and minority individuals from experiencing the negative outcomes associated with perceived discrimination and distress. Specifically, using a short-term longitudinal design, Torres and Ong (2010) found that ethnic identity affirmation attenuated the association between discriminatory experiences on Day $x$ and depressive symptoms on Day $x+1$. Moreover, Armenta and Hunt (2009) found that ethnic identity affirmation can arise as a response to group (but not personal) discrimination—and that ethnic identity can then boost self-esteem.

Research has also generally found that ethnic identity is protective against risk-taking behavior in minority adolescents and emerging adults. Specifically, among ethnic
minority adolescents and emerging adults, ethnic identity has been found to protect against behavior problems (Yasui et al., 2004), alcohol and drug use (Marsiglia, Kulis, Hecht, & Sills, 2004), and unsafe sex (Espinosa-Hernandez, & Lefkowitz, 2009). These effects have been found to be at least partially mediated by self-esteem in both American (Schwartz et al., 2007) and European (Wisssink, Deković, Yağmur, Stams, & De Haan, 2008) adolescents.

However, some research on Hispanic adolescents and emerging adults in the United States has found that ethnic identity can be associated with higher levels of risk taking—including alcohol and drug use (e.g., Zamboanga, Raffaeelli, & Horton, 2006; Zamboanga, Schwartz, Jarvis, & Van Tyne, 2009) and unsafe sex (Raffaeelli, Zamboanga, & Carlo, 2005). Although these counter-intuitive findings are difficult to explain, evidence suggests that they may reflect a defensive, rather than proactive, manifestation of ethnic identity. For example, Schwartz, Weisskirch, and colleagues (2011) found that, in Hispanic emerging adults, controlling for engagement in Hispanic cultural practices (e.g., speaking Spanish, eating Hispanic foods, associating with Hispanic friends), endorsing a Hispanic ethnic identity was positively associated with illicit drug use and with unsafe sexual behavior. Schwartz and colleagues interpreted this finding as indicating that, once Hispanic cultural practices had been factored out, ethnic identity referred to a defensive attachment to being Hispanic—perhaps a reaction to discrimination or other negative experiences with non-Hispanic Americans. Armenta and Hunt’s (2009) finding that perceived group discrimination was associated with increased ethnic identity provides preliminary support for this potential explanation. It should be noted, however, that cultural practices and identifications are closely related—so further research is needed to understand the aspects of ethnic identity that may be more versus less protective against health-risk outcomes.

The defensive activation of ethnic identity represents what Rumbaut (2008) has labeled as reactive ethnicity. Specifically, reactive ethnicity refers to a situation where individuals who do not normally identify strongly with their ethnic or cultural group do so in response to an external threat. For example, Stepick, Dutton Stepick, and Vanderkooy (2011) refer to the 2000 Elián Gonzalez case, in which a young Cuban boy was rescued at sea and subsequently returned to his father in Cuba —against the wishes and protests of the Miami Cuban community. Many young Cuban Americans who had considered themselves American began waving Cuban flags, rejecting symbols of the United States, and developing a newfound interest in Cuban culture and heritage. It may therefore be important to distinguish between proactive and defensive ethnic identifications—especially given that these two types of ethnic identifications may exert opposing effects on psychosocial and health outcomes.

**Acculturation as an Identity Process**

Aside from representing a cultural dimension of identity, ethnic identity also represents a dimension of acculturation (Phinney, 2003). That is, ethnic identity is an index of the ways in which immigrants and their immediate descendants adapt to the receiving society. Schwartz, Unger, and colleagues (2010), as well as others (e.g., Abraido-Lanza, Armbrister, Florez, & Aguirre, 2006; Castillo & Caver, 2009), have suggested that the concept of acculturation not only includes heritage-cultural and receiving-cultural practices, values, and identifications, but also encompasses identity processes. Indeed, the decision to migrate and the processes involved in migrating from one country to another are often akin to starting one’s life over again (e.g., Steiner, 2009; C. Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2008). Just as changing careers in midlife requires an identity transition, so does moving to a new cultural environment. In the case of individuals born in the receiving society but raised by immigrant parents, the presence of the heritage culture in the home and of the receiving culture in school and with friends can present identity challenges, especially when these socialization agents are in conflict with each other. The ways in which one addresses these challenges can be framed as constructing a cultural identity (cf. Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006).

