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1 INTRODUCTION

Developing a coherent sense of self has long been considered the primary task of adolescence (Erikson, 1968). More recently, studies have demonstrated that questions and conflicts of identity go well beyond adolescence and into emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2015; Whitbourne, Sneed, & Sayer, 2009), and that resolving these conflicts is essential for positive psychosocial functioning both within and across developmental stages (Arnett, 2015; Fadjukoff & Kroger, 2016; Waterman, 2007). Indeed, a number of cross-sectional and longitudinal studies have found a positive relationship between identity coherence and various positive psychosocial outcomes, including self-esteem and prosocial behaviors, in both adolescents and emerging adults (Arnett, 2015; Fadjukoff & Kroger, 2016). These findings highlight the value of examining identity processes for understanding and ultimately promoting positive youth development.

A large body of work exists investigating identity development in adolescence and emerging adulthood (e.g., Crocetti, Rubini, & Meeus, 2008; Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky, Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Smits, & Goossens, 2008; Marcia, 1966). Although conceptualizations of the process vary greatly across studies and theories, most recognize that individuals have multiple identities that define who they are (Schwartz, Donnellan, Ravert, Luyckx, & Zamboaga, 2013), and that navigating multiple identities can be especially difficult when these identities are perceived as conflicting with each other (Josselson & Harway, 2012). This is often the case for immigrant-origin youth (Chan, 2009; Huynh, Nguyen, & Benet-Martinez, 2011).

The term immigrant-origin youth refers to adolescents and emerging adults who are either first (i.e., foreign-born), second (i.e., native born to immigrant parents), or third (i.e., grandparents were immigrants) generation immigrants. Central to the development of these
youth is their ability to navigate their memberships to two cultural groups: the native or heritage culture and the national or host culture (i.e., American culture for immigrant-origin youth living in the U.S.). Recent research suggests immigrant-origin youth experience favorable psychosocial outcomes when they are able to identify with both the native and the national group rather than feel distant or disconnected from either or both groups (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Mok, Morris, Benet-Martinez, & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2007; Sam & Berry, 2010; Schwartz et al., 2015). It should be noted that most of the research highlighting the psychosocial benefits of identifying with both the native and national culture comes from the acculturation literature, which examines changes that occur when individuals and groups of different cultures come into contact (Berry, 1980). However, even within this literature, there is great variation in how these identities (i.e., native and national) are defined and measured. For the present study, native and national identity are each conceptualized as a sense of belonging and positive feelings towards the respective cultural group (i.e., native and American) (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Phinney, Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997; Schwartz et al., 2012).

Although considerable research supports the benefits of identifying with both the native and the national group for the well-being of immigrant-origin youth, studies have also found that, under certain circumstances, identifying with both groups might not be an appropriate or adaptive option. Specifically, research suggests that, in the face of racially-based harassment, conceptualized as a psychosocial/interpersonal stressor or threat that may take different forms (e.g., blatant discrimination, subtle mistreatment), a more adaptive option for immigrant-origin youth might be to detach and distance themselves from the national group, and identify more with the native group (e.g., Tabbah, Chung, & Miranda, 2016; Wiley, 2013). This research has been primarily guided by (a) Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), which argues that
when group identities are threatened, individuals will make great efforts to maintain a positive self-concept either by attaching more to the threatened identity (e.g., native), or by detaching from it, and (b) the Rejection-Identification Model (RIM; Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999), which expands the former in the context of perceived discrimination as a form of racially-based harassment and multiple group identities. Specifically, the RIM posits that when individuals experience discrimination from a given group (e.g., Americans), detaching from that group and identifying more with the group being discriminated against (e.g., native) may be the best strategy for maintaining a positive self-concept and enhancing psychological well-being. Thus, when applied to immigrant-origin youth living in the U.S., decreases in American identity and increases in native identity as a function of racially-based harassment are considered adaptive strategies that these youth engage in to protect their psychological well-being. However, not all immigrant-origin youth who experience racially-based harassment will cope and respond to such stressors in the same manner.

A large body of work has linked dispositional traits to the different ways an individual might navigate psychosocial/interpersonal stressors (e.g., Lee-Bagley, Preece, & DeLongis, 2005; Penley & Tomaka, 2002; Vollrath, 2001). More specifically, research has found Big Five personality traits to account for variation in the ways individuals cope with and respond to stressful interpersonal events (e.g., Connor-Smith & Flachsbart, 2007). The underlying idea is that being high/low on some of these personality traits can make an individual more/less likely to respond to a stressful situation in an adaptive rather than maladaptive manner. Given that, under the RIM, increases in native identity and decreases in American identity are considered adaptive responses to experiences of racially-based harassment, it is reasonable to hypothesize that Big Five personality traits might provide both a unique and interactive contribution to our
understanding of multiple group identity development both in general and in the face of racially-based harassment. In particular, theoretical and empirical evidence suggests that the traits of neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness might shape responses to stressful interpersonal events – including experiences of racially-based harassment – among immigrant-origin youth (e.g., Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001; Lee-Baggley, Preece, & Delongis, 2005). To date, however, this has not been directly examined. The present study will expand the literature by examining relationships among experiences of racially-based harassment in the form of racial microaggressions – defined as subtle, but pervasive verbal and behavioral racial insults that individuals experience in their everyday lives (e.g., Nadal, 2011; Sue, Becerri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007) – the traits of neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness, and American and native identity in a sample of immigrant-origin adolescents and emerging adults living in the U.S. The purpose of this study is to examine how different personality traits moderate the relationship between experiences of a subtle, but pervasive form of racially-based harassment (i.e., racial microaggressions) and group identities (i.e., native and American) in this population.

1.1 Identity Development

In his influential model of psychosocial development, Erikson (1968) argued that the primary task of adolescence was to navigate and resolve conflicts of identity. Although his focus was on identity development in adolescence, Erikson (1968) also acknowledged that this was likely not a static process. Indeed, more recent research supports the dynamic nature of the identity development process, demonstrating that conflicts of identity can arise at different stages of development, but are most predominant during adolescence and emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000; Whitbourne, Sneed, & Sayer, 2009), and that resolving these conflicts is critical for positive psychosocial functioning (Arnett, 2015; Fadjukoff & Kroger, 2016). For example, in a
five-wave study of identity development in Hispanic adolescents (ages 12 to 16 at baseline, and 15 to 18 at the final time point), Schwartz, Mason, Pantin, and Szapocznik (2008) found that those who consistently experienced increases in identity confusion across time were also more likely to engage in cigarette and alcohol use, and to initiate sexual behavior earlier than those with stable or decreasing levels of identity confusion. In a more recent longitudinal study of Hispanic adolescents (ages 14 to 17 at baseline, and 17 to 20 at the final time point), Schwartz et al. (2017) found increases in identity coherence over time are associated with higher levels of self-esteem, optimism, and prosocial behavior at the final time point. Similarly, Azmitia, Syed, and Radmacher (2013) found that increases in identity synthesis (i.e., sense of clarity, authenticity, and satisfaction with the self) are associated with increases in self-esteem and decreases in depressive symptoms in first-year college students. These findings hint at the influence and implications of resolving conflicts of identity and developing a coherent identity for positive psychosocial functioning during both adolescence and emerging adulthood. Thus, it is important to identify factors that promote strong identity attachment.

Several theories have already attempted to explain how individuals come to navigate conflicts of identity (e.g., Crocetti, Rubini, & Meeus, 2008; Luyckx et al., 2008; Marcia, 1966). Although there is great variation in the ways these theories define and measure identity processes, most agree that identity development is shaped by both individual and contextual level factors (e.g., Motti-Stefanidi, 2015). In fact, the process has been described as integrative in nature (Kaplan & Garner, 2017). In addition, most current theories recognize that individuals have multiple identities that “come together to define who one is” (Schwartz, Donnellan, Ravert, Luyckx, & Zamboaga, 2013, p. 341), and highlight the complexities of navigating them successfully, especially when they are perceived as incompatible or conflicting with each other
(Josselson & Harway, 2012), as is often the case for immigrant and other racial and ethnic minority youth (Chan, 2009; Repke & Benet-Martinez, 2017).

