

Racial socialization in White American families: An exploration of the roles of parental racial identity, parental racial attitudes, and racial socialization messages

By

Copyright 2016

Jenna A. Kelley

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Educational Psychology and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

Chairperson Dr. Meagan M. Patterson

Dr. David Hansen

Dr. Vicki Peyton

Date Defended: July 20, 2016

The Thesis Committee for Jenna A. Kelley certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Racial socialization in White American families: An exploration of the roles of parental racial identity, parental racial attitudes, and racial socialization messages

Chairperson Dr. Meagan M. Patterson

Date Approved:

Abstract

This paper explores the relationship among White parents' racial attitudes, racial identity development, and racial socialization strategies. Parents were asked to use both quantitative measures and qualitative vignettes to report how they would talk to their pre-adolescent child about race. In line with previous research (Hughes et al., 2006), parents predominantly adopted an egalitarian socialization strategy, suggesting that everyone should be treated the same, regardless of race. Although White parents indicated they found both present and future discussions of race important, when given the opportunity with qualitative vignettes, many parents did not include race or racial issues in their responses. This indicates a pattern of colorblind or colormute socialization that has been reflected in White racial socialization literature; the idea that race should not matter and should not be discussed with children. Egalitarian socialization was linked to White racial identity statuses, but not related to racial bias or school diversity estimates.

Keywords: White identity, parental socialization, racial bias, egalitarian, colormute

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Meagan Patterson at the University of Kansas. Her role in the creation, implementation, and documentation of this thesis was unparalleled. She guided and encouraged me throughout the process, but allowed this work to be my own. She is an invaluable resource for whom I have the utmost respect and gratitude.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. David Hansen and Dr. Vicki Peyton at the University of Kansas as my thesis committee. I am gratefully indebted for each of their very valuable comments on this thesis.

I would like to acknowledge Monica Lang, who graciously agreed to serve as a second coder for my qualitative measures. Her contribution was both helpful and self-less.

Finally, I must express my very profound gratitude to my parents and to my incredibly patient partner Aaron for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you.

Author

Jenna A. Kelley

Contents

Chapter I: Introduction	1
Chapter II: Method	18
Chapter III: Results.....	30
Chapter IV: Discussion.....	38
Chapter V: References.....	45

Chapter I: Introduction

Simply stated, racial bias is characterized as the negative thoughts, beliefs, and actions of one individual or group toward another individual or group of individuals based on the target's racial or ethnic background. These beliefs develop early in life (Bigler & Liben, 2006) and tend to be relatively stable over time (Baron & Banaji, 2006). In children, these attitudes are often developed and perpetuated in part by the way parents choose to talk about race (Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012). The current study examines racial socialization in White American families and ways in which socialization practices may relate to parents' racial attitudes and racial identity.

Intergroup attitudes. Research on intergroup dynamics began with Gordon Allport in 1954 and his research into the development of prejudice and intergroup relations has remained relevant for over 60 years. He discusses the cognitive component to prejudice, stating that it is natural for humans to categorize people and things in order to process them. Without the ability to categorize, humans would feel overwhelmed. The formation of one's ingroup stems from this categorization. Ingroup membership is typically defined on the basis of which categories are most important and most salient to an individual at a particular time. An individual will show favoritism toward their ingroup because they belong to that category although Allport noted that favoritism toward an ingroup does not necessitate the rejection of the outgroup (1954). Since Allport's seminal work, other researchers have stepped up to demonstrate that preference for the ingroup and bias against outgroups are two separate constructs, instead of existing in a reciprocal relationship (Brewer, 1999).

Allport's research concluded that group identification is a common and perhaps fundamental human condition (Allport, 1954). As an individual has more encounters with

members of a group, he or she gathers more information about that group and proceeds to form beliefs and expectancies about the meaning of membership to various groups.

Although Allport's research and theory focused on adults, there is a long history of studies looking at intergroup relations with children and adolescents. For example, in Sherif et al.'s (1969) seminal Robber's Cave study, Sherif and his colleagues created an intergroup relations experiment using elementary school aged boys as participants. Sherif and colleagues found that group membership, particularly in a competitive environment, can allow and encourage people to act physically and verbally hostile toward out-group members, both based on perceptions of discrimination and prejudice.

Elements of Intergroup Attitudes

As commonly defined, racial attitudes include three components: stereotypes (the cognitive aspect of bias), prejudice (the affective aspect of bias), and discrimination (the behavioral aspect of bias). A stereotype, as it relates to this study, would be the cognitive presumption that an individual holds all of the attributes of a group based simply on their group membership (Bigler & Liben, 2006). A similar term that often appears in this literature is prejudice, which would constitute an affective or emotional response to group members on the basis of the stereotype. Stereotyping and prejudice involve two underlying processes. Bigler and Liben (2006) describe them as: "The first is an automatic process, referred to as *implicit attitudes*, which involved unconscious stereotyping and prejudice toward groups. The second is a controlled process, referred to as *explicit attitudes*, which concerns conscious stereotyping and prejudice toward groups" (p 42).

In addition, a third term is often associated with prejudice and stereotyping. Discrimination is considered actions, often negative, taken toward an individual based on their

group membership and related stereotypes. These actions can be taken either because an outgroup member confirms the group stereotype or because they are an exception to the stereotype (Bigler & Liben, 2006).

What is racial bias?

Racial bias includes negative thoughts, beliefs, and actions toward an individual or group of individuals based on their racial or ethnic background (Doyle & Aboud, 1995). This social phenomenon has been studied in adults and children alike for many years. For example, in their seminal 1940's work, Clark and Clark conducted a series of studies where children were shown two identical dolls with one difference: one was white skinned with blonde hair and one was brown skinned with black hair. The children, regardless of their own racial background, indicated that they not only wanted to play with the White doll more, but gave her more positive attributes than the black doll (Clark & Clark, 1947).

As with any other intergroup bias, racial bias includes the elements of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. For the purposes of this study, it is critical to note that all three components of racial bias affect how we interact with and the expectations we have of members of our own group as well as members of groups that differ from us.

Racial bias can be categorized as either implicit or explicit. Implicit racial attitudes are automatic, unconscious attitudes toward outgroup members. These attitudes tend to develop early in life and remain relatively stable (Baron & Banaji, 2006). Implicit attitudes tend to be difficult to study because their very nature requires them to be unconscious. Most commonly, the Implicit Attitudes Task is used to measure the automatic association between objects (Greenwald McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). One study suggests that implicit bias develops differently based on

one's race; White children tend to have more pro-group bias, whereas Black children do not experience this (Baron & Banaji, 2006).

Because these attitudes are unconscious, they are resistant to change, though some studies have shown that close friendships with outgroup members may reduce implicit levels of bias (Aberson, Shoemaker, & Tomolillo, 2004). This is related to a debate within the field of prejudice reduction research: are interventions really reducing the levels of racial bias, or is it just a reduction in expressed bias? Devine and colleagues demonstrated that making individuals aware of their implicit biases (and therefore making them conscious), and giving them strategies to combat these attitudes resulted in a dramatic reduction of negative implicit bias (Devine, Forscher, Austin, & Cox, 2012).