Just as personal identity consists of multiple domains such as career choice, religious orientation, and friendship and dating preferences (Goossens, 2001), cultural identity consists of a number of domains—including behavioral (practices), cognitive (values), and affective (identifications; Kim & Abreu, 2001; Schwartz, Unger, et al., 2010). One’s choices or responses within these domains may or may not correspond to one another; for example, an immigrant (or a child of immigrants) may be fluent in the language of the receiving country or cultural group but may not hold the values of, or identify with, that country or group.

A number of psychological, sociological, and anthropological studies (e.g., Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, 2006; C. Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; C. Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008; Tseng, 2004) have examined large cohorts of first-generation (born in the country of origin)
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and second-generation (born in the receiving country but raised by immigrant parents) adolescents and emerging adults and have mapped the ways in which their cultural adaptation is associated with personality, psychosocial, and health indices. In general, among adolescents and emerging adults, a bicultural orientation (i.e., endorsing the practices, values, and identifications of both one’s culture of origin and the new society of settlement) has been identified as the most “adaptive” cultural identity configuration (e.g., Coatsworth, Maldonado-Molina, Pantin, & Szapocznik, 2005; Sam & Berry, 2010). This is particularly the case when the individual views her/his heritage and receiving cultural streams as incompatible with one another (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2007). Compared to young people who view their two cultural streams as incompatible or opposing, those who are able to combine or integrate their heritage and receiving cultural streams are likely to be more emotionally stable and open to experience (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). Moreover, compared to other cultural orientations, biculturalism has been found to be associated with more advanced cognitive and moral reasoning (Tadmor, Tetlock, & Peng, 2009).

Although cultural constructs have been applied primarily to ethnic minority groups, their applicability to “majority” groups may be increasing. In many Western countries, individuals of European descent comprise a declining share of the population over time, and in some European countries, the actual number of White individuals is decreasing due to low birth rates. At the same time, immigrant and minority groups—many of whom originate from non-European backgrounds—are increasing both in number and in their share of the population. The implication of these demographic changes is that Whites of European descent may cease to represent the numerical majority in many Western countries as the 21st century progresses. Moreover, the rapid advance of globalization and real-time communication has decreased the importance of national boundaries (Arnett, 2002). For example, in 1990, cellular phones were not commonplace, the Internet had not yet been introduced to the general public, and few people outside of universities and government organizations had e-mail addresses. In 2010, the majority of individuals owned cellular phones (and many no longer maintained home phone numbers); and millions not only had Internet and e-mail access but were communicating with others around the world in real time using applications such as Facebook, Twitter, Skype, and other recent advances. What this means for the study of cultural identity is that the “dominant” cultural group in any given nation or region is no longer defined strictly by national or regional boundaries. So mass immigration and globalization have combined to increase the importance of cultural identity for individuals from majority cultural groups (Schwartz, Unger, et al., 2010). Indeed, mass immigration and globalization have prompted many Americans (e.g., Schildkraut, 2007) and Europeans (e.g., Licata, Sanchez-Mazas, & Green, 2011) to consider what their national and cultural identities mean to them. Accordingly, Schwartz, Weissskirch, and colleagues (2010) have argued that individuals of European descent should be regarded as a cultural group, rather than as a comparison group, in studies of cultural processes.

