NO PLACE TO CALL HOME: CULTURAL HOMELESSNESS, SELF-ESTEEM

AND CROSS-CULTURAL IDENTITIES

Raquel Carvalho Hoersting, B.A.

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2009

APPROVED:

Sharon R. Jenkins, Major Professor
Russell D. Clark III, Committee Member
Amy R. Murrell, Committee Member
Linda Marshall, Chair of the Department of
    Psychology
Michael Monticino, Interim Dean of the Robert
    B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Hoersting, Raquel Carvalho. <u>No place to call home: Cultural homelessness, self-esteem and cross-cultural identities</u>. Master of Science (Psychology), May 2009, 74 pp., 10 tables, references, 59 titles.

The study examined relations between a cross-cultural geographically mobile childhood and adult cultural identity, attachment to cross-cultural identities (CCIs) and self-esteem. CCIs are loosely defined identities (e.g., third culture kids [TCKs], military brats, missionary kids) that describe some individuals' childhood cross-cultural experience. The 475 participants spent at least two years before age 18 in a culture different from their parents' and completed an online survey including childhood cross-cultural experiences, Cultural Homelessness Criteria, Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, and Self Label Identity Measure (SLIM) that captured strength of affirmation, belonging and commitment to any CCI. Cultural homelessness (CH) was related to lower self-esteem; higher SLIM scores was related to higher self-esteem and lower CH. TCKs reported lower self-esteem than non-TCKs and older participants experienced less CH and higher self-esteem. SLIM scores buffered the CH-self-esteem relationship, whereas a TCK CCI and having more cross-culturally experienced social networks did not.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapters

Social Identity Theory

Acculturation: Adapting to Belong

Culture and Development

Third Culture Kids

Consequences of a Cross-cultural Childhood

Cultural Homelessness and Cultural Uncertainty

Present Study and Hypothesis

Participants

Procedure

Measures

Descriptive Analysis

Relationships Among Demographic, Independent and Dependent
    Variables

Plan for Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis Testing

Limitations

Future Research

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Humans tend to categorize their social world as a way to reduce chaos (Turner, 1982).

Social categories can be based on gender, age, group, race, country of origin, and numerous other

personal characteristics. Categorization and the resulting identification with social-cultural

groups helps people find a label with which to describe their experiences, and a possible

community to which they can belong. Social categorization, or how we classify others and

ourselves, can influence our thoughts, beliefs, feelings and behaviors (Hogg, 1996; Turner,

1982).

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems model can be useful in explaining different

social layers and social groups to which each individual might belong. On a small scale, groups

can be joined together by shared experiences such as those created by family and friendships. On

a broader scale, groups can be formed at an institutional level, such as belonging to a certain

school, formal activity group, temple or church. Membership in an ethnic group, race, religion

and a nationality can be related to a wider scope and can lead to an individual's experience of

culture membership.

Childhood experiences can be important in consolidating membership and identifying

with social groups, ethnic and cultural groups. During childhood, a person grows to understand

the world around them and learns important social rules and behaviors that are appropriate for

survival in their environment (Erikson, 1963; Phinney, 1990; Pollock & Van Reken, 1999;

Vygotsky, 1986). However, when there is divergent information about one's environment, such

as from cross-cultural experiences, a multicultural environment, or being born to a multi-ethnic

or multi-racial family, that person might experience difficulty attaining a solid cultural, ethnic or

racial identity (La Fromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1993; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). Furthermore, as current and future trends lead toward globalization, it is more common for children to spend their developmental years exposed to many cultural environments, especially as international moves become more frequent (Bandura, 2002).

The development of faster modes of travel, facility in relocation, international schools and the openness and willingness of families to live abroad has led societies to become increasingly global. Along with this global shift, the number of individuals exposed to multiple cultural frameworks has increased (See U.S. Census Bureau articles: Malone, Baluja, Costanzo & Davis, 2003; Schachter, 2001). Between March 1999 and March 2000, about 1.7 million U.S. Americans left the U.S. (Schachter, 2001) for a foreign country (in comparison to 48,000 in 1980; Fernandez, 2000). About 600,000 of them return every year (Schachter, 2001). In 1990, there were about 5 million U.S. children and adolescents living abroad (Useem & Cottrell, 1996). The number of sojourners and their children who were and are raised in differing cultural frameworks is even greater when compiling similar statistics from other countries. Although in the mid-20th century most children living abroad were British, after World War II, there was an increase in U.S. Americans living abroad (Gerner et. al., 1992). Today there is an increase in Japanese children living abroad and returning to Japan (Podolsky, 2005).

The focus of this study is to examine how adults who experienced a cross-cultural childhood negotiate their cultural identity, and how membership in a social category whose commonality is a shared internationally mobile childhood might influence self-esteem. Understanding how these individuals deal with shifting worldviews and exposure to different cultures in their developmental years, and how these may or may not be internalized as an identity, can be useful for the globalized world. People who are raised cross-culturally may

2

experience difficulty with finding a sense of cultural belonging, which may be important for psychological well-being. Social identity theory and some theories of acculturation have presented models for understanding the relationship between belonging and the attainment of group and cultural identity.

<div align="center">Social Identity Theory</div>

Social identity theory was originally developed by Tajfel and Turner (Hogg & Abrams, 1999; Tajfel, 1982) to examine the interaction process of forming individual and group identity, how social identification interacts with the development of self-concept, and resulting self-esteem (Hogg & Mullin, 1999; Turner, 1982). These authors looked directly at self-evaluation and the need for self-esteem as a mechanism for motivation, social categorization, and social comparison (Cox & Gallois, 1996; Hogg & Mullin, 1999; Turner, 1982).

Individuals develop social identities by belonging to different groups through self-categorization. Social categorization divides the social world into comprehensive categories and groups that help a person to identify themselves within a system (Turner, 1982). Creating social categories is important for social survival as it creates a cognitive structure for understanding an otherwise uncertain social world (Hogg & Mullin, 1999). It helps imprint a sense of identity (Frable, 1997) and belonging (Turner, 1982). This is an adaptive and unconscious process that is useful in understanding one's social environment (Cox & Gallois, 1996). Self-categorization goes further than self-labeling by inviting individuals to adopt behaviors, characteristics and values associated with group membership (Cox & Gallois, 1996).

Social comparison aims at the enhancement of self-esteem (Hogg & Abrams, 1999). When a person belongs to a certain group, one may feel motivated to evaluate one's group in a positive way to promote positive self-esteem (Turner, 1982). People generally desire to be a part

<div align="center">3</div>

of groups whose individual and group identity will be seen in a favorable light in relation to others (Hogg, 1996). Self-esteem is partially derived from making comparisons to other groups that appear favorable to oneself (Cox & Gallois, 1996; Hogg & Mullin, 1999; Turner, 1999).

Strong ties of group identification help maintain an individual's sense of belonging and contribute to an overall positive self-concept (Lewin, 1948; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; see Phinney, 1990). Groups can be defined as two or more people who share a common social identity or perceive themselves as members of the same social group (Turner, 1982). Thus, people must negotiate belonging to various groups with different social identities (such as gender, racial, ethnic, sexual, and social class identities). Cultures can also be identified as groups that share common worldviews and customs (Dana, 2005). As in the case of social identity, both group and individual identities make up cultural identity (Frable, 1997).

However, when people do not belong to typical social categories, well-defined cultural groups, or ethnic enclaves, and are exposed to multiple cultural frameworks, they may experience difficulty finding groups and a culture to which they feel a sense of belonging and being understood. They may change aspects of themselves in an attempt to integrate into cultural and social groups-- as can be observed with immigrants, refugees and sojourners. People who experience geographical moves may find that behaviors which were socially appropriate in one context may not be accepted in a new country or culture. Thus, the motivation to establish group membership in the new country may lead to changes in the individual's self in an effort to become more integrated into the new groups and establish cultural membership in that new location.

Acculturation: Adapting to Belong

The broad literature on acculturation (See LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993 for a review) can be useful in explaining how individuals exposed to multiple cultural contexts negotiate their cultural identity. These contexts usually include home cultures (the mainstream culture of country of origin) and host cultures (the mainstream culture of country of residence). Changing aspects of one's self-identity to accommodate new information within a cultural context is generally known as acculturation and can sometimes involve alteration in the individual's sense of self (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). According to Dana (2005), acculturation is the wide-ranging process of an individual as they adjust to a host culture by taking on values, beliefs and the typical behaviors of that culture, thus engaging themselves to attempt to belong to a particular culture.

Earlier studies of acculturation used a unidimensional framework, which assumes that as time elapses a person living in the host culture will adapt to the majority culture. A bidimensional framework, supported by Ryder, Alden and Paulhus (2000), proposes that individuals have multiple cultural identities which can vary in strength depending on the cultural context to which they are exposed. During a person's developmental years, when one is consolidating a cultural identity, one may learn several cultural frameworks which, taken together, lead to a multicultural identity, but also confusion about which identities to internalize.

Berry (1990) proposed different types of acculturation groups (ethnic groups, native peoples, immigrants/sojourners, and refugees), which are categorized by mobility (sedentary or mobile) and the nature of the move/acculturation (voluntary or involuntary). For example, ethnic groups are made up of people who identify with and have a common heritage in second and subsequent generations after immigration (voluntary and sedentary). Those who are indigenous

to a place, residing there prior to colonization, are native peoples (sedentary and involuntary). Refugees and immigrants are first generation arrivals into a host country, but immigrants have moved voluntarily whereas refugees usually have not. Sojourners, like immigrants, voluntarily reside in a host country but in contrast, intend to return eventually to their country of origin (Berry, 1990).

When faced with several cultural frameworks, individuals may employ different acculturation strategies and attitudes. Berry (1990) developed a model that involves four acculturation strategies based on an individual's attitude toward home and host cultures. Integration refers to an individual who values and maintains strong links to both cultures. Assimilation describes individuals who develop relationships within the host culture, whereas individuals in the separated group will likely hold strong relationships with their home culture. Individuals employing marginalization strategies often have little interest or identify with either host or home cultures.

When those living multiple cultural frameworks are able to learn the norms of the two cultures available to them and interact with two distinct cultural frameworks in a successful manner, they are likely to develop bicultural competence (as reviewed by LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). Bicultural competence, then, results from individuals who value and maintain strong links with home and host cultural frameworks, such as those who are integrated according to Berry's (1990) framework. Biculturally competent individuals demonstrate flexibility at understanding language and communication of each culture and can flourish in each cultural setting. When there is a positive attitude toward the two cultures, biculturally competent individuals reap the psychological benefits of having better interpersonal adjustment and socio-cultural adaptation (as reviewed by LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1993).

Children of sojourners, immigrants, and refugees share several commonalities. Living part of their developmental years outside their home country, they do not have a choice in geographical moves because of their position in their family. These transitions, at times, can make it difficult to establish a cultural identity. However, whereas families of immigrants and refugees generally aim to create a new life in a new country, sojourner families' aim is to return to the home culture (Useem & Cottrell, 1996).

As there is an assumption of returning home, children of sojourners may employ different acculturation strategies than those used by children of immigrants and refugees. For example, bicultural competence may be more problematic for children who have spent most of their childhood and/or adolescence outside their home country because they may have little or no direct experience of their home culture. Children who experience frequent geographical moves may experience more difficulty learning important cultural norms of their home culture.

