Korean adoptee identity: Adoptive and ethnic identity profiles of adopted Korean
Americans

A Thesis
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Adam Joseph Beaupre

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

Advisor: Richard M. Lee, PhD

June 2016

Adam Joseph Beaupre
2016
Copywrite

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my advisor Dr. Richard M. Lee for his direction and insight throughout this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Reed Reichwald, Dr. Elizabeth Raleigh, and Xiang Zhou for their input on this undertaking.

I would also like to thank my wife, Susan, for her encouragement and patience – even when I worked while on vacation.

Dedication

To Susan, for helping me develop my own identity as a KAD.

Abstract

Adopted Koreans often emphasize their status as adopted individuals and ethnic Koreans simultaneously, highlighting the importance of considering both social identities. To explore these multiple social identities, I conducted a person-centered study of the identity profiles of 189 adopted Korean American adolescents. Using cluster analytic procedures, I examined patterns of commitment to ethnic and adoptive identities, revealing six conceptually unique identity clusters. Analyzing the association between these identity profiles and psychological adjustment, I found the identity profiles were undifferentiated with respect to behavioral development and risk behaviors. However, group differences were found on life satisfaction, school adjustment, and family functioning. Results confirm the importance of considering the differential impact of multiple social identity configurations on a variety of outcomes.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Dedication	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vi
Introduction.....	1
Identity	2
Person-Centered Research	9
Current Study	10
Method	11
Participants and Procedure.....	11
Measures	12
Results.....	16
Preliminary Analyses	16
Identity Profiles.....	17
Psychological Adjustment	19
Discussion.....	20
Identity Profiles.....	20
Limitations And Future Directions	23
Conclusion	24
References.....	25

List of Tables

Table 1. Bivariate Correlations for Study Variables.....	29
Table 2. Raw Means and Standard Deviations for Cluster Variables.....	31
Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Validation and Adjustment Variables across Six Clusters	32

List of Figures

Figure 1. Identity Profiles 34

Introduction

“When you are in a group of Korean adoptees, you definitely feel like—that, to a certain degree... that’s your race...”

“That’s your people.”

(Kim, 2010, p. 124-125)

Roughly 125,000 Korean children have been adopted transnationally by families in the United States since the 1950s (Kim, 2010). Most of these transnationally adopted individuals were raised transracially in families with White parents (Kreider & Lofquist, 2014; Kreider & Raleigh, 2011), with estimates suggesting that White parents accounted for 80-85% of all transnational adoptions (Baden, Treweek, & Ahluwalia, 2012). Although there is significant research on the physical and psychological development of transracially, transnationally adopted children and adolescents (e.g., Juffer & van IJzendoorn, 2007; Kim, Shin, & Carey, 1999; Odenstad et al., 2008; van IJzendoorn & Juffer, 2006), there is less research on their identity. Extant identity research with transracially, transnationally adopted individuals has focused mainly on ethnic identity (e.g., Tuan & Shiao, 2011), with little research on adoptive identity. Few researchers have examined how adoptive identity and ethnic identity might co-exist within an individual. Using a person-centered approach, the present study examines the ethnic and adoptive identity profiles of adopted Korean American adolescents and their association with adjustment.

Identity

Social identity theory posits that individuals naturally categorize themselves into different social groups and then derive a sense of belonging and identity from membership in these groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Given the paradoxical experience of being racial minorities raised by White adoptive parents (Lee, 2003), many adopted Korean Americans draw on both Korean and adoptive experiences to inform their social identities (Kim, 2010). Narrative accounts by adopted Koreans point towards an identity in which being Korean and being adopted are both important (Jo, 2006; Kim, 2000). For example, one adopted Korean American describes her identity in this way:

When I look at myself, I see a Korean American adoptee. I do not see that I am only a Korean American... Nor am I just a Korean. I tried that one on—it didn't fit. I am a Korean American adoptee; that's how I define myself. (Nafzger, 2006, p. 247)

This individual's experience aligns with other research on how adopted Koreans feel when their identity as Korean/Korean Americans are challenged by non-adopted Koreans (Hoffman & Peña, 2013). Instead, many of these adopted Koreans endorse their adoptive identity in addition to – or instead of – their ethnic identity. Despite the indication that many adopted Koreans endorse multiple social identities, adoption researchers have tended to study ethnic identity and adoptive identity separately.

It is natural for individuals to identify with multiple social groups (Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004). The endorsement of multiple social identities has been found empirically across identity domains and populations (e.g., Ferrari & Rosanti, 2013; Ng Tseung-Wong & Verkuyten, 2013) and has been linked to positive

psychosocial outcomes. In particular, researchers have examined how individuals identify with ethnicity and nationality. For instance, Ferrari and Rosnati (2013) found that strong commitment to ethnic and national identities (concurrently) related positively to a range of psychosocial variables. Similarly, Huynh, Devos, and Goldberg (2014) found that the specific combination of strong ethnic identity and strong national identity buffered the relation between discrimination and psychological distress. Notably, the other combinations of ethnic and national identity that were endorsed (i.e., strong ethnic and weak national, weak ethnic and strong national, weak ethnic and national) were less effective buffers. While adoptive identity has yet to be addressed in this framework, these findings highlight the importance of considering multiple social identities.

Ethnic identity. Ethnic identity is a multidimensional social identity that focuses on how people perceive themselves in relation to their membership in an ethnic group. Roberts et al. (1999) empirically delineated two dimensions of ethnic identity that aligned with prior theorizing: ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity commitment. Exploration focuses on how individuals enact their identity through behavioral engagement in and learning about their ethnic group. Commitment involves a clear understanding of what it means to be a member of an ethnic group and positive regard toward that ethnic group. These two dimensions have often been studied simultaneously (e.g., Seaton, Sellers, & Scottham, 2006) or as a composite (e.g., Lee, Yun, Yoo, & Park Nelson, 2010).

The behavioral exploration aspect of ethnic identity, however, can be difficult for adopted individuals to enact regardless of intention. Behavioral exploration of one's ethnic identity emphasizes ethnic group-specific practices and organizations that require

special knowledge and/or close proximity with co-ethnic members. However, transracially adopted individuals that wish to explore their ethnic identity are limited to opportunities outside of the family (e.g., contact with Koreans in their neighborhood, involvement in the local Korean church). This reliance on extra-familial sources during identity exploration can be problematic for making meaningful interpretations of individual differences on ethnic identity exploration. An individual could be considering her identity as a Korean but her score on a measure of ethnic identity could be low because of a lack of the culture-specific knowledge and/or access to other Koreans that make up the content of current ethnic identity measures¹. Further, many adopted individuals are concerned that exploring their ethnic identity will upset their adoptive parents, thus stifling their exploration efforts. For instance, in a qualitative study of adopted Koreans, one participant recalled developing a short-lived friendship with a Korean woman that was friends with her adoptive mother, which “freaked [her] mom out” (Hoffman & Peña, 2013, p. 158).

