Published in final edited form as:

Soc Psychol Personal Sci. 2014 November ; 5(8): 865–872. doi:10.1177/1948550614537310.

Evidence of Self-Informant Agreement in Ethnic Identity

Stevie C. Y. Yap,

Department of Psychology, Michigan State University

Ivana Anusic,

Department of Psychology, Michigan State University

M. Brent Donnellan, and

Department of Psychology, Michigan State University

Richard E. Lucas

Department of Psychology, Michigan State University

Abstract

Ethnic identity is considered to be a psychologically important characteristic that is associated with adjustment outcomes. However, little is known about the degree to which ethnic identity manifests itself in characteristics that are observable to others. This study is the first to evaluate self-other agreement in ethnic identity and to use a multi-method approach for testing the associations between ethnic identity and adjustment outcomes. Results provide evidence of agreement across self and informant reports of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, the most widely used measure of ethnic identity in the literature. We also find evidence for shared method effects across informant reports of life satisfaction and ethnic identity. Finally, we find evidence for an association between latent ethnic identity and latent life satisfaction and self esteem scores, indicating that the association between ethnic identity and both life satisfaction and self esteem is more than just shared method variance.

Keywords

Ethnic Identity; Well-Being; Self-Esteem; Self-Informant Agreement; Convergent Validity

Evidence of Self-Informant Agreement in Ethnic Identity

Major theoretical approaches to identity (e.g., Erikson, 1968; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) suggest that the construct of *ethnic identity* – defined as thoughts and feelings about one's ethnic group membership and the importance of this group membership to the self – has implications for individuals' psychosocial development and psychological well-being (Rivas-Drake et al., 2014). For instance, several past studies have suggested that ethnic identity is positively correlated with variables such as self esteem, life satisfaction, and negatively associated with variables such as depression (e.g., Kiang, Yip, Gonzales-Backen, Witkow, & Fuligni, 2006; Roberts et al., 1999; Yap, Settles, & Pratt-Hyatt, 2010). One

concern, however, is that most studies have used single method designs thereby raising the concern that shared method variance has produced inflated correlations. In other words, these associations might be driven by a potential artifact stemming from a common method.

One solution to this concern about shared method variance is to use a different method to assess ethnic identity than self-reports. Although the concept of ethnic identity primarily focuses on the subjective sense of belonging to an ethnic group (Phinney, 1990), it is reasonable to believe that knowledgeable informants can provide valid information about a person's ethnic identity for a number of reasons. First, the development of a strong sense of ethnic identity requires exploration and learning about one's ethnic group (e.g., Cross, 1978; Phinney, 1989). This process of exploration would likely entail observable behaviors such as discussion of ethnicity with others, reading about one's culture, and attending cultural events. Second, people who feel strongly that they belong to a particular ethnic group may socialize with others who also identify with that group (e.g., Syed & Juan, 2012), and this would also be observable to others. Third, maintenance of ethnic identity generally would lead to observable behaviors that are consistent with the culture that one identifies with. For example, eating foods or participating in groups and activities that are related to one's cultural background are visible activities. In short, we suggest there are good reasons to suspect that a strong sense of ethnic identity would lead to various behavioral cues that could provide others with the information necessary to make reasonably accurate judgments about a target's ethnic identity. The general idea that internal psychological variables have external referents is perhaps one reason why there is self-other agreement for other kinds of intrapsychic constructs such as well-being and mood. However, no existing studies have evaluated whether ethnic identity is something that can be judged by others.

Knowledgeable informants and Construct Validity

Researchers have argued that informant reports can be advantageous for assessing individual characteristics because they can be cost effective, reasonably valid, and can be aggregated across multiple perspectives to generate a more reliable rating of the target individual (Vazire, 2006). Indeed, research has shown that informant reports can provide valuable information about both observable behaviors (e.g., talkativeness) and inner experiences (e.g., affect) (e.g., Connelly & Ones, 2010). In this study we assessed informant-ratings and self-ratings of ethnic identity and evaluate the extent of convergence between these two sources of information.