Indeed, the literature on acculturation has long supported both the complex and multifaceted nature of multiple group identity development (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005; Fuligni & Tsai, 2015; Nesteruk, Helmstetter, Gramescu, Siyam, & Price, 2015), and the benefits of doing so effectively. Most prominently, studies have found that immigrant-origin youth who are able to develop both a strong native and a strong national identity experience the most favorable psychosocial outcomes, including higher self-esteem, greater life satisfaction, and larger social support networks (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Mok, Morris, Benet-Martinez, & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2007; Sam & Berry, 2010; Schwartz et al., 2015). For instance, in a large study of immigrant adolescents across four receiving countries, Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, and Vedder (2001) examined the relationship between multiple group identities (i.e., native and national) and various measures of psychological adjustment. Results revealed a positive relationship between having an integrated identity (i.e., having high levels of both identities) and psychological adjustment. Similarly, in a sample of Hispanic adolescents, Schwartz et al., (2015) found low levels of bicultural identity integration to be associated with lower self-esteem, optimism, and prosocial behaviors, and less positive family relationships. This research is consistent with a larger literature identifying group identities as a means through which individuals satisfy their fundamental need to belong (e.g., Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, 2013). Collectively, these findings allude to the importance of identifying correlates of both strong native and national identity attachment in immigrant-origin youth. The present study therefore examined correlates of both American and native identity among immigrant-origin youth living in the U.S.
1.2 Racially-based Harassment and Group Identities

Although the U.S. racial and ethnic minority population continues to grow and is expected to comprise over 50% of the total U.S. population by 2060 (Colby & Ortman, 2015), immigrant-origin populations continue to experience high rates of various forms of racially-based harassment, and these are particularly prevalent among youth (Pew Research Center, 2016; National Public Radio, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, & Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, 2017). For example, in a 2017 survey on personal experiences of racial discrimination, Latinx emerging adults (ages 18 to 29) were nearly three times more likely than their older adult counterparts (ages 65 and older) to report having experienced racial slurs (National Public Radio, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, & Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, 2017). Also, a report based on the same survey data revealed that 68% of Asian-origin emerging adults believe discrimination against Asians still exists in contemporary America, compared to only 40% of their older adult counterparts (National Public Radio, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, & Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, 2017). These findings hint at the various forms and prevalence of racially-based harassment against immigrant-origin youth in the U.S. In turn, experiences of racially-based harassment have been consistently found to impact psychosocial outcomes in this population, including the development of multiple group identities (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Solheim, 2009; Ramos, Cassidy, Reicher, & Haslam, 2012).

Most of the research examining the relationship between experiences of racially-based harassment and multiple group identities in immigrant-origin youth has followed the premises of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and the Rejection Identification Model (RIM; Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). The former highlights the value of one’s social
identities (i.e., one’s sense of self in relation to the social groups one is part of) for building a positive self-concept, and argues that, when these identities are threatened, individuals will “strive to achieve or maintain positive social identity” (Tajfel & Turner, 1986, p.181). This theory also introduced the concepts of *social mobility* (i.e., belief that one could move into another group that “suits them better,” p. 175), and *social change* (i.e., belief that it would be impossible or difficult to move into another group) as belief systems that influence one’s reactions to identity threats. Tajfel and Turner (1986) highlighted racial groups as an obvious example of the latter system. Thus, although some individuals might attempt to protect their self-concept by abandoning the group identity that is being threatened and moving into a different group, racial minorities might instead strive to protect their self-concept by making their racial minority group more “positively distinct” (p. 181) because moving into the majority group (i.e., White) is not an option. The RIM empirically examined the premises of this theory in the context of perceived racially-based harassment and multiple group identities. Specifically, the RIM argues that individuals have an inherent “desire to feel that they belong” (p. 137) and that they are accepted; thus, when individuals experience rejection via racially-based harassment, they will seek to meet their needs and protect their self-concept by detaching from the group that is perpetrating the harassment and identifying more with the group being targeted (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). In this sense, increases/decreases in multiple group identities are interpreted as adaptive strategies that individuals engage in to protect themselves against the potentially negative effects of experiences of racially-based harassment on their self-concept.

Originally developed as a framework to understand the effects of perceived racially-based harassment on the well-being of African Americans, the RIM has been tested and applied to different immigrant samples around the world, including first-generation Latinx immigrants in
the U.S. (Wiley, 2013), Arab-American adolescents (Tabbah, Chung, & Miranda, 2016), and international students in the U.K. and Australia (Ramos, Cassidy, Reicher, & Haslam, 2012; Schmitt, Spears, & Branscombe, 2003), among others. While most of this research has used cross-sectional data, there is also evidence for the causal effect of various forms of racially-based harassment on multiple group identities (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Solheim, 2009; Ramos, Cassidy, Reicher, & Haslam, 2012), although some discrepancies have emerged. For instance, in an eight year follow up study of first-generation immigrants living in Finland, Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, and Solheim (2009) found discrimination at time one to be negatively related to national identity at time two; however, discrimination was not significantly related to native identity. Also, in a two-wave study of international students in the U.K., Ramos, Cassidy, Reicher, and Haslam (2012) found support for the causal, positive effect of discrimination on native identity; however, national identity was not examined.

These and other discrepancies and limitations have also emerged in cross-sectional tests of the RIM. Most notably, limitations in the existing literature include (1) a lack of research examining the relation between experiences of racially-based harassment and multiple identities (native and national), (2) inconsistencies in the conceptualization and operationalization of these two identities when both have, in fact, been examined, and/or (3) a lack of research examining multiple group identities as an outcome. It is also important to note that existing examinations of the RIM have primarily focused on the effects of blatant forms of racially-based harassment, while neglecting the role of more subtle manifestations of this phenomenon, which have become increasingly more common over recent years (e.g., Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002; Sue, Becerri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007). Indeed, research has found that, in the past few decades, blatant forms of racially-based harassment have decreased significantly and have
“evolved” or “morphed” into more subtle but pervasive forms of harassment, such as racial microaggressions (Sue, Becerri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007, p. 72). Among immigrant-origin youth, this contemporary form of racially-based harassment has been associated with a number of negative psychosocial outcomes, including depression (e.g., Choi, Lewis, Harwood, Mendenhall, & Huntt, 2017) and low self-esteem (e.g., Nadal, Wong, Griffin, Davidoff, & Sriken, 2014; Thai, Lyons, Lee, & Iwasaki, 2017). These findings provide support for the harmful effects of subtle forms of racially-based harassment on the well-being of immigrant-origin youth, and their potential influence on the development of multiple group identities. To date, however, the relationship between racial microaggressions as a subtle form of racially-based harassment and American and native identity has not been explored.

These limitations have restricted our understanding of multiple group identity development in immigrant-origin youth. In particular, the lack of research on multiple group identities as an outcome has limited our ability to identify factors that might facilitate or hinder the identity development process, which has been found to be influential in the well-being and adaptation of immigrant-origin youth (e.g., Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Sam & Berry, 2010).

For example, in a sample of Latinx college students in the U.S., Cronin, Levin, Branscombe, van Laar, and Tropp (2012) found cross-sectional support for the positive relationship between experiences of racially-based harassment and native identity, which was, in turn, positively related to both well-being and activism. However, the role of American identity was neglected in this study, as were potential moderators or mediators of the relation between racially-based harassment and multiple group identities. Also, Molina, Phillips, and Sidanius (2015) found higher levels of racially-based harassment to be associated with increased native
identity and decreased national identity for both African American and Latinx college students, but not for students of Asian descent. Researchers argued that the pattern found for individuals of Asian descent could be explained by their “greater social status” in the U.S. compared to that of Latinx and African Americans. However, these discrepant findings may also be the result of differences in the conceptualization and operationalization of native versus American identity. Specifically, while researchers assessed native identity via a measure of salience of identity and feelings of closeness to the native group, American identity was conceptualized as “an individual’s love for her/his nation” (p. 228) and was assessed via a measure of patriotism that asked participants to rate their respect and love for the U.S. and its symbols (e.g., American flag). Although love for the U.S. may follow from feelings of attachment to the American culture, it is not necessarily reflective of participants’ identification with that culture. Thus, different findings might have emerged if American identity had been conceptualized and operationalized in the same manner as native identity. Lastly, like most other studies examining the relationship between experiences of racially-based harassment and multiple group identities, this study failed to investigate how this relationship might change depending on third variables, such as personality traits.

Only a few studies have examined potential moderators of the relation between experiences of racially-based harassment and native and national identity in immigrant-origin youth. Most of these studies have focused on external factors, such as cultural differences between the native and the national culture, and on the role of context of reception, more broadly, which refers to the different ways through which host societies can influence the acculturation process of immigrants (e.g., via immigration policies, receptivity towards immigrants) (e.g., Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010; Verkuyten & Martinovic,
This research has consistently yielded support for variation in the relation between experiences of racially-based harassment and group identities in immigrant-origin youth depending on cultural differences and the larger social context. However, developmental psychologists have long highlighted the importance of examining factors at multiple levels of the human ecology, including both contextual and more proximal individual-level factors, as these are likely to interact with each other to predict developmental outcomes (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Thus, it is argued that current research is informative, but limited in its contribution to our understanding of how multi-level factors may influence the development of multiple group identities (i.e., native and national) in immigrant-origin youth. Specifically, the extent to which more proximal individual-level factors, such as personality traits, may have an impact on group identity development in the face of racially-based harassment is unclear. This study will address gaps in the literature by examining main and moderating effects of personality traits on the relationship between racially-based harassment in the form of racial microaggressions and native and American identity among immigrant-origin youth living in the U.S.