Culture and Development

The developmental years of a child's life are important in consolidating a sense of self, understanding social nuance, and consolidating a cultural identity. Erikson's (1963) eight step model of psychosocial stages supports the idea that each person is confronted with a unique set of environmental, social, and interpersonal challenges throughout life. The successful achievement through each stage leads to the attainment of new skills and maturation. According to Erikson, five of the eight stages generally occur between birth and adolescence. Although Erikson's model is based on Western developmental norms, it is, nevertheless, useful in illustrating that a person's formative years are important in the development of cognition, social skills, and identity.

Other developmental theorists support the idea that learning occurs through social environment. Cultural nuances, behaviors, and values that are shared by a group of people are acquired during childhood. Vygotsky (1986) argued that cognitive development can only be understood within a social framework and the context of culture. Children learn by interacting with social environmental agents. Social learning theory supports the idea that learning is a result of observing and imitating other people's behavior though modeling (Bandura, 1965). Personal factors, social and cultural environments during development play equally important roles in a child's acquiring of social and cultural everyday life competency (Bandura, 2002). More exposure to the host country's culture is likely to lead children to gain a better cultural understanding of that society (Armes & Ward, 1989), often leading the child to internalize values and behaviors from the host culture (such as in social relationships, dating and gender roles).

Confronted with frequent moves, the child may not learn the important intricacies of cultural nuances, such as mannerisms, language, and social skills; in essence, how that culture "works" for either home or host cultures. This can be problematic for finding a cultural home and developing an ethnic and cultural identity, which may include belonging to a cultural community with set themes, traditions, and well defined in-groups and out-groups (Phinney, 1990; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). These cross-cultural experiences may hinder a child's development in belonging to one specific group, and basic psychological needs of relatedness may not be met (Downie, Koestner, ElGeledi, & Cree, 2004). Thus, the culture that they may have been raised to identify as "home" by their parents is not familiar to them, yet neither is the culture in which they live (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). Children of sojourners may differ from children of immigrants in that they may approach each cultural environment with different acculturation strategies and they might employ such acculturation strategies more frequently.

8

Furthermore, sociologists have also observed the emergence of a cross-cultural subculture in this particular population (see Pollock & Van Reken, 2001; Useem & Cottrell, 2001).

Third Culture Kids

Drs. John and Ruth Useem (2001; tckworld.com retrieved May 24, 2007) observed sojourners in India and hypothesized that the children developed a unique cultural identity that did not align with either their parents' home country culture or the host country culture (Podolsky, 2005; Pollock & Van Reken, 2001; Useem & Cottrell, 1996). They created the term third culture kid (TCK) to describe children and adolescents of sojourners who lived and worked overseas in a variety of roles (e.g., diplomat, missionary, businesspeople, and educators; Pollock & Van Reken, 2001;Useem & Cottrell, 1996). In their revision of the TCK definition, Pollock and Van Reken (1999) said not only that TCKs are those children who live a significant proportion of their developmental years outside their home culture, but also that:

> The TCK builds relationships to all of the cultures, while not having full ownership in any. Although elements from each culture are assimilated into the TCK's life experience, the sense of belonging is in relationship to others of similar background (p. 19).

Thus, the home culture (first culture) along with the host (second culture) resulted in a third culture, which is neither host nor home. The Useems labeled this phenomenon as an *interstital* culture because it seemed to them that there existed a culture between cultures.

In early cross-cultural studies of TCKs, Useem and Useem (as cited by Pollock & Van Reken, 2001) observed that expatriates generally lived clustered together within their own social networks (such as military bases and missionary compounds), connected through a common institutional activity, be it religious, military, governmental or businesses. Today, more fluid interactions exist between sojourners and host cultures, and sojourners now spend less and less

time in well-defined culturally pocketed communities (Gerner et al., 1992; Pollock & Van Reken, 2001).

Although the term TCK is one of the most commonly used to describe children who experience a cross-culturally mobile childhood, other terms have been created to describe experiences similar to TCKs. Some are related to more specific subsets of TCKs, such as military brats (specifically those children of U.S. military parents living abroad) and missionary kids (MKs, to describe children of missionary parents living abroad). Some are related to country of origin, such as Norway's "suit-case children" (Pirinen, 2002) and Japan's "Kaigai/Kikoki-shijo." (Podolsky, 2005). Furthermore, global nomads (people who lived outside their parents' country of origin during childhood or adolescence because of their parent's occupation; "What is a Global Nomad?" n.d.), cross-cultural children, internationally mobile adolescents, and international school students (Gerner & Perry, 2000) are also terms that have been used interchangeably in the literature focusing on cross-cultural childhood experiences. The term TCK was explored in this study because it is one of the first terms coined and because of its colloquial use in the international community.

<center>Consequences of a Cross-cultural Childhood</center>

Most of the multicultural and bicultural literature focuses on ethnicity, immigration, and acculturation. Although this body of research is useful in explaining the psychological issues of bicultural individuals, formal TCK empirical studies help in understanding childhood cross-cultural experiences more fully. Although most of the information about cross-culturally mobile children stems from a rich anecdotal literature, there are a few very specific studies (Cottrell & Useem, 1999; Gerner & Perry, 2000; Gerner, Perry, Moselle, & Archbold, 1992; Pollock & Van

Recken, 1999), many of which are related to children of missionaries or military personnel (Jones & Austin, 1987; Schultz, 1986; Stringham, 1993; Viser, 1987).

Being a TCK provides several cultural benefits such as cultural sensitivity and adaptability (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Pollock & Van Recken, 2001; Useem & Cottrell, 1996). For example, U.S. adolescents living overseas considered themselves more tolerant of others' cultural diversity (Gerner et al., 1992), reported less racial prejudice, and showed more compassion towards others (Viser, 1987). They are more likely to volunteer for social causes and relate more easily to a diverse set of people (Useem & Cottrell, 1996). They reported seeking out situations that might broaden their experiences, often becoming keen observers and quickly understanding unwritten rules by which members of a culture live (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). They are more likely to engage more of themselves in experiencing an event and develop an appreciation and knowledge of a range of cultures, not just their host and home cultures (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001).

In one study, internationally mobile adolescents wished to maintain a geographical mobile lifestyle (Gerner et al., 1992), and the experience of living abroad was crucial in developing an interest in international careers among women (Gerner & Perry, 2000). This desire to be active in the international community usually continues into adulthood (Useem & Cottrell, 1996). Useem and Cottrell (1996) found that about 80% of TCKs in their sample ($N > 600$) earned a bachelors degree and that most held managerial and high standing administrative positions. TCKs are often bilingual and find it easy to learn new languages (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). Even in adolescence, they have a greater desire to learn other languages compared to those who experienced a higher monocultural upbringing. This desire and interest in travel was even stronger in those TCKs born outside of the U.S. (Gerner et al., 1992).

Useem and Cottrell (1996) found that TCKs have broad worldviews shown as a desire to be connected to a larger world. They are socialized to participate in diverse cultural settings, and such an expanded worldview helps them see that one situation can be observed from many different perspectives (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). Pollock and Van Reken (2001) describe TCKs as *cultural chameleons*. Like a chameleon that changes color to blend with its environment, TCKs change their behavior by incorporating mannerisms, nuances, and speech to match the cultural setting in which they find themselves. Adapting one's behavior to display more culturally appropriate behaviors is also known as cross-cultural code-switching (Molinsky, 2007).

Although Gerner et al. (1992) found that internationally mobile adolescents reported feeling closer to their families due to a shared international history than did their monocultural U.S. counterparts, and Viser (1987) found that missionary children displayed strong sibling relationships, TCKs may experience difficulty adjusting to their home culture upon return. Reentry into the home culture was associated with a decline of family cohesiveness (Stringham, 1993). Interestingly, Schultz (1986) found that second and third born (birth order) TCKs experienced less difficulty adjusting to their home country upon return when they had lived in the host country for five years or less than those who had lived there longer.

Exposure to cultural experiences can also influence psychological development and well-being. The demand placed on many TCKs to be independent at an early age may lead them to experience earlier psychological maturation and resilience (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001) and to respond to hardships in a more mature manner (Viser, 1987). Useem and Cottrell (1996) found that TCKs are prone to experience a delayed adolescence, taking longer to become adjusted to

life upon return to their home country. They are apt to be more tolerant and flexible when facing diversity and ambiguity, developing problem-solving skills (Useem & Cottrell, 1996).

The benefits to a cross-cultural upbringing come at the cost of feeling culturally rootless (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001) and suspended between cultures (Useem & Cottrell, 1996). It may be difficult for TCKs to identify with a cultural home, which suggests that they may feel culturally homeless, as defined by Vivero & Jenkins (1999). In one study Useem and Cottrell (1996) found that only one tenth of adult TCKs felt attuned to everyday life in the U.S. In another study, Useem, Useem, Cottrell, & Jordan (1993) found that three-quarters of TCKs feel culturally different from individuals without overseas experience. Stringham (1993) found that TCKs who returned to their home country reported grieving over loss of everyday overseas life. The contradictions of home and hosts' cultural values that the child may experience growing up may lead to confusion and ambivalence regarding his or her cultural identities in adulthood (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001; Viser, 1987). Although TCKs reported feeling different from others, they did not report feeling isolated or adrift (Useem & Cottrell, 1996) as for marginalized individuals in some acculturation literature (Berry, 1990; LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1993) or culturally homeless (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). A consistent theme in the TCK literature is the struggle for a sense of belonging to one cultural or ethnic group, feelings of rootlessness, and a need for a cultural home (Pollock & Van Reken, 1999).

Cultural Homelessness and Cultural Uncertainty

Cultural homelessness is a framework proposed by Vivero & Jenkins (1999) that describes individuals who feel a lack of cultural or ethnic group membership, emotional detachment from any cultural group, and a need for a cultural home. Those individuals that experience multiple cultural frameworks may be at risk for developing cultural homelessness.

This includes not only individuals whose family moves geographically during childhood, but also racially or ethnically mixed individuals. Culturally homeless individuals may have multiple minority status, even making their cultural, ethnic or racial identity different from that of their parents (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999).

Culturally homeless individuals live in a framework that may include experiences, feelings, and thoughts that do not belong to any specific cultural reference group (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). Not belonging to and not being accepted by any group moves them consistently into out-groups, "always a minority wherever they go" (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999, p. 12). Because culturally homeless individuals lack an ethnic enclave or a community with which to identify, they lack a cultural home. They may experience a strong yearning to "go home," but home is no one place (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999).

TCKs, like culturally homeless individuals, face a unique challenge in consolidating cultural and ethnic group memberships (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). As with the theoretical model of cultural homelessness, TCKs may lack the formal cultural and ethnic groups necessary when living between cultures to uphold one as their own, and may live in a state of being in a constant cultural out-group (Podolsky, 2005; Useem, 1999; Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). TCKs show a strong desire to find a cultural home (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001)

Uncertainty arises when there is a disagreement of beliefs, attitudes, feelings, and behaviors with people who are considered to be "similar" to oneself (Hogg & Mullins, 1999). In the case of TCKs, their monocultural peers in both home and host cultures might be the expected group in which to belong. However, because of their upbringing, they may have internalized thoughts, beliefs, worldviews, and behaviors of their host country, creating a gap between the

14

home culture and themselves yet never being fully accepted as a member of the host culture because of their minority status.

Unlike culturally homeless individuals, who may live in a continued state of cultural uncertainty, it is possible that TCKs recognize their unique qualities and categorize themselves by identifying with those who also lack cultural attachment. Schaetti (2000) hypothesized a developmental model for a global nomad identity (similar to TCK framework) stating that global nomads and TCKs have complex cultural developmental experiences which set them apart from those who have not undergone such experiences. However, the result of such experiences is an incongruent cultural identity. Therefore, terms as global Nomad or TCK, not only offer a label that validates their childhood experiences but also help negotiate an ambivalent cultural identity. Schaetti (2000) states that introduction of such labels is a crucial moment in the formation of their development of identity.