Development of Racial Bias

For White children, explicit bias tends to increase in early childhood, peak in the early elementary school years, and then decline in middle and late childhood as the child learns that it is less socially acceptable to display explicit negative feelings toward an outgroup member (Bigler & Liben, 1993; Rutland, Cameron, Milne & McGeorge, 2005). As a child understands the social acceptability of their biases, their explicit bias tends to show dramatic reductions, while their implicit bias remains stable across development (Baron & Banaji, 2006).

Aboud's work on children's racial attitude development is of importance here. She laid out four major ideas as to how prejudice develops in the context of perspectives (both the self and others') and the shift from perception to cognition (Aboud, 2008). The first idea is that age changes in prejudice development are not linear, but rather increase drastically around ages four to five then taper around age seven, as children are more able to cognitively assess their attitudes. Her second idea, in line with Degner and Dalege (2013) is that parents and peers, although they

influence the child's social environment, do not influence prejudice development as much as past research may have led us to believe. Third, she contends that children's age related changes in domains such as attention and information processing facilitates a shift from self-related focus, to group-related focus, to focus on the individual. As such, their social interactions and intergroup assessments also follow this same trajectory. Finally, Aboud proposed that as a result of the self-group-individual focus change, there is also a shift in decision-making and judgment processes. Early decisions (prior to age four) are often guided by affective or emotional processes. Next, children use perceptual processes, such as social comparison and attending to observable social cues to guide decision-making. These processes seem to be most prevalent between ages four and seven, which coincides with the child's high prejudice levels. At some point around age seven, children adopt a more cognitive approach to decision making, including skills such as the ability to understand abstract and internal qualities about individuals and begin to understand and process differing points of view (Aboud, 2008). This tends to also be when there is a plateau or decline in explicit racial bias (Bigler & Liben, 1993; Rutland, Cameron, Milne & McGeorge, 2005). Part of the reduction in explicit racial attitudes, particularly, may be due to children taking cues from their parents that race should not be discussed (Pahlke et al., 2012; Pauker, Apfelbaum, & Spitzer, 2015).

Although parents are influential in children's overall social development, there is mixed evidence suggesting that they influence children's implicit and explicit racial attitudes. Allport (1954) suggested that parental prejudice is mirrored by children, due to both the influence that parents have over their children, but also the environment they have created for their children. In Allport's view, children are receptacles for parental influence. If this were true, there should be a strong correlation between parent and child on racial attitudes measures. However, Bigler and

Liben's (2006) Developmental Intergroup Theory suggests that although children may learn prejudice from parents, these attitudes are often as a result of interactions in the environment that the parents created, rather than passively learning attitudes from their parents.

In a recent meta-analysis of 129 studies about racial attitudes in parents and children, Degner and Dalege (2013) found small effects of parental influence on children's explicit racial attitudes. This analysis found an effect of age, finding that the attitudes of young children (ages 7 and below) have no relationship to parental racial attitudes, but that after age 8, children and adolescents' attitudes tend to have a small to moderate relationship to parental attitudes. In addition, this meta-analysis found an effect of racial or ethnic status, finding that majority status children are more likely to have similar attitudes to their parents than minority status children. Degner and Delage noted that most of these studies focused on children's perceptions of their parents' attitudes and concluded that this finding may be as the result of majority status parents failing to discuss race or racial attitudes with their children (Degner & Delage, 2013). This finding is particularly relevant in this study, as it concludes that there is a difference in the way majority and minority parents talk to their children about race, and thus that there is a difference in how these groups of children think about race.

Racial/ethnic identity and racial bias

Guiding the development and expression of racial attitudes is one's racial or ethnic identity. Racial identity development as a field started primarily to understand Black identity development in the face of a White society. As such, much of the individual models of racial identity development use "White" as their reference group (Smith, 1991). Because "White" is often the reference group in empirical studies of racial identity development, seen as the oppressor in some situations, it tends to be overlooked. However, White identity researchers seek

to demonstrate that racial identity achievement is something for which everyone has the potential. “White as reference” does not mean that those individuals do not possess racial identities; instead it means that as a result of white privilege, American societal systems are in place to reward White people without causing them to go through a stage of identity searching or understanding where they fit in regard to other groups (Hagerman, 2014; Helms, 1995).

Helms (1995) proposes that White individuals go through stages of identity development much like any other racial group. However, instead of coping with their diminished role in comparison to the White majority like other racial groups, the stages in Helms’ theory help White individuals to grapple with the racism they have been living with and perpetuating. Like the other groups, this development occurs as a result of beginning to notice and understand the societal meaning of different racial groups. Helms’ theory (1995) suggests that the six statuses of White racial identity development are contact, disintegration, reintegration, pseudo-independence, immersion/emersion, and autonomy. When developing this theory, Helms pointed out that although each of these identity stages evolve from each other, they should instead be thought of as schemata or ways of thinking of and interacting with the world. Thus, although other proposed identity theories develop as stages, Helms argued that thinking of White racial identity as statuses is more accurate.

The first status, contact, suggests ignorance toward one’s own racial identity. This would be an individual who does not believe they have a race or racial identity; they are “just White,” indicating they are the neutral from which all other racial identities are judged. Helms refers to the contact identity status as a stage of satisfaction with the status quo and obliviousness to the role the individual plays in perpetuating racism.

The second status is disintegration. In this status, individuals acknowledge they are White, but fail to recognize the significance of their racial identity, particularly in the face of other races. Helms refers to this status as a period of anxiety and disorientation as the result of a mental battle between ingroup loyalty and humanism (Helms, 1995).

The third status, reintegration, is characterized by the tendency to idealize White people while denigrating other races. In this status, individuals would display social distance ratings suggesting they are fine with minority individuals from a distance, but would not openly welcome a person of color to join their family or play with their child. This status almost plays as a reaction to the anxiety and disorientation felt in disintegration. It summons a degree of rationalization for one's racial attitudes and behaviors.

Helms' fourth status is pseudo-independence, which suggests an intellectual acceptance of one's own race, as well as the acceptance and understanding of others' race. It is during this status that an understanding of one's own White privilege would begin to occur, though Helms would be quick to point out that this understanding may be more of the result of deceptive tolerance of other groups, rather than a truly enlightened view on one's own group.

The fifth status, immersion/emersion, would be the honest intellectual and affective understanding of racism and the significance of the role that individual plays in its perpetuation. Helms suggests that this status is marked with the constant reshaping of the meaning of whiteness and hypervigilance as to the role one's whiteness plays in their everyday lives. Finally, the last status is autonomy, the understanding of the self as a multi-cultural being with non-racist Whiteness at the center and the ability to renounce the benefits of racism. Helms (1995) acknowledges that this status of White identity development is rarely achieved and maintained.

This theory goes from racial ignorance, to cognitive dissonance (for example, not wanting to think of oneself as racist, but also not wanting their child to marry a member of a minority group), to accommodation of and reaching out to those minority groups, to exploring what it means to be White. Helms' (1995) achieved identity status, autonomy, would be an individual who understands his role in perpetuating racism, has reduced feelings of White guilt, and no longer shies away from race issues, but embraces them fully and well-informed.