1.3 Personality Traits and Group Identities

Considerable evidence supports the influence of personality traits on identity processes (e.g., Lounsbury, Levy, Leong, & Gibson, 2007; Luyckx, Teppers, Klimstra, & Rassart, 2014). Perhaps the most widely studied model of personality traits within this literature is the Big Five taxonomy (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). This may, in part, be a result of a large literature demonstrating that the structure of this model largely transcends cultural differences, and that the dimensions of personality that comprise this model are human universals (McCrae, 2002). These dimensions are (a) neuroticism, which includes traits such as anxiety, irritability, and vulnerability, (b) extraversion, which is correlated with being outgoing, assertive, sociable, and
enthusiastic, (c) openness, which is associated with being curious and excitable, (d)
agreeableness, which encompasses such traits as sympathy, trust, and compliance, and (e)
conscientiousness, which is associated with being cautious, dependable, organized, and planful
(John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & John, 1992; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001; Soto & John,
2012).

Despite the universality of the Big Five taxonomy, most of the research examining the
influence of Big Five personality traits on identity processes has focused on non-immigrant
White adolescent and emerging adult populations in the U.S. and other developed countries
(Lounsbury, Levy, Leong, & Gibson, 2007; Luyckx, Teppers, Klimstra, & Rassart, 2014). For
example, in a Dutch sample of high school students, Luyckx, Teppers, Klimstra, and Rassart
(2014) found strong positive associations between openness and identity exploration in depth and
in breadth, and to a lesser extent, emotional stability (low neuroticism), extraversion, and
conscientiousness also emerged as predictors of identity processes (i.e., higher levels of these
traits were associated with more exploration). On the other hand, direct relations between Big
Five personality and native and national identity in immigrant-origin populations have not been
examined carefully. Still, there is conceptual and some empirical support for this linkage,
although not without limitations. For example, among various ethnic groups in New Zealand,
Duckitt and Sibley (2016) found higher levels of agreeableness and lower levels of neuroticism
to be directly related to greater national identity. However, no significant relations emerged
between any of the Big Five personality traits and native identity (Duckitt & Sibley, 2016). In
contrast, in a sample of Vietnamese migrant students in Australia, Mak and Tran (2001) found a
significant negative correlation between openness and native identity. However, a notable
methodological limitation of this study involves the use of a single-item and unilinear measure of
cultural identity with higher scores being indicative of having a strong native (i.e., Vietnamese) identity, and lower scores being indicative of having a strong national (i.e., Australian) identity. Although the process of developing a national identity may be related to the development of a native identity in immigrant populations, these processes are considered distinct and independent of each other (Birman & Trickett, 2001), and should, therefore, be measured as such.

Notably, while a large body of work supports the value of examining personality traits as sources of individual variation in identity processes among non-immigrant adolescents and emerging adults, only a few studies have examined the role of personality traits on the development of multiple group identities (i.e., native and national) in immigrant-origin youth. Although informative, these studies have been characterized by a number of limitations that have contributed to inconsistent findings, including the different ways multiple group identities have been conceptualized and operationalized. The present study seeks to address some of these limitations by using a bilinear measure of identity that yields an independent score for an individual’s sense of belonging and positive feelings towards the national culture (i.e., American identity), and a sense of belonging and positive feelings towards the native culture (i.e., native identity).

1.4 Racially-based Harassment, Personality Traits, and Group Identities

Consistent with the premises of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and the Rejection-Identification Model (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999), experiences of racially-based harassment are psychosocial/interpersonal stressors or threats to an individual’s self-concept, which have implications for the development of multiple group identities. Specifically, among immigrant-origin youth, increases in native identity and decreases in national identity as a function of racially-based harassment are considered adaptive strategies that protect one’s self-
concept and overall psychological well-being. However, there is likely individual variation in the ways immigrant-origin youth respond to and cope with experiences of racially-based harassment (e.g., Latzman, Chan, & Shishido, 2013; Pearson, Derlega, Henson, Holmes, Ferrer, & Harrison, 2014).

Personality traits have been found to exert great influence on every aspect of the stress-coping process, including one’s reactions and efforts to navigate stressors (e.g., Latzman, Chan, & Shishido, 2013; Lee-Baggley, Preece, & Delongis, 2005). Particularly, a large literature has examined and found support for the negative impact of neuroticism on responses to a variety of stressful events, including those involving interpersonal conflicts. For example, in relation to interpersonal conflicts within the family unit, Lee-Baggley, Preece, and Delongis (2005) found neuroticism to be associated with withdrawal, avoidance, and self-blame. In addition, in the only identified study of the influence of personality traits on reactions to experiences of racial discrimination, Pearson et al. (2014) found neuroticism to be positively related to self-blame and disengagement. The same pattern of findings has been reported in a plethora of studies on the stress-coping process (see Connor-Smith & Flachsbart, 2007, for a review). It is possible that these findings reflect the anxious-avoidant nature of individuals high on neuroticism, and their overall propensity to experience negative emotions, including anxiety (Beer, Watson, & McDade-Montez, 2013; Watson & Clark, 1992). In fact, a larger literature identifying neuroticism as a correlate of negative affect is often referenced in studies examining the role of this personality trait on the stress-coping process (Watson & Clark, 1992). These findings also have implications for multiple group identity development in the face of interpersonal stressors, including experiences of racially-based harassment. Specifically, given that multiple group identities are conceptualized as a sense of belonging and positive feelings towards the respective
group (i.e., native and American), we hypothesized that high levels of neuroticism would be negatively associated with American and native identity, because the propensity of individuals high on neuroticism to experience negative emotions would likely make it more difficult for them to feel positively about these groups. In addition, given the anxious-avoidant nature of individuals high on neuroticism, we hypothesized that the expected positive relationship between racially-based harassment and native identity would not emerge for those high on neuroticism, whereas the hypothesized negative relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity would be stronger for those same individuals. Individuals high on neuroticism might not have the skills to adaptively navigate stressful situations and might, therefore, feel more easily overwhelmed by them, and be more likely to avoid and distance themselves from both groups altogether.

In contrast, individuals high on extraversion are prone to experiencing positive emotions (Watson & Clark, 1992, 1997), and have been frequently found to engage in adaptive/flexible rather than maladaptive/inflexible responses to stressful interpersonal situations (e.g., Lee-Baggley, Preece, & Delongis, 2005). For example, individuals high on extraversion have been found to be more likely to engage in compromise across situations of interpersonal conflict and have been described as “flexible copers,” who adapt responses to meet the needs of a situation (Lee-Baggley, Preece, & Delongis, 2005, p. 1169). Also, in a meta-analysis of associations between personality and coping, Connor-Smith and Flacsbart (2007) found extraversion to be positively associated with various engagement coping strategies, or “approach-oriented responses directed toward the stressor or one’s reactions to the stressor” (p. 1082), including instrumental and emotional social support strategies, such as seeking help and advice, as well as comfort and closeness with others. Relatedly, studies have also often found extraversion to be negatively associated with social avoidance motives (i.e., motives characterized by a disposition
to avoid negative social interactions), whereas extraversion is positively associated with social approach/affiliation motives (i.e., motives characterized by a disposition to engage in positive social interactions) (Nikitin & Freund, 2015). These findings are not surprising given the large personality literature identifying positive affect and sociability as prominent aspects of extraversion (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 2010; Soto & John, 2017). Both their propensity to experience positive emotions and their sociable nature may allow individuals high on extraversion to (a) feel positively about the groups they are part of (i.e., American and native for immigrant-origin youth in the U.S.), and (b) adaptively navigate interpersonal stressors or conflicts, including experiences of racially-based harassment. Specifically, we hypothesized that high levels of extraversion would be directly and positively associated with both American and native identity. Also, it was expected that extraversion would moderate the hypothesized negative relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity, such that this relationship would only emerge for those low on this trait, and the hypothesized positive relationship between racially-based harassment and native identity would be stronger for those high on extraversion.

Furthermore, research suggests that the trait of agreeableness may be particularly relevant to adaptive coping in the face of interpersonal stressors or conflicts. Described as empathic, trusting, and trusted (Freitag & Bauer, 2016; Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Hales, Kassner, Williams, & Graziano, 2016; Neto, 2007), individuals high on agreeableness have been found to be more likely to compromise and resolve interpersonal conflicts (Field, Tobin, & Reese-Webber, 2014; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001), and less likely to engage in self-blame in the face of marital conflict (Lee-Baggley, Preece, & Delongis, 2005). Similarly, in interpersonal contexts, agreeableness has been negatively linked to maladaptive conflict resolution strategies, such as confrontation, power assertion, and attacking, and positively linked to adaptive strategies, such
as support seeking and negotiation (e.g., Field, Tobin, & Reese-Webber, 2014; O’Brien & DeLongis, 1996). In addition, like extraversion, agreeableness has been positively associated with social approach motives, although it has also been positively linked to social avoidance motives (Nikitin & Freund, 2015). These findings may reflect the fundamental desire of highly agreeable individuals to develop and maintain positive relationships. In interpersonal contexts, the affiliation motives of those high on agreeableness seem to distinguish them from those high on extraversion. Although both are driven to engage with others, those high on extraversion may be more likely to do this for self—rather than other—oriented motives, including a need for social attention (Ashton, Lee, & Paunonen, 2002; Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, & Shao, 2000).