Ethnic identity commitment represents the cognitive and affective aspects of ethnic group membership (Roberts et al., 1999). This sense of meaning, belonging, and pride is posited as a core aspect of group identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and shows unique relations with adjustment (e.g., Iwamoto & Liu, 2010). Further, commitment is more accessible to transracially-adopted individuals across contexts as it places emphasis on the subjective, internal, nature of social identity (e.g., pride in being Korean) rather

¹ Example exploration items: “I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group” (from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure; Roberts et al., 1999); “I have experienced things that reflect my ethnicity, such as eating food, listening to music, and watching movies” (from the Ethnic Identity Scale; Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bámaca-Gómez, 2004).

than a set of behaviors. Given the central nature of identity commitment to ethnic identity and the problems with studying ethnic identity exploration with adopted Koreans, the focus of this study was on ethnic identity commitment.

Ethnic identity development has been consistently linked with ethnic socialization (the transmission of cultural knowledge). For instance, Song and Lee (2009) examined the ethnic identity development of adopted Korean American adults. This mixed-method study found that narrative reports of ethnic socialization in young adulthood (defined as ages 18-21) related positively with ethnic identity in a sample of adopted Korean adults. Similarly, Yoon (2004) found a positive relation between parental ethnic socialization and ethnic identity in a sample of adopted Korean adolescents.

Ethnic identity also is positively related to psychological adjustment (Rivas-Drake et al., 2014; Smith & Silva, 2011). Research with Asian Americans, in particular, suggests that ethnic identity is a psychological asset (e.g., Shrake & Rhee, 2004), however little work has examined ethnic identity as a multidimensional construct. In one of the few studies to disaggregate ethnic identity, ethnic identity commitment, but not exploration, was positively related to psychological well-being (Iwamoto & Liu, 2010). Ethnic identity studies with adopted Korean Americans, while far fewer, have found somewhat similar results. For instance, Yoon (2004) found that ethnic identity (composite) related positively with well-being, and Lee et al. (2010) found that ethnic identity (composite) related to positive affect. However, Lee et al. (2010) did not find a relation between ethnic identity (composite) and general life satisfaction. While these two studies are limited in quantity and fail to disaggregate the dimensions of ethnic identity, their findings align with the broader ethnic identity literature.

Adoptive identity. Adoptive identity is a multidimensional social identity that taps into how an individual identifies with being adopted. Similarly to ethnic identity, adoptive identity has been theorized as tapping into two primary dimensions: a sense of clarity and understanding of being an adopted person (Grotevant, Dunbar, Kohler, & Lash Esau, 2000), and exploration of what it means to be adopted (Colaner, 2014). However, while ethnic identity has benefitted from a host of purpose built measures (e.g., Phinney, 1992; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004), adoptive identity research has been limited to ad hoc adaptations of current measures (as in the present study) and qualitative data collection, suppressing the amount of research on the topic.

The limited work on adoptive identity has typically focused on how adopted individuals reflect on their adoption (Colaner, 2014; Dunbar & Grotevant, 2004). The Adoptive Identity Work Scale (Colaner, 2014), the first purpose-built measure of adoptive identity, is aligned with this conceptualization of exploration. Colaner's (2014) reflective exploration dimension of adoptive identity consists of items such as, "Reflecting on the events leading up to my adoption has been helpful to me" and "Reflecting on the events leading up to my adoption has helped me understand how I relate to my adoptive parents." Reflective exploration, therefore, is dependent upon the amount and content of the information that the adopted individual has about their adoption. For transnationally adopted individuals, reflective exploration can be especially difficult, as they often have very limited information about their pre-adoption lives. This emphasis also highlights a relational and personal view of adoptive identity and

emphasizes rumination, rather than the social aspect of identity that is underscored by statements like “That’s your race” or “That’s your people” (Kim, 2010, p. 125).

Adoptive identity commitment is the meaning that adopted individuals draw from their adoptive status (Colaner, 2014). Extant adoptive identity commitment research has focused specifically on preoccupation with the personal and relational aspect of adoption, with Colaner’s (2014) preoccupation scale comprising items such as, “People cannot understand anything about me if they do not know I am adopted.” However, as Grotevant and colleagues (2000) note, there is a social side to adoptive identity, such that adopted individuals may see themselves as members of a community of adopted individuals. This social identity perspective on adoptive identity more accurately reflects the reality presented by narratives from adopted Koreans. Thus, the present study investigates the pride and understanding that adopted Koreans have in being a member of the adoptive community.

The few studies that focus on adoptive identity suggest that, like ethnic identity, it serves as a psychological asset. Mohanty (2013) found that adoptive identity comfort (emphasis on clarity and understanding, conceptually equivalent to commitment) mediated the relationship between racial socialization and self-esteem such that an increase in racial socialization was related to a stronger adoptive identity, which was in turn related to higher reported self-esteem. Similarly, Basow, Lilley, Bookwala, and McGillicuddy-DeLisi (2008) found a significant relation between adoptive identity (composite) and psychological well-being in a survey of adopted Korean American adults. These findings are congruent with Grotevant’s (1997) argument that the lack of a coherent adoption narrative can lead to various forms of psychological distress.

Korean Adoptee Identity. While ethnic and adoptive identities have been studied individually, narrative accounts from adopted Koreans point to the endorsement of multiple social identities in which both adoptive and Korean identities are emphasized. In discussing adopted Korean (KAD) culture and identity, adopted Korean Sunny Jo notes,

In addition to being minorities in society, KADs are also minorities in our own families, making it hard for some to turn to adoptive parents for support and advice... Nor do most share our adopted status with our adoptive parents. For some, this has prompted a sense of loyalty and nationalism with other KADs and the KAD community. (Jo, 2006, p. 289)

Jo suggests that their adopted status sets them apart from the people that are supposed to be closest to them – their (adoptive) parents – and their Korean ethnicity sets them apart from the majority society as a whole. It is these differences that drive adopted Koreans into community with each other. Jo describes this community – KAD nation – using the identity commitment language of “belonging,” “loyalty,” and “nationalism.”

