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ABSTRACT

As the U.S. becomes increasingly diverse, individuals will need to interact effectively with a wide range of people. The theory of multicultural personality refined by Ponterotto (2010) proposes that some individuals may be better suited than others to adapt to the changing demographic landscape. Individuals with a multicultural personality are theorized to have the ability to interact effectively within a wide range of contexts and draw on diverse experiences and resources to solve everyday problems in multiple ways as well as seek out diversity in their lives. Because of their skills and disposition, Ponterotto (2010) suggests that those with a multicultural personality may experience better psychological functioning than their non-multicultural counterparts. The current study utilized Structural Equation Modeling to test the hypothesis that individuals who endorse greater multicultural personality also exhibit less prejudice, greater ethnic identity, and better psychological functioning, defined as a combination of subjective well-being and clinical symptomology. Results indicated moderate fit to the data and examination of specific paths within the model suggests that the relationship between multicultural personality and subjective well-being may be stronger than that between multicultural personality and clinical symptomology. Differences by ethnicity were also found on measures of ethnic identity and mental health. These results highlight the need to further refine the concept of multicultural personality as well as examine the complex relationships between multicultural personality, subjective well-being, and clinical symptomology.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been an increase in research on what constitutes and promotes “optimal human functioning” (Ponterotto, 2010, p. 715). In accordance with positive psychology, the construct of the multicultural personality has emerged in the literature to address the way people function within culturally diverse environments (Brummett, Wade, Ponterotto, Thombs, & Lewis, 2007; Burkard & Ponterotto, 2008; Ponterotto, 2010; Ponterotto et al., 2007). The United States is becoming increasingly diverse, and as a result it is likely that individuals will need to be able to work with people from many different socioeconomic, cultural, and religious backgrounds in their daily lives (Brummett et al., 2007; Burkard & Ponterotto, 2008; Ponterotto, 2010; Ponterotto et al., 2007). Those who are more open to many forms of diversity may be better able to function in such a work environment (Burkard & Ponterotto, 2008; Clarke et al., 2009) and, by extrapolation, such people may be better able to function within the broader scope of an increasingly diverse world. Individuals with a multicultural personality are theorized to “be better able to adjust to cultural pluralism in our society, be more effective in culturally diverse environments, and consequently experience a higher level of psychological well-being and quality of life” (Burkard & Ponterotto, 2008, p. 59).

Ramirez (1991) was the first to coin the term *multicultural personality* and describe its probable components (as cited in Brummett et al., 2007). Through observation of ethnically diverse students, Ramirez (1999) noted that students with a pluralistic orientation to life had a special ability to move within and among diverse cultural environments with relative ease. These students also demonstrated a *cognitive flexibility*, defined as the ability to navigate and solve a variety of problems using a wide array of learned styles (Ramirez, 1999). The research
performed by Ramirez (1999) focused primarily on students of mixed ethnic origin and was closely related to the concept of biculturalism and multiculturalism.

Van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) expanded upon Ramirez’s (1999) foundation to develop a theory of multicultural personality that was applicable to individuals of any ethnicity. Van der Zee and van Oudenhoven conceptualize a multicultural personality as consisting of narrow aspects of the broad Big Five personality traits. These aspects are theorized to predict multicultural effectiveness, defined as “success in the fields of professional effectiveness, personal adjustment and intercultural interactions” (p. 293). The personality aspects that the authors described are made up of seven factors that have been demonstrated to predict multicultural effectiveness based on previous research: Cultural Empathy, Openmindedness, Flexibility, Emotional Stability, Adventurousness/Curiosity, Orientation to Action, and Extraversion. Van der Zee and van Oudenhoven developed the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) to measure these traits, which were later reduced to the five factors of Social Initiative, Flexibility, Open-Mindedness, Emotional Stability, and Cultural Empathy in order to predict international effectiveness (Van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2001). Individuals who score higher on the MPQ are theorized to be better able to adapt to a new cultural environment, minimize acculturative stress, and have better psychological well-being than their non-multicultural counterparts (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000). Research using the MPQ in a sample of college students has demonstrated that multicultural personality traits are positively correlated with aspects of psychological well-being, such as autonomy, personal relationships with others, and self-acceptance (Ponterotto et al., 2007).