A growing literature has evaluated self-informant agreement of various traits and a number of insights have emerged (see e.g., Funder, 2012). One generalization is that agreement varies to some extent based on the characteristic that is being rated. Characteristics that have more visible referents tend to generate somewhat higher levels of agreement. For example, a meta analysis of self-informant agreement across Big Five personality traits yielded an average agreement of $r = .34, .41, .34, .29, .37$ for Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, respectively (Connelly & Ones, 2010). Extraversion had the highest level of agreement but there was nonetheless some agreement on more internal constructs like Neuroticism. Likewise, another recent meta-analysis evaluating agreement among self and informant ratings of various indicators of subjective

well-being indicated that the average self-informant correlation among life satisfaction, happiness, and affect was $r = .42$ (Schneider & Schimmack, 2009). These meta-analytic estimates can serve as benchmarks for evaluating self-informant agreement in measures of ethnic identity.

Convergence provides additional evidence for the construct validity of measures and evidence that informant-reports of ethnic identity predict relevant criterion variables also strengthens the case that these measures have validity.¹ Unfortunately, surprisingly little multi-method research has been devoted to assessing the criterion-related validity of even widely used measures of ethnic identity. The existing literature is based on self-report studies and thus it can be difficult to evaluate the strength of the evidence for associations between ethnic identity and other subjective constructs such as well-being. The central concern is that any observed associations might be inflated because of shared method variance above and beyond the substantive connections between two constructs. Purely objective measures of ethnic identity are not readily available, a reality that is true for many psychological constructs. Informant reports can offer an additional perspective and help researchers generate more insight into the validity of the construct of ethnic identity.

One widely accepted framework for accumulating evidence in support of the validity of a measure and construct was proposed by Campbell and Fiske (1959). This approach allows researchers to indirectly estimate the validity of a set of measures by examining the correlation between measures of a construct that were assessed using different methods. Known as the *multi-trait, multi-method* (MTMM) approach, this strategy allows researchers to estimate the convergent validity of a set of measures, the discriminant validity between two or more distinct traits, and to quantify the amount of variance that is accounted for by shared method effects. At a bare minimum, the MTMM approach requires that at least two conceptually distinct constructs be measured with two distinct methods.

Summary of Goals for the Present Study

The objectives of the present study are to evaluate self-informant agreement for ethnic identity and to test whether ethnic identity is related to well-being outcomes controlling for shared method variance using the logic of the MTMM. To accomplish this goal, we use one of the most widely used measures of ethnic identity in both adolescence and adulthood, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992). Despite this measure's wide popularity, no other research has evaluated agreement on self- and informant-ratings. In terms of the second goal, previous studies has shown that method effects can inflate correlations between variables measured using a single method (Anusic, Schimmack, Pinkus, & Lockwood, 2009; Schimmack, Schupp, & Wagner, 2008). Thus, we can assess the degree to which the typical correlation between ethnic identity and well-being found in past research (e.g., Roberts et al., 1999) reflects a "true" association between these underlying constructs over and above any association that arises due to shared assessment method.

¹However, we should note that the lack of convergence may not necessarily indicate that self-ratings of a measure are invalid. Rather, it may suggest that ethnic identity is a purely subjective experience that is not observable by others

This paper is theoretically and empirically important because it is the first to evaluate whether informants can observe and judge the construct of ethnic identity. In addition, this study is also the first to use informant ratings of ethnic identity to evaluate evidence of criterion-related validity of the most commonly used measure of this construct – the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. Thus, this paper also is the first to evaluate the degree to which the observed association between ethnic identity and well-being reflects a true relationship between the underlying constructs (relative to the shared method variance between the measures of identity and well-being).

Method

Participants and Procedure

A total of 633 initial target individuals participated in the current study. These participants were recruited from an undergraduate psychology student subject pool and participated in return for partial course credit. Targets completed study measures in the laboratory via a computer based questionnaire. As part of the questionnaire, targets were asked to provide names and email addresses of four or more informants. On average of those who provided information for at least one informant, targets provided emails for 3.89 informants each. Potential informants were sent an email inviting them to participate in an online questionnaire in which they would rate the target participant on a number of psychological attributes. Ultimately, we received at least one informant rating for 318 target individuals (73% of those who provided contact information for at least one informant; 243 female; 74 male; 1 other gender). Ages of targets ranged from 18 to 47 years ($M = 19.95$; $SD = 2.54$). Targets self-identified as belonging to one of the following ethnic groups: American Indian/Alaska Native ($n = 4$); Asian ($n = 53$); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ($n = 3$); Black or African American ($n = 45$); White ($n = 185$); Other ($n = 28$). Of these targets, 27 also indicated they were Hispanic or Latino/a. Each target was rated by 1–5 informants, with an average of 2.17 informants per target ($SD = 1.08$).² Informants were compensated with an entry into a draw for one of two \$50 gift cards.