Narrative research with adopted Korean adults mirrors Jo’s discussion of an adopted Korean community and identity. Anthropologist Eleana J. Kim notes how this adopted Korean identity is similar to that of “other marginalized groups” (Kim, 2010, p. 131). Kim explores this idea further in describing adopted Korean identity as a sense of collective identity and kinship that goes beyond the biological or the adoptive family:

Adoptees share stories, compare personal histories, and negotiate their individual and collective identities as Korean adoptees in a variety of spaces... In doing so they rework ways of doing and knowing kinship... thereby producing new kinds

of social identities and intimate relations. From this perspective, kinship is not a preexisting truth that is discovered or found, but rather a set of relationships actively created out of social practice and cultural representation. (Kim, 2010, p. 87)

This kinship, built upon their collective experiences as adopted Koreans, produces a new community and culture in which the adopted and Korean social identities are simultaneously salient. Drawing upon these narrative accounts (see also: Palmer, 2011), I use the term *KAD identity* to refer to a configuration of multiple social identities that emphasizes commitment to both a Korean (ethnic) identity and an adoptive identity.

Person-Centered Research

In order to examine this multiplicity, I implemented a person-centered approach to identify patterns expressed across two social identities within a group of individuals. Unlike the more commonly used variable-centered approach, a person-centered approach to studying multiple identities involves interpreting a person's response to one measure of identity in light of responses to other measures of identity (Kiang, Yip, & Fuligni, 2008). This method gives researchers the ability to study how multiple social identities co-occur within an individual by creating identity profiles.

Identity profiles are especially relevant for adopted Korean American adolescents who likely vary in the extent to which they identify as Korean and as adopted persons. While narrative accounts point to the importance of considering multiple social identities that emphasize both ethnicity and adoptive status, it is likely that that adopted Korean Americans vary along both identity domains, with some adopted Koreans emphasizing their adoptive identity over their ethnic identity and vice-versa. Still others may not

identify with either group; instead, choosing to identify with some other social group (e.g., White or American).

A person-centered approach also allows for a unique perspective on how different combinations of multiple social identities relate to adjustment. For instance, examining ethnic and national identities Ferrari and Rosnati (2013) found four unique profiles that differentially related to behavioral problems, life satisfaction, and self-esteem among adopted Latino/a adolescents living in Italy. Specifically, adopted adolescents with stronger adherence to the dual (ethnic and national) identity reported fewer behavioral problems and greater life satisfaction and self-esteem. This pattern is also evident in Kiang, Yip, and Fuligni's (2008) study on the social identity profiles of ethnically diverse, non-adopted young adults. Young adults with strong adherence to the "multiple social identity" (combined ethnic, American, family, religious) reported greater positive affect and self-esteem. Drawing on these findings on multiple social identities from other populations, I expect that a strong *KAD identity* will have a positive relationship with adjustment and well-being for adopted Korean American adolescents.

Current Study

The current study takes a person-centered approach to the study of ethnic and adoptive identity in a sample of adopted Korean American adolescents in order to answer two research questions. First, what do the ethnic and adoptive identity profiles for adopted Korean adolescents look like? The current study used cluster analysis to empirically derive identity profiles based on measures of ethnic and adoptive identity commitment. I hypothesize that there will be at least four distinct ethnic and adoptive identity profiles: *KAD Identity* (strong ethnic, strong adoptive), *uncommitted* (weak

ethnic, weak adoptive), *adoptee* (weak ethnic, strong adoptive), and *Korean* (strong ethnic, weak adoptive). The validity of these profiles will be determined by examining how the profiles differentially relate to ethnic socialization. Participants with profiles that are built upon a strong ethnic identity (e.g., *KAD Identity*, *Korean*) should report more ethnic socialization than participants in profiles that are built upon weak ethnic identity (e.g., *uncommitted*, *adoptee*).

Second, how do these identity profiles relate to adjustment? While prior empirical work in this area is limited, I hypothesize that profiles with stronger social identities (ethnic and/or adoptive) will relate to better adjustment. However, the exact nature of the relationships is exploratory.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Data were collected as a part of a longitudinal project on the experiences of adopted Korean Americans and their adoptive parents (for more information, see Lee, J. P., Lee, R. M., Hu, & Kim, 2014). The present data represent responses from the first wave of data collection. The sample consisted of 189² transnationally adopted Korean American adolescents (49.74% female). The average age at the time of the survey was 15.59 years old ($SD = 1.78$ years). The average age at adoption was 7.05 months old (range: 3-35 months; $SD = 5.20$ months).

Outliers. Cluster analysis is highly sensitive to multivariate outliers (Good, Willoughby, & Busseri, 2011). With this in mind, Mahalanobis distance was calculated

² If multiple adopted Korean adolescents responded from one family, only data from the eldest sibling were used in this study. This was done in order to avoid nested data, which violates inherent assumptions of independence for cluster analysis.

for the two clustering variables: ethnic identity commitment and adoptive identity commitment. Based on $p < 0.001$, there were no outliers and no cases were excluded.

Missing Data. The final sample included only 1.91% missing data (Little's MCAR test: $p = .490$). However, in order to retain the full sample, the missing data was imputed using the expectation maximization algorithm. Schafer and Graham (2002) have suggested that this method of missing data treatment is preferable to the more traditional listwise deletion, pairwise deletion, and mean substitution.

Measures

Ethnic identity. Ethnic identity was measured using the commitment dimension from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Roberts et al., 1999). Ethnic identity commitment ($\alpha = .83$; 7 items) represents the cognitive and affective aspects of ethnic identity, the combination of taking pride in your group, having a sense of belonging to your group, and understanding the meaning of group membership. Example items are, "I have a clear sense of my being Korean and what it means for me" and "I feel good about being Korean." Participants responded using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The scale-score was computed by averaging across all of the items (there were no reverse scored items). Higher scores indicate higher ethnic identity commitment.

Adoptive identity. Adoptive identity was measured using a modified form of the commitment dimension of Roberts et al.'s (1999) MEIM with some form of "adopted" being substituted for "Korea/Korean." Adoptive identity commitment ($\alpha = .83$, 6 items) is conceptually similar to ethnic identity commitment, with an emphasis on the meaning, belonging, and pride placed on being adopted. Example items are, "I have a clear sense of

being adopted and what it means for me” and “I feel good about being an adoptee.” Participants responded using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The scale-score was computed by averaging across all of the items (there were no reverse scored items). Higher scores indicate higher adoptive identity commitment.