Most recently, Ponterotto (2010) put forth a model of multicultural personality based on an integration of theoretical models of personality and human interaction as well as primarily
qualitative research on the characteristics of persons presumed to have multicultural personalities. Individuals with multicultural personalities are thought to have a combination of stable traits and learned abilities. Stable traits include an emotional stability, a sense of humor, a wide-reaching sense of empathy, and cognitive flexibility. Learned abilities include security in one’s own ethnic or other identities, active attempts to embrace diversity in all aspects of one’s life, an ability to effectively interact within multiple cultural contexts, an appreciation of the differences and similarities that exist between and among people, and an understanding of the biases inherent in one’s own worldview. Drawing from evolutionary psychology, Ponterotto (2010) posits that as many countries in the world become more culturally diverse, individuals will need to adapt to an environment in which they will need to interact effectively with diverse others in order to succeed. In such an environment, those with multicultural characteristics are likely to have the advantage. Thus, a multicultural personality is presumably adaptive in a diverse society and, as such, is likely to promote “optimal human functioning” (Ponterotto, 2010, p. 727). Ponterotto (2010) additionally suggests that a multicultural personality is likely to be positively associated with quality of life, overall life satisfaction, career success, physical health, and psychological well-being.

Among the few constructs used to capture some aspect of multicultural personality, universal-diverse orientation (UDO; Miville et al., 1999) is perhaps one of the most thoroughly researched (Miville, Carlozzi, Gushue, Schara, & Ueda, 2006). UDO, also referred to as openness to diversity, is described as “an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both the similarities and differences among people” (Miville et al., 1999, p. 291). Acceptance of the differences between people reflects individuals’ uniqueness due to many factors, including culture and national origin, and an appreciation of the similarities between everyone can be a
way to unify and connect people (Sawyerr, Strauss, & Yan, 2005). Miville et al. (1999) posit that individuals who are more open to diversity may seek out situations in which they are likely to encounter diverse others. The experience of interacting with diverse people then reinforces and increases the individual’s openness to diversity, and thus the cycle continues. This relates to several proposed components of multicultural personality, including effective communication with diverse others and, to some degree, extraversion. UDO is mentioned by Ponterotto (2010) as one of the theoretical constructs that comprise the foundation of his theory, suggesting that individuals’ openness to diversity is important to both the development and maintenance of multicultural personality.

In their study, Brummett et al. (2007) found that a multicultural personality, measured by UDO, was positively related to self-esteem, interpersonal functioning, and psychological hardiness, all correlates of psychological well-being. Openness to diversity also has been found to correlate positively with “aspects of a well-functioning self” (Miville et al., 1999, p. 298), further suggesting that UDO and, by extension, a multicultural personality, may be related to psychological well-being. UDO also has been found to correlate positively with empathy, healthy narcissism, self-efficacy, and openness to experience (Bowman, 2010; Miville et al., 1999; Miville et al., 2006; Miville, Romans, Johnson, & Lone, 2004; Sawyerr et al., 2005). Research on the connection between aspects of multicultural personality and psychological well-being has focused primarily on correlates of well-being that may be related, in whole or in part, to components of multicultural personality itself. Multicultural personality, by definition, is comprised of attributes such as empathy, interpersonal efficacy, and emotional stability (Ponterotto, 2010). Due to the overlap of characteristics of multicultural personality and well-being, it is unclear whether aspects of psychological well-being truly reflect a multicultural
personality, or whether they simply help define and identify the construct. Extant literature has yet to investigate the relation between multicultural personality and positive psychological adjustment (i.e., is multicultural personality associated with greater mental health?). Theory would suggest that individuals who have multicultural personality traits are likely to be able to adapt to change, function well within different kinds of relationships and social situations, and maintain a stable emotional palette (Ponterotto, 2010). Although research tends to support the idea that individuals with more multicultural personalities may also have attributes that are associated with good psychological well-being, it does little to clarify the nature of this connection.

Positive ethnic identity, for example, has been found to correlate with components of psychological functioning such as life satisfaction (Ghavami, Fingerhut, Peplau, Grant, & Wittig, 2011) and self-esteem (Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997; Negy, Shreve, Jensen, & Uddin, 2003; Phinney, 1990; Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). Ethnic identity has also been found to negatively correlate with aspects of psychological maladjustment such as depression (Costigan, Koryzma, Hua, & Chance, 2010; Street, Harris-Britt, & Barnes, 2008; Yasui, Dorham, & Dishion, 2004) and internalizing problems (Yasui et al., 2004) and to relate to positive psychological functioning (Carter, 1991). A recent meta-analysis (Smith & Silva, 2011) suggested that the correlation between ethnic identity in people of color and positive indicators of psychological functioning (e.g., self-esteem, optimism) may be particularly salient, with studies examining these relationships yielding average effect sizes double those of studies focused on correlations between ethnic identity and negative indicators of psychological functioning (e.g., distress, symptomology). However, the relation between ethnic identity and prejudice is unclear. Whereas ethnic identity is correlated with greater self-esteem (Goodstein &
Ponterotto, 1997) and prejudice is correlated with lower self-esteem (Utsey et al., 2002), research indicates that higher levels of ethnic identity may be correlated with higher levels of prejudice (Negy et al., 2003). According to multicultural personality theory, individuals with greater multicultural personality traits are likely to have also developed an awareness and appreciation of their own ethnic and racial identities as well as low levels of prejudice and ethnocentrism (Ponterotto, 2010). To date, research has not examined the potential roles that ethnic identity and prejudice may jointly play in mediating the relation between multicultural personality, psychological well-being, and psychological adjustment.