Measures

Both target participants and their informants provided information about the targets' ethnic identity and well-being. Targets responded to the typical items for each measure and rated their own thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (described below). For informants, items in each measure were reworded to elicit ratings of the target individual rather than the self (e.g., "She/he is happy that she/he is a member of the group she/he belongs to."). Survey instructions to informants were personalized and referred to the target person specifically by name. Individual item wording and pronouns used in all study measures were customized based on the reported gender of the target. Thus, items read "she" if the target indicated she

²This average only includes targets that had at least one informant respond. We also acknowledge that the informant response rate was slightly lower than might have been expected based on past research using similar methods to recruit informants (e.g., Vazire, 2006). It is unclear why this may be, but it is possible that the emails we sent to potential informants inviting them to the study were seen as junk mail or automatically treated as junk mail by users' email accounts. Additional analyses comparing targets with informant data to those without suggest that there were no significant differences in MEIM scores or SISE for these two groups. There were, however, significant differences in SWLS scores among groups (with informant data, $M = 5.07$, $SD = 1.16$; without informant data, $M = 4.76$, $SD = 1.17$).

was female, “he” if target indicated he was male, and “she/he” if target gender was not reported or reported as “Other”. Where appropriate, items were reverse-scored such that higher scores indicated higher levels of the construct. Composite scores for each measure from each data source (self versus other) were computed by taking the mean across items. Total informant scores for each target individual were created by averaging across informants for each person to create a single aggregate informant score for each target on each measure. These aggregated informant scores were used in all subsequent analyses involving informants. Reliability estimates and correlations among all study variables between self and informants are reported in Table 1.

Ethnic Identity—Ethnic identity was measured using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. This study included the original 14-item version of the MEIM (Phinney, 1992).³ Example item: “I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group” (self ratings); “She has a strong sense of belonging to her own ethnic group” (informant ratings). Items were answered using a four-point Likert-type scale ranging 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*).

Self-Esteem—Global self esteem was measured using the Single-Item Self-esteem Scale (SISE; Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001), which comprised a single item asking respondents to describe how accurately the statement “I have high self esteem” described themselves. The item was answered using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 5 (*very accurate*). Past research suggests that the SISE is strongly correlated with various multi-item global self-esteem scales, including the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale ($r = .74-.80$; Robins et al., 2001).

Subjective Well-Being—Subjective well-being was measured using the five-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985). For this scale, informants were given same wording as the target, but were asked to indicate the extent to which they thought the target would agree with each scale item. Example item: “I am satisfied with my life.” Items were answered using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Analytic Approach

We used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in MPlus 5.0 to model our MTMM data. Following the recommendations of Kenny and Kashy (1992), we used the correlated uniqueness approach to specify our MTMM. This model (shown in Figure 1), specifies that each indicator (either the self-report or informant report composite variable) loads on a single trait factor and trait factors are free to intercorrelate with one another. Method effects are captured in this model by the covariances among the uniquenesses of each indicator that uses the same method. We constrained the loadings for the indicators loading on to the same trait factor to be equal in order for our model to be identified (see Kenny & Kashy, 1992). In

³Originally, the MEIM included 20 items that assessed two distinct constructs, ethnic identity (14 items) and other group orientation (6 items). In this paper, we limit our focus to the ethnic identity component of the measure.

other words, the latent trait variables reflected an equal weighting of self- and informant-reports.