Building off Helms' theory, research has shown that those in the later statuses of White identity development were more open to cultural experiences (Sciarra & Gushue, 2003) and were more likely to exhibit empathy towards minority group members (Carter, Helms, & Juby, 2004). Roberts et al. (1999) found that there was a positive relationship between ethnic identity and psychological well-being markers, insofar as those who reported higher levels of belonging and commitment to their ethnic identity were more coping skills, higher self-esteem, and lower levels of loneliness and depression. Development of one's racial/ethnic identity in adolescence is important, as it is more likely to remain relatively crystallized across contexts later in life (a process known as remoooring) if one is fully committed, whereas those early in their identity development may change or regress in different environments (Ethier & Deaux, 1994). Strength in identity, considered "achieved identities", allows an individual to seek out environments and groups that validate that identity later in life (Ethier & Deaux, 1994). In addition, one study demonstrated that as acknowledgement of privilege increases throughout the identity development, levels of prejudice decreased and support for more egalitarian social systems increased (Phillips & Lowery, 2015). Helms' theory would support these findings; in her writing she suggested that as a White individual develops his or her White racial identity, he or she sheds the internalized societal message of White superiority and chooses to denounce privilege in order

to promote equality (Helms, 1990). Similarly, the Phillips and Lowery study attempts to demonstrate that greater identity development in White individuals results in fewer colorblind or colormute socialization messages, suggesting that positive identity development is associated with not just implicitly believing that racial groups are equal, but explicitly engaging in conversations about those beliefs (Phillips & Lowery, 2015).

Racial socialization

Racial/ethnic socialization practices are meant to expose individuals to cultural artifacts, instill pride within their cultural identity, discuss discrimination and coping, and offer strategies for succeeding and assimilating to mainstream society (Hughes et al., 2006). Whereas the term “racial socialization” has been predominantly used in research regarding Black Americans, “ethnic socialization” covers the same content, but includes multiple ethnicities. Although there are differences between ethnic and racial socialization, research tends to muddle the difference and combine the two concepts in order to create a more inclusive construct. Following the lead of Umana-Taylor et al. (2014), this study will combine racial and ethnic socialization and use “racial socialization” to refer to the meta-construct. In the current literature, racial socialization is broadly used to describe how parents convey information regarding race and ethnicity on to their children. More specifically, this concept is focused on the explicit transmission of this racial information (Hughes and Chen, 1997), although parents may also impact children’s attitudes through nonverbal behaviors (Castelli, De Dea, & Nesdale, 2008).

Although racial socialization happens to an extent in all families, much of the early research focused on how Black parents share race-related information with their children. Socialization was broken up into four categories: cultural socialization, egalitarianism,

preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust (Hughes, et al., 2006). *Cultural socialization* refers to parental practices in teaching their child about his or her racial or ethnic history, as well as cultural customs and traditions. *Egalitarianism* refers to messages that emphasize the importance of each individual's unique qualities over their racial group membership. Often this type of socialization suggests colorblind and more meritocratic attitudes for children, valuing hard work and individuality as the basis children should use to judge each other, rather than skin color or ethnic background. Colorblind attitudes suggest that individuals should not notice race (Hughes et al., 2006). This ideology is based on the faulty assumption that noticing race predicates racism; thus by not noticing race, one can reduce their racist attitudes (Pahlke et al., 2012). Similarly, another term related to colorblind and egalitarian socialization is "colormute" socialization (Hughes et al., 2006). This term suggests that by not talking about race, parents signal that race is not important (Hughes et al., 2006) though we know from the previous discussion on implicit and explicit attitudes that this too is a faulty assumption.

Preparation for bias strongly differs from the egalitarianism approach, suggesting instead a parental effort in making their children aware of discrimination and helping them to develop coping mechanisms for that discrimination. Finally, *promotion of mistrust* refers to parental messages of wariness of other racial groups and the general discouragement of interracial interactions. Because the nature of this research focuses primarily on self-reported practices, egalitarianism and cultural socialization tend to be the socialization practices most likely reported, with preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust rarely being explicitly reported (Hughes et al., 2006).

There are also cultural and environmental differences regarding socialization practices. Egalitarianism is the most common strategy for all racial and ethnic groups (Hughes et al., 2006).

However, preparation for bias is more common in Black families than in any other minority family setting, likely as the result of the history of racial tension in America, where most of these studies are conducted (Hughes et al, 2009). Black families are also likely to engage in moderate levels of cultural socialization in order to promote pride and positive racial identity (Hughes et al., 2009). In addition, Black families in neighborhoods with higher levels of economic disadvantage were more likely to utilize messages of mistrust and preparation for bias than Black families with greater economic advantage. Hughes and colleagues (2009) found that utilization of the preparation for bias strategy was related to a reduction in self-esteem, negative ethnic affirmation and antisocial behavior. They concluded that this strategy brought more awareness of the vulnerability that goes along with awareness of discrimination against one's group, and thus did not produce the protective effect intended by parents (Hughes, Witherspoon, Rivas-Drake, & West-Bey, 2009).

Although egalitarianism tends to be the most common practice for parents, white parents tend to adopt colorblind/colormute (the assumption that because one should not notice race, one should also not talk about race) attitudes more often than non-white parents (Hagerman, 2014; Hughes, et al., 2006; Pahlke et al., 2012; Pauker et al., 2015). Although cultural socialization is common across groups, it tends to be highly prevalent in immigrant families and American Indian families (Hughes et al., 2006; Lasane-Brown, Brown, Tanner-Smith, & Bruce, 2010).

Racial socialization in families can change as a result of a variety of individual factors. When controlling for race, parents are more likely to engage in discussions about race and racial socialization with their female children than male children (Lasane-Brown et al., 2010). Hughes and colleagues (2006) suggest that this difference is as a result of parents anticipated different experiences associated with the sex of their child. In addition to gender-differentiated practices,

parents are also likely to change their socialization practices as their children develop and have more intergroup experiences, using developmentally appropriate practices to engage in racial conversations with their children (Hughes et al., 2006). Parents with young children are more likely to utilize basic messages of cultural socialization and egalitarianism, whereas they were more likely to discuss preparation for bias with their adolescent children (Hughes & Chen, 1997). In addition, as children develop, they are likely to hear socialization messages from their parents more frequently (Hughes et al., 2006). These individual differences, however, do not overshadow the primary role that race plays in parental socialization.

Although white racial socialization is largely unstudied, qualitative work in the field has found an intersection between class and race in the way parents discuss racial issues with their children. For example, in a recent study, researchers found that parents preferred to avoid the topic of racial issues, choosing instead to maintain a level of segregation. When deciding between two schools, one mother said, “I would welcome more people of color, but I want everyone who’s here to be on the same page as all the parents like me. I want to be in a community that feels the same as we do” (Hagerman, 2014, p. 2604).