There is some evidence that a TCK identity exists and that others with a similar childhood experience are attracted to such a label. There are several interest groups on www.facebook.com which cater to TCKs, Global Nomads, International School Kids, and Military Brats. The Facebook group, Third Culture Kids Everywhere has more than 16,000 members (Retrieved November 1, 2008 from www.facebook.com). The social networking website, www.myspace.com also has similar cyber social groups. Hundreds of blogs exist that are dedicated to the international sojourner community. Individuals consistently label and present themselves as TCKs or as having another similar cross-cultural label. In some cases, definitional boundaries exist between TCKs and non-TCKs illustrating a possible in-group/out-group dynamic. For example, a sojourner in Africa says of a fellow sojourner that she may have lived in that country for a while, but is not really a TCK (Koteskey, 2003).

The use of labels such as TCK, global nomad, and others may offer individuals who experienced a cross-cultural childhood and who may be at risk for cultural homelessness a group to which they may belong. Categorizing themselves into social groups may be a beneficial action to reduce cultural uncertainty and help TCKs make sense of their social world by fulfilling their need for a meaningful existence (Hogg & Mullin, 1999).

Present Study and Hypothesis

The literature on cross-cultural childhood experiences supports the argument that TCKs feel suspended between cultures (Pollock & Van Reken), which can lead to cultural uncertainty (Hogg & Mullins, 1999) and cultural homelessness (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). This can be problematic because it is associated with sensing less perceived control over one's life (Hogg & Abrams, 1999) and the need for belonging and attachment is not met (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

As a mechanism to reduce cultural uncertainty, these individuals may attempt to categorize their social world (Turner, 1982) and to find a place to which they can belong (Hogg & Mullins, 1999). Such categorization can be helpful in consolidating an identity. Identity is a multifaceted construct that involves labels, social affirmation and categorization. It is also party shaped by how individuals define themselves in terms of their relationships to others and to social groups (Brewer & Gardner, 1996) and by how others perceive them (Coley, 2004).

The purpose of this study was to address how self-labeling and self-categorization into cross-cultural identities (CCI) might promote positive self-esteem, even when individuals experience cultural homelessness. CCIs are loosely defined identities, such as TCKs, global nomads, military brats, overseas brats, diplo brats, missionary kids, expat kid, and so forth, which offer a label for an individuals' childhood cross-cultural experience. Such labels may be

16

indicative of a common social identity. Because a cross-cultural, geographically mobile childhood and adolescence might affect attachment to a mainstream cultural group in adulthood, such CCI labels might help reduce cultural ambiguity. It is important to establish whether these culturally ambiguous groups exist and if so, whether self-categorization into a CCI helps one reap psychological benefits (self-esteem) that arise from belonging to said group(s).

Coley (2004) argued that identity is shaped in part by language, thus, labels provide a linguistic representation of identity (Hatch & Schultz, 2004) and possibility of social self-categorization. In this study, CCI is addressed in three ways: strength of commitment to a CCI, self-categorization to the TCK CCI, and sharing similar cross-cultural experiences with social networks. First, CCIs will be addressed by evaluating the strength of affirmation, belonging and commitment that participants feel to any CCI. Stronger feelings of commitment may indicate the formation of a CCI. Second, because the TCK label is the most frequently used in this cross-cultural literature, it was chosen among other CCI labels for assessing belonging. Self-categorization as a TCK addresses dichotomous attachment to labels. Third, one aspect of the TCK construct as proposed by Pollock and Van Reken (1999) is that a TCK's sense of belonging is with others of a similar background and experiences. Therefore, the level of multicultural experience of friends and family as perceived by the participant might be important for assessing common cultural experiences and social aspects of group membership.

It was anticipated that although adults with cross-cultural childhood experiences may not feel full membership to any specific culture, CCI might lead them to benefit from a higher level of self-esteem than those who experience CH and do not have a CCI to which belong. Specifically, it was hypothesized that:

17

1. Participants who report low CH would report high self-esteem; high CH reporters would report low self-esteem.

2. Participants who report more affirmation, belonging and commitment toward a CCI would report lower CH scores.

3. Those who score higher on affirmation, belonging and commitment to a CCI would also score higher on self-esteem.

4. Those who consider themselves TCKs would report higher levels of self-esteem than those who do not.

5. CCI would have a buffering effect on CH and self-esteem. Those with a CCI would be studied in several ways using three different moderator variables: representing CCI affirmation, belonging and commitment; TCK self-categorization; and close social network's cross-cultural experience..

It was hypothesized that of the three CCI variables, TCK self-categorization and cross-cultural relationships would act as a stronger moderator than affirmation, belonging and commitment to a CCI in CH and non-CH participants.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Individuals who spent more than two years on one or more occasions in a culture that was not a parent's home culture (as children, younger than age 18) and later returned to their parent's home culture were asked to complete the survey. Although the initial intention of the study was to recruit an estimated 100 participants, 520 inviduals provided data that were originally downloaded into SPSS directly from the online survey program (ZOPE). However, only 475 met the selection criteria for this study. There were 19 individuals who spent less than two years abroad, 22 individuals whose first moving age was sixteen or older (thus not completing two years abroad before the age of 18), and 4 participants who had significant missing data (> 80%).

The mean age of the final sample of 475 was 42.6 *(SD* = 14.7; see Table 2). There were 301 females (63.4%) and 174 males (36.6 %). Married individuals made up 59.9% (*n* = 280) of the sample, 28.2% (*n* = 134) reported being single, 6.5% (*n* = 31) said they were divorced, 2.7% (*n* = 13) indicated currently living with a partner, and 3.7% (*n* = 17) were engaged, widowed, or separated (see Table 3).

A large majority of the participants had completed some form of post-secondary education (see Table 3). Whereas 28.0% (*n* = 133) had completed some university, 34.3% (*n* = 163) had an undergraduate or similar degree and 30.1% (*n* = 144) finished either a master or doctoral level of education. Only 6.1% (*n* = 29) of the sample participants held a secondary degree, and 1.3% (*n* = 6) did not complete a secondary schooling level. One participant reported "other" for education.

Family occupation, which are a main reason for a familys' cross-cultural relocation, were represented in this sample by 39.6% ($n = 188$) from the U.S. military force (i.e., U.S. Air Force, Army, Marines, Navy), 29.1% ($n = 138$) from missionary organizations, 9.7% ($n = 46$) from international business organizations, 5.5% ($n = 26$) were part of a diplomatic corps, 4.2% ($n = 20$) were from a government agency, 2.9% ($n = 14$) were part of a non-governmental agency (NGO) and 9.1% ($n = 43$) designated their family occupation as "other" (see Table 3).

A large percentage of the sample (90.1%, $n = 428$) reported belonging to one racial group. Only 8.6% ($n = 41$) were biracial, and .8% ($n = 4$) of participants belonged to three or more racial groups. Two participants (.4%) left the question blank. Of the monoracial participants, 4.7% ($n = 20$) were of Asian descent, 1.6% ($n = 7$) reported being of Black or African descent, 1.2% ($n = 5$) were of Native American or Indigenous to the Americas, 90.9% ($n = 389$) were White or of European descent, 0.2% ($n = 1$) reported their race as unknown and 1.5% ($n = 6$) reported their race as "other." Of the multiracial group, 100% ($n = 45$) reported at least one race as White. The most common second race was Native American or Indigenous to the Americas ($n = 23$), followed by Asian ($n = 15$), Black ($n = 3$), Pacific Islander ($n = 2$) and other ($n = 7$).

The mean age of the first move was 5.6 years *(SD = 4.63, $n = 474$; see Table 2)*. Of the 475 participants, 93.9% ($n = 446$) provided information concerning the time they spent in a foreign country during their childhood. The mean time spent abroad during childhood was 9.5 years *(SD = 5.22; see Table 2)*. The distribution was somewhat platykurtic (kurtosis = -1.32) and no one age of first move was found to be most typical.

The mean number of international moves was 2.4 *(SD = 1.52)*. The modal number of moves was one (36.6%; n = 174), 25.9% ($n = 123$) of the sample participants reported moving

twice, 15.6% ($n = 74$) reported three moves, 9.1% ($n = 43$) reported four moves, 6.1% ($n = 29$) reported 5 moves and 6.7% ($n = 32$) reported six or more moves (see Table 2).

The majority of the sample participants (83.4%; $n = 396$) reported possessing one citizenship. The rest of the sample was comprised of 13.1% ($n = 62$) who reported possessing two citizenships, and 2.9% ($n = 14$) reported three or more citizenships. Three people (.6%) left this question blank (see Table 3).

Most participants spoke at least two languages before the age of 18. The modal languages spoken was two (45.9%; $n = 218$). Monolingual participants comprised 22.8% ($n = 107$) of the sample, trilingual participants made up 20.3% ($n = 95$), 7.7% ($n = 36$) reported speaking four languages, and 2.7% ($n = 13$) reported speaking five or more languages (see Table 3).

Of the sample of 475 participants, 71.4% ($n = 339$) reported a phrase or label that described their childhood cross-cultural experiences or a CCI. Of those, 310 participants offered a label. Of these, 33.2% ($n = 103$) labeled themselves as military brats (or similar variations such as army brat, air force brat, overseas brat, GI brat), 23.2% ($n = 72$) labeled themselves relative to TCK (including ATCKs, adult third culture kids), 14.2% ($n = 44$) labeled themselves as missionary kids (including MKs), 12.9% ($n = 40$) labeled themselves relative to an intercultural or multicultural arena (i.e., Mestizo cultural, multicultural, traveled), 5.5% ($n = 17$) offered some type of ethnic label (i.e., Hispanic, American, Greek), 2.3% ($n = 7$) labeled themselves as global nomads, 1.0% ($n = 3$) offered the label of diplokids or diplobrats, 7.8% ($n = 24$) were incorporated in a miscellaneous category which included those who described themselves as being "rootless" or without a group (see Table 3).

Of the sample of 475 participants, 56.5% ($n = 268$) had heard the phrase "third culture kid" or "TCK." Of those who had heard the phrase, 88.5% ($n = 238$) considered themselves to be

adult TCKs. Of the sample of 475 participants, 55.6% ($n = 264$) had heard the phrase "global nomad." Of those that had heard the phrase, 53.8% ($n = 143$) considered themselves adult global nomads.

Most of the participant recruiting occurred through a snowball-like design. Emails were sent to individuals who met criteria for the study and were asked to circulate these to those who did. Members of organizations who work directly with international sojourners were contacted and asked to post a blog or publish the survey information in newsletters of Websites (such as www.membercare.org, Ecolint alumni Newsletter, www.tckid.com, Among World blog). Announcements were posted on www.facebook.com interest groups and military and international school alumni organizations were contacted. Individuals and organizations who received the standard email voluntarily forwarded the survey's web address at their discretion. See Table 1 for more information.

<div align="center">Procedure</div>

Participants were invited to complete an anonymous online survey in English, which was available at the researcher's institution's online server, https://web2survey.unt.edu. Participants were directed to an initial page that briefly explained the study, overviewed confidentiality, participant rights and possible risks. It was anticipated that individuals completing the survey would experience minimal risk. Although no participants have reported this concern, they were encouraged to do so if they experienced discomfort as a result from completing the survey. Their consent to participate was required before continuing onto the survey. An opportunity was given to those participants who wished to enter a drawing. Eight participants were selected at random and sent $50 gift certificates from www.amazon.com, an online retailer. Participants emailed

their contact information to an account that was created specifically for this purpose. Their contact information was kept separate from their responses for confidentiality purposes.