Although the MEIM was originally conceptualized as a multi-dimensional measure comprising two highly-related dimensions, typically labeled exploration and commitment, there is substantial ambiguity regarding the factor structure of the MEIM (see Yap et al., in press for a review) and past research has shown evidence for one, two and three dimension structures emerging out of the MEIM. In addition, of the studies that show evidence for a multi-dimensional structure in the MEIM, these dimensions are often highly correlated ($r = .70-.75$; Roberts et al., 1999). In the current paper, the total score of the MEIM was evaluated for the sake of parsimony. The total MEIM score captures the general notion of ethnic identity and the operationalization of the MEIM as a total mean score of the instrument has been used in past research (e.g., Roberts et al., 1999).⁴

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations among self and informant reports of study variables are shown in Table 1. These findings provide first evidence of consensus in ethnic identity ratings among different raters. The intraclass correlation among informants' ratings of MEIM was .47, indicating that there is substantial agreement among different raters' perceptions of a person's sense of ethnic identity. Importantly, the self-informant MEIM correlation was .52, which shows the first evidence that people can, to an impressive extent, accurately perceive others' sense of ethnic identity. Together, these findings suggest that ethnic identity can be observed and judged by friends and family members. It is also notable that self-informant correlations (i.e., mono-trait, multi-method correlations) were similar in magnitude across the SWLS, SISE and MEIM, suggesting that the MEIM has similar levels of self-other agreement as the SWLS and SISE – which are both well-established psychological measures.

The correlation between self-ratings of MEIM and SWLS ($r = .15$), and MEIM and SISE ($r = .20$) were modest and similar to what has been observed between ethnic identity and well-being in past literature. For instance, Yap et al. (2011) reported correlations between various dimensions of ethnic identity (assessed with a different measure) and life satisfaction between .20 and .23 and Roberts et al. (1999) reported correlations between the MEIM and various well-being outcomes (e.g., self-esteem, optimism) to range from .19 to .23. The correlation between informant-ratings on the MEIM and SWLS ($r = .24$) and informant-ratings on the MEIM and SISE ratings ($r = .21$) were also modest, but slightly higher than self ratings – and may suggest that there is more overlap between observers' judgments of ethnic identity and life satisfaction than self ratings of the same constructs. This may be because informants are more accurate in perceiving the link between ethnic identity and well-being, or it may reflect stronger influence of method effects in informant ratings.

⁴As we noted, there is debate as to the best dimensional structure of the MEIM. The MEIM is commonly operationalized as two dimensions labeled exploration and commitment. In our data, these subscales were highly correlated in both self and informant reports (self reports: $r = .60$; informant reports: $r = .74$). Moreover, the self-informant correlations for each subscale (commitment: $r = .42$; exploration: $r = .52$) were not significantly different.

However, it is important to note that this difference is relatively small and may be unreliable.

The correlated uniqueness model used to evaluate convergence between self and informant ratings of the ethnic identity, life satisfaction, and self-esteem is shown in Figure 1. To evaluate whether there were significant differences between White and ethnic minority participants (defined here as individuals who reported belonging to a non-White ethnic group or reported that they were Hispanic or Latino/a), we modeled White ($N = 172$) and ethnic minority ($N = 146$) participants in a multigroup CFA and compared the fit of this model to a nested model where equality constraints were placed on all corresponding parameters across White and minority groups (i.e., corresponding factor loadings, covariances, and correlations across groups were all constrained to equality across groups). This comparison compares a model where White and ethnic minority participants are represented as distinct groups with varying parameter estimates to a model where these distinct groups are represented as having equal parameter estimates. Indeed, if the additional constraints of the latter model result in significant decrement in model fit (compared to the unconstrained model), it would suggest that there are significant differences in the model parameters among White and ethnic minority groups.

Chi-square difference tests revealed that there was a significant decrement in fit ($\chi^2_{\text{diff}} = 21.32$; $df_{\text{diff}} = 9$; $\chi^2_{\text{diff}} > 16.92$, $p < .05$) when these constraints are included, suggesting that there are significant differences in at least some of the model estimates across White and ethnic minority target participants. Further model comparisons revealed that there was no significant decrement in model fit when all corresponding factor loadings and covariances among latent traits were constrained to be equal across groups ($\chi^2_{\text{diff}} = 7.50$; $df_{\text{diff}} = 6$; $\chi^2_{\text{diff}} < 12.59$, ns), suggesting that there are no significant differences in corresponding factor loadings and associations among latent constructs among White and ethnic minority groups. However, equality constraints on the correlations among uniquenesses across groups produced substantial model misfit, suggesting that there were significant differences in these estimates across Whites and ethnic minorities.