Not coincidentally, Chen, Benet-Martinez, and Bond (2008) have proposed two types of acculturation—immigration-based and globalization-based. Individuals do not necessarily need to move to a new country to experience acculturation; indeed, many “dominant-culture” adolescents and emerging adults in Asian, Latin American, and African countries have begun to experience and embrace Western music, dress styles, and manners of speaking (often to their parents’ chagrin; Jensen, Arnett, & McKenzie, 2011). Similarly, the influx of immigrants to many Western countries has led individuals from the dominant cultural group to explore immigrant cultures. For example, due to both globalization and mass East Asian immigration, Buddhism and other Eastern religions have become increasingly popular among American adolescents and emerging adults (Coleman, 2002). Simply put, the availability of a wider range of cultural options has increased the range of cultural identity choices that young people can make, as well as the ways in which young people might define what their ethnic/cultural identity might mean for themselves.

Agency, as defined within the personal identity literature, may therefore also come into play with regard to the development of cultural identity. Although adolescents and young adults whose parents have socialized them toward the values, practices, symbols, and traditions of the family’s culture of origin are especially likely to retain and identify with the heritage culture (Juang & Syed, 2010; Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006), this is not guaranteed to occur. Individuals have choices with regard to how much of their cultural heritage they wish to retain, and this applies to individuals from both minority and majority backgrounds. For example, Ponsertotto and colleagues (2001) and Rodriguez, Schwartz, and Whitbourne (2010) found that Italian, Greek, Irish, and Polish Americans may wish to retain practices, values, and identifications from
their cultural heritage well into the third and fourth generations. More recent immigrants are also somewhat at choice regarding how much of the new receiving cultural stream they will acquire, and how much of their heritage cultures they will retain (e.g., Berry, 1997; Sam & Berry, 2010).

With that said, however, demographic and contextual factors can (and often do) work to constrain the range of cultural identity options from which a given individual can choose. In particular, individuals whose physical features or foreign accents identify them with socially devalued groups may be precluded from full participation in the mainstream society in which they have settled (Schwartz, Unger, et al., 2010; Steiner, 2009). For example, in the United States, Hispanic immigrants—especially those from Mexico, Central America, and the Dominican Republic—may be looked upon with scorn by White Americans (Cornelius, 2002), especially by those who equate “American culture” with “White culture” (Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010). In turn, negative perceptions of immigrant groups can lead to discrimination against individuals from these groups, both by adults (Liu & Nicholson-Crotty, 2010) and by children and adolescents (Brown, Spatzier, & Tobin, 2010). Such discrimination may manifest as lack of recognition and acknowledgement of the needs and rights of minority individuals (Licata et al., 2011) or in the form of verbal or physical offenses (Guerin, 2005). In any case, discrimination can send a message to young immigrant and minority individuals that they do not fit in the receiving society. As a result, it is entirely possible for a person to identify as American, British, French, Australian, and the like, but not to be accepted as such by members of the dominant cultural group (e.g., Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, 2006). For example, Portes and Rumbaut (2001) use the example of a young Korean American woman who “identifies with Americans, but Americans do not identify with me” (p. 191). The resulting feelings of rejection can be interpreted (among other ways) as discrimination. Conversely, second or later generation individuals from visible-minority groups may be labeled as foreigners or complemented on their fluency in the language of the receiving society—and this may also be taken as discriminatory because it labels the person as “something other than American” (Lee, 2005).

Discrimination has been identified as among the most prominent and deleterious psychosocial stressors in the lives of immigrant and minority individuals, including adolescents and emerging adults. In particular, experiences of discrimination may be associated with depression and anxiety (Berkel et al., 2010) and with cigarette, alcohol, and illicit drug use (Flores, Tschan, Dimas, Pasch, & de Groot, 2010; Wiehe, Aalsma, Liu, & Fortenberry, 2010). In the longer term, discrimination may lead to chronic physical, emotional, and health problems in adulthood (Finch & Vega, 2003; Williams & Mohammed, 2009).

**THE INTERSECTION OF PERSONAL AND CULTURAL IDENTITY IN ADOLESCENCE AND EMERGING ADULTHOOD**

Thus far, we have considered personal and cultural identity, and their associations with psychosocial, personality, emotional, and health outcomes, separately. Until very recently, the literatures on various dimensions of identity have similarly remained separated (Schwartz, Zamboanga, & Weisskirch, 2008; Vignoles et al., 2011). However, adolescents and emerging adults establish identity-related commitments in personal, cultural, and other areas (Kiang, Yip, & Fuligni, 2008). The ways in which these multiple dimensions of identity relate to one another and to psychosocial, emotional, personality, and health indices have only recently begun to be studied.