Measures

The website allowed data collection for both self-rating scales and open-ended questions. Although several other measures were included in the questionnaire, for the purpose of the present study, only measures of demographic background information, self-labels and self-categorization, cultural homelessness, strength of affirmation, belonging and commitment to a CCI, and self esteem were used.

The General Demographics Questionnaire (GDQ). Self-descriptive information and demographic data included gender, age, marital status, family occupation while abroad, and highest level of education attained, as well as open-ended questions regarding racial, ethnic and cultural background (see Appendix A). They were asked detailed questions regarding geographical moves, time spent in each location, age of first move, and type of overseas community in which they resided, number of languages spoken and number of citizenships.

Childhood cross-cultural experiences questions. Questions regarding familiarity of the TCK and Global Nomad CCI label, and the benefits and challenges of a cross-culturally mobile childhood were asked to further explore the participants' cross-cultural experiences. For some questions, participants were asked to describe elements of their personal experience in their own words. For example, "What benefits and difficulties would you say arise from your experience living in a culture(s) different from that of your parents?" and "What communities and/or cultures do you feel you belong to, identify with, and would like to be accepted by as a member?" Questions such as "Have you ever heard of the term 'Third Culture Kid'? If so, do you consider yourself an adult 'Third Culture Kid'?" were asked to assess for familiarity,

knowledge and self-categorization to the TCK CCI. Similar questions were also asked of the CCI term, Global Nomad (see Appendix A).

Cultural Homelessness Criteria Items (CH; Vivero, 1999). This 14-item theory-based self-report scale measures three specific domains of cultural belonging: feelings of not belonging to any group, struggles to determine ethnic group membership, and lack of emotional attachment to any particular cultural group (Vivero, 1999; see Appendix A). The three subscales used in this study included Ethnic/Cultural Identity Conflicts & Rejection, 2. Lack of Membership and Attachment to any Ethnic/Cultural Groups and Need for a Cultural Home. Sample items for the Ethnic/cultural identity conflict and rejection subscale included "I struggle to determine where I belong ethnically or culturally," and "I don't feel culturally 'at home' anywhere I go." Sample items for the subscale Lack of Membership and Attachment to any Ethnic/Cultural Groups included "When I think which ethnic or cultural group I mostly act or think like, I cannot find one," and "No one ethnic group label accurately describes me." Finally, the third subscale, Need for a Cultural Home, is comprised of one item, "Finding a cultural home is important to me."

Individuals were considered CH when each of three domains were met to a moderate degree (higher than a mean score of 3 on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale). Ratings ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The three subscales showed discriminant validity in the initial development of this measure. Vivero (1999) reported Cronbach's alphas of .84 and .71 for Subscales 1 and 2, respectively, and overall interitem correlations of .33 to .78. Inter-scale correlations ranged from .33 to .46.

Reliability analysis for this study was conducted on the three subscales separately. Subscale 1, Ethnic/Cultural Identity Conflicts & Rejection, had a Cronbach's alpha of .85, with interitem correlations ranging from .32 to .65. No significant increase in reliability would occur

24

if an item were to be deleted. Subscale 2, Lack of Membership and Attachment to any Ethnic/Cultural Group had a Cronbach's alpha of .83 with interitem correlations ranging from .27 to .75. Again, no significant increase in reliability would occur if an item were to be deleted. Subscale 1 and Subscale 2 were strongly correlated (r = .77, p < .001). The single-item subscale 3, Need for a Cultural Home, was correlated with items on the other two subscales between -.18 and .17. Furthermore, the correlations between this item and Subscale 1 and Subscale 2 were .10 (*p* < .05) and -.07 (*p* > .05), respectively (see Table 4).

Although both interitem correlations and inter-scale correlations for the subscale 3 item were particularly low and orthogonal to the other scale items, it is central to the theory. As CH criteria are conceptualized as an index, not a scale, high inter-scale correlations are not required (Streiner, 2003).

Based on Vivero's (1999) scoring of CH, the final categorical CH scale consisted of presence of CH (moderate score of 3 or above) on all three scales. New variables were created which reflected the mean categorical and continuous CH scales. The continuous CH score was calculated by taking the mean of the scores of all three scales. Vivero's (1999) original calculation for CH consisted of categorical and continuous scores, however, it was noted that future research should explore the use of continuous CH score because less variance is lost than when using a continuous variable. The point biserial correlation between the categorical CH and the continuous CH score was .68 (*p* < .001)

Self Label Identity Measure (*SLIM*). Items to assess affirmation, belonging, and commitment to a self-labeled CCI were drawn from the Multigroup Ethic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992). This new modified scale was named Self Label Identity Measure (SLIM). The MEIM was originally developed to assess ethnic identity and consisted of two

factors: Ethnic Identity Search and Affirmation, Belonging, and Commitment. Cronbach's alphas

for Affirmation, Belonging, and Commitment ranged between .81 - .92 in past studies

(Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzzy & Sava, 2003). Only this second factor was used for the

creation of the SLIM.

The directions and seven questions from the affirmation, belonging and commitment

scale were adapted to allow participants to name a label or a CCI (such as TCK, Global Nomads

and Military Brats) rather than directing them to name an ethnic group (see Appendix A for

SLIM questions). The directions for this scale were changed to:

"Most people belong to one or more social groups, communities, or networks. There

 might be several ways to describe people who have had a variety of cross-cultural

experiences. Is there a particular label that you feel best describes a group that

encompasses your childhood cross-cultural experience? If so, what is that?

Only participants who answered "yes" to having a CCI label were asked to complete the

SLIM. Those who answered "no" were directed to skip this section (see Table 4). A new variable

was created which reflected the mean of SLIM scores. A Cronbach's alpha of .90 was found for

the seven items in this study. Interitem correlations ranged from .38 to .75. No significant

increase in reliability would occur if an item were to be deleted.

Social-Interpersonal Networks' Cross-cultural Experience (SINCE). The SINCE was

created to evaluate whether participants' family and peers (close social networks) underwent

similar cross-cultural experiences as themselves. The SINCE score was derived from the

question, "List initials and relationship (i.e. mother, brother, friend, spouse) of those who you

feel are closest to you" and "Now go back and indicate on a scale from 1 to 5, what level of

cross-cultural/multicultural experiences you perceive they have." Participants were asked to rate

three individuals with whom they felt close. Cross-cultural experience scores were 1 (*limited*), 2 (*somewhat limited*), 3 (*lived for a brief time in another country*), 4 (*lived for an extended period of time in another country during adulthood*) and 5 (*lived for an extended period of time in another country during their childhood or adolescence*; see Appendix A). The average of three highest ratings was taken as a summary score.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1989). The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale is a 10-item self-report scale that measures participants' own feelings regarding their self-worth, relevant to their psychological well-being (see Appendix A). Questions are rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A new variable were created which reflected the mean of self-esteem scores (after reversing 5 items). Test-retest reliability for this scale has been found to be between .82 and .88 and the reliability found for this particular scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .77 - .99 in the past (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). The present study found a Cronbach's alpha of .89 with interitem correlations ranging from .24 to .74 for all 10 items. No significant increase in reliability would occur if an item were to be deleted (see Table 4).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Descriptive Analysis

The data matrix was visually inspected for missing data. Distributions were checked for outliers and normality. Frequencies, means, standard deviations, kurtosis, and skewness were calculated for demographic, independent, and dependent variables as appropriate. Graphs were created to visually assess normality and unusual patterns of responses. There was no variable with significant missing data. Except for self-esteem and the Self-Label Identity Measure (SLIM), which revealed ceiling effects, there were no other unusual patterns of responses.

The mean response of the first Cultural Homelessness (CH) scale, Ethnic/Cultural Identity Conflicts & Rejection was 2.59 (*SD* = .93). The mean response for the second scale, Lack of Membership and Attachment to Any Ethnic/Cultural Groups, was 2.58 (*SD* = .99). The mean response for the third single-item scale, Need for a Cultural Home, was 3.57 (*SD* = 1.07). Mean scores higher than 3 (on a scale from 1-5) indicated the presence of CH (0 = absence; 1 = presence) on that particular scale. In this sample, 22.3% (*n* = 106) of participants scored a 3 or higher on all three CH scales (see Table 4).

There were 339 participants (71.4%) who responded to the seven questions on the Self Label Identity Measure (SLIM) regarding feelings of group belonging to a chosen CCI (cross-cultural identity). The mean response on all items was 3.55 (*SD* = .53; see Table 4). The distribution of means was negatively skewed (skewness = -1.36) and leptokurtic (kurtosis = 2.00), revealing a ceiling effect. About 50% of participants mean on the SLIM was between 3.7 and 4.

In the sample of 475 participants, there were 238 (50%) who considered themselves TCKs. The sample mean for the SINCE (Social-Interpersonal Networks' Cross-cultural Experience) was 3.72 (*SD* = 1.0). About 50% of cases fell between 4 and 5 (see Table 4).

The mean response on the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale was 4.39 (*SD* = .65). The distribution was negatively skewed (skewness = -1.34) and leptokurtic (kurtosis = 1.54), revealing a ceiling effect. The majority of the scores fell at a higher range of this scale and showed little variability among high scores (see Table 4).

<p align="center">Relationships Among Demographic, Independent and Dependent Variables</p>

Bivariate correlations were run to identify relationships among variables and any demographic confounding variables. Significant relationships were found between demographic, cultural experiences and scale variables (see Table 5 & 6). Older participants tended to reach higher levels of education (*r* = .26, *p* <.001), be more committed to a CCI (*r* = .15, *p* = .006), have higher levels of self-esteem (*r* = .28, *p* <.001) and display less CH (*r* = -.38, *p* <.001). Younger participants tended to be more multiracial (*r* = -.10, *p* <.03), spend more time abroad (*r* = -.35, *p* <.001), possess more citizenships (*r* = -.23, *p* <.001), speak more languages, (*r* = -.13, *p* = .004), have relationships with people with more cross-cultural experience (*r* = -.13, *p* = .04) and consider themselves TCKs or Global Nomads (*r* = -.40, *p* < .001; *r* = -.11, *p* = .02).

Women tended to spend more time abroad (*r* = .13, *p* = .007), consider themselves Global Nomads (*r* = .12, *p* = .01) and report lower self-esteem (*r* = -.11, *p* = .02). A higher level of education was related to being monoracial (*r* = -.10, *p* = .03), but having less commitment to a CCI (*r* = -.14; *p* = .008). Higher levels of education was also related to higher self-esteem (*r* = .12, *p* = .009). Multiracial participants reported higher CH (*r* = .15, *p* = .001) and lower self-esteem (*r* = -.12, *p* = .007).

Geographical cross-cultural mobility also revealed significant relationships. More time spent abroad was related with more moves ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), more citizenships ($r = .20$, $p < .001$) and being multilingual ($r = .20$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, those who spent more time abroad were more inclined to consider themselves TCKs ($r = .30$, $p < .001$), report higher CH ($r = .19$, $p < .001$), and lower self-esteem ($r = -.10$, $p = .03$). More cross-cultural moves were related to more citizenships ($r = .15$, $p = .001$), knowing more languages ($r = .24$, $p = .001$), and higher commitment to any CCI ($r = .11$, $p = .04$). Possessing more citizenships and speaking more languages was related to CH ($r = .22$, $p < .001$; $r = .18$, $p < .001$).