Social support is likely to be an additional factor in the relationship between multicultural personality and psychological functioning. While it is largely accepted that positive social support likely serves as a buffer to protect against poor mental health (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Kawachi & Berkman, 2001), the question of overall social support has not been investigated in the context of multicultural personality. Ponterotto (2010) suggests that individuals with a multicultural personality might be more likely to function well within diverse social contexts and that this could be one pathway through which multicultural personality is related to better mental health; however, the quality of social support itself may be independent of multicultural personality. Specifically, those who are disinclined towards the multicultural perspective may not navigate diverse social encounters as efficiently, but they may also be less likely to seek such encounters when compared to individuals with a multicultural personality. Additionally, any person may seek social support from like-minded individuals and thereby experience the buffering effects of positive social support, regardless of multicultural orientation or diversity of social encounters; therefore, it is important to consider the role that social support might play in
overall mental health when investigating the possible relationship between multicultural personality and psychological functioning.

The Current Study

The current study extends previous research by focusing on the relations between multicultural personality, ethnic identity, prejudice, and psychological functioning in a community sample.

The current study improves upon previous research in three ways. First, investigations of the relation between multicultural personality and psychological well-being to date have not examined the potential roles of ethnic identity and prejudice as mediators. Second, the current study investigated the nature of the relation between multicultural personality, ethnic identity, prejudice, and psychological well-being in a community setting. Third, instead of relying exclusively on participants’ subjective self-appraisal of their psychological well-being, participants also reported symptoms of maladjustment based on a traditional clinical test (i.e., the OQ-45, discussed below). In this way, relatively more objective data about participants’ psychological functioning was obtained that can be evaluated against standardized clinical norms and is independent from theoretical elements of multicultural personality.

For my study, I use the term psychological well-being to refer to subjective self-appraisals as measured by Ryff’s (1989) Psychological Well-Being (PWB) scales (discussed below). On the PWB scales, respondents communicate their level of well-being based on their own idiosyncratic appraisal. I use the term psychological adjustment to refer to symptoms of distress as measured by the Outcome Questionnaire - 45 (Lambert et al., 2001) a well-validated, relatively objective clinical measure (discussed below). Although the OQ-45 also relies on
subjective self-reports of symptoms, unlike the PWB, a clinician or researcher subsequently determines respondents’ level of psychological adjustment (rather than respondents themselves) based on established criteria from controlled clinical studies (Lambert et al., 2001). Finally, I use the term psychological functioning to refer in a general, broad sense, to participants’ overall functioning level based on subjective well-being and relatively objective symptoms of distress.
METHODS

Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that community individuals who have more of a multicultural personality have a stronger sense of positive ethnic identity, lower levels of prejudice, and corresponding greater psychological functioning following the model identified in Figure 1. This hypothesis is based on previous research demonstrating a positive correlation between college students’ multicultural personality and psychological well-being (Ponterotto et al., 2007) as well as a relation between positive ethnic identity and correlates of psychological functioning (Carter, 1991; Ghavami et al., 2011; Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997; Negy et al., 2003; Phinney, 1990; Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). Social support is included as a covariate of psychological functioning to control for the independent role it is likely to play in mental health (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Kawachi & Berkman, 2001).

Figure 1. Hypothesized model.
Participants

GPower 3.1 software (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) was used to calculate the minimum sample size needed for the present study. In order to detect a medium effect size (e.g., 0.18), a minimum of 100 participants were required. Participants consisted of 220 adult community members living in the Southeast United States. Three cases were excluded due to missing data, leaving a total of 217 participants. Participant ages ranged from 18 to 83 (median age of 26) and reported living in a variety of community settings (26.6% Urban, 60.1% Suburban, 9.6% Small Town, and 3.7% Rural/Remote). Of the participants, 41.5% \((n=90)\) were male, 54.4% \((n=118)\) were female, and 4.1% \((n=9)\) did not report their sex. With regards to ethnicity, 47.5% \((n=103)\) of participants were White, 18.9% \((n=41)\) were Hispanic/Latino, 15.2% \((n=33)\) were Black, 11.1% \((n=24)\) were Asian, 6.5% \((n=14)\) indicated “Other,” and 0.9% \((n=2)\) did not indicate their ethnicity.