In contrast, when exposed to hostile contexts, individuals low on agreeableness have been found to be more likely to engage in aggressive behaviors than their more agreeable peers (Meier & Robinson, 2004). These findings are consistent with a larger literature highlighting the flexible, cooperative, and prosocial/interpersonally oriented nature of individuals high on agreeableness (e.g., Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Martin-Raugh, Kell, & Motowidlo, 2016). In fact, some studies have identified agreeableness as the most closely related personality trait to processes and outcomes of interpersonal conflict (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001; Jensen-Campbell, Gleason, Adams, & Malcolm, 2003). Thus, levels of agreeableness were likely to contribute to individual variation in responses to racially-based harassment. Specifically, we hypothesized that agreeableness would moderate the hypothesized positive relationship between racially-based harassment and native identity, such that this relationship would be stronger for those high on this trait. On the other hand, it was expected that the hypothesized negative relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity would only emerge for those low on agreeableness.
With regard to the role of conscientiousness, there is little evidence to suggest that this trait might influence how an individual responds to or copes with interpersonal stressors that might threaten their self-concept. Individuals high on conscientiousness are described as organized, planful, and self-disciplined (John & Srivastava, 1999; Soto & John, 2012). It has been argued that the planful and organized nature of conscientious individuals facilitates the use of active and problem-solving strategies (e.g., Penley & Tomaka, 2002; Watson & Hubbard, 1996). This has been examined largely in the context of stressors perceived as controllable or solvable (e.g., task/performance stressors), but not in the context of uncontrollable interpersonal stressors, such as experiences of racially-based harassment. Similarly, evidence for the role of openness to experience on adaptive responses to interpersonal stressors, such as racially-based harassment is limited. Individuals high on this trait are excitable, imaginative, and have wide interests (e.g., John & Srivastava, 1999; Soto & John, 2012). In terms of coping skills, some researchers have linked their receptivity to novelty and diversity to an increased likelihood to engage in problem-focused strategies (Bouchard, 2003). However, much like conscientiousness, studies examining the role of openness to experience on responses to stress have primarily focused on laboratory and task performance stressors, and even within this literature, the evidence is equivocal (Penley & Tomaka, 2002; Williams, Rau, Cribbet, & Gunn, 2009). Given the lack of relevant evidence regarding the influence of conscientiousness and openness on adaptive responses to stressful interpersonal conflicts, these traits were not examined in the current study.

1.5 Current Study

A large literature confirms the influence of experiences of racially-based harassment on multiple group identities in immigrant-origin youth (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Solheim,
However, there is also ample support for the potential role of personality traits in facilitating or hindering adaptive responses to interpersonal stressors, including experiences of racially-based harassment, although researchers have not yet directly examined such relations. The current study fills gaps in the literature by examining main and interactive effects of three of the Big Five personality traits on the relations between experiences of racially-based harassment and both American and native identity in immigrant-origin youth living in the U.S.

A number of hypotheses were proposed based on the relevant literature. First, in accordance with the RIM (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999), it was hypothesized that experiences of racially-based harassment would be positively associated with native identity and negatively related to American identity. Second, given the association between neuroticism and negative affect, and the overall anxious-avoidant nature of individuals high on neuroticism (Watson & Clark, 1992; Beer, Watson, & McDade-Montez, 2013), it was expected that higher levels of neuroticism would be directly associated with lower levels of native and American identity. On the other hand, based on the well-established relationship between extraversion and positive affect, and the more sociable nature of individuals high on extraversion (Watson & Clark, 1992, 1997), it was hypothesized that higher levels of this trait would be directly associated with higher levels of native and American identity. In addition, given the literature on the prosocial and interpersonally oriented nature of individuals high on agreeableness (Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Martin-Raugh, Kell, & Motowidlo, 2016), higher levels of this trait were expected to be associated with higher levels of native and American identity. Third, significant interactions were expected to emerge between these three personality traits and experiences of racially-based harassment to impact levels of native and American identity. Specifically, given the accumulating evidence on the increased stress susceptibility of those high on neuroticism and their likelihood to adopt disengagement strategies
(e.g., Connor-Smith & Flacsbart, 2007), it was expected that the hypothesized positive relationship between racially-based harassment and native identity would not emerge for those high on neuroticism, while the negative relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity was expected to be stronger for these same individuals. With regard to extraversion, based on the literature establishing positive affect and sociability as key components of this trait (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 2010; Soto & John, 2017), and the research linking extraversion to adaptive/flexible responses to stressful interpersonal situations (e.g., Connor-Smith & Flacsbart, 2007; Lee-Baggley, Preece, & Delongis, 2005), it was expected that the hypothesized positive relationship between racially-based harassment and native identity would be stronger for individuals high on this trait, while the hypothesized negative relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity was only expected to emerge for those low on extraversion. Finally, consistent with the literature on the ability of individuals high on agreeableness to successfully navigate interpersonal conflicts (Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001; Martin-Raugh, Kell, & Motowidlo, 2016), it was expected that the positive relationship between racially-based harassment and native identity would be stronger for those high on this trait. Conversely, the hypothesized negative relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity would only emerge for those low on agreeableness. These hypotheses were pre-registered using the Open Science Framework. Official project documents can be viewed at https://osf.io/3zu5n/?view_only=7cc8319163814c7db5f02f50ea00b46b

2 METHOD

2.1 Participants

The sample was comprised of 171 immigrant-origin adolescents and emerging adults. Participants in this sample (62% female) were between the ages of 12 and 21 with 35.5% identifying as a first-generation immigrant (i.e., foreign-born), 53.3% identifying as a second-
generation immigrant (i.e., U.S.-born to immigrant parents), and only 7.3% identifying as a third-generation immigrant (i.e., grandparents were immigrants). Participants were drawn from two previously collected data sets that were combined to increase sample size and power. The first original sample included 81 immigrant-origin high school students. Participants in this sample (54.3% female) were between the ages of 12 and 20 ($M_{age}= 15.7$). Most participants in this sample reported being first-generation immigrants (57%). Second-generation immigrants comprised approximately a third of the sample (30.4%), and there was only a small proportion of third generation immigrants (2.6%). The ethnic composition of this sample was diverse with Asian nationalities (e.g., Nepali, Vietnamese) being the most represented (71.4% of participants who agreed to report on this), followed by groups of African (14.2%), Hispanic (14.3%), or multiracial/other descent (<1%). Participants in the second sample were immigrant-origin college students, who were initially recruited for a two-year longitudinal study with four waves of data collection. However, measures of group identity were only administered during year two at times three and four. The sample size at time four was significantly smaller than at time three and was not adequate for the intended analyses; thus, only time three data are included in the combined and final sample. This second sample ($N=90$) was primarily comprised of second-generation immigrants (74%), followed by first (15%) and third (11%) generation immigrants. Participants in this sample (68.4% female) were between the ages of 18 and 21 ($M_{age}= 19.4$). In terms of ethnicity, the majority of participants identified as Asian American (38.9%), followed by African American/Black (31%), Latinx/Hispanic (10%), or multiracial/other (20%).
2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Racially-based Harassment

The Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS; Nadal, 2011) was used to assess racially-based harassment. The REMS is a 45-item scale that measures the extent to which racial and ethnic minorities experience subtle verbal or behavioral racial insults in their everyday lives. Participants indicate how often they have experienced an event in the past six months. Items are ranked on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from I did not experience this event to I experienced this event 10 or more times, and are categorized into six subscales: Assumptions of Inferiority (e.g., “Someone assumed that I would not be intelligent because of my race”), Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality (e.g., “Someone avoided sitting next to me in a public space because of my race”), Microinvalidations (e.g., “Someone told me that she or he was color-blind”), Exoticization and Assumptions of Similarity (e.g., “Someone told me that all people in my racial group are all the same”), Workplace and School Microaggressions (e.g., “My opinion was overlooked in a group discussion because of my race”), and Environmental Microaggressions (e.g., “I observed people of my race portrayed positively in movies,” reversed). Scores are summed and averaged to obtain a total score. All subscales have been found to have adequate psychometric properties (i.e., Cronbach’s alphas are greater than .70, and significant correlations were found with similar measures), except for the last one (i.e., Environmental Microaggressions) (Nadal, 2011). In the original measurement study, this subscale had only small correlations with the other subscales and was the only subscale that did not significantly correlate with the Racism and Life Experiences Scale-Brief (RaLES-B; Utsey, 1998) – a more traditional, validated measure of discrimination. The author notes that one possible reason for this finding is that “environmental microaggressions represent perceptions
that individuals have of the environment around them” (Nadal, 2011, p. 478), whereas the other subscales measure microaggressions that occur during interpersonal exchanges. Given the weak properties of the Environmental Microaggressions subscale and the interpersonal nature of group identity development, the total microaggression score was computed without these items.