Although they emanate from very different metatheoretical traditions, personal and cultural dimensions of identity share a number of features in common. They both have the potential to protect against distress and against risk-taking behavior—in the form of personal identity synthesis and what Usborne and Taylor (2010) have labeled “cultural identity clarity.” Cultural identity clarity is akin to feeling a sense of bonding and solidarity with one’s heritage-cultural group (i.e., ethnic identity)—which, along with heritage-cultural practices and values, is likely protective against depressive symptoms (Canio & Castillo, 2010; Torres & Ong, 2010), behavior problems (Dinh, Roosa, Tein, & Lopez, 2002; Yasui et al., 2004), and health-compromising activities (e.g., Marsiglia et al., 2004; Schwartz, Weisskirch, et al., 2010) for many adolescents and emerging adults.

Research has suggested that, when personal and cultural dimensions of identity are used together as predictors of well-being, distress, and health risks, personal identity tends to emerge as a significant predictor whereas cultural identity does not (e.g., Schwartz, Mason, Pantin, Wang, et al., 2009; Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, & Rodriguez, 2009). Indeed, indices of personal identity consolidation appear to mediate the contributions of cultural identity clarity—or both heritage and receiving cultural practices, values, and identifications—to psychosocial and health outcomes (Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, &
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Wang, 2010; Usborne & Taylor, 2010). These patterns suggest that cultural identity may in fact represent a domain or aspect of personal identity, and that one’s personal self may include cultural elements (Schwartz, Armenta, et al., 2011). Given the confluence of individual and group levels of identity (Vignoles et al., 2011), whether personal identity or cultural identity is most salient in any given moment may depend on the situation at hand—specifically, whether group identity has been made salient by specific circumstances (cf. Spears, 2011). In particular, discriminatory events (both perceived and actual) can activate ethnic and cultural identities and can render them most “important” in a given situation (Rumbaut, 2008). Family needs and crises may also activate collectivist-based value systems—for example, the illness or death of a family member may cause one’s personal goals, values, and beliefs to be subjugated to family obligations.

At the same time, however, it is easy to see how personal goals, values, and beliefs can be guided by cultural orientations. For example, a person with a highly individualistic value system may establish a set of goals largely on her or his own, without seeking or utilizing much input from others; whereas someone with a highly collectivist value system may internalize goals from significant others, or might at least seek (and adhere to) the opinions of family members before setting important goals (Triandis, 1995). The specific cultural system in which one resides, and the extent to which one endorses and identifies with this cultural system, are likely to constrain and direct the ways in which one goes about developing a sense of personal identity (Bosma & Kunnen, 2001).

As a result, the direction of effects that Usborne and Taylor (2010) found in their series of studies (i.e., that personal identity mediated the relationship between cultural identity and psychosocial outcomes) is likely to reflect reality for many people. Personal identity is developed within a social, cultural, and historical context (Baumeister & Muraven, 1996; Burkitt, 2011)—such that the agentic, individualist, exploration-based pathway that Erikson (1950) and Marcia (1966) identified may not be functional in collectivist-oriented, non-Western contexts (Berman et al., 2011). Nonetheless, across cultural contexts, “successful” identity development is likely perceived as making and identifying with commitments. Whether commitments are developed using internal standards or based on group norms, they likely serve the same function—that is, to anchor the person within a set of social roles and responsibilities (Stryker, 2003). Whether this means entering into an assigned role in an Eastern society or settling down after a period of exploration in a Western country, the commitments into which one enters will establish a set of expectations for one’s future choices and behavior. For example, regardless of when it happens, having a child places one into the role of “parent,” and this role carries a set of defined expectations and responsibilities. Although these expectations and responsibilities differ from one cultural society to the next, some set of expectations and responsibilities accompanies the transition to parenthood across social and cultural groups. The term “commitment” refers both to a choice made to adopt a specific set of goals, values, and beliefs and to the roles and responsibilities that accompany having placed oneself (or having been placed) into a specific societal position (Schwartz, Vignoles, & Luyckx, 2011). Therefore, for example, when adolescents and emerging adults are considering whether they want to become parents at some point in their lives, they are considering not only the act of becoming a parent, but also the social roles and responsibilities that come along with it.