Cross-cultural self-labels, self-categorization to CCIs and strength of commitment to CCIs revealed significant findings. Those who reported a CCI tended to consider themselves TCKs and/or Global Nomads ($r = .19$, $p < .001$; $r = .15$, $p = .001$). Those who considered themselves TCKs also tended to consider themselves Global Nomads ($r = .29$, $p > 001$). Considering oneself a Global Nomad or a TCK also revealed significant relationships related to cross-cultural experiences. Participants who considered themselves Global Nomads and/or TCKs reported more time spent abroad ($r = .14$, $p = .002$; $r = .30$, $p < .001$), more relationships with people with cross-cultural experience ($r = .12$, $p = .005$; $r = .21$, $p < .001$) and more CH ($r = .21$, $p < .001$; $r = .34$, $p < .001$) than non-TCKs or non-Global Nomads. TCKs also reported more citizenships ($r = .12$, $p < .001$) and lower self-esteem ($r = -.23$, $p < .001$), but Global Nomads reported more cross-cultural moves ($r = .12$, $p = .01$), knowing more languages ($r = .14$, $p = .002$) and more commitment to a CCI ($r = .22$, $p < .001$).

Plan for Hypothesis Tests

Correlations and *t*-tests were planned to test Hypotheses 1-4 and Baron and Kenny's (1986) approach for testing moderator variables was implemented for Hypothesis 5. However, as

reported above, bivariate correlations were run to identify any demographic confounding

variables before hypotheses were tested. Significant relationships were found among age, self-

esteem, CH, and SLIM scores (see Table 5). Because of these relationships, partial correlations

controlling for age, rather than bivariate correlations, were used to test Hypotheses 1-3. A

univariate Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) with age controlled, rather than a t-test, was a

more suitable analysis to test differences in the level of self-esteem for those who do or do not

consider themselves TCKs and for those who are or are not CH (Hypotheses 1 & 4). Age, race,

and time spent abroad were demographic covariates entered into hypothesis 4 and only age was

entered into hypothesis 1. Age was entered as step one of all regression equations in Hypothesis

5. These modifications from the original data analysis plan were incorporated to remove any

confounds that age and other demographic variables might have with the results.

A post-hoc power analysis indicated that small effect sizes can be detected with high

power levels (power = .80, p = .05) for correlations, multiple regressions, and ANOVAs (Cohen,

1992).

To test Hypothesis 5, Baron and Kenny's (1986) approach to evaluating moderator

variables was used as a guide to evaluate three possible moderating variables affecting the

association between CH (independent variable) and self-esteem (dependent variable). These

three all represented the broader construct of cultural identity conflicts, membership and

attachment to cultural groups and the need for a cultural home. In this analysis both self-esteem

and CH are continuous variables. Of the three models, SLIM and SINCE scores were both

continuous moderating variables. However, considering oneself a TCK or not was a

dichotomous, categorical variable. Therefore, two different approaches were taken to test for

moderation depending on whether the moderator was a continuous or categorical variable.

31

Baron and Kenny (1986) emphasize that before running a moderator analysis, the independent and dependent variable should be uncorrelated with the moderating variable so as to provide support for the moderation effect. The correlation between SLIM and self-esteem scores and the SLIM scores and CH was significant ($r = .22$, $p < .001$ and $r = -.20$, $p < .001$, respectively). Significant point biserial correlations were found between TCK self-categorization and CH, and TCK self-categorization and self-esteem ($r = .34$, $p < .001$, $r = -.23$, $p < .001$ respectively). SINCE scores were not correlated with CH or self-esteem.

Although two moderating variables revealed significant relationships with the independent and dependent variable, age might be a likely factor in explaining these relationships. Age was significantly correlated with CH scores, SLIM, and self-esteem scores ($r = -.38$, $p < .001$; $r = .15$, $p = .05$; $r = .28$, $p < .001$, respectively). Thus, age was entered into the regression equation as a first step in all three moderator analysis. Partialling age from these associations did not significantly affect the strength of the correlations (see Table 7).

To equate the means and variances of the variables for creating the multiplicative interaction term for continuous variables, CH, SLIM scores and SINCE scores were standardized and recentered (by computing z-scores for each variable and adding 10, to eliminate negative values). The interaction variable (CH * Moderator) was calculated by multiplying the standardized and recentered independent variable (CH) by the similarly transformed moderating variable. These were then into the regression analysis.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1. It was hypothesized that participants who reported low CH would report high self-esteem; high CH reporters would report self-esteem. Continuous and categorical CH scores were used in this analysis separately.

32

It was hypothesized that the continuous CH scores and self-esteem would be negatively correlated. A partial correlation was performed to determine the strength and direction of the relationship of CH and self-esteem with age as a control variable. A statistically significant negative correlation was found, r (468) = -.43, p <.001. This hypothesis was supported with a medium to large effect size (see Table 7).

It was hypothesized that the level of self-esteem would be lower for those who meet criteria for CH than for those who do not. Age was entered as covariate and controlled. Results from an ANCOVA revealed that those identified as CH *(n = 106)* scored statistically significantly lower *(F* [1, 473] = 79.27, p <.001*)* on self-esteem *(M = 3.81, SD = .76)* than those who belonged in the non-CH group *(M = 4.56, SD = .51, n = 369)*. A large effect size was found (partial eta squared = .25). These findings support the hypothesis that the level of self-esteem is lower for those who met criteria for CH than for those who are not CH even when variability due to age is controlled.

Hypothesis 2. It was thought that participants who reported more affirmation, belonging and commitment toward a CCI would report lower CH scores. It was hypothesized that CH and SLIM scores would be negatively correlated. A partial correlation was performed to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between these two variables. Age was used a control variable. A statistically significant relationship was found, r (332) = -.15, p <.01, with a small effect size. This hypothesis was supported (see Table 7).

Hypothesis 3. It was hypothesized that those who scored higher on affirmation, belonging and commitment to a CCI would also score higher on self-esteem. It was predicted that SLIM scores and self-esteem would be positively correlated. A partial correlation was performed to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between these two variables. Age was

33

used a control variable. A statistically significant relationship was found, r (332) = .18, p <.001. This hypothesis was supported with a small effect size (see Table 7).

Hypothesis 4. Self-esteem would be higher for those who considered themselves TCKs than those who did not. This hypothesis was tested by an ANCOVA with age, race and time spent abroad as control variables. Those who considered themselves TCKs *(n* = 238) scored significantly and statistically lower (*F* [1, 446] = 13.71, *p* <.001) on self-esteem *(M* = 4.24, *SD =* .72) than those who did not consider themselves TCKs (*M* = 4.54, *SD* = .54, *n* = 219). A medium effect size was found (partial eta squared = .10). Although this was a statistically significant finding, it did not support the hypothesis. The result indicated that the direction (TCKs scored lower on self-esteem) is opposite that which was originally predicted (TCKs scoring higher on self-esteem).

Hypothesis 5: Moderation analyses. CCI would moderate the association between CH and self-esteem. CCI membership was tested using three different moderator variables: SLIM scores, TCK self-categorization and SINCE scores.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to evaluate the moderating effects of the continuous moderating variables (SLIM and SINCE scores) with self-esteem as the dependent variable. Age was entered at the first step, then on the second step, both the moderating variable (either SLIM or SINCE) and the independent variable (CH) were entered, and, finally, the interaction variable on the third step. If the standardized regression coefficient (β) for the interaction was significantly different from zero (reflected by a t-test), then the moderator model would be supported.

Baron & Kenny's (1986) approach to evaluating the interaction effect of a dichotomous moderating variable (TCK self-categorization or not) was also used. Two hierarchical multiple

regression equations were calculated, one using only participants who categorize themselves as

TCKs (TCK = 1), and the other using participants who did not (TCK = 0). In both equations, age

was controlled in the first step and the independent variable (CH) entered as a second step. The

standardized regression coefficient (β) for CH in the two groups were compared for a significant

difference using a t-test.

For the first moderator, those who scored higher on CH and higher on the SLIM were

hypothesized to have higher levels of self-esteem than those who scored higher on CH and lower

on the SLIM, to a greater extent than would occur with the cumulation of main effects. Low CH

participants with high or low SLIM scores would experience levels of self-esteem similar to

those found in a normative population. When testing using Baron & Kenny's (1986) procedure,

with age entered on the first step to control for its effects, the standardized regression coefficient

for the interaction variable (SLIM * CH) was significantly different from zero (β = 1.84, p =

.002; see Table 8) with a large effect size (f^2 = .31). The findings from this analysis indicated that

strong feelings of affiliation, belonging, and commitment to a CCI act as a moderator between

CH and self-esteem explaining about 2 % of the variance (the difference in R square between

step 2 and step three equals .02). This hypothesis was supported.

Using the second moderator, categorizing oneself as an adult TCK was hypothesized to

lead to higher self-esteem despite high CH. Those who have high CH and do not self-categorize

as an adult TCK would have lower self-esteem. Those with low CH and who self-categorize as

TCKs, or those with low CH and who do not self-categorize as TCKs would experience self-

esteem that is similar to a normative population. The difference between the standardized

regression coefficient for those who consider themselves adult TCKs (β = -.40) and non-TCKs

(β = -.47) was not significant (t = -.47, p > .05; see Table 9). The findings from this analysis

indicated that considering oneself an adult TCK does not moderate the relationship between CH and self-esteem. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported.

With the third moderator, the higher the SINCE scores, the higher their hypothesized self-esteem, despite experienced CH. Those who experienced CH and had lower SINCE scores would experience lower self-esteem. Those with low CH scores would experience similar self-esteem than that of a normative population despite high or low SINCE scores. With age controlled, the standardized regression coefficient for the interaction variable $(SINCE * CH)$ on the third step was not significantly different from zero ($\beta = .13$, $p = .17$; see Table 10). The findings from this analysis indicated that having close relationships with people with a high level of cross-cultural experience did not moderate the relationship between CH and self-esteem. This hypothesis was not supported.

Summarizing the Hypothesis 5 findings, SLIM scores were found to moderate the relationship between self-esteem and CH. The higher participants scored on the SLIM, the higher their level of self-esteem despite experiencing CH. Although it was originally thought that considering oneself a TCK or having higher SINCE scores would act as a stronger moderator than the SLIM, the opposite was found.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to look at how a cross-cultural geographically mobile childhood and adolescence might affect attachment to cultural identities in adulthood and how this might be related to self-esteem. This study took varied perspectives on assessing group, self-categorization and cultural identity. Significant findings included a strong negative relationship between CH and self-esteem, a weak negative relationship between Self-Label Identity Measure (SLIM) and Cultural Homelessness (CH), and a weak positive relationship SLIM and self-esteem (See Table 7). Strength of affirmation, belonging and commitement to a CCI (as measured by SLIM scores) buffered the negative association between CH and self-esteem, but considering oneself an adult TCK or rating high SINCE scores did not.

Four out of the five hypotheses were supported; the fifth revealed an unexpected statistically significant finding which is opposite that which was predicted. Results indicated that the presence of CH and meeting full CH criteria were both related to lower self-esteem (Hypothesis 1), but higher SLIM scores, or affirmation, belonging, and commitment to a CCI, were related to lower CH (Hypothesis 2) and higher self-esteem (Hypothesis 3). Contrary to the original hypothesis, individuals who considered themselves TCKs experienced lower self-esteem than those who did not (Hypothesis 4). One out of three moderator analyses showed support for a moderator model. Affirmation, belonging, and commitment to a CCI as reflected by SLIM scores moderated the negative relationship between CH and self-esteem, whereas self-categorization to a TCK group or SINCE (Hypothesis 5) did not. Age was controlled for all hypothesis testing as it was found to be a confounding variable.