Parental Ethnic Socialization. Adolescent report of parental ethnic socialization efforts over the past year was measured using a modified version of the ethnic socialization measure by Johnston, Swim, Saltsman, Deater-Deckard, and Petrill (2007; see also: Hughes & Chen, 1997). Example item: “In the past year, has one or both of your parents talked to you about important Korean people or historical events.” Participants responded using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Scales were computed by averaging across all of the items (there were no reverse scored items). Higher scores indicate more parental ethnic socialization efforts ($\alpha = .87$; 7 items).

Adolescent Ethnic Socialization. Adolescent report of their own engagement in ethnic socialization activities was assessed using 15 items generated for the present study ($\alpha = .90$). Building on the ethnic socialization literature (e.g., Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Johnston et al., 2007), items were created that assessed the adolescent’s report of their own involvement in ethnic socialization activities. Example items are “How many times have you participated or engaged in the following activities in the past year: Celebrated a Korean holiday or ceremony” and “How many times have you participated or engaged in the following activities in the past year: Email/Internet interactions with other Koreans.” Participants responded using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (none) to 5 (four+ times). Scales were computed by averaging across all of the

items (there were no reverse scored items). Higher scores indicate more ethnic socialization.

Behavioral Development. Behavioral development was measured using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 1997). I used the scoring procedure developed by Ruchkin, Jones, Vermeiren, and Schwab-Stone (2008) to assess the adjustment of American adolescents. Emotional distress/withdrawal ($\alpha = .70$; 8 items) taps into internalizing problems. Example items include, “I would rather be alone than with people of my age” and “I worry a lot.” Higher scores indicate more internalizing problems. Behavioral reactivity/conduct problems ($\alpha = .73$; 7 items) taps into externalizing problems. Example items include, “I am restless, I cannot stay still for long” and “I am easily distracted, I find it difficult to concentrate.” Higher scores indicate more externalizing problems. Prosocial behavior/peer competence ($\alpha = .73$; 10 items) examines individual strengths. Example items include, “I try to be nice to other people. I care about their feelings” and “I usually share with others, for example CDs, games, food.” Higher scores indicate more prosocial behavior. Participants responded to the three dimensions using a Likert scale that ranged from 0 (not true) to 2 (certainly true). Scales were computed by averaging across all of the items within the individual dimension (there were no reverse scored items).

Risk Behaviors. The present study used three items to assess risk behaviors. Drawing from Palmqvist and Santavirta (2006), the first two items asked about alcohol use (“I drink alcohol, such as beer, wine, or liquor”) and cigarette use (“I smoke cigarettes”). A third item assessing recreational drug use (“I have tried drugs, such as marijuana”) was added for the current study. Items were scored on a Likert scale that

ranged from 1 (never or not at all) to 5 (almost always). The scale score ($\alpha = .83$) was computed by averaging across all three items (there were no reversed scored items).

Higher scores indicate more risk behaviors.

Satisfaction with Life. Global life satisfaction was assessed using the Satisfaction With Life Scale ($\alpha = .88$; 5 items; Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985). Example items include, “In most ways my life is close to my ideal” and “The conditions of my life are excellent.” Participants responded to the single dimension using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The scale score was computed by averaging across all of the items (there were no reverse scored items). Higher scores indicate more global life satisfaction.

School Adjustment. School adjustment was measured using a modified version of the eight-item Programme for International Student Assessment measure of student engagement (PISA; Programme for International Student Assessment, 2003; for more information, see: Seol, Yoo, Lee, Kyoung, & Kyeong, 2015). School belongingness/peer competence ($\alpha = .88$; 6 items; 3 reverse scored) assesses if an adolescent feels that they fit in and are well liked at their school. Example items include, “I make friends easily at school” and “I feel awkward and out of place at school (reverse coded). Higher scores indicate more belongingness. School interest/motivation ($\alpha = .78$; 5 items; 2 reverse scored) assesses how interested an adolescent is in academic achievement. Example items include, “I want to do well at school” and “I do not want to go to school (reverse coded). Higher scores indicate more school interest. Participants responded to the two dimensions using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Scales were computed by averaging across all of the items within each dimension.

Family Functioning. The conflict and involvement dimensions of the Parental Experiences Questionnaire were used to examine the interactions between the adolescent and the adoptive parent(s) (Elkins, McGue, & Iacono, 1997). The conflict dimension ($\alpha_{\text{mother}} = .91$; $\alpha_{\text{father}} = .92$; 7 items) assesses conflict and disagreement between the adolescent and the adoptive father/mother. Example items include, “My mother often criticizes me” and “I often seem to anger or annoy my father.” The involvement dimension ($\alpha_{\text{mother}} = .79$; $\alpha_{\text{father}} = .87$; 7 items; 2 reverse scored) assesses how involved the adoptive parent is with the adolescent. Example items include, “I talk about my concerns and experiences with my mother” and “My father doesn’t seem to know much about how I do in school or at work (reverse coded).” Participants responded to the two dimensions using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Scales were computed by averaging across all of the items within each dimension. Higher scores indicate more parental conflict/involvement.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Bivariate correlations between study variables are reported in Table 1. Ethnic identity is positively correlated with adoptive identity ($r = .72, p < .01$). Ethnic identity and adoptive identity show similar patterns of positive correlations with ethnic socialization, satisfaction with life, school interest and family involvement with both parents. They also show similar negative correlations with conflict with father. Almost all adjustment variables except emotional distress are significantly correlated with each other in the expected direction.

Identity Profiles

In order to identify conceptually distinct identity profiles I used a multi-stage cluster analytic technique that was informed by Good, Willoughby, and Busseri (2011). First, the two clustering variables (ethnic identity and adoptive identity) were standardized to normalize the variances across measures. Second, an agglomerative hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward's method with squared Euclidean distance as the dissimilarity measure was performed, estimating three to six cluster solutions. Analysis of the dendrogram supported the possibility of a maximum of six clusters. Third, the cluster centers from the agglomerative hierarchical analysis were used as starting values for a series of *k*-means cluster analyses, with three to six clusters specified. Fourth, the reliability of the four separate cluster solutions was assessed. Five randomly selected subsamples were created, each composed of roughly two-thirds of the total sample. Steps two and three were repeated on each of these five subsamples. Upon inspection, the six-cluster solution was determined to be the most stable and conceptually meaningful. The raw means and standard deviations for the six-cluster solution are presented in Table 2 (for a graphical representation see: Figure 1).