Materials

Demographics Sheet

Participants indicated their age, gender, ethnicity, country of birth, highest level of education obtained, and approximate annual household salary on a one-page demographics sheet. Participants were also asked to list any languages they may speak other than English and the degree of fluency with which they speak each language. They were asked to list the countries in which they have lived, as well as the countries to which they have traveled. Regarding travel history, countries visited as part of a cruise experience were disregarded, given that such visits
typically include numerous countries (particularly islands) and are relatively superficial in nature.

*Multicultural Personality Questionnaire*

The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ; Van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000) is a 91-item self-report questionnaire on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Participants are given a list of statements and asked to indicate the extent to which the statements apply to them, with possible responses ranging from 1 (totally not applicable) to 5 (completely applicable). The MPQ is comprised of five factors: Open-mindedness, Social Initiative, Emotional Stability, Cultural Empathy, and Flexibility. Open-mindedness (18 items) reflects “an open and unprejudiced attitude towards outgroup members and towards different cultural norms and values;” Social Initiative (17 items) is “a tendency to actively approach social situations;” Emotional Stability (20 reverse-scored items) is the “tendency to remain calm in stressful situations;” Cultural Empathy (18 items) encompasses “the ability to empathize with the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of members from different cultural groups;” and Flexibility (18 reverse-scored items) is “the ability to switch easily from one strategy to another...to feel attracted to new and unknown situations” (Van der Zee & Brinkmann, 2004, p. 289). Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the MPQ was .93.

*Universal-Diverse Orientation*

A person’s inclination to an attitude of awareness and acceptance of the similarities and differences between others was measured by the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale-Short Form (M-GUDS-S; Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000), which is based
on the original 45-item M-GUDS (Miville et al., 1999). This measure is comprised of 15 items, with response options ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 6 (Strongly agree). The measure yields a total score and three subscale scores: Diversity of Contact (the extent to which a person engages in interactions with diverse others and seeks out diverse experiences), Relativistic Appreciation (an appreciation of both the differences and similarities between and among people), and Comfort With Differences (the degree to which a person is comfortable with and feels a sense of connection with others who are both different from and similar to themselves), with higher scores indicating more awareness and acceptance of differences between others (Fuertes et al., 2000). Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the M-GUDS was .86. The measure also has demonstrated adequate discriminant validity, convergent validity, and construct validity (Miville et al., 1999).

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) is a 12-item self-report questionnaire designed to assess an individual’s level of ethnic identity to their ethnic group. It can be administered individually or to groups, and takes approximately 5 minutes to complete. In addition to an overall ethnic identity score, the MEIM also provides three subscale scores including 1) Ethnic Identity Achievement (EIA), 2) Affirmation and Belonging (AB), and 3) Ethnic Behaviors (EB). Ethnic Identity Achievement relates to having a secure sense of one’s own identity. A sense of pride and positive feelings toward one’s ethnic group is encompassed in Affirmation and Belonging. Ethnic Behaviors involve both engagement in social activities with one’s own ethnic group as well as participation in culture-specific traditions. Each MEIM item is a statement that the participant responds to on a 4 point Likert scale ranging from
“strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the MEIM was .91. For additional information about the development and psychometric properties of the MEIM, see Phinney (1992).

Multiethnic Climate Inventory

To assess level of ethnocentrism, the participants responded to ten items from the Multiethnic Climate Inventory (MCI; Johnson & Johnson, 1996) using a 5-point Likert scale response format. The MCI is considered an appropriate scale for measuring ethnocentrism because only a handful of instruments exist that attempt to measure ethnocentrism or prejudice. Moreover, they typically only measure Whites’ prejudice toward nonwhites—usually, African Americans. In contrast, the MCI was written in a way that makes the scale appropriate for individuals irrespective of their race or ethnicity, and worded to assess prejudice against no single group in particular. Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the MCI was .87 (for additional information on the development of the MCI, see Johnson & Johnson, 1996).

Scales of Psychological Well-Being

The four scales of psychological well-being developed by Ryff (1989) included in the present study were: (1) Personal Growth, (2) Positive Relations With Others, (3) Purpose in Life, and (4) Self-Acceptance. The scales consist of 14 items each and were based on the original 20-item parent scales detailed in Ryff (1989). Participants respond to each item on a 6-point Likert-type scale with responses ranging from 1(Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree). Higher scores in each scale indicate higher self-ratings for that dimension. The scales have high internal
consistency, with coefficient alphas ranging from .85 to .91. These four scales were selected for the current study because they were deemed to be most relevant to the research question at hand. Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the four SPWB was .95.