The concern is often that by engaging in conversations about race with their children, white parents feel they may be encouraging and perpetuating racial inequality (Hagerman, 2014; Pauker et al., 2015), though we know that is not the case. In fact, by failing to explicitly discuss race, parents may be teaching their child that discussions of race is not considered appropriate, resulting in a reluctance among children to talk about race (Pauker et al., 2015). Developmental intergroup theory suggests that although children are aware of racial differences, they have a very rudimentary understanding of what these differences may mean (Bigler & Liben, 2007). Without explicit instruction, children tend to construct their own definitions of what the racial

differences may mean, overwhelmingly fabricated in favor of their own group (Bigler, Jones, & Lobliner, 1997). These findings suggest that without some understanding of historical context or institutional racism, children will create a narrative that fosters higher levels of outgroup bias (Bigler, Jones, & Lobliner, 1997; Pauker et al., 2015) From previous developmental research, we see that white children actually report lower levels of racial bias in classrooms and households where racial bias is explicitly addressed (Aboud, 2008; Bigler & Liben, 2006; Degner & Dalege, 2013).

Previous literature with racial minority groups has suggested that racial socialization messages influence identity development as discussions of group history and preparation for bias help to inform an individual how he fits into his group or into society as a whole (Trimble, Helms, & Root, 2003). Parents are responsive, as studies have shown that an increase in perceived discrimination against their child results in an increase of socialization messages within the household (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001). In addition, these parents draw upon their own ethnic identity and perceived discriminatory experiences when choosing how and to what extent race should be discussed (Hughes & Johnson, 2001). Despite the research on persons of color, similar socialization research has not been conducted using White parents.

The current study

The current study focuses then on racial socialization strategies used by parents from a racial majority group (i.e., White Americans). Despite the relatively small body of literature on racial socialization in racial-majority families, the current consensus within the field is that White parents tend to take a colorblind approach to racial socialization and often believe that their children do not see or notice race (Katz & Kofkin, 1997). Although there have been both

quantitative and qualitative studies within this field, to my knowledge there has not been a mixed-methods study designed to research racial socialization in White families. This study will extend current research by utilizing both qualitative and quantitative measures of socialization across several possible scenarios.

In addition, much of the socialization research has failed to include a measure of White racial identity, a variable that I contend is pivotal in understanding how White parents communicate with their children about race (Hughes & Johnson, 2001). Because much of White racial identity development focuses on understanding the role of privilege in one's life, I suggest that, in line with previous research, more advanced racial identity development will be related to greater adoption of egalitarian socialization practices (Phillips & Lowery, 2015).

Allport's Contact theory would suggest that increased contact with outgroup members would foster more positive racial attitudes and interracial relationships. Indeed, this finding has been replicated, with research suggesting that close relationships with outgroup members may help to facilitate a reduction in children's explicit racial bias (Aboud, Mendelson, & Purdy, 2003; Crystal, Killen, & Ruck, 2008; Pahlke et al., 2012). Based on previous research with Black families, we see that the racial socialization process can be adaptive and reciprocal. In Hughes & Johnson's (2001) study, researchers demonstrated that children's experiences with racial discrimination may influence the ways in which their parents approach socialization. However, little research has been done to see if children's attitudes or experiences (e.g., experiences with diverse school settings) have a similar impact in White parents. This study aims to extend this line of research.

Furthermore, little research has addressed the reasoning behind the adoption of various strategies in White families. Although previous research has concluded that White parents may

be hesitant to discuss race because they fear they will appear racist (Hagerman, 2014; Pahlke et al., 2012), little research has been done to test a link between White parents' racial attitudes and their preferred socialization messages. We know however that for people of color, greater levels of perceived discrimination influence the amount and types of socialization messages shared within the household (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001). This study aims to explore this link within White families.

For the current study, I chose to focus on families with children between the ages of 8 and 12 because previous research suggests that children in this age range are aware of racial biases (Aboud, 2003), but in the early stages of forming their own racial identity (Helms, 1990). Messages from parents are a potentially important influence on the process of racial identity formation (Helms, 1990; Phinney, 1990; Pauker et al., 2015).

This study examines the following research questions:

- 1.) How do White parents talk to their children about race?
- 2.) Do parents' racial attitudes predict their use of racial socialization strategies?
- 3.) Does parental racial identity development predict their use of racial socialization strategies?
- 4.) Does the racial diversity of the child's school predict parents' use of racial socialization strategies?

I hypothesize the following:

1. In line with previous research (Hughes et al., 2006), I predicted that White parents are more likely to utilize egalitarian approaches to socialization (e.g. "People are equal, regardless of their skin color") than other approaches.

2. Participants who scored higher in early stages of White identity development (such as Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration) would be more likely to support egalitarian socialization practices than other socialization practices.
3. Participants with higher levels of racial bias would be more likely to endorse preparation for ingroup bias socialization strategies.
4. Parents with higher levels of racial bias will be less likely to discuss strategies related to discrimination or preparation for other group bias.
5. Parents will be more likely to endorse egalitarianism strategies if their children attend a less diverse school.
6. Parents will think their children's racial attitudes are the same as their own.
7. Socialization strategies described in the qualitative socialization measure will relate to racial attitudes. For example, parents who indicate that they explicitly discuss race and racial issues will likely have less outgroup bias than those who do not engage in these conversations.

Chapter II: Method

Participants. One hundred sixty one White parents (Male = 81) with children ages 8-12 years old participated between the months of February-April, 2016. Participants were recruited using a student subject pool from a large Midwestern university ($n = 8$) as well as Amazon's Mechanical Turk ($n = 153$). Previous research has demonstrated that although Mechanical Turk allows for more socioeconomic and racial diversity in sampling, results from an MTurk sample were not significantly different than results gathered from a face-to-face sample (Casler, Bickel, & Hackett, 2013). Using this information, I included participants from both subject pools as my sample.

A total of 233 participants started the survey, but 72 participants were excluded because their child was not in the appropriate age range or they did not identify their child as White. All included participants identified themselves and their child as White. All participants were U.S. citizens. Parents ranged in age from 24 to 54 years ($M = 34.21$, $SD = 6.06$). Nearly all parents had graduated from high school (99.1%) and most had graduated from college (85.0%). A small percentage of our sample had completed a graduate degree (10.0%). In addition, their children (Male = 89) ranged in age from eight to twelve years old ($M=9.65$, $SD=1.26$; see Table 1).

Table 1. Participant age breakdown.

Age of participant's child	Eight	Nine	Ten	Eleven	Twelve
Number of respondents	34	34	48	16	17

Procedure. After IRB approval, I disseminated the socialization measures online via Qualtrics. On the first page of the online survey, consent was presented and affirmed according to IRB regulations. The inclusion criteria for the study were self-identified White parents living in the United States with at least one child 8-12 years old (participants who had more than one child in the selected age range were randomly instructed to choose either the youngest or the oldest child). The order of the measures was somewhat randomized. All participants were asked to report their child's age and race immediately after consent in order to determine eligibility. The White Identity measure, Modern Racism measure and Black/White Evaluative Scale were then randomly presented, as generated using the online software. All participants ended with the quantitative socialization measures, followed by the qualitative vignettes, and lastly their own demographic information. Participants were offered course credit (if recruited from the university) or a small monetary value of \$2.50 (if recruited from Mechanical Turk) for their participation.