Cluster 1 (n=38), labeled *KAD-Marginally Committed*, is characterized by relatively low scores on both identity measures. Cluster 2 (n=36), labeled *Korean*, is characterized by a relatively high score on ethnic identity-commitment and an average score on adoptive identity-commitment. Cluster 3 (n=37), labeled *KAD-Strongly Committed*, is characterized by relatively high scores on both identity measures. Cluster 4 (n=47), labeled *KAD-Committed*, is characterized by average scores on both identity measures. Cluster 5 (n=20), labeled *Adoptee*, is characterized by an average score on

ethnic identity-commitment and a relatively high score on adoptive identity-commitment. Cluster 6 ($n=11$), labeled *Uncommitted*, is characterized by relatively *very* low scores on both identity measures – the lowest scores on each measure. A series of ANOVAs were conducted to determine mean differences in identity dimension across clusters (ethnic identity commitment: $F = 197.54, p < .001$; adoptive identity commitment: $F = 199.17, p < .001$). Tukey's post hoc comparisons indicated significant differences ($p < .05$) between all of the clusters on both variables except for two comparisons: the *KAD-Committed* and *Adoptee* clusters did not differ on ethnic identity commitment ($p = .65$), and the *KAD-Strongly Committed* and *Adoptee* clusters did not differ on adoptive identity commitment ($p = .91$).

Demographics. A test of independence was used to assess whether cluster membership varied significantly by gender. Pearson's chi-square tests indicated significant cluster differences by gender. Conducting pairwise comparisons, I found that there were significantly more males than females in the *Korean* and *Uncommitted* profiles.

Profile Validation. A series of ANOVAs with the ethnic socialization variables as the dependent variable were performed to validate the identity cluster profiles. There was a significant difference in parental ethnic socialization by cluster membership ($F = 13.12, p < .001, \omega^2 = 0.24$). Multiple comparisons (Table 3) indicated that the *KAD-Marginally Committed* profile reported significantly fewer parental ethnic socialization activities than the *KAD-Strongly Committed* ($p < .001, d = -0.93$) and *Korean* profiles ($p < .001, d = -0.61$). The *Korean* profile reported significantly more parental ethnic socialization activities than the *Uncommitted* profile ($p = .010, d = 0.82$). The *KAD-*

Strongly Committed profile reported significantly more parental ethnic socialization activities than the *KAD-Committed* ($p < .001$, $d = 0.63$), *Adoptee* ($p < .001$, $d = 0.73$) and the *Uncommitted* ($p < .001$, $d = 1.18$) profiles.

There also was a significant difference in adolescent ethnic socialization by cluster membership ($F = 9.03$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = 0.18$). Multiple comparisons indicated that the *KAD-Marginally Committed* profile reported significantly less adolescent involvement in ethnic socialization than the *Korean* ($p = .002$, $d = -0.60$) and the *KAD-Strongly Committed* ($p < .001$, $d = -0.73$) profiles. The *Korean* profile reported significantly more adolescent ethnic socialization activities than the *KAD-Committed* ($p < .007$, $d = 0.45$) and the *Uncommitted* ($p < .010$, $d = 0.87$) profiles. The *KAD-Strongly Committed* profile reported more adolescent ethnic socialization activities than the *KAD-Committed* ($p < .001$, $d = 0.58$), *Adoptee* ($p = .023$, $d = 0.56$), and *Uncommitted* ($p = .001$, $d = 1.02$) profiles. These results offer strong support of the validity of the six-profile solution.

Psychological Adjustment

There were several significant differences on psychological adjustment by cluster membership. For life satisfaction by cluster membership ($F = 3.65$, $p = .004$, $\omega^2 = 0.07$), the *Uncommitted* profile reported significantly less satisfaction with life than the *Korean* ($p = .049$, $d = -0.90$), *KAD-Strongly Committed* ($p = .005$, $d = -1.15$), *KAD-Committed* ($p = .011$, $d = -1.32$), and *Adoptee* ($p = .008$, $d = -1.04$) profiles (Table 3). For school belongingness by cluster membership ($F = 3.72$, $p = .003$, $\omega^2 = 0.07$), the *Adoptee* profile reported significantly more school belongingness than the *KAD-Committed* profile ($p = .002$, $d = 0.65$) (Table 3). For school interest by cluster membership ($F = 2.34$, $p = .043$,

$\omega^2 = 0.03$), the *KAD-Strongly Committed* profile reported significantly more school interest than the *Uncommitted* profile ($p = .038$, $d = 0.58$) (Table 3). Although cluster memberships did not differ on perceived conflict with the mother, there was a significant group difference on perceived involvement by the mother ($F = 4.78$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = 0.09$). The *Uncommitted* profile reported significantly less perceived involvement than the *KAD-Strongly Committed* profile ($p = .015$, $d = -0.59$) and the *Adoptee* profile ($p = .021$, $d = -0.66$) (Table 3). The *KAD-Strongly Committed* profile reported greater involvement by mother than the *KAD-Marginally Committed* profile ($p = .029$, $d = 0.32$) and the *KAD-Committed* profile ($p = .029$, $d = 0.28$). Cluster membership did not differ on perceived conflict with the father or perceived involvement by the father. There also were no significant group differences by cluster membership on behavioral development or risk behaviors.

Discussion

There has been limited work in adoption research examining how multiple social identities co-occur. The present study filled this gap by creating ethnic and adoptive identity profiles of adopted Korean American adolescents and testing these profiles against a number of adjustment measures.

Identity Profiles

The first research interest was to determine the quantity and configuration of unique identity profiles that existed for adopted Korean adolescents. Rather than assuming profile configurations, I empirically derived six distinct identity profiles. In line with my hypothesis, I found a *KAD Identity* profile (strong ethnic, strong adoptive) and an *Uncommitted* profile (weak ethnic, weak adoptive). Furthermore, although I found an

Adoptee profile and a *Korean* profile, they exhibited average rather than weak non-characteristic identities (i.e., *Adoptee* had average ethnic identity and *Korean* had average adoptive identity). I also found two variations on *KAD Identity*: *KAD-Marginally Committed* (average ethnic, average adoptive) and *KAD-Strongly Committed* (especially strong ethnic, especially strong adoptive). These six profiles align with narratives from adopted Koreans (for example, see: Kim, 2010) and are further supported by their relationship with ethnic socialization – less ethnic socialization related to the less committed profiles and more ethnic socialization related to the more committed profiles.