Outcome Questionnaire-45

The Outcome Questionnaire – 45 (OQ-45; Lambert et al., 2001) is a 45-item self-report measure designed to assess psychological adjustment. The measure yields a Total Score and three subscale scores: Symptom Distress, Interpersonal Relations, and Social Role. The Symptom Distress subscale screens for the presence of common symptoms of anxiety, affective, and adjustment disorders in addition to stress. The Interpersonal Relations subscale assesses for loneliness and difficulties in significant relationships. Finally, the Social Role subscale measures the extent to which difficulties and conflict are present within participants’ various social roles (e.g., homemaker, student, employee). Participants respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type scale with options ranging from “never” to “always,” with higher scores indicating greater distress. Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the OQ-45 was .93.

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding

The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1988; 1991) was included in the questionnaire battery to assess social desirability responding. The BIDR contains 40 items to which respondents rate their agreement using a seven-point Likert scale. The BIDR measures two constructs. One construct, self-deceptive enhancement (SDE), assesses the
tendency to respond honestly to items, but in a positively biased manner. The other construct, impression management (IM), assesses a deliberate self-presentation and can be viewed as a measure of defensiveness. Scores on both constructs were combined and treated continuously; higher scores reflected higher levels of responding to the items in a socially desirable manner. Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the BIDR was .83. Further, the BIDR has been found to correlate .71 with the Marlowe-Crowne scale and .80 with the Multidimensional Social Desirability Inventory of Jacobson, Kellogg, Cauce, and Slavin (1977). For more information on the BIDR and its development, see Paulhus (1991).

The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support

Social support was assessed using the 12-item Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; Dahlem, Zimet, & Walker, 1991) to determine participants’ perceptions of social support from family members, friends, and significant others. Each item is responded to using a 7-point Likert scale, with options ranging from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree.” Based on the present sample, the internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the MSPSS was .93.

Procedure

Participants were asked to complete a packet of questionnaires that took between 30 and 45 minutes to complete. Participants were recruited within the community through the assistance of graduate and undergraduate students working in a cross-cultural psychology research laboratory. Research assistants were directed to seek a broad representation of adults across age and socioeconomic status and were permitted to recruit members of their own immediate family
as well as encouraged to draw on their own social and organizational contacts. To qualify for the study, participants had to be at least 18 years of age and able to read and write in English. Student recruiters were responsible for obtaining informed consent, providing the study rationale, and administering all questionnaires to participants in their homes. Participants were encouraged to contact the researcher with any questions or concerns but were not provided feedback regarding their responses at the time of participation. Upon completion of the questionnaire packet, all participants received a $5 gift card to a local department store as compensation.
RESULTS

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analyses were conducted using LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2006). In the hypothesized model, the latent construct of Multicultural Personality was measured using the MPQ, with five observed subscales of Cultural Empathy, Open-Mindedness, Social Initiative, Emotional Stability, and Flexibility. Openness to Diversity was measured using the M-GUDS with three observed subscales of Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort With Differences. The latent construct of Psychological Functioning was comprised of Psychological Well-Being (RYFF; with four observed subscales of Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance) and Psychological Distress (OQ-45; with three observed subscales of Symptom Distress, Interpersonal Relations, and Social Role). Scores on the OQ-45 were reversed to allow for consistency in the directionality of measures of psychological functioning (i.e., higher scores indicate better psychological functioning). Prejudice was measured using the MCI and treated as an observed rather than latent variable due to an insufficient number of subscales on the measure, and the Ethnic Identity was measured using the three observed subscales of the MEIM: Affirmation and Belonging, Ethnic Identity Achievement, and Ethnic Behaviors. Perceived Social Support was measured using the MSPSS and its three subscales of Significant Other, Family, and Friend support. The relationship between multicultural personality and psychological functioning was predicted to be mediated by prejudice and ethnic identity, and perceived social support was included as a covariate of psychological functioning. Socially desirable responding (BIDR) was also included as a covariate of multicultural personality, ethnic identity, prejudice, and psychological functioning. The BIDR was treated as an observed variable secondary to an insufficient number of subscales.
In addition to the hypothesized model (Model A), two hierarchical models were tested to further elucidate the nature of the proposed relationship between multicultural personality and psychological functioning. The first of these, Model B, is identical to the hypothesized model with one exception: in this model, the more subjective measure of psychological well-being (i.e., Ryff’s Scales of Psychological Well-Being) was utilized as the sole determinant of psychological functioning. Similarly, Model C employs the more objective measure of psychological adjustment (i.e., the Outcome Questionnaire – 45) as the determinant of psychological functioning. In this way, the author was able to investigate whether multicultural personality affects various components of psychological functioning differently.

Goodness of fit was determined using the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), the Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). CFI, GFI, and NNFI values ≥.90 and ≥.95 indicate adequate and good fit, respectively, and SRMR values ≤.08 and ≤.05 indicate adequate and good fit, respectively (Schweizer, 2010).