Measures

School diversity. Participants were asked to report the name of their child's school as well as the school's city and state. I used this information to look up racial composition statistics for the school from the website greatschools.org. For the purposes of this study, school diversity is operationalized as percentage of the school's students identifies as "non-White". From our sample of 161 participants, 14 did not have school diversity data, due to either failing to report a school ($n = 8$) or reporting a school for which I was unable to obtain diversity information ($n = 6$). The mean percentage of non-White students reported was 39%, with a median of 33% and a range between 0-99%.

Racial attitudes. This study used a modified version of the *Black/White Evaluative Trait Scale* to measure explicit racial attitudes (BETS, Hughes, Bigler, & Levy, 2007). This measure was designed to explicitly measure an individual's positive and negative attitudes towards Black, White, and Hispanic people. The scales consist of 12 items, including positive, negative and neutral traits about each racial group. Participants are asked how many people within the group possess the traits, on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Hardly any) to 5 (Almost all). Scores were compiled for each of the six subscales: Positive Black, Positive White, Positive Latino, Negative Black, Negative White, and Negative Latino. For the analysis in this study, bias scores were calculated by reverse coding the negative items, then taking the total score and subtracting it from the individual's White total score. This leaves bias scores as attitudes toward Blacks and attitudes toward Latinos, with a positive score indicating an ingroup (White) bias, and a negative score indicating an outgroup (Black or Latino) bias. Previous research on the subscales has found reliabilities ranging from .56 to .82 (Hughes, et al., 2007). See Appendix A for full measure.

In addition, this study used a modified version of Henry & Sears' (2002) Symbolic Racism scale. This scale is designed to measure symbolic racism, which is the predominantly White belief that racial struggles in America are no longer an issue and racial differences now exist as a factor of meritocracy as opposed to social and institutional constructs (Henry & Sears, 2002). This scale consists of eight items, assessing one's beliefs that racial struggles, particularly for black people, were no longer an issue in America. Statements addressing four different themes (work ethic and responsibility for outcomes, excessive demands, denial of continuing discrimination, and undeserved advantage) were given and participants were asked to respond using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 4 (Strongly agree). Scores are

added up to create a composite symbolic racism score. Previous research on this scale has found relatively high reliability coefficients ($\alpha = 0.78$) (Henry & Sears, 2002).

White Racial Identity. This study's White identity measure was Helms & Carter's (1990) White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS). It is a 60-item measure designed to assess self-conceptions of White individuals in regard to their membership to their own group and how that contrasts with reactions to members of other groups. Based on Helms' (1995) theory of White identity development, it has six subscales, each with ten items: Contact (e.g. "I hardly ever think of what race I am"), Disintegration (e.g. "There is nothing I can do by myself to solve society's racial problems"), Reintegration (e.g. "Society may have been unfair to Black people, but it have been just as unfair to White people"), Pseudo-Independence (e.g. "Black people and White people differ from each other in some ways, but neither race is superior"), Immersion/Emersion (e.g. "I am examining how racism relates to who I am") and Autonomy (e.g. "I have refused to accept privileges given to me because I am White"). Responses to each of the five subscales are measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Racial socialization. This study employed two quantitative racial socialization measures. The first is Hughes & Chen's (1997) Parental Racial-Ethnic Socialization Behaviors measure. The scale asks parents to rate the frequency with which they discuss various messages of race with their child (i.e. "How often do you tell your child __?") This questionnaire contains four subscales reflected in the socialization literature: *egalitarianism* (e.g. "People are equal, regardless of their skin color"), *history of other groups* (e.g. "about important people of other racial/ethnic groups"), *discrimination against other groups* (e.g. "people from different racial or ethnic backgrounds are still discriminated against based on their racial/ethnic background"), and

preparation for bias (e.g. “there is a possibility someone may treat them badly based on their racial or ethnic background”). Response options were given on a 5-point Likert type response scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Previous research suggests internal reliability estimates were high on each of the four sub-scales (α s = 0.89, 0.79, 0.92, and 0.74, respectively).

In addition, we utilized Pahlke, Bigler, and Suizzo’s (2012) modification to the Hughes and Chen measure to look at future socialization goals. Participants were asked “How important is it that you tell your child ___ in the future?” The subscales remain the same. Response options for this modification range from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important). These modifications were also found have high reliability estimates for each subscale (α s = 0.70, 0.77, 0.78, and 0.70, respectively).

Qualitative racial socialization measure. In addition, we asked participants the following open-ended questions to address socialization behaviors in greater depth:

- “Do you think your child notices race? If so, how do you know?”
- “Do you actively encourage/discourage your child to talk with you about race? If so, how?”
- “Do you think your child’s racial attitudes match your own? Why?”
- “Imagine you were watching the news with your child and a story came on about the "Black Lives Matter" movement. How would you talk with your child about this movement?”
- “Imagine your child came home from school and said that he or she had overheard another child use a racial slur. How would you respond?”

- “Imagine that you are watching the news with your child and the news reported a racially motivated attack or hate crime. What would you say to your child about this event?”

Similar questions have been posed in past socialization literature (Hamm, 2001; Pauker et al., 2015; Vittrup & Holden, 2010).

Coding for qualitative items. Coding for qualitative responses was based on a mixture of a priori hypotheses and themes that emerged from the data. For two of the questions (“Do you think your child notices race? If so, how do you know?” and “Do you think your child’s racial attitudes match your own? Why?”) were coded for “yes”, “no”, and “I don’t know” responses, then coded for implicit (e.g., they have friends from all different backgrounds) and explicit (e.g., they have specifically asked about why someone looks different than them) justifications for why they believe their child holds that belief. These codes were based on previous research indicating that parents are likely to cite contact as an explanation for their observations of their child’s attitudes, without having direct or explicit conversations with their child about race (Hamm, 2001). See Tables 2 and 3 for frequencies and inter-rater reliability.

Table 2. Frequencies of each coded response for the question “Does your child’s attitude match your own?”:

Does your child’s attitude match your own? How do you know? (N=136)				
Yes	No	Not sure	Explicit	Implicit
105	15	16	17	119
$\kappa = .85$	$\kappa = .89$	$\kappa = .77$	$\kappa = .80$	$\kappa = .80$

Table 3. Frequencies of each coded response for the question “Does your child notice race?”:

Does your child notice race? How do you know? (N=149)				
Yes	No	Not sure	Explicit	Implicit
88	56	5	44	91

$\kappa = .96$	$\kappa = .97$	$\kappa = .56$	$\kappa = .79$	$\kappa = .79$
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

The question of “Do you actively encourage/discourage your child to talk with you about race? If so, how?” was coded for the following responses: “Encourage”, “Discourage”, “Neither”, and “Neither AND it does not come up.” These codes were based on previous research indicating although parents may believe racial issues are important, they are hesitant, bordering on ambivalent in actively engaging their child in discussion of these issues (Hamm, 2001). I speculated, based on the research on colorblind socialization, that within a more egalitarian socialization family, where race is rarely approached, parents may indicate that it fails to come up in everyday conversation (Hughes et al., 2006). See Table 4 for frequencies and inter-rater reliability.