The second research interest was to determine if these profiles differentially related to adjustment. Contrary to my hypothesis, I found very few differences across eleven different measures. One exception was the perceived involvement by the mother: the *KAD-Strongly Committed* profile reported the most involvement by the mother and the *Uncommitted profile* reported the least involvement by the mother. This finding is particularly notable because perceived involvement by the father did not differ across the six profiles. Other exceptions generally involved the *Uncommitted* profile reporting worse adjustment.

Adopted Korean adolescents regardless of identity profile configuration have, on average, relatively positive adjustment. Across identity profiles, I found few differences in adjustment. The one exception to this trend was the *Uncommitted* group, with the lowest scores across both identity measures. These results suggest that there is not necessarily a ‘right’ way to grow up as an adopted Korean. While the modal group – *KAD-Committed* – had average ethnic identity and adoptive identity scores, there was a marked spectrum of responses. One out of five (20%) adolescent Korean adoptees fit

under the profile of *KAD-Marginally Committed*, reporting relatively low scores in terms of ethnic and adoptive identity. But despite these potential red flags, there were no significant differences among profiles in terms of strengths, difficulties, or risk behaviors.

Although I present rather encouraging results in terms of the prospects of adjustment for adopted Korean adolescents, I urge caution in extrapolating an adopted Korean ‘success story’ from the findings. Recent news coverage of adult adopted Koreans returning to Korea suggests that questions surrounding ethnic and adoptive identity may become more salient for some later on in the transition to adulthood (Jones, 2015).

Cohorts of transnationally and transracially adopted persons from other countries may have more varied psychological adjustment compared to adopted Korean adolescents. Adopted Koreans tend to be placed at a very young age (children in the present study averaged seven months) with little time in institutionalized care. In contrast the 7,000 children transnationally adopted into American families in 2013 averaged closer to three years old (U.S. Department of State). Adopted Korean children also have some of the lowest rates of disabilities (Kreider & Cohen, 2009), so they may be a relatively advantaged subset of the transnationally adopted population. With a significantly different context in childhood, it is unclear at the population level how later cohorts of transnationally adopted persons will fair in terms of their psychosocial adjustment.

Last, the newest waves of adopted Koreans are less likely to grow up amidst other Korean-born adopted children, as the rates of adoption from Korea have declined dramatically. Without the same cohort experience of perhaps meeting and befriending

other adopted Koreans, there may be fewer opportunities to develop committed identities as Koreans and as adopted persons.

Limitations And Future Directions

Although Korean and adoptive identities are likely to be particularly salient for adopted Korean Americans, a White or national identity might be equally important to their self-concept. It is likely that those participants who were relatively less committed to the measured domains, yet presented positive adjustment, may have been especially committed to a third, unmeasured identity. Similarly, given the differential availability of identity exploration for group members – as operationalized by current identity measures, I focused exclusively on identity commitment. Furthermore, adoptive identity and ethnic identity are strongly correlated ($r = .72$). It is possible that ethnic and adoptive identities are so intertwined for transnationally adopted persons that they are unable to fully differentiate the two identities. Last, participants were adolescents, a developmental period during which social identities are just beginning to form. Therefore, it is expected that these adolescents' commitment to their social identities will continue to develop as they mature. As such, some caution should be taken in interpreting the results. Future research should expand in scope to examine developmental trajectories along with other domains and dimensions of identity while keeping potential measurement complications in mind.

The current study contained additional limitations. First, I had a limited sample size, which resulted in some identity profiles to have few participants (e.g., *Uncommitted* $n = 11$). Second, the study relied on self-report data from one time point, giving us a 'snap-shot' of the adolescent's development at that point. Longitudinal study designs

would enable scholars to examine potential differences in developmental trajectories. Third, cluster analytic approaches are inherently sample-dependent. The profiles that were determined in the present study may not all appear in subsequent samples. Last, participants were drawn from a registry of adoptive parents that consented to be contacted by researchers. It is possible that this sample is somewhat unique, potentially presenting a biased sample. Future research should determine the reproducibility of the present profiles while striving for larger sample sizes, unbiased sampling, and longitudinal assessments,

Conclusion

The present study advances our understanding of how adopted Korean American adolescents commit to their ethnic and adoptive identities. Further, it suggests that there is no “right way” to be an adopted Korean, as there were limited inter-profile differences on adjustment. Future research should examine additional identity domains and dimensions. Not only will this provide a more complete picture of how adopted Korean American adolescents explore and commit to their identities, it will further the larger body of literature on identity in general.

References

- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(1), 80-114.
- Baden, A. L., Treweek, L. M., & Ahluwalia, M. K. (2012). Reclaiming culture: Reculturation of transracial and international adoptees. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 90, 387-399.
- Basow, S. A., Lilley, E., Bookwala, J., & McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. (2008). Identity development and psychological well-being in Korean-born adoptees in the U.S. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 78(4), 473-480.
- Colaner, C. W. (2014). Measuring adoptive identity: Validation of the Adoptive Identity Work Scale. *Adoption Quarterly*, 17, 134-157.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Dunbar, N., & Grotevant, H. D. (2004). Adoption narratives: The construction of adoptive identity during adolescence. In M. W. Pratt & B. H. Fiese (Eds.), *Family stories and the life course: Across time and generations* (pp. 135-161). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Elkins, I.J., McGue, M., & Iacono, W.G. (1997). Genetic and environmental influences on parent-son relationships: Evidence for increasing genetic influence during adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(2), 351-363.
- Ferrari, L., & Rosnati, R. (2013). Internationally adopted adolescents: How do they integrate ethnic and national identity? *Italian Journal of Sociology and Education*, 5(3), 45-61.
- Good, M., Willoughby, T., & Busseri, M. A. (2011). Stability and change in adolescent spirituality/religiosity: A person-centered approach. *Developmental Psychology*, 74(2), 538-550.
- Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 5, 581-586.
- Grotevant, H. D. (1997). Coming to terms with adoption: The construction of identity from adolescence into adulthood. *Adoption Quarterly*, 1(1), 3-27.
- Grotevant, H. D., Dunbar, N., Kohler, J. K., & Lash Esau, A. M. (2000). Adoptive identity: How contexts within and beyond the family shape developmental pathways. *Family Relations*, 49, 379-387.
- Hoffman, J., & Peña, E. V. (2013). Too Korean to be White and too White to be Korean: Ethnic identity development among transracial Korean American adoptees. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 50(2), 152-170.
- Hughes, D., & Chen, L. (1997). When and what parents tell children about race: An examination of race-related socialization among African American families. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1(4), 200-214.
- Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 981-995.
- Huynh, Q. -L., Devos, T., & Goldberg, R. (2014). The role of ethnic and national identifications in perceived discrimination for Asian Americans: Toward a better understanding of the buffering effect of group identifications on psychological distress. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 5(3), 161-171.