Altogether, social and cultural contexts and forces, and the extent to which one identifies with them, help to direct the development of personal identity. However, what happens when one is transitioning from one cultural context to another, as in international migration, or when one has “roots in two cultures,” as in individuals born in one society but raised by parents who migrated from somewhere else? The construct of acculturation—by virtue of its operationalization as cultural identity change—implies that one’s cultural identity is in flux (Schwartz et al., 2006). How does one form a personal identity without a firm set of cultural principles to serve as a guide? And what of individuals who live in multicultural areas where no one cultural stream predominates, such as parts of Quebec, Belgium, Switzerland, South Africa, Hong Kong, or Singapore?

Although research on the development of personal identity in situations of cultural identity change, flux, or multiplicity is scant, it may be possible to apply theories of biculturalism to the development of personal identity (Schwartz et al., 2006). As Benet-Martínez and colleagues (e.g., Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2007) have found with regard to the development of cultural identity among integrated bicultural individuals, the person selects identity elements from a number of cultural sources, depending on the compatibility of a given identity element with the overall sense of self that the person wishes to create. In this way, an integrated bicultural identity is agentic by nature. For example, a young Chinese American person may wish to develop a set of goals,
values, and beliefs that combines familial elements from Chinese culture with individual ingenuity and creativity from American culture.

However, as is the case with the vast array of choices presented to young people by postindustrial Western societies, developing a sense of personal identity within a bicultural or multicultural context may not be entirely clear and straightforward. As noted by Chen, Benet-Martínez, and Bond (2008), the process of developing a sense of cultural identity can be confusing, uncertain, and distressing for individuals who find their multiple cultural streams to be opposing or incompatible. The same may be true of personal identity. In the case of individuals who are from (or whose families are from) collectivist-based societies but are living in individualistic Western cultural contexts, the expectations of family members and other heritage-cultural influences can clash with those of the receiving cultural stream. Rudmin (2003) characterizes biculturalism as a potentially precarious condition where any given set of identity choices may be met with resistance from either the heritage or receiving cultural community. For bicultural individuals who are not willing or able to integrate their multiple cultural streams, the process of developing a personal, as well as cultural, identity may be difficult, confusing, and frustrating.

AREA IN NEED OF FURTHER RESEARCH

We will close this chapter with a review of some areas in which extant knowledge needs expansion. The first hearkens back to one of the first issues we raised in the chapter—specifically, a closer, in-depth, empirical examination of Arnett’s (2007) contention that the majority of identity work in modern, industrialized societies now takes place during emerging adulthood rather than during adolescence. Côté and Bynner (2008), among others, have criticized Arnett’s notion of emerging adulthood by stating that it is an economic phenomenon rather than a developmental one. More specifically, they claim that the “luxury” of emerging adulthood is reserved for those individuals with the financial resources to attend college full-time or to otherwise delay entry into full adulthood, and that individuals without these financial resources are unlikely to experience emerging adulthood at all. So, for those individuals in the “forgotten half” (Halperin, 2001)—that is, those whose financial situations require them to enter the workforce in their teens or early 20s—does identity work occur during adolescence? And can individuals who do not attend college have similar developmental opportunities for growth in the years following adolescence as do college students? Tanner (2006) comes to the conclusion that identity exploration should be possible for non-college-bound emerging adults, as long as supportive resources (e.g., policies, mentors) are available. A similar question can be posed regarding collectivist-based societies in which individualized decision making is discouraged. Does a period of emerging adulthood still occur in such societies, and if not, when does the majority of personal identity development take place?