Table 4. Frequencies of each coded response for the question “Do you actively encourage or discourage your child to talk with you about race?”:

Do you actively encourage or discourage discussions of race with your child? If so, how? (N=153)			
Encourage	Discourage	Neither	Neither and it does not come up
50	31	29	43
$\kappa = .82$	$\kappa = .67$	$\kappa = .66$	$\kappa = .55$

For the three vignette situations, the codes were loosely mapped on to the socialization practices described by Hughes and Chen (1997) with additional themes emerging as we analyzed. For the Black Lives Matter Vignettes, responses were coded as “Egalitarian” (e.g. “All lives matter”), “History of Blacks in the United States” (e.g. “I would connect it to what he’s learned about the Civil Rights...”), “Discrimination against other groups” (e.g. “...some groups of people are still very much oppressed in our society and what she is seeing is the result of

this”), “Explanation” (e.g. “I would explain what it means”), “Bad Movement” (e.g. “That it is a lot of hate-filled Black individuals who feel like society owes them something”), and “Not sure” (e.g. “I don’t know enough about the movement. I’d have to research it first. For code examples, definitions, and inter-rater reliability, see Table 5.

Table 5. Codes and definitions for the Black Lives Matter vignette.

Imagine you were watching the news with your child and a story came on about the "Black Lives Matter" movement. How would you talk with your child about this movement? (N=149)

Code	Definition	Example	Number of responses	Reliability estimates
Egalitarian	Indicates that everyone should be treated equally, regardless of race	“All lives matter”	39	$\kappa = .87$
History of Blacks in the United States	Explains the movement within the context of the history of other groups	“I would connect it to what he’s learned about the Civil Rights...”	11	$\kappa = .68$
Discrimination against other groups	Includes a discussion of the discrimination against and/or oppression of other groups in explanation.	“...some groups of people are still very much oppressed in our society and what she is seeing is the result of this”	25	$\kappa = .80$
Explanation	Indicates they would explain the movement, but offers no real concrete description of how they would do that.	“I would explain what it means”	34	$\kappa = .74$
Bad movement	Indicates they would tell their child that BLM is a negative or even racist movement.	“That it is a lot of hate-filled Black individuals who feel like society owes them something”	22	$\kappa = .86$
Not sure	Indicate they either would not engage in a discussion or would not know how to discuss the movement.	“I don’t know enough about the movement. I’d have to research it first”	18	$\kappa = .89$

In the Racial Slur vignette, codes tended to be more thematic than based on previous socialization research. One potential explanation for this shift is that, unlike the other two vignettes, the child would have hypothetically witnessed this situation first hand. Therefore, the parental response shifts from a distant teachable moment about race to a response similar to if any curse word was spoken. I believe this is in line with the colormute approach, suggesting that in situations where race comes up, White parents believe it is better not to talk about it or address race explicitly (Hagerman, 2014; Hughes et al., 2006). Responses were coded as “Terrible words” (e.g. “I would tell him he should never repeat that word”), “Report to authority” (e.g. “I would call the principal”), “Free speech” (e.g. “I would just tell him not to care about what other people say”), “Affect response” (e.g. “I would ask her how she felt when that word was used”), and “Ignore”, either on the part of the parent or the student (e.g. “I would not say anything”). Responses were then coded for any mention of race (i.e. does the parent explain why the word is wrong or address the group that may be offended by the slur?). Finally, responses in this vignette were coded for a call to action (i.e. does the parent suggest that the child tell an adult or stand up to the individual saying the slur?) Reliability estimates were also moderately high for this vignette, $\alpha = 0.92$. For code examples, definitions, and inter-rater reliability, see Table 6.

Table 6. Codes and definitions for the Racial Slur vignette.

Imagine your child came home from school and said that he or she had overheard another child use a racial slur. How would you respond? (N= 143)

Code	Definition	Example	Number of responses	Reliability estimates
Terrible words	Indicates that the slur was a bad word and/or it should not be repeated.	“I would tell him he should never repeat that word”	93	$\kappa = .87$

Report to authority	Indicates parents would either encourage the child to report to the teacher or principal, or the parent would report it themselves.	“I would call the principal”	9	$\kappa = .94$
Free speech	Indicates that people have the right to use that language, whether it is good or bad. For some people, it’s just the way they are.	“I would just tell him not to care about what other people say”	20	$\kappa = .75$
Affective response	Focuses primarily on the child’s affective response to the slur.	“I would ask her how she felt when that word was used”	17	$\kappa = .93$
Ignore	Failure to engage in a conversation or actively discouraging engagement, either on the part of the parent or the child.	“I would not say anything”	4	$\kappa = .85$
Mention of race*	Any mention of race, oppression, discrimination, etc.	“...Racial slurs are a way to oppress a certain group of people and make them feel unequal...”	5	$\kappa = .60$
Call to action*	This suggests that the child is encouraged to act against the racial slur, either currently or in the future	“I would tell him next time he should speak up.”	19	$\kappa = .65$

Finally, in the Hate Crime vignette, responses were coded according to a combination of previous socialization research and themes emerging from the data. Responses were coded as “Bad people” (e.g. “I would tell her it’s unfortunate, but it happens”), “Wrong to attack; race shouldn’t matter” (e.g. “...this is wrong and we should make sure to always love our neighbor, no matter what color”), “Historical basis” (e.g. “I would explain the social history of why they don't get along and explain the importance of looking beyond race”), and “Discrimination” (e.g. “I would use it as an opportunity to discuss how people use the idea of separate human races to

divide, hurt, oppress people”). Then, like the Slur vignette, we coded to see if the response mentioned race or racial discrimination at any point. Interrater reliability estimates for this vignette were moderately high, $\alpha = 0.81$. For code examples, definitions, and inter-rater reliability, see Table 7.

Table 7. Codes and definitions for the Hate Crime vignette.

Imagine that you are watching the news with your child and the news reported a racially motivated attack or hate crime. What would you say to your child about this event? (N=139)

Code	Definition	Example	Number of responses	Reliability estimates
Bad people	Indicates that perpetrators are just bad people; suggests good people could not and would not commit these crimes	“I would tell her it’s unfortunate, but it happens”	55	$\kappa = .74$
Wrong to attack; race should not matter	Indicates that this crime is wrong regardless of race or motivations	“...this is wrong and we should make sure to always love our neighbor, no matter what color”	42	$\kappa = .74$
History of Blacks	Explains the crime within the context of the history of negative racial attitudes or violence toward other groups	“I would explain the social history of why they don’t get along and explain the importance of looking beyond race”	5	$\kappa = .49$
Discrimination	Includes a discussion of the discrimination against and/or oppression of other groups in explanation.	“I would use it as an opportunity to discuss how people use the idea of separate human races to divide, hurt, oppress people”	19	$\kappa = .50$
Would not engage	Failure to engage in a conversation or actively discouraging engagement, either on the part of the parent or the child.	“I would not say anything”	18	$\kappa = .90$
Mention of race*	Any mention of race, oppression, discrimination, etc.	“...there are still people in this country who have negative views of	39	$\kappa = .81$

		minorities...”		
--	--	----------------	--	--

Chapter III: Results

As a first step in the data analysis process, descriptive statistics were calculated for all measures (see Table 8). Next, prior to hypothesis testing, correlations among all study variables were calculated (see Table 9).