- Iwamoto, D. K., & Liu, W. M. (2010). The impact of racial identity, ethnic identity, Asian values, and race-related stress on Asian Americans and Asian international college students' psychological well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(1), 79-91.
- Jo, S. (2006). The making of KAD nation. In J. J. Trenka, J. C. Oparah, & S. Y. Shin (Eds.), *Outsiders within: Writing on transracial adoption* (pp. 285-290). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Johnston, K. E., Swim, J. K., Saltsman, B. M., Deater-Deckard, K., & Petrill, S. A. (2007). Mothers' racial, ethnic, and cultural socialization of transracially adopted Asian children. *Family Relations*, 56, 390-402.
- Jones, M. (2015, January 14). Why a generation of adoptees is returning to South Korea. *New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com
- Juffer, F., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2007). Adoptees do not lack self-esteem: A meta-analysis of studies on self-esteem of transracial, international, and domestic adoptees. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(6), 1067-1083.
- Kiang, L., Yip, T., & Fuligni, A. J. (2008). Multiple social identities and adjustment in young adults from ethnically diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 18(4), 643-670.
- Kim, E. (2000). Korean Adoptee Auto-Ethnography: Refashioning Self. Family and Finding Community. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 16(1), 43-70.
- Kim, E. J. (2010). *Adopted territory: Transnational Korean adoptees and the politics of belonging*. Duke University Press.
- Kim, W. J., Shin, Y., & Carey, M. P. (1999). Comparison of Korean-American adoptees and biological children of their adoptive parents: A pilot study. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 29(3), 221-228.
- Kreider, R. M., & Cohen, P. N. (2009). Disability among internationally adopted children in the United States. *Pediatrics*, 124(5), 1311-1318.
- Kreider, R. M., & Lofquist, D. A. (2014). *Adopted children and stepchildren: 2010* (Current Population Reports, P20-572). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Kreider, R. M., & Raleigh, E. (2011). Contexts of racial socialization: Are transracial families more like multiracial or White monoracial families? *Population Association of America meeting, Washington, D. C.*
- Lee, J. P., Lee, R. M., Hu, A. W., & Kim, O. M. (2014). Ethnic identity as a moderator against discrimination for transracially and transnationally adopted Korean American adolescents. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*. Advance online publication.
- Lee, R. M. (2003). The transracial adoption paradox: History, research, and counseling implications of cultural socialization. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 31(6), 711-744.
- Lee, R. M., Yun, A. B., Yoo, H. C., & Park Nelson, K. (2010). Comparing the ethnic identity and well-being of adopted Korean Americans with immigrant/U.S.-born Korean Americans and Korean international students. *Adoption Quarterly*, 13, 2-17.
- Mohanty, J. (2013). Ethnic and racial socialization and self-esteem of Asian adoptees: The mediating role of multiple identities. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36, 161-170.

- Nafzger, A. I. (2006). Proud to be me. In J. J. Trenka, J. C. Oparah, & S. Y. Shin (Eds.), *Outsiders within: Writing on transracial adoption* (pp. 233-247). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Ng Tseung-Wong, C., & Verkuyten, M. (2013). Religious and national group identification in adolescence: A study among three religious groups in Mauritius. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(5), 846-857.
- Odenstad, A., Hjern, A., Lindblad, F., Rasmussen, F., Vinnerljung, B., & Dalen, M. (2008). Does age at adoption and geographic origin matter? A national cohort study of cognitive test performance in adult inter-country adoptees. *Psychological Medicine*, 38, 1803-1814.
- Palmer, J. D. (2011). *The dance of identities: Korean adoptees and their journey toward empowerment*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Palmqvist, R., & Santavirta, N. (2006). What friends are for: The relationships between body image, substance use, and peer influence among Finnish adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 35(2), 203-217.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7(2), 156-176.
- Programme for International Student Assessment. (2003). *Student engagement at school: A sense of belonging and participation (Results from PISA 2000)*. Paris, FR: Willms.
- Rivas-Drake, D., Seaton, E. K., Markstrom, C., Quintana, S., Syed, M., Lee, R. M., ... Ethnic and Racial Identity in the 21st Century Study Group. (2014). Ethnic and racial identity in adolescence: Implications for psychosocial academic, and health outcomes. *Child Development*, 85(1), 40-57.
- Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19(3), 301-322.
- Ruchkin, V., Jones, S., Vermeiren, R., & Schwab-Stone, M. (2008). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: The self-report version in American urban and suburban youth. *Psychological Assessment*, 20(2), 175-182.
- Schafer, J. L., & Graham, J. W. (2002). Missing data: Our view of the state of the art. *Psychological Methods*, 7(2), 147-177.
- Seaton, E. K., Sellers, R. M., & Scottham, K. M. (2006). The status model of racial identity development in African American adolescents: Evidence of structure, trajectories, and well-being. *Child Development*, 77(5), 1416-1426.
- Sellers, R. M., Rowley, S. A. J., Chavous, T. M., Shelton, J. N., & Smith, M. A. (1997). Multidimensional inventory of Black identity: A preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(4), 805-815.
- Seol, K., Yoo, H. C., Lee, R. M. Kyoung, J., & Kyeong, Y. (2015). *Racial and ethnic socialization as moderators of racial discrimination and school outcomes among adopted and non-adopted Korean American adolescents*. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. Advance Online Publication.
- Shrake, E. K., & Rhee, S. (2004). Ethnic identity as a predictor of problem behaviors among Korean American adolescents. *Adolescence*, 39(155), 601-622.

- Smith, T. B., & Silver, L. (2011). Ethnic identity and personal well-being of People of Color: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58(1), 42-60.
- Song, S. L., & Lee, R. M. (2009). The past and present cultural experiences of adopted Korean American adults. *Adoption Quarterly*, 12, 19-36.
- Syed, M., Walker, L. H. M., Lee, R. M., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Schwartz, S. J.,... Huynh, Q. (2013). A two-factor model of ethnic identity exploration: Implications for identity coherence and well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 19(2), 143-154.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tuan, M., & Shiao, J. L. (2011). *Choosing ethnicity, negotiating race: Korean adoptees in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Yazedjian, A., & Bámaca-Gómez, M. (2004). Developing the ethnic identity scale using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives. *Identity*, 4(1), 9-38.
- U.S. Department of State. *Intercountry adoption: Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://travel.state.gov/content/adoptionsabroad/en/about-us/statistics.html>
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Juffer, F. (2006). The Emanuel Miller Memorial Lecture 2006: Adoption as intervention. Meta-analytic evidence for massive catch-up and plasticity in physical, socio-emotional, and cognitive development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47(12), 1228-1245.
- Yoon, D. P. (2004). Intercountry adoption: The importance of ethnic socialization and subjective well-being for Korean-born adopted Children. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 13(2), 71-89.