Conceptually, these initial analyses suggest that there was no statistically meaningful evidence that the connections between self-reports and informant composites were moderated by majority versus minority group membership. In other words, the level of convergence among self and informant reports across measures of ethnic identity, life satisfaction and self-esteem did not differ among White and ethnic minority group members. Likewise, there was no evidence that the latent correlations between ethnic identity, life satisfaction and self-esteem were moderated by majority versus minority group membership – indicating that the “true” associations between ethnic identity, life satisfaction and self-esteem did not differ among Whites and ethnic minority group members. However, there were differences among majority and minority group members in the extent to which the item uniquenesses were correlated across measures – indicating that the shared method effects across self and informant rated ethnic identity, life satisfaction and self-esteem did in fact differ significantly among Whites and ethnic minority members.

Further analyses revealed that the largest differences in method effects across White and ethnic minority participants were for self rated and informant rated SWLS and SISE. That is, equality constraints on the error covariances among self and informant rated SWLS and SISE across groups generated the largest decrement in overall model fit. Equality constraints on the error covariances among the ratings of other measures (i.e., MEIM with SWLS; MEIM with SISE) individually did not result in significant decrements in model fit. Based on these findings, we retained a multigroup model which modeled White and ethnic minority participants as distinct groups in all subsequent analyses. For the sake of parsimony, we placed equality constraints on corresponding factor loadings and latent covariances, but allowed error covariances to vary among groups.

Model parameter estimates for the overall sample are shown in Figure 1. Results shown in Figure 1 revealed substantial factor loadings for self and informant ratings of MEIM, SWLS, and SISE. This finding suggests that there is overlap in different ratings of these three constructs and provides evidence for convergence across self and informant ratings of ethnic identity, life satisfaction, and self-esteem. Figure 1 also shows that there are small but significant correlations between uniquenesses for both self rated and informant rated measures of ethnic identity and life satisfaction. This finding suggests that there are significant method effects across both self reports and informant reports of life satisfaction and ethnic identity.⁵ In contrast, Figure 1 also shows that correlations between uniquenesses for both self rated and informant rated measures of ethnic identity and self-esteem are nonsignificant, suggesting that method effects across self and informant reports of self-esteem and ethnic identity are negligible. The correlations between uniquenesses in self-ratings and informant ratings are consistent with the size of method effects for other constructs such as personality (Anusic et al., 2009). Importantly, this model suggests that the association between ethnic identity and life satisfaction scores ($r = .36$) and self-esteem scores ($r = .40$) persists even after accounting for inflation due to shared methods.⁶

Discussion

Overall, we found evidence of convergent validity across self and informant reports of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. Indeed, these results also suggest self and informant rated MEIM had similar standardized loadings on latent ethnic identity as self and informant rated SWLS and SISE had on latent life satisfaction and self-esteem, respectively (see Figure 1). These results indicate that the convergent validity of the MEIM is comparable to the convergent validity of the SWLS and SISE, two well validated measures of life satisfaction and self-esteem.

Importantly, our study provides the first evidence of self-other agreement for ethnic identity. Although ethnic identity primarily focuses on inner feelings of belonging to a group, our findings suggest that these feelings do, to some degree, manifest themselves in observable

⁵Method effects across self and informant ratings were constrained to equality for the sake of parsimony. Comparisons of this model to a model where methods effects were free to vary across self and informant methods showed negligible decrement in fit ($\chi^2_{\text{diff}} = 8.57$; $df_{\text{diff}} = 6$; $\chi^2_{\text{diff}} < 12.59$, *ns*).

⁶It is important to note that these correlations may appear higher than is typically reported in the literature because these latent correlations are disattenuated for measurement error.

behaviors that provide others with information about the person's identity. As ethnic identity by definition must be situated in the context of groups, these observable behaviors may also serve to provide cues others use to identify the person as an in- or out-group member. Further research should use these behavioral cues for continued validation of ethnic identity measures such as the MEIM. Ethnic identity is conceptualized as a psychologically important construct and thus the implications of evidence for self-informant agreement are important. Little work (if any) has evaluated the convergent validity of this measure using a multitrait, multimethod approach. It is clear that valid measurement of ethnic identity is essential for developing a better understanding this construct and evaluating its functions, processes and importance to other outcomes. Thus, this study offers an important addition to the ethnic identity literature – by showing strong validity evidence for its most popular measure.