Table 8. Descriptive statistics for each of the measures:

Measure	Alpha	M	SD	Possible range (min-max scores)	Observed range (min-max scores)
Modern Racism Scale	.94	23.45	7.59	10-40	10-40
BETS-African American	.92	3.52	.65	1-5	1.5-5
BETS-Latino/Hispanic	.91	3.50	.59	1-5	1.3-5
BETS-White	.90	3.50	.56	1-5	1.9-5
WRIAS-Contact	.58	31.48	5.08	10-50	15-43
WRIAS-Disintegration	.71	24.12	5.80	10-50	11-40
WRIAS-Reintegration	.89	22.16	8.11	10-50	10-48
WRIAS-Pseudo-Independence	.61	32.96	5.29	10-50	11-45
WRIAS-Immersion/Emersion	.81	27.87	6.82	10-50	10-40
WRIAS-Autonomy	.51	33.45	4.53	10-50	18-43
PRESB-Egalitarian	.88	3.75	.94	1-5	1.2-5
PRESB-Ingroup Bias	.79	2.64	1.16	1-5	1-5
PRESB-Other group discrimination	.88	2.97	.89	1-5	1-5
PRESB-Other group history	.90	3.23	1.01	1-5	1-5
PRESB-EgalitarianFUTURE	.89	4.18	.88	1-5	1.2-5
PRESB-Ingroup BiasFUTURE	.84	3.16	1.15	1-5	1-5
PRESB-Other group discriminationFUTURE	.90	3.61	.93	1-5	1-5
PRESB-Other group historyFUTURE	.91	3.91	.94	1-5	1-5

Table 9. Correlation matrix for all relevant variables.

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1.MSRS	1	-.10	-.16*	.06	-.07	-.13	-.15	-.12	-.32**	-.25**

2. Child age	-.10	1	.03	-.15	.12	.05	.28**	.05	-.09	-.13
3. Child sex	-.16*	.03	1	-.20*	.13	.12	.20	.09	.19*	.07
4. Percent non-White in school	.06	-.15	-.20*	1	-.12	-.10	-.11	-.06	.07	.08
5. Annual income	-.07	.12	.13	-.12	1	-.02	.29**	.34**	.19*	.12
6. Parent sex	-.13	.05	.12	-.10	-.02	1	.01	-.18*	.02	-.10
7. Parent age	-.15	.28**	.20*	-.11	.29**	.01	1	.18*	.11	.08
8. Parent education	-.12	.05	.09	-.06	.34**	-.18*	.18*	1	.15	.09
9. BETS.AA	-.32**	-.09	.19*	.07	.19*	.02	.11	.15	1	.81**
10. BETS.LAT	-.25**	-.13	.07	.08	.12	-.10	.08	.09	.81**	1
11. BETS.WHI	.05	.01	.09	.17*	.18*	-.05	.04	.12	.57**	.61**
12. WRIAS. Contact	-.22**	-.12	.09	.01	-.01	-.06	.08	.00	.35**	.32**
13. WRIAS. Disintegration	.49**	-.16	-.19*	.03	-.20*	-.06	-.21**	-.15	-.30**	-.26**
14. WRIAS. Reintegration	.72**	-.12	-.25**	.03	-.10	-.11	-.19*	-.18*	-.49**	-.33**
15. WRIAS. Pseudoindependence	-.45**	-.12	.12	.08	.05	.05	.22**	.11	.41**	.34**
16. WRIAS. Immersion/Emersion	-.31**	-.08	-.08	.08	.02	.06	.05	-.02	.13	.08
17. WRIAS. Autonomy	-.35**	.07	.03	.01	.06	-.09	.19*	.13	.26**	.30**
18. Social.EG	-.31**	-.02	.12	.10	.10	.00	.13	.08	.33**	.25**
19. Social. OGB	-.34**	-.04	-.03	.60	.07	.02	.05	.09	.16	.12
20. Social. OGH	-.32**	-.09	.05	-.01	.15	-.01	.10	.09	.25**	.19*
21. Social. IGB	.11	-.08	-.12	.15	-.09	-.02	-.16	-.06	.00	-.08
22. Social.FUT.EG	-.48**	.07	.23**	.11	.11	.18*	.26**	.10	.46**	.39**
23. Social.FUT. OGB	-.53**	-.04	.12	.12	.06	.14	.13	.08	.27**	.21**
24. Social.FUT. OGH	-.47**	-.03	.26**	.09	.07	.16	.17	.07	.38**	.32**
25. Social.FUT.IGB	.04	.01	.02	.18*	-.12	.01	-.10	-.12	.03	-.03
	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
1.MSRS	.05	-.22**	.49**	.72**	-.45**	-.31**	-.35**	-.31**	-.34**	-.32**
2. Child age	.01	-.12	-.16	-.12	-.12	-.08	.07	-.02	-.04	-.09
3. Child sex	.09	.09	-.19*	-.25**	.12	-.08	.03	.12	-.03	.05
4. Percent non-White in school	.17*	.01	.03	.03	.08	.08	.01	.10	.06	-.01
5. Annual income	.18*	-.01	-.20*	-.10	.05	.02	.06	.10	.07	.15
6. Parent sex	-.05	-.06	-.06	-.11	.05	.06	-.09	.00	.02	-.01
7. Parent age	.04	.08	-.22**	-.19*	-.22**	.05	.19*	.13	.05	.10
8. Parent education	.08	.00	-.15	-.18*	.11	-.02	.13	.08	.09	.09
9. BETS.AA	.57**	.35**	-.30**	-.46**	.41**	.13	.26**	.33**	.16	.26**

10. BETS.LAT	.61**	.32**	-.26**	-.33**	.34**	.08	.30**	.25**	.12	.19*
11. BETS.WHI	1	.08	-.18*	-.11	.13	-.01	.13	.178	-.03	.08
12. WRIAS. Contact	.08	1	-.02	-.22**	.61**	.19*	.52**	.26**	.18*	.26**
13. WRIAS. Disintegration	-.18*	-.02	1	.73**	-.24**	.14	-.25**	-.38**	-.14	-.32**
14. WRIAS. Reintegration	-.11	-.22**	.73**	1	-.50**	-.01	-.36**	-.54**	-.32**	-.36**
15. WRIAS. Pseudoindependence	.13	.61**	-.24**	-.50**	1	.33**	.63**	.47**	.29**	.40**
16. WRIAS. Immersion/Emersion	-.01	.19*	.14	-.01	.33**	1	.30**	.16*	.30**	.25**
17. WRIAS. Autonomy	.13	.52**	-.25**	-.36**	.63**	.30**	1	.39**	.26**	.38**
18. Social.EG	.17*	.26**	-.38**	-.54**	.47**	.16*	.39**	1	.61**	.72**
19. Social. OGB	-.03	.18*	-.14	-.32**	.29**	.30**	.26**	.61**	1	.76**
20. Social. OGH	.08	.26**	-.32**	-.36**	.40**	.25**	.38**	.72**	.76**	1
21. Social. IGB	-.05	-.02	.16*	.08	-.02	.22**	-.03	.27**	.48**	.30**
22. Social.FUT.EG	.19*	.32**	-.44**	-.66**	.52**	.11	.38**	.66**	.32**	.44**
23. Social.FUT. OGB	.04	.32**	-.29**	-.51**	.46**	.20*	.32**	.45**	.65**	.54**
24. Social.FUT. OGH	.14	.36**	-.43**	-.59**	.51**	.09	.40**	.57**	.51**	.65**
25. Social.FUT.IGB	.01	.09	.00	-.04	.05	.09	.00	.20*	.26**	.14