2.2.2 Personality Traits

Personality traits were measured via the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999). The BFI is a 44-item inventory that measures an individual in relation to the five dimensions of personality (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). Independent scores are obtained for each trait. Participants indicate the extent to which a statement describes the way they see themselves on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from Disagree Strongly to Agree Strongly. Sample items include “Worries a lot” for neuroticism, “Is outgoing, sociable” for extraversion, and “Can be cold and aloof” (reversed) for agreeableness. The BFI-A (Adolescent version; John & Srivastava, 1999) was used for high school students. This version contains modified wording for certain items to make them more appropriate for adolescents (e.g., “Can be cold and distant with others” for agreeableness). For scoring both versions, some of the items are reversed, and all are summed to obtain subscale scores. Higher scores on each of the subscales indicate higher levels of each of the traits. The BFI and BFI-A are commonly used measures of personality traits that have demonstrated adequate psychometric properties in immigrant samples with Cronbach’s alphas on each subscale ranging from .71 to .80 (Eap, DeGarmo, Kawakami, Hara, Hall, & Teten, 2008; Fang, Friedlander, & Pieterse, 2016).
2.2.3 Native and American Identity

Native and American identity were measured using the Identity subscale of the Language, Behavior, and Identity (LIB) Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001). This subscale yields an independent index score for national identity (i.e., American Identity) and for native identity (i.e., native identity). The American Identity index is comprised of seven items, and it includes statements such as “I think of myself as being American.” The native identity index is parallel in structure to the American identity index. Items are ranked on a 4-point Likert type scale ranging from Not at All to Very Much. Scores are averaged with higher scores indicating higher levels of identity. The LIB has been found to have good psychometric properties in samples of refugee and immigrant-origin youth with reliabilities ranging from .76 to .96 for each subscale (Birman, Trickett, & Buchanan, 2005; Choi, Tan, Yasui, & Hahm, 2016).

2.3 Data Analytic Plan

Histograms, P-P plots, and skewness and kurtosis values were examined using the Explore command on IBM SPSS® Statistics 25 to determine whether the dataset was modeled for normal distribution. Absolute values of skew greater than 3 and absolute values of kurtosis greater than 10 indicated severely non-normal distributions (Kline, 2016). A robust correction to standard errors and test statistics was applied in later analyses to account for non-normality (e.g., Enders, 2013; Kline, 2016). Then, internal consistency estimates were computed using the Reliability Analysis procedure in IBM SPSS® Statistics 25. Cronbach’s alpha values greater than .70 indicated acceptable test reliability. Scales with reliabilities lower than .70 were examined

1This plan was pre-registered using the Open Science Framework. Official project documents can be viewed at [https://osf.io/3zu5n/?view_only=7cc8319163814c7db5f02f50ea00b46b](https://osf.io/3zu5n/?view_only=7cc8319163814c7db5f02f50ea00b46b). Some deviations were necessary to be consistent with previously published work. These are described in detail in the results section.
further. Specifically, inter-item correlations and Cronbach’s alpha if Item Deleted values were analyzed to identify items that did not perform well and were to be removed (Field, 2013). Inter-item correlations falling in the .15 to .50 range were considered adequate (Clark & Watson, 1995). Zero-order correlations among study variables were assessed next. Partial correlations were also conducted to determine whether relationships between any of our independent (i.e., racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness) and dependent variables (i.e., American and native identity) were confounded by age. Independent sample t-tests were also conducted to determine whether there were differences in the dependent and/or independent variables across the two samples (i.e., high school = -1, college = 1) that had to be controlled for in subsequent analyses. Next, the dataset was examined for missing data mechanisms (i.e., missing completely at random, at random, or not at random) using the Missing Values Analysis procedure in IBM SPSS® Statistics 25. Missing data were to be handled using Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) in Mplus 8 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017). FIML and Multiple Imputation (MI) are the two recommended methods for handling data missing completely at random (MCAR) or missing at random (MAR). Even when data are not missing at random (MNAR), these methods generally yield less biased estimates than those produced by classical methods for handling missing data, such as listwise deletion (e.g., Kline, 2016; Peters & Enders, 2002). FIML estimates model parameters utilizing all available data, while MI estimates values for the missing scores and replaces them prior to data analysis. The two methods have been described as equivalent (e.g., Enders, 2017; Graham, Olcohowski, & Gilreath, 2007); however, FIML has been described as a more practical and efficient method for handling missing data, especially when working only with continuous variables (Enders, 2017; Graham, Cumsille, & Shevock, 2013; Yuan, Yang-Wallentin, & Bentler, 2012).
To aid in the interpretation of regression coefficients, all predictor variables were mean-centered. This also helped reduce nonessential multicollinearity between the predictor variables (e.g., Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003; Preacher, Curran, & Bauer, 2006). Then, two separate path models were tested using Mplus 8 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017). Path analysis was selected because it offers a number of advantages over multiple regression models. First, path analysis allows us to include and examine multiple dependent variables at the same time. In the current study, this was an important advantage over multiple regression analysis, because the outcome variables (i.e., native and American identity) were likely to be correlated with each other. Thus, it was important that these variables be modeled simultaneously and not separately, so that we were better able to understand the relationships among variables. In addition, it is well known that testing multiple analyses increases the likelihood of a Type 1 error, or of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is actually true (Field, 2013). By using path analysis and reducing the number of tests to be conducted, we also lowered the likelihood of Type I error inflation.

The first path model tested for main effects of racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness on American and native identity. Interaction terms between racially-based harassment and each personality trait were created and added to the second model. In both models, immigrant generation (first = 1, second = 2, and third = 3) was included as a covariate as it has often been found to influence identity development in immigrant-origin youth (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2012). Significant interactions were probed using Preacher, Curran, and Bauer’s (2006) MLR two-way interaction tool. This method was chosen because it offers several advantages over the traditional simple slopes technique, which involves choosing values of the moderator at which to assess the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. When performing a traditional simple slopes analysis for continuous moderators, the conditional
values are typically set at +1 $SD$ above and -1 $SD$ below the mean of the moderator (Aiken and West, 1991). Although useful and still widely practiced, a major limitation of this approach is that the chosen values (i.e., +1 $SD$ above and -1 $SD$ below the mean) are not theoretically meaningful and this may, in turn, result in biased estimates (e.g., Liu, West, Levy, & Aiken, 2017). Preacher, Curran, and Bauer (2006) addressed this limitation via an online calculator that allows researchers to obtain meaningful conditional values that serve to define the regions of significance, or the ranges of the moderator(s) for which the simple slopes are statistically significant. In order to do this, we first obtained a covariance matrix of the regression coefficients, or ACOV matrix, using Mplus 8 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017). Next, regression coefficients were entered into the online calculator along with their corresponding variance and covariances. Degrees of freedom ($df = N - k - 1$) were also entered. Significance level was set at .05. Additionally, following Preacher, Curran, and Bauer’s (2006) recommendation of calculating regions of significance in place of or in addition to performing a traditional simple slopes analysis, we calculated simple intercepts and slopes for values of the moderator set at +1 $SD$ above and -1 $SD$ below the mean. The resulting output included syntax for graphing the shape of the interaction(s) with confidence intervals using R (R Core Team, 2013).

3 RESULTS

3.1 Preliminary Analyses

Missing data were handled differently for the two samples. For the high school sample, missing data were imputed at the item level using EM Estimation in SPSS® Statistics 25 to be consistent with previously published work (Chan & Latzman, 2015; Latzman, Malikina, Hecht, Lilienfeld, & Chan, 2016). In the college sample, eight participants were identified as missing all items from at least one of the measures of interest and were therefore removed from the analyses.
Three other cases were identified as missing one to two items from a scale of interest. Therefore, we computed average (instead of sum) scores for all scales in both samples. The final sample was comprised of 163 participants (High School $N = 81$ and College $N = 82$). A post-hoc power analysis was performed using GPower 3.1.9.2 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) with power set at .80 and including seven tested predictors. A Bonferroni correction was applied to account for multiple dependent variables (i.e., native and American identity) with significance level set at .025. The expected effect size was estimated from previous research examining relationships among experiences of racially-based harassment and multiple group identities, and/or among personality traits and multiple group identities. In the studies reviewed, effect sizes (converted to Cohen’s $f^2$) ranged from .02 to .09, which are considered small and small to medium, respectively (Cohen, 1988; small = .02, medium = .15, and large = .35). Results revealed that with our sample size of 163 and an estimated effect size of .09, our power to detect an effect is .70, and with an effect size of .15, our power increases to .93.