Another aim of this study was to evaluate the extent to which the relations between MEIM scores and adjustment variables persist after accounting for any shared method variance. One of the most important questions for ethnic identity research is to evaluate the extent to which ethnic identity is related to important adjustment outcomes. The empirical associations between ethnic identity and adjustment have also been used to support arguments for the validity of the MEIM (e.g., Roberts et al., 1999). However, most of this literature has relied on self-report measures of ethnic identity and adjustment and thus relatively little is known about the extent to which empirical links between ethnic identity and adjustment reflect shared method biases. The results of this study suggest that there is evidence for a “true” relationship between ethnic identity, life satisfaction and self-esteem over and above method effects. That is, we found that moderate associations between latent ethnic identity, life satisfaction and self-esteem persist even after accounting for the effects of shared assessment methods in our model. The shared method effects we observed were relatively modest and this suggests that method effects account for only a small part of the association between ethnic identity and adjustment. However, this finding should be replicated before strong conclusions regarding the role of shared method effects in links between these constructs should be made.

Limitations and Future Directions

The main limitation of this study has to do with the characteristics of the sample. The target individuals in this study were undergraduate students, and it is possible that the findings garnered in this study are not generalizable to other demographic groups. For instance, past identity and ethnic identity theories predict that adolescence and young adulthood is a critical time for identity development (e.g. Erikson, 1968; Phinney, 1989). Accordingly, it is possible that many individuals in our sample are going through transitions in their ethnic identity. It may be the case that our findings are only characteristic of individuals going through this unique transition period. Undergraduate students are also not representative of the population in terms of their socioeconomic status and education level, particularly in comparison to many members of ethnic minority groups in the United States. Thus, it is possible that the identity processes evaluated here would differ among samples with more representative demographic characteristics. However, it is worth noting again that we did not find significant group differences in estimates among White and Non-White participants,

suggesting that the psychological processes evaluated here are fairly similar for these groups, at least in an undergraduate population.

Valid measurement of theoretically important constructs like ethnic identity is vital to any research evaluating the origins and consequences of ethnic identity. Indeed, more work evaluating the construct validity of popular measures of ethnic identity, such as the MEIM, would be an important and fruitful avenue for future work. For instance, future research could attempt to identify objective, behavioral indicators of ethnic identity, and examine the association between these objective indicators and the extant subjective measures of ethnic identity. There is also little knowledge about the longitudinal stability of ethnic identity, and future work would benefit from evaluating the extent to which ethnic identity remains stable through adulthood.

More research evaluating the feasibility of informant reports of ethnic identity would be a useful addition to the literature as informant reports of ethnic identity may offer researchers a functional alternative to traditional self-report measures. This may be particularly useful when examining younger populations (such as children or adolescents), where informant reports from parents, teachers or other adult caregivers may offer an invaluable assessment tool. Further research should also try to identify the individual characteristics and behavioral cues that observers use to make judgments. There appears to be agreement among informants and between informant and self ratings of ethnic identity, and better knowledge of the behavioral cues associated with ethnic identity would enhance the evidence for importance of this psychological variable.

Overall, this study provides additional evidence in support of the validity of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure and suggests that this instrument captures variance in individuals' ethnic identity that is consistent with observer reports. This suggests there are good reasons to incorporate informant assessments of ethnic identity into future studies on this topic. We hope that these findings will not only encourage confidence in the use of this measure to study the construct of ethnic identity, but will also encourage work aimed at further refining the MEIM and increase our understanding of the MEIM's psychometric properties.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada doctoral fellowship awarded to Stevie Yap and NIA grant AG040715 awarded to Richard Lucas and M. Brent Donnellan. We thank Debby Kashy for her helpful comments on a previous draft.