Preliminary Analyses

The correlation matrix and standard deviations of study measures are reported in Table 1. The data from a total of three participants were excluded due to missing scores on several measures, bringing the total N to 217. All variables were screened for normality, outliers, and collinearity as suggested by Kline (2011).

A series of ANCOVAs were run to determine whether scores on any of the variables differed by ethnicity when controlling for desirable responding. Significant differences between ethnicities were found on the MEIM, F(4,209) = 7.17, p<.001, and on the OQ-45, F(4,209) =
2.42, \( p = .049 \). Post-hoc analysis revealed that on the MEIM, participants who identified as White reported significantly less ethnic identity than those identifying as Black \( (p = .007) \), Hispanic \( (p = .011) \), or Asian \( (p = .001) \). Additionally, participants identifying as Black reported significantly greater psychological adjustment than those who identified as White, \( p = .027 \). The possible relationship between ethnic identity and psychological adjustment was examined, and a significant correlation was found between the MEIM and OQ-45 for non-Whites, \( r(112) = .25, p = .008 \), but not for Whites, \( r(103) = -.037, p = .71 \). The difference between these two correlations was significant, \( Z = -2.11, p = .035 \), suggesting that in the present sample, greater ethnic identity was associated with better psychological adjustment for ethnic minorities but that the two were not related for Whites. These results should be kept in mind when interpreting model fit statistics and pathways.

The measurement model indicates the correlations between observed indicators (e.g., measure subscales) and the latent variables they are intended to measure. This correlation is represented by the factor loadings for the indicator variables. The factor loading squared indicated the proportion of variance in that indicator which is explained by the latent construct. The complement of this (i.e., 1 minus the squared factor loading) represents the proportion of unexplained variance and is indicated by the value “E” in figures 2-4.

Examination of factor loadings in the original hypothesized model revealed that the M-GUDS subscales did not represent a significant contribution to the latent construct of multicultural personality (i.e., squared loadings ranging from .15 to .33). Additionally, modification indices suggested that the error terms between the Relativistic Appreciation subscale of the M-GUDS and the Emotional Stability subscale of the MPQ were correlated and comparison of items on the M-GUDS and MPQ indicated moderate redundancy between the two
scales. The M-GUDS was thereby removed from the model. After removing the M-GUDS, factor loadings indicated good internal consistency in the measurement component of the revised model, and correlations between indicator and latent variables were all significant at $p<.01$ level. No additional abnormalities in the modification indices were noted.

Model A

The original model (Model A; Figure 2) tested the relationships between multicultural personality, prejudice, ethnic identity, and psychological functioning. Social support was included as a covariate of psychological functioning, and socially desirable responding was included as a covariate of all variables. Consistent with the proposed hypothesis, multicultural personality was significantly related to increased ethnic identity ($\beta=.16$), decreased prejudice ($\beta=-.44$), and greater psychological functioning ($\beta=.29$). Additionally, ethnic identity positively predicted greater psychological functioning ($\beta=.16$). However, prejudice was not significantly related to psychological functioning ($\beta=-.11$), which was inconsistent with the hypothesis. This model was found to fit the data marginally well (CFI=.90; NNFI=.88; SRMR=.09; GFI=.88).
Model B

This model (Figure 3) investigated the relationships between multicultural personality, prejudice, ethnic identity, and the more subjective psychological well-being. Consistent with previous research (Ponterotto et al., 2007), multicultural personality was found to have a significant positive relation with psychological well-being ($\beta=.32$) and ethnic identity ($\beta=.16$) and a significant negative relation with prejudice ($\beta=-.44$). Similar to that in Model A, there was a significant positive relation between ethnic identity and psychological well-being ($\beta=.17$), but a non-significant relation between prejudice and psychological well-being ($\beta=-.10$). Fit statistics for Model B were equivalent to or better than those for Model A (CFI=.92; NNFI=.90; SRMR=.09; GFI=.84).
Table 1. Correlations and Standard Deviations of Observed Variables and Latent Variable Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Multicultural Personality (MP)</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity (EI)</th>
<th>Psychological Functioning</th>
<th>BIDR</th>
<th>MSPSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>- .42**</td>
<td>- .43**</td>
<td>- .35**</td>
<td>- .17**</td>
<td>- .28**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>- .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>- .37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>- .29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>- .26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>- .16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>- .21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OQ</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>- .22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>- .22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>- .28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>- .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>- .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>- .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CE = Cultural Empathy; O = Open-mindedness; SI = Social Initiative; ES = Emotional Stability; F = Flexibility; PRE = Prejudice; AB = Affirmation and Belonging; EIA = Ethnic Identity Achievement; EB = Ethnic Behaviors; SPWB = Scales of Psychological Well-Being; PG = Personal Growth; PR = Positive Relations; LP = Life Purpose; A = Acceptance; OQ-45 = Outcome Questionnaire – 45; SD = Symptom Distress; IR = Interpersonal Relations; SR = Social Role; DR = Desirable Responding; PSS = Perceived Social Support; SO = Significant Other; FA = Family; FR = Friends.