Second, and relatedly, the ways in which identity develops between early adolescence and emerging adulthood are in need of examination (Schwartz, 2005). We know that identity work begins in early adolescence (Archer, 1982) and that a sense of personal identity is first consolidated by the time one settles into a set of adult commitments (Schwartz, 2007). However, how does identity develop between these two points in the life span? Some longitudinal studies on personal identity (e.g., Klimstra, Hale, Raaijmakers, Branje, & Meeus, 2010; Luyckx, Goossens, & Soenens, 2006; Meeus et al., 2010; Schwartz, Mason, et al., 2008) have been conducted within adolescence or within emerging adulthood, but there has been a dearth of longitudinal studies conducted across these two age periods. In particular, an examination of the heterogeneity of developmental trajectories between early adolescence and emerging adulthood would provide a useful illustration of the ways in which personal identity development might proceed. For example, what are the developmental precursors and consequences of ruminate exploration, foreclosed commitments, or identity achievement?

Third, we know that agency is an important prerequisite for the development of a coherent and synthesized sense of personal identity in most Western cultural contexts, but we do not yet know where agency comes from. How does it develop? What sorts of personality traits and developmental experiences in childhood and early adolescence are most likely to facilitate the development of agency later in adolescence and in emerging adulthood? Some studies (e.g., Soenens et al., 2007) have identified parenting processes that may be linked with self-determined functioning in adolescence and in emerging adulthood. However, it is not entirely clear whether this self-determined functioning is equivalent to the type of agency of which Erikson (1950) spoke and that Côté and colleagues (e.g., Côté, 2000, 2002; Côté & Levine, 2002; Côté & Schwartz, 2002) have linked with “successful” personal identity development (see Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2011, for an extended discussion).

Fourth, concerning cultural identity, it is not yet known how cultural identity develops—that is, the possible
trajectories that it can follow. Although longitudinal studies have examined the course of ethnic identity in early adolescence (French et al., 2006), in later adolescence (Pahl & Way, 2006), and in emerging adulthood (Syed & Azmitia, 2010), the developmental courses of cultural practices and values, or of identification with the dominant or receiving society, have not been empirically examined. As Schwartz, Unger, and colleagues (2010) have reviewed, cultural practices, values, and identifications represent distinct components of acculturation and of cultural identity—and the developmental course of one of these components may not necessarily reflect the developmental course of the others. Moreover, although ethnic identity has received a great deal of empirical attention, identification with the dominant or receiving society has received surprisingly little attention (see Kiang, Witkow, Baldelomar, & Fuligni, 2010; Phinney et al., 1997; Schwartz, Weisskirch, et al., 2011, for examples of such research)—and all of the research to date on receiving or dominant culture identity has been cross-sectional.

Fifth, the interface between personal and cultural identity is an extremely new and emerging area of study, and much remains to be investigated. Although some cross-sectional work (e.g., Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, & Wang, 2010; Usborne & Taylor, 2010) has examined the associations between personal and cultural identity, the ways in which these two dimensions of identity develop together has not been examined. Some work has suggested ways in which cultural contexts shape the development of personal identity. For example, consistency of self across time and place appears to be desirable in Western contexts but not in Eastern contexts (Cross et al., 2003), and identity exploration—at least the type proposed by Erikson and Marcia—appears consistent with American cultural standards but not with those in Asian countries (Berman et al., 2011). However, aside from these general principles, how do cultural and historical currents guide the development of personal identity (cf. Baumeister & Muraven, 1996)? How do people with individualistic or collectivist personality tendencies differ in their patterns of personal identity development (Triandis, 1995)? Moreover, research has demonstrated that parents can socialize their children’s ethnic and cultural identities (Hughes et al., 2006; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006)—but what impact does this socialization have on the development of personal identity? Given that personal identity appears to mediate the associations of cultural identity to psychosocial and emotional outcomes (Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, & Wang, 2010; Usborne & Taylor, 2010), the ways in which cultural processes influence personal identity are important to examine. Moreover, the ways in which personal identity develops in situations where cultural identity is changing or in flux—as well as how the resulting sense of personal identity may help to offset the potentially deleterious effects of cultural identity change—are in need of study (Schwartz et al., 2006). Does an integrated form of biculturalism indeed translate into the development of a synthesized sense of personal identity in individuals who are exposed to multiple cultural backgrounds or streams?