Significant relationships were found among demographic, dependent, and independent variables. Some relationships were expected; those who spent more time abroad tended to move more and at younger ages than those who spent less time abroad. Older participants were more likely to have completed higher levels of schooling. Furthermore, significant correlations revealed possible trends for this cross-cultural population. Younger participants had spent more time abroad and more of them had heard of the TCK phrase than had older adults. It is feasible that today's cross-cultural children are spending more time during their childhood abroad than children in the past. This trend might be possible because of more efficient modes of transportation, more access to international schools, homeschooling materials, and/or better level of health care in host countries. The phrase TCK might be in the process of becoming more common among a younger generation. Younger individuals considered themselves adult TCKs more often than older individuals, but they also experienced more CH and lower self-esteem. However, it should be noted some of the younger participants that were recruited primarily from www.facebook.com belonged to TCK-specific groups (i.e., "Third Culture Kids Everywhere," and "3rd Culture Kids"). This may influence how familiar younger participants were with the TCK term.

Adults who led cross-culturally mobile childhoods and adolescence are at high risk for CH (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999), which may impact an individual's sense of self. About one-fourth of the sample met criteria for CH (based on Vivero's 1999 scale criteria) which, although it was an expected finding, demonstrates the representation of participants' cross-cultural experience and a significant sample for studying CH. In addition, meeting criteria for all three CH scales placed individuals at even higher risks for lower self-esteem than meeting criteria for only one or two. The relationship of CH and self-esteem was an important aspect of this study because this

38

finding supported a previous study of college students in Texas (Vivero, 1999) and because this study aimed to find possible CCI moderators of this relationship.

There are two important findings that should be noted which support the theory that strong ties to group identification helps maintain an individual's sense of belonging (Lewin, 1948, Tajfel & Turner, 1972) and that self-categorization goes beyond self-labeling (Cox & Gallois, 1996). One is that strength of affirmation, belonging, and commitment to a CCI acted as a moderator between CH and self-esteem. The other is that the group that considered itself TCKs actually had a lower level of self-esteem than did other participants, the opposite of what was predicted. First, strength of affirmation, belonging, and commitment of a CCI was found to moderate the relationship between CH and self-esteem, but considering oneself a TCK or high levels of SINCE did not. Thus, those who experienced CH but expressed greater commitment to any cross-cultural label or identity tended to have higher self-esteem than those who did not exhibit such a commitment but were CH. Simply considering oneself a part of a TCK CCI or having close relationships with individuals who also had high levels of cross-cultural experience was not enough to moderate the relationship between CH and self-esteem.

Second, TCKs experienced lower levels of self-esteem than was predicted. This is an unexpected finding because it was originally thought that individuals who self-categorize as TCKs would display higher self-esteem than individuals who did not. Although there may be several explanations for this, it is possible that simple categorization of oneself as a TCK may not enough be to consolidate a TCK identity or reap the benefits of group belonging (as described by social identity theory; Tajfel, 1982; Turner, 1982; Cox & Gallois, 1996; Hogg & Mullin, 1999). The TCK may not offer the same types of benefits that ethnic groups or traditionally formed groups reap. Only the TCK CCI was tested in this study because it is one of

the most common terms in the international community. Therefore, it is possible that other CCI labels serve as better buffers. Furthermore, CCIs are different than ethnic identities, which are often characterized by the presence of a clearly defined culture to which a person might feel they belong. When individuals who belong to specific ethnic groups traverse cultural boundaries, commonalities such as language, history, typical foods and/or traditions become bedrocks for defining ethnic identity. The TCK CCI has little of these commonalties. Categorizing oneself as a TCK may not offer enough shared activities, relationships or interests compared to typical social groups.

Another explanation might be a problem with the label itself. People might self-categorize as TCKs even when they do not want to, simply because they might fit the definition. Thus, their commitment to an identity might be undetermined and they might not develop strong group ties. Conversely, the TCK label may subtly suggest a negative connotation and differentiation rather than in-group pride as hypothesized (as it is possible with other CCI labels, such as the use of "brat" in Military Brats). Belonging to a group that is seen as negative might emphasize the differences between TCKs and out-groups, thus promoting lower self-esteem. Although readings from the TCK anecdotal literature generally offer a benevolent attitude to CCIs and labels, which suggests that such labels are not stigmatic, individuals may not perceive such labels in the same manner.

Simply accepting a self-label, or identifying oneself with group but feeling only a static connection to that group is different than identifying with a CCI and experiencing commitment to that identity or group. Categories and groups are formed when there is a dynamic interaction among members and members experience some benefit to belonging to that group or identity. In

this case, the strength of affirmation, belonging, and commitment that individuals reported about a particular CCI and SINCE is the foundation for the existence of CCI.

Categorizing oneself as a TCK is probably not enough to consolidate a CCI identity or reap the benefits of group belonging, but having strong ties and identification to a group does. Capturing an accurate construct of CCIs was problematic because CCIs are difficult to define. They do not follow typical patterns of socio-cultural groups or ethnic identity. Because CCIs do not follow typical patterns found in family, peer or institutional groups, several different dimensions of the CCI construct were investigated in this study. The SLIM was aimed at assessing the participants' perceived level of belonging and commitment to a CCI, self-categorization to a TCK group was aimed at exploring the TCK label and definition, and the SINCE were aimed at understanding participants' social networks of close peer and family relationships. Of the three dimensions, the SLIM offered the best assessment of CCI in this study.

One particular benefit of using the SLIM was that it allowed participants to spontaneously label a CCI using their own words. Then for those given labels, a scale of affirmation, belonging and commitment was calculated. Having a continuum of commitment to any CCI was more informative than the dichotomous categorization of TCK belonging. Because sample participants had different personal experiences, albeit this sample's population had a cross-cultural childhood in common, the experiences of such childhoods and cultures are likely to be highly individualized. Therefore, the SLIM was more adept at portraying these differences as it allowed participants to offer their own cross-cultural label.CCI, as well as indicate the strength of their feelings toward it.

<center>Limitations</center>

<center>41</center>

The sample was a convenience sample made up of people who still were somewhat connected to an international community and experienced a cross-cultural mobile childhood. Thus, the results may not generalize to people that experience cross-cultural childhood mobility but are not connected to an international community. Because recruitment focused on contacts with international organizations, people who have remained in an international context through adulthood were more likely to complete the survey rather than those who grew up internationally but were no longer in contact with an international community.

Some of the benefits of using a Web-based survey were minimal financial expenditure and accessibility to the questionnaire regardless of the participant's geographical location. However, the use of a Web survey was also a limitation since the sample was comprised of participants with a higher socioeconomic status, who had internet access and were somewhat computer savvy. This sample might have overrepresented the higher educational levels, which is consistent with previous research (Useem, 1999). About 64% of the entire sample had completed at least a bachelor degree. The reason for such a high percentage might be due to either the type of sampling procedures (use of the internet might have selected persons in higher socio-economic status) or the nature of the cross-cultural population sampled (most individuals who are hired to live abroad have highly specialized skill sets and education, therefore it was likely that children attained a level of education similar to that of their parents). Although there were more women than men that completed the survey, this finding is typical in social research.

The sample also had a large percentage (82%) of racially White individuals (10% multi-racial, 7% non-white). This may be due mostly to the sampling procedure. The survey was written in the English language; participants were required to have English reading skills. Traditionally, the U.S. and Europe have acted as hosts for organizations that send employees

abroad. Most organizations and individuals contacted to help disseminate the survey were based in the U.S. (such as the U.S. Military) or Europe (such as MemberCare). However, as other countries are quickly developing larger economies and incorporating international business practices (such as India, Japan and China), this demographic will likely change.

When looking at the results of this study, two important limitations should be taken into consideration. First, results of the self-esteem measure and the SLIM revealed ceiling affect. When individuals in one group were found to have lower self-esteem than other groups, these "low" groups still had a mean self-esteem score in the moderate to high range. Although the SLIM was particularly effective for identifying CCIs, the seven-question scale showed limited variability as well. Face validity might be an important factor to consider for the SLIM because the questions were directly related to the construct (belonging).

Secondly, age was a significant confounding variable in all analyses. Younger individuals may still be consolidating a personal and cultural identity, independent of their childhood cross-cultural experiences, which might explain the relationship between age, CH and self-esteem. Older participants may have already developed coping strategies for dealing with CH.

Although the design and subsequent statistical analysis were based on the theoretical model taken from social identity theory, it is still a cross-sectional correlation based study. Significant relationships, which might have revealed possible trends for this cross-cultural population, should be interpreted with caution as the use of correlational statistics are a limitation because causality cannot be inferred.

Future Research

In the future, efforts should be made to develop a more precise measuring scale for CCI that might include other dimensions. One such dimension might be exploring quality and

perceived cross-cultural experience in social relationships. Another might be if friends and family members also report membership to a CCI. Researchers may wish to study children of military persons overseas first because they share several characteristics and experiences in common (such as similar school systems and similar institutional environment). They might be good candidates for exploring the dimensions of the "Military Brat" CCI.

Another direction of future research might be exploring the role of the internet in the creation of CCIs and similar subcultures and how these individuals connect with a shared history of a cross-cultural childhood. Because individuals with childhood cross-cultural experiences are likely not to be concentrated in any geographical location, internet communities might become an important medium of communication and support to other individuals with similar experiences.

Future studies should attempt to include a more racially diverse sample, perhaps catering to other countries where international businesses are flourishing and emerging. Researchers may wish to look at how living abroad during sensitive developmental stages in children's lives might affect their overall mental health, self-concept and sense of cultural identity in adulthood.

In the U.S. and Europe, educators working with established re-entry programs, such as those that try to reduce reverse culture-shock and educate sojourners returning to their home culture, may wish to incorporate into their curriculum strategies for individuals to explore their cultural identity in their own words, rather than impose labels or definitions (if they are not doing so already). Although the definition of a TCK may be helpful in understanding oneself, it is not the label or definition itself that is involved in increased self-esteem but the commitment to the self-label of the individual's choosing.

Table 1

Frequencies for Type of Recruitment

How did you hear about this survey?	N
Email from friend, family member or organization	207
Facebook	39
Blog or Website post	44
Online or through web searches	9
Military Brats Registry Blog, Military Brats Online & other military blogs	41
Alumni and international school associations	122
Directly from investigators	13
Total	475

Table 2

Demographic Statistics

	M	*SD*	*Range*
Demographic variables			
Age	42.6	14.7	18-78
Age of first move	5.6	4.6	0-16
Time spent abroad	9.5	5.2	2-18
Number of international moves	2.4	1.5	1-6

Table 3

Demographic Frequencies

Variables and levels	*N*	% of sample
Gender		
Females	301	63.4
Males	174	36.6
Marital Status		
Married	280	59.9
Single	134	28.2
Divorced	31	6.5
Living with partner	13	2.7
Engaged, widowed or separated	17	3.7
Education completed		
Less than secondary	6	1.3
Secondary	26	5.5
By exam/GED	3	.6
Some university	133	28.0
Undergrad	163	34.3
Masters	115	24.0
Doctorate	29	6.1

(*table continues*)

Table 3 (*continued*).