** p<.01.
* p<.05.
Model C

The third model (Figure 4) focused on the relationships between multicultural personality, prejudice, ethnic identity, and more objective psychological adjustment, which had not been previously included in research on correlates of multicultural personality. Consistent with Model A and Model B, multicultural personality significantly predicted prejudice (β=-.44) and ethnic identity (β=.16). Contrary to the hypothesis, however, there was not a significant relationship between multicultural personality and psychological adjustment (β=.08). Ethnic identity significantly predicted psychological adjustment (β=.14), and there was not a significant relation between prejudice and psychological adjustment (β=-.11). The fit statistics for Model C indicated better fit than either Model A or Model B (CFI=.94; NNFI=.92; SRMR=.08; GFI=.88).
Figure 4. Model C. Structural equation model predicting psychological adjustment. Socially desirable responding was included as a covariate but is not depicted in the figure for visual clarity. * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$
DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to expand upon current research regarding the nature of the relations between multicultural personality, ethnic identity, prejudice, and psychological functioning. It was hypothesized that increased multicultural personality would predict greater ethnic identity, lower prejudice, and improved psychological well-being. Additionally, the hypothesized model suggested that lower levels of prejudice and greater ethnic identity would predict better psychological functioning. The full model indicated several highly predictive relationships consistent with the hypotheses and previous research.

Multicultural Personality and Psychological Functioning

As expected, greater multicultural personality was associated with better psychological functioning overall, which suggests that an appreciation of and preference for experiences with diverse others may serve as a protective factor against poor mental health and promote positive appraisal of general well-being. Comparison of alternate models, however, indicated that this relationship is far from straightforward. When examining the relationship between multicultural personality and the more subjective psychological well-being, the model is highly consistent with previous research supporting the theory that multicultural personality is related to more positive relationships with others, greater self-acceptance, and overall well-being (Burkard & Ponterotto, 2008; Ponterotto et al., 2007). Contrary to the hypothesis, no relationship between multicultural personality and indicators of positive mental health was found. The discrepancy suggests that while individuals with a multicultural personality are likely to perceive themselves as experiencing more positive well-being, this perception may not translate to fewer symptoms of mental illness and less psychological distress. This finding is not entirely at odds with
multicultural personality theory, however, when the indicators of mental health utilized in the present study are taken into consideration.

Many measures that assess for mental health, including the OQ-45 used in the present study, adopt a multifaceted approach which combines clinical symptomology with relationship quality. In the OQ-45, one of the three subscales is concerned directly with clinical symptomology, and the other two relate to the stability of interpersonal relationships and satisfaction within one’s social roles. Ponterotto (2010) and Ramirez (1999) theorized that individuals who exhibit multicultural personality are likely to be better able to navigate various social and cultural contexts as well as draw from experiences with diverse others to aid in problem-solving. If such persons are able to navigate various cultural frameworks efficiently and effectively, logic dictates that they would be less likely to experience interpersonal stress associated with the increasingly diverse environments common in today’s society. Individuals with a multicultural personality are also theoretically more likely to seek out these diverse experiences (Ponterotto, 2010) and, conversely, those without a multicultural personality are less likely to seek diversity in their relationships. However, homogeneity in social relationships may not have a significant impact on the quality of those relationships. Specifically, an individual who does not exhibit a multicultural personality may be more likely to seek friendships and other relationships with like-minded individuals, thus avoiding diverse social contexts and the probable subsequent interpersonal stress. In this way, persons with or without multicultural personality may be equally as likely to experience stable interpersonal relationships; the former for proficiency in navigating diverse social contexts, and the latter for avoiding them. It is thereby possible that any measure which considers the quality of interpersonal relationships as a
significant contributing factor to psychological adjustment may not identify differences between individuals with or without multicultural personality and, indeed, none may be present.

Further, although the supposed relation between perceived psychological well-being and mental health is widely accepted in the literature, studies to date have yet to examine whether such a relation exists. Previous research has noted that subjective well-being is identified along with clinical symptomology as a component of overall well-being and is correlated with agreeableness and extraversion (Baker, Soto, Perez, & Lee, 2012), but in large part subjective psychological well-being has merely been presumed to correlate with positive mental health (for example, see Alfred, Hammer, & Good, 2013; Baker et al., 2012; Brummet et al., 2007; Mock & Eibach, 2011; Ponterotto et al., 2007). It is therefore possible that while multicultural personality has been demonstrated to relate to positive psychological well-being in the present study as well as in previous research (Ponterotto et al., 2007), it may have little to no relation with more objective clinical symptomology.