The assumption of normality was considered next. Skewness and kurtosis values of American identity were considerably less than $|3|$ and $|10|$, respectively, indicating that the residuals of this variable are normally distributed. On the other hand, the residuals of native identity were slightly negatively skewed (skewness value = -4.40), indicating that the residuals of this variable deviate from normal. Histograms were also examined to confirm these results. A robust maximum likelihood (MLR) estimator was thus specified in later models to adjust for non-normality.

Reliabilities were examined separately for the two samples. In the high school sample, Cronbach’s alphas for American identity, native identity, and racially-based harassment ranged from .87 to .97, indicating adequate psychometric properties. Consistent with previously
published work (Latzman, Malikina, Hecht, Lilienfeld, & Chan, 2016), Cronbach’s alphas for personality traits were .68, .64, and .48 for neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness, respectively. We proceeded to remove item two from the agreeableness scale (“Tends to find fault with others”) as it had been previously identified as having a problematic item-total correlation ($r = .06$; Latzman, Malikina, Hecht, Lilienfeld, & Chan, 2016). Removing this item resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of .50. In the college student sample, Cronbach’s alphas for American identity, native identity, and racially-based harassment ranged from .93 to .98, suggesting excellent reliability. For personality traits, Cronbach’s alphas were .71, .82, and .77 for neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness, respectively, indicating adequate reliability.

Bivariate correlations among all study variables (i.e., racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, native identity, and American identity) were conducted next and are presented in Table 1. Surprisingly, racially-based harassment did not significantly correlate with native ($r = .02, p = .82$) or American identity ($r = -.03, p = .68$). Similarly, neuroticism was not significantly associated with native ($r = -.05, p = .50$) or American identity ($r = .02, p = .81$). Extraversion ($r = .22, p = .005$) and agreeableness ($r = .40, p < .001$) were both significantly positively associated with native identity. On the other hand, extraversion ($r = -.04, p = .63$) and agreeableness ($r = -.08, p = .32$) did not significantly correlate with American identity. Regarding associations among predictor variables, racially-based harassment was uncorrelated with neuroticism ($r = .01, p = .90$) and extraversion ($r = .06, p = .47$), but was significantly negatively associated with agreeableness ($r = -.22, p = .004$). Also, extraversion was negatively associated with neuroticism ($r = -.28, p < .001$). Agreeableness was not significantly associated with extraversion ($r = .06, p = .47$) or neuroticism ($r = -.07, p = .38$). Finally, a positive association emerged between our two outcome variables (i.e., native and
American identity; $r = .25, p = .001$). Partial correlations were also conducted controlling for the effect of age (see Table 2). However, doing so did not change the results. Therefore, age was not included as a covariate in later analyses.

**Table 1. Correlations Among All Study Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Racially-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neuroticism</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extraversion</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Native Identity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. American Identity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 163. ***p < .001; **p < .01.*

**Table 2. Partial Correlations Among All Study Variables Controlling for Age.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Racially-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neuroticism</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extraversion</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Native Identity</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. American Identity</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 163. ***p < .001; **p < .01.*

Independent sample t-tests were conducted next to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the means of the high school and college student samples that should be controlled for in subsequent analyses (see Table 3). A Bonferroni correction was applied to account for multiple comparisons with significance level set at $\alpha/n = .008$, where $\alpha = .05$ and $n = 6$ comparisons (Field, 2013). Participants in the high school ($M =
and college sample ($M = 1.84, SD = .83$) did not differ in reported experiences of racially-based harassment ($t (161) = .01, p = .99$). Also, there were no significant differences in reported levels of neuroticism ($t (161) = .60, p = .55$), extraversion ($t (161) = 1.18, p = .24$), or agreeableness ($t (161) = .74, p = .46$) across the two samples. Further, participants in the high school ($M = 3.20, SD = .69$) and college sample ($M = 3.45, SD = .67$) differed in reported levels of native identity at the .05 but not the .01 significance level ($t (161) = -2.41, p = .02$). With regard to American identity, results revealed significant differences between high school ($M = 2.77, SD = .76$) and college students ($M = 3.21, SD = .77$), such that the latter reported higher levels of American identity than the former ($t (161) = -3.64, p < .001$). The effect size for this difference was moderate (Cohen’s $d = .57$). Sample (high school = -1, college = 1) was therefore included as a covariate in subsequent analyses.

### Table 3. Independent Sample T-Tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th></th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>99% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racially-based Harassment</td>
<td>1.84 .81</td>
<td>1.84 .83</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.94 .68</td>
<td>2.89 .57</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.20 .60</td>
<td>3.08 .70</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.70 .54</td>
<td>3.64 .58</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Identity</td>
<td>3.20 .69</td>
<td>3.45 .67</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Identity</td>
<td>2.77 .76</td>
<td>3.21 .77</td>
<td>-3.64</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* High School $N = 81$; College $N = 82$. 99% CIs that do not contain zero are considered statistically significant.

### 3.2 Path Analyses

#### 3.2.1 Model (1) Testing for Main Effects

The first model tested main effects of racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness on native and American identity, after controlling for immigrant generation and sample, and accounting for the shared variance between the two outcomes (see Table 4,
Table 4. Results of Path Analysis Testing for Main Effects of Racially-based Harassment and Personality Traits on Native and American Identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI for β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Identity</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration Generation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racially-based Harassment</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neoroticism</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Identity</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration Generation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racially-based Harassment</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neoroticism</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>Native Identity with American Identity</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercepts</td>
<td>Native Identity</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Identity</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variances</td>
<td>Native Identity</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Identity</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 163. All predictor variables were mean-centered prior to analyses. Sample was coded as high school = -1, college = 1. Immigration Generation was coded as first = 1, second = 2, third = 3. Native Identity $R^2 = .27$, $p < .001$. American Identity $R^2 = .11$, $p = .02$. 95% CIs that do not contain zero are considered statistically significant.
Figure 1. Path analysis assessing main effects of racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness on native and American identity controlling for immigrant generation and sample, and accounting for the shared variance between outcomes. Estimates are standardized and only shown for significant paths (in bold) for clarity. *** p < .001, ** p < .05.

In terms of path estimates, results revealed that, consistent with the previously reported correlations, and contrary to our hypotheses, racially-based harassment was not significantly associated with native (β = .10, p = .12) or American identity (β = -.05, p = .56). Regarding personality traits and their contribution to native identity, results revealed positive main effects of extraversion (β = .23, p < .001) and agreeableness (β = .43, p < .001) on native identity, as hypothesized. These effects were medium to large in magnitude. Contrary to expectations, neuroticism did not account for a significant amount of variance in native identity (β = .06, p = .41). Additionally, a significant positive association emerged between sample (high school = -1, college = 1) and native identity (β = .22, p = .002), and this effect was moderate. Regarding variation in American identity, results revealed only significant positive main effects of sample (β = .31, p < .001) and immigrant generation (β = .15, p = .035). These effects were
moderate. Personality traits did not emerge as significant predictors of American identity ($\beta = .02, p = .86$ for neuroticism, $\beta = -.01, p = .88$ for extraversion, and $\beta = -.07, p = .41$ for agreeableness). Also, a significant positive association emerged between native and American identity ($\beta = .30, p < .001$). The full model explained a significant 27% of the variance in native identity ($p < .001$), and a significant 11% of the variance in American identity ($p = .02$).

3.2.2 Model (2) Testing Main and Interactive Effects

The second model tested main and interactive effects of racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness on native and American identity (see Table 5, Figure 2). The contribution of racially-based harassment to variation in native ($B = .08, p = .15$) and American identity ($B = -.07, p = .39$) remained non-significant. Regarding native identity, the traits of extraversion ($B = .25, p < .001$) and agreeableness ($B = .52, p < .001$) continued to account for a significant amount of variance. Also, the association between sample and native identity remained significant ($B = .15, p = .002$). With regard to variation in American identity, results revealed a positive main effect of sample only ($B = .22, p < .001$). Additionally, a significant interaction emerged between racially-based harassment and agreeableness ($B = -.26, p = .046$) on American identity (described in detail below). Finally, the association between native and American identity remained significant ($B = .13, p < .001$). The final model explained a significant 28% of the variance in native identity ($p < .001$), and a significant 14% of the variance in American identity ($p = .009$).