Appendix

Table 1. Bivariate Correlations for Study Variables

	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
(1) EI	.72**	.54**	.51**	-.07	-.10	.13	.18*	.04	.15	.19*	-.08	.24**	-.15*	.17*
(2) AI	-	.36**	.31**	-.04	-.10	.13	.32**	.14	.25**	.24**	-.05	.31**	-.20**	.19**
(3) ES-P		-	.58**	.11	-.01	.09	.18*	-.01	.04	.18*	-.07	.28**	-.11	.22**
(4) ES-A			-	.16*	.14	.00	-.11	.21**	-.04	-.07	.18*	.00	.16*	-.12
(5) EDW				-	.41**	-.25**	-.28**	.10	-.45**	-.14	.48**	-.16*	.41**	-.23**
(6) BRCP					-	-.55**	-.35**	.21**	-.26**	-.37**	.56**	-.39**	.45**	-.40**
(7) PBPC						-	.40**	-.20**	.38**	.49**	-.49**	.43**	-.46**	.44**
(8) SWL							-	-.10	.41**	.40**	-.36**	.48**	-.43**	.48**
(9) RB								-	-.02	-.25**	.27**	-.24**	.13	-.17*
(10) SBPC									-	.40**	-.37**	.30**	-.35**	.34**
(11) SIM										-	-.31**	.44**	-.30**	.48**
(12) C-M											-	-.56**	.62**	-.47**

(13) I-M	-	-.49**	.69**
(14) C-F		-	-.64**
(15) I-F			-

Note. EI: Ethnic Identity; AI: Adoptive Identity; ES-P: Parental Ethnic Socialization; ES-A: Adolescent Ethnic Socialization; EDW:

Emotional Distress/Withdrawal; BRCP: Behavioral Reactivity/Conduct Problems; PBPC: Prosocial Behavior/Peer Competence;

SWL: Satisfaction with Life; RB: Risk Behaviors; SBPC: School Belongingness/Peer Competence; SIM: School Interest/Motivation;

C-M: Conflict with Mother; I-M: Mother's Involvement; C-F: Conflict with Father; I-F: Father's Involvement

n=189; *p < .05; **p < .01.

Table 2. Raw Means and Standard Deviations for Cluster Variables

	KAD- Marginally Committed	Korean	KAD-Strongly Committed	KAD- Committed	Adoptee	Uncommitted
	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Korean Identity	2.44(0.19)	3.20(0.21)	3.59(0.24)	2.74(0.14)	2.82(0.18)	1.90(0.34)
Adoptive Identity	2.66(0.18)	3.13(0.18)	3.69(0.23)	2.95(0.16)	3.63(0.21)	2.06(0.31)

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Validation and Adjustment Variables across Six Clusters

	KAD-Marginally Committed	Korean	KAD-Strongly Committed	KAD- Committed	Adoptee	Uncommitted
	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)
ES-P*	1.59(0.46) ^c	2.26(0.75) ^{ab}	2.65(0.85) ^a	1.84(0.61) ^{bc}	1.86(0.61) ^{bc}	1.47(0.57) ^c
ES-A*	1.51(0.43) ^c	2.20(0.94) ^{ab}	2.39(1.02) ^a	1.61(0.62) ^c	1.72(0.77) ^{bc}	1.31(0.38) ^c
EDW	0.40(0.38)	0.29(0.22)	0.39(0.31)	0.38(0.29)	0.40(0.35)	0.48(0.45)
BRCP	0.44(0.23)	0.38(0.40)	0.38(0.38)	0.45(0.37)	0.44(0.39)	0.58(0.19)
PBPC	1.58(0.28)	1.60(0.25)	1.64(0.29)	1.50(0.24)	1.55(0.32)	1.47(0.29)
SWL*	5.30(1.00) ^{ab}	5.54(1.06) ^a	5.82(1.03) ^a	5.69(0.87) ^a	5.88(1.24) ^a	4.49(1.61) ^b
RB	1.22(0.37)	1.17(0.48)	1.37(0.84)	1.16(0.46)	1.36(0.78)	1.18(0.30)
SBPC*	3.35(0.41) ^{ab}	3.43(0.55) ^{ab}	3.49(0.52) ^{ab}	3.23(0.43) ^a	3.72(0.30) ^b	3.23(0.60) ^{ab}
SIM*	3.11(0.37) ^{ab}	3.15(0.47) ^{ab}	3.35(0.47) ^a	3.15(0.39) ^{ab}	3.27(0.58) ^{ab}	2.87(0.77) ^b
C-M	2.01(0.54)	1.77(0.56)	1.90(0.75)	2.07(0.63)	1.90(0.84)	2.03(0.84)
I-M*	3.17(0.43) ^{bc}	3.37(0.38) ^{abc}	3.48(0.52) ^a	3.19(0.42) ^{bc}	3.51(0.31) ^{ab}	2.99(0.57) ^c

C-F	2.05(0.57)	1.76(0.51)	1.73(0.73)	1.93(0.50)	1.70(0.70)	2.09(0.83)
I-F	2.91(0.49)	3.16(0.44)	3.18(0.66)	3.01(0.40)	3.24(0.64)	2.81(0.77)

Note. ES-P: Parental Ethnic Socialization; ES-A: Adolescent Ethnic Socialization; EDW: Emotional Distress/Withdrawal; BRCP:

Behavioral Reactivity/Conduct Problems; PBPC: Prosocial Behavior/Peer Competence; SWL: Satisfaction with Life; RB: Risk

Behaviors; SBPC: School Belongingness/Peer Competence; SIM: School Interest/Motivation; C-M: Conflict with Mother; I-M:

Mother's Involvement; C-F: Conflict with Father; I-F: Father's Involvement

Asterisks denote grand mean differences. Within row means with no common superscript denote significant differences between the identity profiles ($p < .05$).

Figure 1. Identity Profiles