A third possible factor in the relation between multicultural personality and psychological well-being lies in the theoretical definition of the construct. Specifically, multicultural personality as measured by UDO has been found to correlate with aspects of psychological well-being such as empathy, self-efficacy, and openness to experiences (Bowman, 2010; Miville et al., 1999; Miville et al., 2006; Miville et al., 2004; Sawyerr et al., 2005), which are also identified as components of multicultural personality itself (Ponterotto, 2010). It would be expected, therefore, that multicultural personality would correlate highly with subjective well-being due to similarities in definition rather than exhibit a true correlational relationship. Comparison of model paths and fit indices between Model B (with subjective well-being) and Model C (with more objective psychological adjustment) reveals that this may partially be the
case in the present study. In particular, it would be expected that the model with the greatest number of significant pathways would also have the best overall fit given the same data set. In the current study, however, Model C was a better fit to the data than Model B despite the non-significant relation between multicultural personality and psychological adjustment in Model C. This discrepancy between pathway significance and overall model fit further suggests that the significant association between multicultural personality and subjective well-being identified within the present study may be related in part to similarity between the two constructs’ theoretical components.

**Ethnic Identity**

Consistent with the hypothesis, multicultural personality predicted greater ethnic identity, but to a lesser degree than anticipated. Ponterotto (2010) listed security in one’s own ethnic identity as a component of multicultural personality itself; however, the magnitude of the relationship between multicultural personality and ethnic identity was poor. This suggests that ethnic identity is likely not a component of multicultural personality but rather a distinct construct.

Similarly, ethnic identity only minimally predicted positive psychological functioning. This relationship was consistent between subjective well-being and psychological adjustment, suggesting that a secure ethnic identity is associated not only with having a positive perception of life but also with fewer clinical symptoms and more secure interpersonal relationships. The association between ethnic identity and psychological functioning supported previous research linking ethnic identity with greater life satisfaction (Ghavami et al., 2011) and positive psychological adjustment (Costigan et al., 2010; Street et al., 2008; Yasui et al., 2004).
Additionally, ethnic identity was related to better psychological adjustment for ethnic minorities, but no correlation was found for Whites. This finding is consistent with the research of Smith & Silva (2011) and further emphasizes the need to examine the complex role that ethnic identity plays in the lives of ethnic minorities. The difference between white and ethnic minority ethnic identity endorsement found in the present sample also indicates the importance of research focused on whether Whites consider themselves to have an ethnic identity and whether or not an equivalent construct may exist in this population that relates to better mental health.

**Prejudice**

As hypothesized, results indicated that greater multicultural personality predicted significantly lower levels of prejudice. This finding suggests that those who are able to move effectively within diverse cultural contexts and seek diversity in their lives are much less likely to subscribe to negative stereotypes and attitudes against others. Contrary to the hypothesis, however, less prejudice was not associated with any change in psychological functioning. Theory would suggest that those who exhibit greater prejudice would experience greater interpersonal conflict as a result of discrimination against others, which would affect the quality of their interpersonal relationships. That logic, however, would only hold true if the prejudicial views were expressed rather than suppressed. In today’s society, prejudice is generally taboo and individuals are only likely to express their prejudice within social situations in which discrimination is accepted by the group (Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002). It would therefore be expected that expression of prejudice would have little or no effect on the quality of interpersonal relationships because prejudice would only be expressed to individuals who consider it socially acceptable.
Conclusions

Overall, the results were supportive of the current hypotheses and previous research, but provide several opportunities for clarification of the nature of the relationships between multicultural personality, ethnic identity, prejudice, and psychological functioning. In particular, multicultural personality was predictive of subjective well-being but not of more clinical adjustment as was hypothesized by Ponterotto (2010). This could be due to the nature of the clinical measure used, the theoretical foundation of multicultural personality, or even an overestimate in the literature regarding the proposed association between psychological well-being and clinical distress. Multicultural personality predicted significant reduction in prejudice, but lower prejudice was unrelated to psychological functioning. Additionally, model pathways suggest that ethnic identity may play a much smaller role in multicultural personality and psychological functioning than had previously been thought.

There are of course limitations to the present study. These results were obtained using a convenience sample of the social contacts of undergraduate research assistants working in a cross-cultural psychology lab and as such may not be representative of the population as a whole. A larger sample size would also serve well to provide additional clarification to the model and give researchers the ability to fully examine ethnic differences that may be present.
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