3.3 Simple Slopes Analyses

The significant interaction between racially-based harassment and agreeableness was probed using Preacher, Curran, and Bauer’s (2006) MLR two-way interaction tool. First,
Table 5. Results of Path Analysis Testing for Main and Interactive Effects of Racially-based Harassment and Personality Traits on Native and American Identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Identity</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant Generation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racially-based Harassment</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBH*Neuroticism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBH*Extraversion</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBH*Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Identity</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant Generation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racially-based Harassment</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBH*Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBH*Extraversion</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBH*Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>Native Identity with</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercepts</td>
<td>Native Identity</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Identity  | 2.94 | .06 | 3.71 | <.001 | 2.82 | 3.06
VARIANCES          |  .34 | .05 |  .72 | <.001 |  .24 |  .44
American Identity  |  .54 | .05 |  .86 | <.001 |  .44 |  .65

Note. N = 163. All predictor variables were mean-centered prior to analyses. Sample was coded as high school = -1, college = 1. Immigrant Generation was coded as first = 1, second = 2, third = 3. RBH = Racially-based Harassment. Native Identity $R^2 = .28, p < .001$. American Identity $R^2 = .14, p = .009$. 95% CIs that do not contain zero are considered statistically significant.

Figure 2. Path analysis assessing main and interactive effects of racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness on native and American identity controlling for immigrant generation and sample, and accounting for the shared variance between outcomes. Estimates are unstandardized and only shown for significant paths (in bold) for clarity.*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .05$, * $p = .046$.

asymptotic variances or squared standard errors of $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$, $\hat{\varepsilon}_1$, $\hat{\varepsilon}_2$, and $\hat{\varepsilon}_3$ were calculated manually and entered into the coefficient variances section of the online calculator. Asymptotic covariances of $\hat{\varepsilon}_2$ with $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ and of $\hat{\varepsilon}_3$ with $\hat{\varepsilon}_1$ were obtained using the TECH3 command in Mplus 8 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017) and entered into the corresponding coefficient covariances section (see
Table 6 for complete covariance matrix). The effect of racially-based harassment on American identity was assessed at specific conditional values of agreeableness (i.e., 1 SD below the mean, at the mean, and 1 SD above the mean). Results evidenced non-significant simple slopes of .08 at 1 SD below the mean ($p = .44$) and -.07 at the mean ($p = .38$), while a marginally significant slope of -.22 emerged at 1 SD above the mean of agreeableness ($p = .07$) (see Figure 3).

Table 6. Asymptotic Covariance Matrix of the Regression Parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Racially-based Harassment</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>RBH*A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.0037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially-based Harassment</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td>.0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBH*A</td>
<td>.0022</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td>.0018</td>
<td>.0165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* RBH = Racially-based Harassment. A = Agreeableness.

![Figure 3](image)

Figure 3. Plot of the interaction between racially-based harassment and agreeableness on American identity. Low and high values correspond to 1 SD below and above the mean of agreeableness, respectively.
However, as previously noted, conditional values of 1 SD above/below the mean are not theoretically meaningful. Thus, we instead focused on examining the values of agreeableness for which the simple slope is statistically significant. Results revealed that the region of significance on agreeableness ranged from -14.02 to .87, indicating that only simple slopes that fall outside of this region are statistically significant. In the current sample, centered agreeableness ranged from -1.67 to 1.08. This suggests that the effect of racially-based harassment on American identity is significant only for high observed values of agreeableness. Confidence bands for the observed values of agreeableness were plotted next (see Figure 4). The values of the moderator were set at -2 and +2 to more accurately represent the range of observed data. Notably, the confidence bands did not include simple slopes of zero for values of agreeableness above .87. This serves as further evidence that the simple slope of American identity regressed on racially-based harassment is significantly different from zero for high values of agreeableness.

![Figure 4. Plot of confidence bands for simple slopes of American identity regressed on racially-based harassment at conditional values of agreeableness.](image)

4 DISCUSSION

The present study investigated main and interactive effects of racially-based harassment, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness on native and American identity among immigrant-origin adolescents and emerging adults. Following the premises of the RIM (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999), it was hypothesized that racially-based harassment would be positively associated with native identity and negatively related to American identity. Additionally, it was hypothesized that higher levels of neuroticism would be associated with lower levels of American and native identity, while extraversion and agreeableness were expected to be positively associated with these outcomes. Further, significant interactions were expected to emerge between racially-based harassment and each of these personality traits to influence levels of American and native identity. Findings of path analyses supported some but not all of our hypotheses. First, we found no significant main effect of experiences of racially-based harassment on native or American identity. Also, we found higher levels of agreeableness and extraversion to be significantly associated with higher levels of native but not American identity. Finally, we found that the relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity was only significant at high levels of agreeableness.

In contrast to previous tests of the RIM (e.g., Ramos, Cassidy, Reicher, & Haslam, 2012; Schmitt, Spears, & Branscombe, 2003), we did not find experiences of racially-based harassment to be significantly associated with native or American identity. One potential explanation for this finding is that certain types of racially-based harassment may be more relevant to group identities than others. In this study, racially-based harassment was assessed via a measure of microaggressions. Previous research has found types of microaggressions (e.g., microinvalidations) to be differentially related to psychosocial outcomes (e.g., Nadal et al.,
For example, Nadal et al. (2014) examined the relationship between different types of racial microaggressions and self-esteem on graduate college students from diverse racial groups. Results revealed that microaggressions experienced in the workplace and at school were particularly harmful to students’ self-esteem. Based on this research, we might hypothesize different findings would have emerged had we examined subtypes of microaggressions rather than focused on an overall score. Post-hoc analysis, however, revealed no significant correlations between any of the different subtypes of microaggressions measured and native or American identity.

Our unexpected findings may be linked to the uniqueness of microaggressions as a form of racially-based harassment and the developmental stages of participants in our sample. As mentioned previously, most of the research on the RIM has focused on blatant forms of racially-based harassment or discrimination. On the other hand, the impact of more subtle forms of racially-based harassment, such as microaggressions, has not been carefully examined. Researchers have previously noted that, relative to other forms of racially-based harassment, microaggressions are “harder to interpret” (Forrest-Bank & Cuellas, 2018, p. 46). Many have argued that the ambiguous nature of microaggressions makes them more harmful than overt forms of discrimination, because they leave individuals feeling confused about the intent of the perpetrator and how to respond (e.g., Forrest-Bank & Cuellas, 2018; Sue, Becerri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007); however, most of this research has been conducted on emerging adult and adult samples (e.g., Forrest-Bank & Cuellas, 2018; Nadal et al., 2014) and has not been considered within the RIM. In our study, a large proportion of participants were under 18 years old (ages ranging from 12 to 21). It will thus be important for future research to replicate these findings in other samples in order to better understand the extent to which the RIM generalizes to such
subtle forms of racially-based harassment as microaggressions within and across stages of development.

Regarding the influence of personality traits on group identities, results of the current study were partially consistent with our hypotheses and previous research. Specifically, contrary to expectations and previous research identifying neuroticism as a correlate of negative affect and anxious-avoidant behaviors (e.g., Beer, Watson, & McDade-Montez, 2013; Watson & Clark, 1992), we did not find a significant association between neuroticism and native or American identity. We conceptualized group identities as positive feelings and sense of belonging towards the respective group and, thus, hypothesized that neuroticism would be negatively associated with both native and American identity; however, our predictions were not supported.

Extraversion, on the other hand, emerged as a significant predictor of native identity, such that higher levels of this trait were associated with higher levels of native identity, as hypothesized. This is in line with previous research identifying extraversion as a correlate of positive affect and highlighting the sociable nature of individuals high on this trait (e.g., Lee, Dean, & Jung, 2008; Smillie, Wilt, Kabbani, Garratt, & Revelle, 2015). However, no significant association was found between extraversion and American identity.

It is unclear why neither extraversion nor neuroticism significantly influenced American identity. It may be that, for immigrant-origin youth attending school in the U.S., developing a native identity requires more intentional and purposeful exploration than developing an American identity and this process is, therefore, more greatly influenced by individual variation in personality traits (see Schwartz et al., 2013, for a review on the role of personality and context on agentic identity development). It is also possible that certain aspects (i.e., facets) of these personality domains are more important than others for developing a sense of belonging and
positive feelings towards a given group. Indeed, researchers have previously highlighted the “distinctive developmental trends” associated with facets of personality and their unique contributions to psychosocial outcomes (Soto & John, 2017; p.118). For example, in a longitudinal study, Klimstra, Luycks, Hale, and Goossens (2014) found no significant overall effect of extraversion or agreeableness on delinquency; however, the positive affect facet of extraversion and the non-antagonistic facet of agreeableness emerged as significant negative predictors of delinquency. Also, particularly relevant to the current study is Klimstra, Luyckx, Goossens, Teppers, & De Fruyt’s (2013) finding that personality facets are differentially related to dimensions of personal identity development (i.e., commitment making, identification with commitment, exploration in breath, exploration in depth, and ruminative exploration). Researchers found, for instance, that at the domain-level, extraversion was not significantly associated with commitment making. However, at the facet-level, warmth, assertiveness, and positive affect all significantly contributed to variation in this dimension. Although the influence of personality facets on native and American identity, specifically, has not yet been examined, the above-mentioned findings suggest that it will be important for future research to consider the additive value and specificity of personality facets when examining variation in native and American identity among immigrant-origin youth.