Demographic Frequencies

Variables and levels	*N*	% of sample
Family occupation abroad		
Missionary	138	29.1
Military	188	39.6
Government agency	20	4.2
Non-Governmental agency	14	2.9
Diplomatic Corps	26	5.5
International business	46	9.7
Other	43	9.1
Number of citizenships		
1	396	83.4
2	62	13.1
3	13	2.8
5	1	.2

(*table continues*)

Table 3 (*continued*).

Demographic Frequencies

Variables and levels	*N*	% of sample
Number of languages		
1	107	22.8
2	218	45.9
3	95	20.3
4	36	7.7
5	8	1.7
6 or more	5	1.0
Cross-cultural identity (CCI) label		
Third Culture Kid or Adult Third Culture Kid	72	23.2
Missionary Kid	44	14.2
Global Nomad	7	2.3
Military/Army/Airforce Brat	103	33.2
Ethnic label	17	5.5
Dipkids, diplobrats and NGO's	3	1.0
Other-related to In't moves	40	12.9
Other-religion, emotional states, etc	21	6.8
Stateless	3	1.0

Table 4

Scale Statistics and Reliability

	M	*SD*	Range	α	Inter-item r
Scale variables					
Cultural Homelessness (CH) Scale 1	2.59	.93	1-5	.85	.32-.65
Cultural Homelessness Scale 2	2.58	.99	1-5	.83	.27-.75
Cultural Homelessness Scale 3[a]	3.57	1.07	1-5	--	--
Cultural Homessness mean of 3 scales[b]	2.91	.71	1-4.74	--	--
Self Label Identity Measure	3.55	.53	1-4	.90	.38-.75
SINCE[c]	3.72	1.00	1-5	--	--
Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale	4.39	.65	1-5	.89	.24-.74

Note: CH scale 1 & 2 interscale *r* = .77, *p* < .001; CH scale 1 & 3 interscale *r* = .10, *p* < .05; CH scale 2 & 3 interscale *r* = -.07, *p* > .05).

[a] CH scale 3 is composed of 1 item. [b] Reliability for CH is calculated for each separate CH scale. [c] Social-Interpersonal Networks' Cross-Cultural Experience

Table 5

Relationships Among Variables I

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
					--						
1. Age	--										
2. Gender [a, b]	-.06	--									
3. Highest level of schooling	.26***	-.08	--								
4. Multiracial	-.10*	-.03	-.10*	--							
5. Time spent abroad	-.35***	.13**	-.04	.09	--						
6. Number of moves	-.01	.06	.00	.08	.40***	--					
7. Number of citizenships	-.23***	.01	-.02	.08	.20***	.15**	--				
8. Number of languages	-.13**	.05	.07	-.04	.20***	.24***	.06	--			
9. Cultural Homelessness	-.38***	.01	.00	.15*	.19***	-.01	.22***	.18***	--		
10. Self Label Identity Measure	.15**	.05	-.14*	-.02	.02	.11*	.02	-.02	-.20***	--	
11. Self-esteem	.28***	-.11*	.12**	-.12*	-.10*	.02	-.02	.01	-.49***	.22***	--

[a] Point biserial correlation. [b] Coded 1 = Male, 2 = Female

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 6

Relationships Among Variables II

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Highest level of schooling	--										
2. Time spent abroad	-.04	--									
3. Number of moves	.12***	.40***	--								
4. Number of citizenships	-.02	.20***	.15**	--							
5. Has a CCI [a, b]	.04	.02	.00	-.10*	--						
6. Considers self TCK [a, c]	-.08	.30***	.02	.12**	.19***	--					
7. Considers self Global Nomad [a, d]	-.05	.14**	.12*	.09	.15**	.29***	--				
8. Cultural Homelessness	.00	.19	-.01	.18***	-.05	.34***	.21***	--			
9. Self Label Identity Measure	-.14*	.02	-.11*	.02	-- [e]	.01	.22***	-.20***	--		
10. SINCE[f]	-.13*	.04	-.08	.00	-.02	.21***	.12*	.09	.13**	--	
11. Self-esteem	-.12**	-.11*	.02	-.02	.00	-.23***	-.05	-.49***	.22***	-.02	--

[a] Point biserial correlations. [b] Coded 0 = Did not name a CCI, 1 = Named a CCI. [c] Coded 0 = Non-TCK, 1 = TCK. [d] Coded 0 = Non-Global Nomad, 1 = Global Nomad. [e] Only participants with a CCI answered SLIM questions. [f] Social-Interpersonal Networks' Cross-Cultural Experience

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 7

Partial Correlations, Controlled for Age

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Cultural Homelessness	--			
2. Self Label Identity Measure	-.15**	--		
3. Considers self TCK [a, b]	.27***	.08	--	
2. Self-esteem	-.43***	.18**	-.17**	--

[a] Point biserial correlation. [b] Coded 0 = Non-TCK, 1 = TCK.

** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for SLIM Scores as a

Moderator for Predicting Self Esteem (N = 475)

Variable	Zero-order *r*	*B*	*SE B*	β	*R²*	*ΔR²*
Step 1					.11	.11
Age	.33	.22	.03	.33***		
Step 2					.29	.18
Age		.08	.03	.12*		
Cultural Homelessness (CH)	.54	-.29	.04	-.44***		
Self Label Identity Measure (SLIM)	.37	.07	.03	.11*		
Step 3					.31	.02
Age		.09	.03	.14*		
Cultural Homelessness (CH)		-1.25	.31	-1.88***		
Self Label Identity Measure (SLIM)		-.89	.32	-1.33**		
SLIM * CH interaction	.55	.10	.03	1.84**		

Note: All variables were standardized and recentered on 10.

* *p* <.05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for TCK Self-Categorization as a

Moderator for Predicting Self Esteem (N = 475)

Variable	Zero-order *r*	*B*	*SE B*	β	*R²*	*ΔR²*
TCK = 238						
Step 1					.07	.07
Age	.27	.20	.05	.27***		
Step 2					.21	.14
Age		.11	.04	.15*		
Cultural Homelessness (CH)	.46	-.30ᵃ	.05	-.40***		
Non-TCK = 238						
Step 1					.02	.02
Age	.13	.01	.04	.13		
Step 2					.22	.20
Age		-.01	.04	-.01		
Cultural Homelessness (CH)	.47	-.27ᵃ	.03	-.47***		

Note: All variables were standardized and recentered on 10.

ᵃ The difference between the standardized regression coefficient of TCK and non-TCK is not statistically significant.

* *p* <.05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Cross-cultural level of relationships as a

Moderator for Predicting Self Esteem (N = 475)

Variable	Zero-order r	B	$SE\ B$	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1					.08	.08
Age	.29	.19	.03	.29***		
Step 2					.25	.17
Age		.08	.03	.12**		
Cultural Homelessness (CH)	.50	-.29	.03	-.45***		
SINCE[a]	.29	.02	.03	.03		
Step 3					.26	.01
Age		.09	.03	.13**		
Cultural Homelessness (CH)		-.35	.05	-.53***		
SINCE		-.03	.04	-.04		
SINCE * CH interaction	.51	.01	.00	.13		

Note: All variables were standardized and recentered on 10.

[a] Social-Interpersonal Networks' Cross-Cultural Experience.

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Questionnaire

Directions: Please provide the following information

1. How did you hear about this survey?

2. Age

3. Gender

4. Current Marital Status:

   a. Single

   b. Engaged

   c. Married

   d. living with partner

   e. widowed

   f. divorced

   g. separated

5. What is your highest level of education?

    a. Less than secondary school (high school or equivalent)

    b. Secondary school graduate (high school or equivalent)

    c. By exam (GED or similar qualifying exams)

    d. Some university (post-secondary education, college, associate degree, technical

        degree)

    e. University graduate (College of equivalent)

    f. Masters degree or equivalent

    g. Doctorate (PhD, EdD, MD, JD)

    h. Other

6. In what countries do you hold citizenship?

7. With what type of organization was your family affiliated when living abroad?

    a. Missionary

    b. Military

    c. Government Agency

    d. Non-Government Agency (NGO)

    e. Diplomatic Corps

    f. International Business

    g. Other

Demographic Questionnaire

(Continued)

8. What was your mother's occupation while you were growing up?

9. What was your father's occupation while you were growing up?

10. How many language(s) did you speak before age 18, and in what situations did you speak them? (e.g., one language at home or with different family members, another at school)

11. In which country were you born?

12. How old were you when you first moved to another country?

13. What was the second country to which you moved? Please use the following template: Moved to_____, Lived there how long:_____

14. What type of education did you receive while living at this location? (Choose all that apply)

    a. National private school

    b. National public school (including U.S. American public school)

    c. Correspondence/Homeschool

    d. International School

    e. Mission School

    f. Boarding School

    g. Department of Defense School (DODS)

15. Did you move to any other countries before the age of 18?

→if yes, survey repeated question 13-15 up to 5 more times.

→if no, continue to next

Demographic Questionnaire

(Continued)

We would like to know some information about you and your biological parents' race, ethnicity, and cultural orientation. Race refers to a general, more inclusive category based on genetics such as Asian, Black, Native American or Indigenous, White or Caucasian, Pacific Islander, etc. Please use the following numbers that correspond with each category:

(1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, South Asian

(2) Black or African Heritage

(3) Indigenous to South or Central America, Native American/American Indian

(4) White, Caucasian, Anglo

(5) Asian Pacific Islander or Aboriginal

(6) Unknown

(7) Other

16. My racial heritage is: (check all that apply using the numbers above)

17. My father's race is: (check all that apply using the numbers above)

18. My mother's race is: (check all that apply using the numbers above)

Ethnicity is more specific. It refers to a family's cultural heritage such as Jewish, Cherokee, Navajo, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South Korean, Japanese, Kenyan, African-American, Italian, Irish, etc. Since people can have more than one race and/or ethnicity, list all that apply. If you do not have this information, please answer Don't Know.

19. How would you describe yourself ethnically? (List all)

20. My father's ethnicity is: (List all)

21. My mother's ethnicity is: (List all)

Cultural Homelessness Criteria Items

(Vivero, 1999)

Directions: Using the numbers given below, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1= Strongly disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Neither agree or disagree; 4= Agree; 5= Strongly agree

Scale 1: Ethnic/Cultural Identity Conflicts & Rejection

1. I am an ethnic or cultural minority everywhere I go

2. I am often asked about my ethnicity or where I am from

3. I struggle to determine where I belong ethnically or culturally

4. I have more than one set of cultural values and these contradict each other

5. It is difficult for me to find others like me ethnically or culturally

6. I have felt discriminated against by all groups because of my ethnicity

7. I don't feel culturally "at home" anywhere I go

8. There is no group anywhere that represents who I am ethnically

Scale 2: Lack of Membership and attachment to any ethnic/cultural groups

1. I feel that I don't belong to any ethnic or cultural group

2. When I think which ethnic or cultural group I mostly act or think like, I cannot find one.

3. There is no ethnic group with which I can identify

4. I don't feel emotionally attached to any ethnic or cultural group

5. no on ethnic group label accurately describes me

Scale 3: Need for a cultural home

11. Finding a cultural home is important to me.

Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale

(Rosenberg, 1989)

Directions: Using the numbers given below please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1= Strongly disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Neither agree or disagree; 4= Agree; 5= Strongly agree

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

9. I certainly feel useless at times.

10. At times I think I am no good at all.

Self-Label Identity Measure

(SLIM; Modified questions from Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure, 1992)

Most people belong to one or more social groups, communities, or networks. There might be several ways to describe people who have had a variety of cross-cultural experiences. Is there a particular label that you feel best describes a group that encompasses your childhood cross-cultural experience?