References

- Anusic I, Schimmack S, Pinkus R, Lockwood P. The nature and structure of correlations among the Big Five ratings: The halo-alpha-beta model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2009; 97:1142–1156. [PubMed: 19968424]
- Campbell DT, Fiske DW. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1959; 56:81–105. [PubMed: 13634291]
- Connelly BS, Ones DS. An other perspective on personality: Meta-analytic integration of observers' accuracy and predictive validity. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2010; 136(6):1092–1122. [PubMed: 21038940]

- Cote JA, Buckley MR. Estimating trait, method, and error variance: Generalizing across 70 construct validation studies. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 1987; 24(3):315–318.
- Cross WE. The Thomas and Cross Models of Psychological Nigrescence: A Review. *Journal of Black Psychology*. 1978; 5(1):13–31.
- Diener ED, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1985; 49(1):71–75. [PubMed: 16367493]
- Erikson, EH. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton; 1968.
- Kenny DA, Kashy DA. Analysis of the multitrait-multimethod matrix by confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1992; 112(1):165–172.
- Kiang L, Yip T, Gonzales-Backen M, Witkow M, Fuligni AJ. Ethnic Identity and the Daily Psychological Well-Being of Adolescents From Mexican and Chinese Backgrounds. *Child Development*. 2006; 77(5):1338–1350. [PubMed: 16999802]
- Phinney JS. Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 1989; 9:34–49.
- Phinney JS. Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1990; 108(3):499–514. [PubMed: 2270238]
- Phinney JS. The multigroup ethnic identity measure a new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 1992; 7(2):156–176.
- Rivas-Drake D, Seaton EK, Markstrom CA, Quintana SM, Syed M, Lee RM, Schwartz SJ, Umaña-Taylor AJ, French SE, Yip T. Ethnic and Racial Identity in the 21st Century Study Group. Ethnic and racial identity in childhood and adolescence: Implications for psychosocial, academic, and health outcomes. *Child Development*. 2014; 85:40–57. [PubMed: 24490891]
- Roberts RE, Phinney JS, Masse LC, Chen YR, Roberts CR, Romero A. The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*. 1999; 19(3):301–322.
- Rowley SJ, Sellers RM, Chavous TM, Smith MA. The relationship between racial identity and self-esteem in African American college and high school students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 74(3):715–724. [PubMed: 9523414]
- Schneider L, Schimmack U. Self-informant agreement in well-being ratings: A meta-analysis. *Social Indicators Research*. 2009; 94(3):363–376.
- Schimmack U, Schupp J, Wagner GG. The influence of environment and personality on the affective and cognitive component of subjective well-being. *Social Indicators Research*. 2008; 89:41–60.
- Sellers RM, Copeland-Linder N, Martin PP, Lewis RH. Racial identity matters: The relationship between racial discrimination and psychological functioning in African American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 2006; 1(2):187–216.
- Syed M, Juan MJD. Birds of an ethnic feather? Ethnic identity homophily among college-age friends. *Journal of Adolescence*. 2012; 35:1505–1514. [PubMed: 22100784]
- Vazire S. Informant reports: A cheap, fast, and easy method for personality assessment. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2006; 40(5):472–481.
- Yap SCY, Donnellan MB, Schwartz SJ, Kim SY, Castillo LG, Zamboanga BL, Weisskirch RS, Lee RM, Park IJK, Whitbourne SK, Vazsonyi AT. Investigating Measurement Invariance of the Multi-Group Ethnic Identity Measure in a Multiethnic Sample of College Students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. (in press).
- Yap SC, Settles IH, Pratt-Hyatt JS. Mediators of the relationship between racial identity and life satisfaction in a community sample of African American women and men. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2011; 17(1):89–97. [PubMed: 21341901]

Figure 1.

Multigroup CFA Model. Estimates for White participants before slashes, estimates for ethnic minority participants follow slashes. Standardized estimates for both White and ethnic minority participants are shown in parentheses. Boldface indicates $p < .05$. SWLS = Satisfaction with Life Scale; MEIM = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure; SISE = Single-Item Self-esteem Scale

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations Among Self and Informants

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	SD
1. Self SWLS							5.06	1.16
	(.85 ^α)							
2. Informant SWLS	.46						5.05	1.05
	(.80 [†])							
3. Self MEIM	.15	.10					2.86	0.56
		(.89 ^α)						
4. Informant MEIM	.11	.24	.52				2.86	0.55
			(.47 [†])					
5. Self SISE	.51	.36	.20	.16	-		3.49	1.10
6. Informant SISE	.28	.53	.18	.21	.39	(.84 [†])	3.91	0.84

Note. All correlations significant, $p < .05$.
SWLS = Satisfaction with Life Scale; MEIM = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure; SISE = Single-Item Self-esteem Scale. Reliability estimates for each measure shown in parentheses.
Cronbach's alpha values signified α .
ICC values signified by $\dagger$.