With regard to agreeableness, results revealed a significant positive main effect on native identity, which is consistent with existing conceptual and empirical support for the more prosocial and interpersonally oriented nature of individuals high versus low on this trait (e.g., Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Martin-Raugh, Kell, & Motowidlo, 2016). Like extraversion and neuroticism, agreeableness did not uniquely contribute to American identity, although it did significantly interact with racially-based harassment to influence this outcome.
Specifically, findings of the current study suggest that experiencing more racially-based harassment is associated with lower levels of American identity only for individuals high, but not low, on agreeableness. The direction of this interaction was contrary to expectations. A large literature has found individuals high on agreeableness to be less likely to experience negative affect and more likely to use constructive and prosocial strategies in the face of interpersonal conflicts (e.g., Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996). Thus, we expected the relationship between racially-based harassment and American identity to be stronger for those low, not high on agreeableness. A person-environment fit perspective (e.g., Diener, Larsen, & Emmons, 1984; Hunt, 1975) might be helpful in interpreting this unexpected finding.

As highlighted previously, individuals high on agreeableness are generally more motivated to maintain harmonious relationships and engage in prosocial behaviors, and less likely to experience interpersonal conflict than their counterparts (e.g., Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001; Suls, Martin, & David, 1998). When faced with interpersonal conflicts, however, these individuals have been found to experience more distress than their peers, because such situations “represent a greater mismatch of their interpersonal orientation” (Suls, Martin, & David, 1998; p. 89). Indeed, previous research has identified compassion, respectfulness, and interpersonal trust as the main affective, cognitive, and behavioral facets of agreeableness, respectively, and all three point to a prosocial nature (Soto & John, 2017). Thus, our findings seem to indicate that agreeableness exacerbates the negative effects of racially-based harassment on American identity, because these experiences conflict with the prosocial/interpersonal motives and expectations that characterize individuals high on agreeableness. The person-environment fit framework may also be used to explain the lack of association between neuroticism and native and American identity in the face
of racially-based harassment. It may be that the propensity of individuals high on neuroticism to experience negative emotions is already so high that interpersonal stressors, such as experiences of racially-based harassment, do not result in more negative feelings or reactions towards either cultural group (i.e., native or American). However, this does not explain the lack of association between neuroticism and native or American identity, and it only partially explains our findings regarding the main and moderating effects of extraversion on our two outcomes. Findings from the current study may thus reflect the uniquely influential role of the motives and characteristics of individuals high on agreeableness in shaping responses to interpersonal stressors, such as racially-based harassment. Although both extraversion and agreeableness have been found to directly and indirectly influence interpersonal interactions and relations (e.g., Festa, McNamara, Sherman, & Grover, 2012; Nikitin & Freund, 2015; Tov, Nai, & Lee, 2016), a fundamental motivation to maintain positive interpersonal relations and avoid conflict seems to underlie all aspects of agreeableness (e.g., Nikitin & Freund, 2015; Soto & John, 2017), while there are competing explanations for the underlying motivations of those high on extraversion to engage in interpersonal interactions (e.g., Ashton, Lee, & Paunonen, 2002; Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, & Shao, 2000). Some studies have argued that the sociability component of extraversion is distinct from affiliation motives and “may simply be a by-product of greater sensitivity to rewards” (Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, & Shao, 2000, p. 465), and others have argued that it is social attention that underlies all aspects of extraversion (Ashton, Lee, & Paunonen, 2002). Notably, there is stronger theoretical and empirical support for the prosocial/interpersonally oriented nature of those high on agreeableness compared to those high on extraversion. Our findings suggest that, in the context of racially-based harassment, the interpersonally oriented nature of those high on agreeableness restricts the development of a national identity.
Findings of the current study also indicate that racially-based harassment may be more influential in the development of a national rather than native identity in immigrant-origin groups, although only in the context of high agreeableness. Previous research has found stronger support for a rejection-disidentification rather than rejection-identification model (e.g., Bobowik, Martinovic, Basabe, Barsties, & Wachter, 2017). For example, among multiple immigrant and refugee groups living in Spain and the Netherlands, Bobowik, Martinovic, Basabe, Barsties, and Wachter (2017) found consistent support for the negative effect of discrimination on national identity, while evidence for the positive effect of discrimination on native identity was less conclusive. Together, results from the current study shed light on the value of examining contributions of factors within and across levels of the human ecology to developmental outcomes among immigrant-origin youth.

4.1 Limitations and Future Directions

Although our study is characterized by several strengths, a number of limitations should be addressed in future studies. First, the RIM posits that, in the face of racially-based harassment, individuals will seek to protect their self-concept by identifying more with the group being discriminated against (e.g., native) and detaching from the group that is perpetrating the discrimination (e.g., Americans). In this study, although we assumed racially-based harassment was perpetrated by members of the dominant/national group (i.e., White Americans), this was not directly measured. Immigrant-origin youth may experience racially-based harassment from multiple groups, including other minority groups (e.g., Wiley, 2013). Additionally, the impact of such offenses on psychosocial outcomes has been previously found to vary by race of the perpetrator (e.g., Wiley, 2013; Wong-Padoongpatt, Zane, Okazaki, & Saw, 2017). As such, it is possible different findings might have emerged had we captured the race of the perpetrator.
Future studies should, therefore, use measures of racially-based harassment that directly assess this. Further, the reliability of the personality subscales, particularly agreeableness, were less than adequate in the high school sample, which may have attenuated associations with the outcome variables. However, agreeableness uniquely contributed to variation in native identity, and it significantly interacted with racially-based harassment to contribute to variation in American identity, highlighting the importance of agreeableness to identity development – both independently and in the context of racially-based harassment. Also, as previously noted, although our power to detect a medium sized effect was adequate given our sample size, small effect sizes might not have been detected. Future studies should thus replicate these findings in larger samples. Finally, although the present study addressed gaps in the literature by examining both American and native identity and conceptualizing both in the same manner – as a sense of belonging and positive feelings towards the respective group – the measure used did not allow for examination of dimensions of identity, such as exploration and commitment, which could have offered a clearer understanding of multiple group identity development in this population. Examining overall scores of native and American identity without attention to different aspects of these identities might have obscured differential associations with racially-based harassment and personality traits. It will be important for future research to extend these analyses to multidimensional measures of native and American identity.

## 5 CONCLUSION

Findings of the current study suggest that personality traits may be particularly important for group identities in immigrant-origin youth, as these uniquely contributed to variation in native identity. Results of the current study also shed light on the ways individual-level factors may interact with contextual-level factors to influence identity development in this population with findings highlighting the impact of agreeableness on American identity in the face of racially-based
harassment. Although agreeableness is generally considered an asset in interpersonal contexts (e.g., Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996; Habashi, Graziano, & Hoover, 2016; Meier & Robinson, 2004; ), our findings reveal that, in the context of racially-based harassment, high levels of this trait hinders the development of a sense of belonging and positive feelings towards the national culture. Our findings have implications for the development of intervention programs aimed at promoting positive development among immigrant-origin youth. In particular, findings of the current study suggest that, to maximize effectiveness, intervention efforts with this population should consider individual differences in responding to and coping with psychosocial/interpersonal stressors, such as experiences of racially-based harassment. It is important to note that, although in our study racially-based harassment did not uniquely contribute to group identities, a large literature supports the impact of such experiences on psychosocial outcomes among immigrant-origin youth (e.g., Cano et al., 2016; Zeiders, Umaña-Taylor, & Delan, 2013). As such, it is important that clinicians and researchers continue to consider and examine the different ways immigrant-origin youth are affected by, respond to, and cope with racially-based harassment. Researchers should also continue to examine correlates of native and American identity as these have often been found to serve as a buffer against negative outcomes and facilitate the positive development and adaptation of immigrant-origin youth (e.g., Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Mok, Morris, Benet-Martinez, & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2007; Sam & Berry, 2010; Schwartz et al., 2015). Examining multi-level contributors to resilience and positive developmental outcomes among immigrant-origin youth may be especially important in current times, given the implementation of increasingly restrictive immigration policies in the last few years, and the growing literature supporting the negative impact of these policies on the well-being of immigrant communities (e.g., Roche, Vaquera, White, & Rivera, 2018).
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