→If yes, answer the following questions

→If no, skip following questions

1. What is that word or phrase?

Directions: Please use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Agree; 4= Strongly Agree

2. I have a clear sense of my culturally mobile background and what it means for me.

3. I am happy that I am a member of the group I named above.

4. I have a strong sense of belonging to the group I named above.

5. I understand pretty well what my membership in this group means to me.

6. I have a lot of pride in the group I named above.

7. I feel a strong attachment towards the group I named above.

8. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

Childhood Cross-Cultural Experience Questions

1. What communities and/or cultures do you feel you belong to, identify with, and would like to be accepted by as a member?

2. Where do you feel most at home? (Please describe)

3. What benefits would you say arise from your experience living in a culture(s) different from that of your parents? (Please list three)

4. What difficulties would you say arise from your experience living in a culture(s) different from that of your parents? (Please list three)

5. Have you ever heard of the term "Third Culture Kid" (TCK)?)

→If yes, go to the next question if no, skip to question 13.

6. Do you consider yourself an adult "Third Culture Kid"?

→If yes, go to the next question, if no, skip to question 13

7. What does the term "Third Culture Kid" mean to you?

8. How long have you considered yourself a "Third Culture Kid"?

9. Why do you consider yourself an adult "Third Culture Kid"?

Childhood Cross-Cultural Experience Questions

(Continued)

Directions: Please use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Agree; 4= Strongly Agree

10. I consider myself an adult "Third Culture Kid" because I have grown up in a culture that is different than my parents.

11. I consider myself an adult "Third Culture Kid" because it helps me find a sense of belonging.

12. Even though I am an adult "Third Culture Kid", I don't feel like other adult "Third Culture Kids".

13. Have you ever heard of the term "Global Nomad"?

→If yes, go to the next question if no, END

14. What does the term "Global Nomad" mean to you?

→If yes, go to the next question if no, END

15. Do you consider yourself a "Global Nomad"?

→If yes, go to the next question, if no, END

16. What does the term "Global Nomad" mean to you?

17. How long have you considered yourself a "Global Nomad"?

18. Why do you consider yourself an adult "Global Nomad"?

Childhood Cross-Cultural Experience Questions

(Continued)

Directions: Please use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Agree; 4= Strongly Agree

19. I consider myself a "Global Nomad" because I have grown up in a culture that is different than my parents.

20. I consider myself a "Global Nomad" because it helps me find a sense of belonging.

21. Even though I am a "Global Nomad", I don't feel like other "Global Nomads".

22. Which best describes your level of cross-cultural/multicultural experience? (Check all that apply)

    a. I have had few interactions with people who were culturally different than myself during childhood and adolescence.

    b. I lived in a mostly homogeneous cultural environment, but have known people who were culturally different from myself, such as people from other countries.

    c. My knowledge of other cultures is gathered through direct experiences such as traveling, exchange programs, volunteer work, temporary employment, etc.

    d. I lived for an extended period (over a year) of time in another country during adulthood.

    e. I lived for an extended period (over a year) of time in another country during childhood or adolescence.

Childhood Cross-Cultural Experience Questions

(Continued)

Directions: Please use the following numbers that correspond with each category.

1 = Few interactions with people who were culturally different than oneself during childhood and adolescence.

2 = Lived in a mostly homogeneous cultural environment, but have known people who were culturally different from oneself, such as people from other countries.

3 = Knowledge of other cultures is gathered through direct experiences such as traveling, exchange programs, volunteer work, temporary employment, etc.

4 = Lived for an extended period (over a year) of time in another country during adulthood.

5 = Lived for an extended period (over a year) of time in another country during childhood or adolescence.

Directions: For the following questions, think of three people who know you well.

23. Person 1. Using the numbers above, please indicate what level of cross-cultural/multicultural experiences you perceive he/she has. (Check all that apply. Please check N/A for any relationships you do not rate.)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

24. What is their relationship to you? (i.e. friend, mother, partner, sibling, etc)

Childhood Cross-Cultural Experience Questions

(Continued)

25. Person 2. Using the numbers above, please indicate what level of cross-

cultural/multicultural experiences you perceive he/she has. (Check all that apply. Please

check N/A for any relationships you do not rate.)

1 2 3   4 5 N/A

26. What is their relationship to you? (i.e. friend, mother, partner, sibling, etc)

27. Person 3. Using the numbers above, please indicate what level of cross-

cultural/multicultural experiences you perceive he/she has. (Check all that apply. Please

check N/A for any relationships you do not rate.)

1 2 3   4 5 N/A

28. What is their relationship to you? (i.e. friend, mother, partner, sibling, etc)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armes, K. & Ward, C. (1989). Cross-cultural transitions of sojourner adjustment in Singapore. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *129*, 273-275.

Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of model's reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 589-595.

Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *51*, 269-290.

Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.

Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation: Understanding individuals moving between cultures. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.) *Applied cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 232-253). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Blascovich, J. & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem. In L. S. Wrightsman (Ed). *measures of personality and social psychology attitudes* (115-160). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. B. & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 83-93.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 155-159.

Coley, C. H. (2004). Society and the individual. In M. J. Hatch and M. Shultz (Eds.) *Organizational identity: A reader* (pp. 16-29). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cox, S. & Gallois, C. (1996). Gay and lesbian identity development: a social identity

        perspective. *Journal of Homosexuality, 30*, 1-30.

Dana, R. H. (2005). *Multicultural assessment: Principles, applications, and examples*. Erlbaum

        Associates: Mahwah, N. J.

Downie, M., Doestner, R., ElGeledi, S., & Cree, K. (2004). The impact of cultural

        internalization and integration on well-being among tricultural individuals. *Personality*

        and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30, 305-314.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

Facebook.com (2008). *ThirdcCulture kids everywhere*. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from

        http://www.facebook.com.

Fernandez, E. W. (1985, January). Estimation of the annual emigration of U.S. born

        persons by using foreign censuses and selected administrative data: Circa 1980. U.S.

        Census Bureau, Population Division. Retrieved May 24, 2007, from

        http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0010/twps0010.html

Frable, D. E. S. (1997). Gender, racial, ethnic, sexual and class identities. *Annual Review of*

        Psychology, 48, 1997.

Gerner, M. E., Perry, F., Moselle, M. A. & Archbold, M. (1992). Characteristics of international

        mobile adolescents. *Journal of School Psychology, 30*, 197-214.

Gerner, M. E. & Perry, F. (2000). Gender differences in cultural acceptance and careers

        orientation among internationally mobile and non-internationally mobile adolescents.

        School Psychology Review, 29, 267-284.

Global Nomads Washington Area. *What is a global nomad*? Retrieved June 1, 2007, from

        http://www.globalnomads-dc.org.

Hogg, M. A. (1996). Intergroup processes, group structure and social identity in W. P.

   Robinson, *Social groups and identities: Developing the legacy of Henri Tajfel.*

   Butterworth-Heinemann (pp. 65-94). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hogg, M. A. & Mullin B-A. (1999). Joining groups to reduce uncertainty: Subjective uncertainty

   reduction and group identification. In D. Abrams and M. A. Hogg (Eds.) *Social identity*

   and social cognition (pp. 249-179). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Hogg, M. A. & Abrams, D. (1999). Social identity and social cognition: a historical background

   and current trends. In D. Abrams and M. A. Hogg (Eds.) *Social identity and social*

   cognition (pp. 1-25). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Jones, B. V. & Austin, C. N. (1987). Reentry among missionary children. An overview of

   reentry research from 1934-1986. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 14*(4), 315-325.

Koteskey, R. L. (2005). *Third culture kids and adolescence: Cultural Creations*. New Hope

   International Ministries, Wilmore, KY.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H.L. & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism:

   Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 395-412.

Lewin, K (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. Harper: New York.

Malone, N., Baluja, K. F., Costanzo, J. M. & C. J. Davis (December 2003). The foreign-born

   population: 2000. *Census 2000 Brief*. Retrieved on May 24, 2007, from

   http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-34.pdf

Molinsky, A. (2007). Cross-cultural code-switching: The psychological challenge of adapting

   behavior in foreign cultural interactions. *Academy of Management Review, 32*, 622-640.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: A review of research.

   Psychological Bulletin, 108, 499-514.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7,* 156-176.

 Phinney, J. S., & Navarro-Devich, M. (1997). Variations in bicultural identification among African American and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *7*, 3-32.

Pirinen, M. (2002). *In place, out of place: Meaning of place and question of belonging for adult-third culture kids*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Joensuu, Finland.

Podolsky, M.K. (2004). Cross-cultural upbringing: A comparison of the 'third culture kids' framework and 'Kaigai/Kikoku-shijo' studies." *Contemporary Society* (*Kyoto Women's University Bulletin), 6*, 67-78.

Pollock, D., & Van Reken, R. (1999). *Third culture kids: The experience of growing up among worlds*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Stracuzzi, T. & Saya, R. (2003). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM): Psychometric review and further validity testing. *Educational and Psychological Measures*, *63*, 502-515.

Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Revised edition. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Ryder, A., Alden, L. & Paulhus, D. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 79*, 49-65.

Sam, D. L. (2000). Psychological adaptation of adolescents with immigrant backgrounds. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140*, 5-25.

Schachter, J. (May 2001). Geographical mobility: Population characteristics. *Current*

    populations report. Retrived May 24, 2007, from

    http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p20-538.pdf

Schaetti, B. F. (2000). *Global nomad identity: Hypothesizing a developmental model.*

    Unpublished dissertation, The Union Institute, Cincinnati, OH.

Schultz, D. M. (1986). *A study of third culture experience in relation to the psycho-cultural*

    adjustment of returned Church of Christ missionaries families. Unpublished doctoral

    dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Streiner, D. L (2003). Being inconsistent about consistency: when coefficient alpha does and

    doesn't matter. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *80*, 217-222.

Stringham, E. M. (1993). Reacculturation of missionary families: A dynamic theory. *Journal of*

    Psychology and Theology, 21, 66-73.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*,

    1-39.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S.

    Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey,

    CA: Brooks/Cole.

Turner, J. C. (1982). Toward a cognitive redifintion of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed), Social

    identity and intergroup relations. Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, NY.

TCK World proudly presents: Dr. Ruth Hill Useem (2001). Retrieved May 24, 2007, from

    http://www.tckworld.com/useem/home.html).

Useem, R. H. (1999). *Third Culture Kids: Focus of major study—TCK "mother" pens history of*

    field. Retrieved September 10, 2004, from www.tckworld.com/useem/artl.htlm.

Useem, R. H. & Cottrell, A. B. (1996). Adult third culture kids. In C. Smith (Ed.) *Strangers at home: Essays on the effects of living overseas and coming home to a strange land* (pp. 22-35). Bayside, NY: Alethea.

Useem, R. H., Useem, J., Cottrell A. B. & Jordan, K. A. F. (1993). Research on adult TCKs. *NewsLink.* Princeton, NJ: International Schools Services.

Viser, W. C. (1978). *A psychological profile of missionary children in college and the relationship of intense group therapy to weekly group therapy in the treatment of personality problems as reflected by the by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, TX

Vivero, N. V. (1999). *Ethnically mixed individuals: Cultural homelessness or multicultural integration*? Unpublished thesis, University of North Texas, Denton.

Vivero, N. V., & Jenkins, S.R. (1999). Existential hazards of the multicultural individual: Defining and understanding "cultural homelessness." *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 5*, 6-26

Vygotsky, L.S. (1934/1986). *Thought and Language.* A. Kozulin (Trans.), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.