Finally, the direction of effects between identity and psychosocial, emotional, and health outcomes is important to examine. Does a coherent sense of personal identity lead to positive emotional and psychosocial development, or vice versa? Some research has suggested that identity precedes emotional adjustment (Schwartz, Klimstra, et al., 2011), whereas other research suggests that the association may be reciprocal (Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, et al., 2008). As noted, recent work by Luyckx and colleagues (2011) seems to suggest that the direction of effects observed might very well depend, in part, on the developmental period under study. Associations between and among developmental processes may be quite different in adolescence versus in emerging adulthood. Another factor potentially influencing temporal sequences between identity and well-being is the time span under consideration (e.g., day-to-day versus longer-term change; Lichtwarck-Aschoff, van Geert, Kunnen, & Bosma, 2008). Moreover, how personal and cultural identity are related to adjustment, and whether these associations are moderated by cultural context, is an open question. Some initial research indicates that personal identity may mediate the relationship between cultural identity and psychosocial and emotional adjustment. However, these studies have been conducted in the United States and Canada—countries characterized by individualistic, Western cultural streams (Côté, 2000; Côté & Allahar, 1994). It is unclear whether similar findings will emerge in Latin American, Asian, Middle Eastern, or African cultural contexts.

CONCLUSIONS

Taken together, the field of identity development—including personal, cultural, and other dimensions of identity—in adolescence and emerging adulthood is an exciting area of research and offers great potential for understanding how and why some adolescents appear well-adjusted whereas others do not. At least five prominent themes have been included within the present review. First, identity development differs markedly
across individuals, as well as across the cultural and historical contexts in which individuals are embedded. Understanding the development of identity requires understanding both intrapersonal (e.g., temperament, personality, self-understanding) and contextual/cultural determinants, as well as how these determinants work together. Second, within many Western cultural contexts, making commitments following a period of exploration appears to be the most “successful” way to develop one’s identity. However, this exploration may be marked by a sense of confusion and distress—though in most cases these are temporary symptoms. Third, the exercise of personal agency is critical in postindustrial Western countries where individuals are presented with a vast array of choices and where a period of time (i.e., emerging adulthood) may be set aside for identity work. Fourth, the ways in which identity develops in collectivist-oriented, non-Western contexts are not well understood—but it does appear that identity exploration and personal agency are not the primary considerations.

Fifth, globalization and mass international migration have highlighted cultural processes as identity processes. These include not only ethnic identity—which is clearly an aspect of identity—but also cultural practices and values. These cultural identity processes may be most visible, and most amenable to study, in international migrants whose cultural orientations are markedly different from those of the society in which they have settled. The process of acculturation is, in itself, an identity transformation—that is, it is a process by which cultural identity changes. Moreover, cultural principles can be used to study the ways in which personal identity is developed within a cultural context. In particular, the agency that accompanies biculturalism—especially the integrated form of biculturalism—may help young immigrants (and children of immigrants) to develop a sense of personal identity while their cultural identities—or those of their parents—are in flux.

In closing, both personal and cultural identity are rooted in rich theoretical and empirical literatures, and much is known about their associations with personality and psychosocial development—but much still remains to be understood. We hope that the issues discussed in this chapter have helped to bring together and summarize the existing literatures, as well as to highlight unanswered questions that can help to move these fields forward. In turn, the study of identity in its various forms can point to ways in which identity constructs can be used to promote adolescent and emerging adult wellness, to help prevent or reduce risk-taking behavior, and to facilitate successful transitions into responsible adulthood among today’s youth.
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