	21.	22.	23.	24.	25.
1. MSRS	.11	-.48**	-.53**	-.47**	.04
2. Child age	-.08	.07	-.04	-.03	.01
3. Child sex	-.12	.23**	.12	.14	.02
4. Percent non-White in school	.15	.11	.12	.09	.12
5. Annual income	-.09	.11	.06	.07	-.12
6. Parent sex	-.02	.18*	.14	.16	.01
7. Parent age	-.16	.26**	.13	.17*	-.10
8. Parent education	-.06	.10	.08	.07	-.12
9. BETS.AA	.00	.46**	.27**	.37**	.03
10. BETS.LAT	-.08	.39**	.21**	.32**	-.03
11. BETS.WHI	-.05	.19*	.04	.14	.01
12. WRIAS. Contact	-.02	.32**	.32**	.36**	.09
13. WRIAS. Disintegration	.16*	-.44**	-.29**	-.43**	.00
14. WRIAS. Reintegration	.08	-.66**	-.51**	-.59**	-.04
15. WRIAS. Pseudoindependence	-.02	.52	.46**	.51	.05

16. WRIAS. Immersion/Emersion	.22**	.11	.20*	.09	.09
17. WRIAS. Autonomy	-.03	.38**	.32**	.40**	.00
18. Social.EG	.27**	.66**	.45**	.57**	.20*
19. Social. OGB	.47**	.32**	.65**	.51**	.26**
20. Social. OGH	.30**	.44**	.54**	.65**	.14
21. Social. IGB	1	.03	.19*	.09	.62**
22. Social.FUT.EG	.03	1	.63**	.75**	.25**
23. Social.FUT. OGB	.19*	.63**	1	.75**	.32**
24. Social.FUT. OGH	.09	.75**	.75**	1	.16*
25. Social.FUT.IGB	.62**	.25**	.32**	.16*	1

*Significant at .05

**Significant at .01

Hypotheses:

Hypothesis One: In line with previous research (Hughes et al., 2006), *we predicted that White parents are more likely to utilize egalitarian approaches to socialization (e.g. “People are equal, regardless of their skin color”) than other approaches.*

In order to examine parental socialization, a 2 (time: current versus future) X 4 (socialization: egalitarianism, discrimination against others, history of other groups, and preparation for bias) repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted. Results indicated that the sphericity assumption was violated, and thus the degrees of freedom associated with the F tests were adjusted based on Greenhouse–Geisser correction values. Results indicated an overall effect of socialization, $F(2.48, 377,185) = 47.83, p < .001$. Bonferroni-corrected paired-samples t-tests were used for follow-up analyses. Follow-up analyses compared all of the current socialization strategies and found egalitarian socialization strategies were the most likely to be used. Egalitarian socialization practices were more likely to be used than discrimination against

others, $t(153) = 11.98, p < .001$; other groups' history, $t(153) = 8.95, p < .001$; and preparation for bias, $t(153) = 10.70, p < .001$, respectively (see Table 10 for means).

Table 10. Means for current socialization practices

Subscale	Mean	SD
Egalitarianism	3.76	.94
Discrimination against others	2.97	.89
History of other groups	3.23	1.01
Preparation for bias	2.65	1.16

Similarly, a paired-samples t test demonstrates there is a significant difference between current and future socialization beliefs in egalitarianism, $t(151) = -6.89, p < .001$; history of other groups, $t(151) = -10.14, p < .001$; and preparation for bias, $t(153) = -6.29, p < .001$; and discrimination against other groups, $t(152) = -10.30, p < .001$, indicating for all strategies that parents are more likely to find them important for use in the future than for current use.

Table 11. Means for future socialization practices

Subscale	Mean	SD
Egalitarianism	4.18	.88
Discrimination against others	3.61	.93
History of other groups	3.91	.94
Preparation for bias	3.16	1.15

Hypothesis Two: *Participants who scored higher in early stages of White identity development (such as Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration) would be more likely to support egalitarian socialization practices than other socialization practices.*

Correlation analyses indicated that this hypothesis was partially confirmed. Current egalitarian socialization practices were significantly and positively related to the WRIAS Contact subscale ($r = .26, p = .001$), WRIAS Pseudo-Independence subscale ($r = .47, p < .001$), and the WRIAS Autonomy subscale ($r = .39, p < .001$). In addition, current egalitarian socialization

practices were related significantly and negatively to the WRIAS Disintegration subscale ($r = -.38, p < .001$) and the WRIAS Reintegration subscale ($r = -.54, p < .001$).

A regression analysis was used to further investigate this hypothesis. I ran the analysis using current egalitarian socialization practices as the outcome variable and WRIAS contact, WRIAS disintegration, and WRIAS reintegration as predictor variables. Identity status explained a significant proportion of variance in egalitarian socialization practices, $R^2 = .32, F(3, 150) = 22.95, p < .001$. WRIAS Contact Identity was a significant predictor of egalitarian socialization strategies, $\beta = .03, t = 1.99, p = .048$. WRIAS Disintegration Identity was not a significant predictor of egalitarian socialization strategies, $\beta = .00, t = .014, p = .99$. However, WRIAS Reintegration Identity was a significant and negative predictor of egalitarian socialization strategies, $\beta = -.06, t = -4.90, p < .001$.

Similar effects were found for future egalitarian socialization practices: significant and positive relationship to the WRIAS Contact subscale ($r = .32, p < .001$), WRIAS Pseudo-Independence subscale ($r = .52, p < .001$), and the WRIAS Autonomy subscale ($r = .38, p < .001$), as well as significant and negative relationship to the WRIAS Disintegration subscale ($r = -.44, p < .001$) and the WRIAS Reintegration subscale ($r = -.66, p < .001$).

Again, I ran a regression analysis to further investigate this the relationship between Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration identity statuses and future egalitarian socialization practices. I ran the analysis using future egalitarian socialization practices as the outcome variable and WRIAS contact, WRIAS disintegration, and WRIAS reintegration as predictor variables. Identity status explained a significant proportion of variance in future egalitarian socialization practices, $R^2 = .46, F(3, 148) = 42.69, p < .001$. WRIAS Contact Identity was a significant predictor of future egalitarian socialization strategies, $\beta = .03, t = 2.57, p = .01$.

WRIAS Disintegration Identity was not a significant predictor of future egalitarian socialization strategies, $\beta = .01, t = .38, p = .71$. WRIAS Reintegration Identity was a significant and negative predictor of egalitarian socialization strategies, $\beta = -.07, t = -6.93, p < .001$.

Hypothesis Three: *Participants with higher levels of racial bias would be more likely to endorse preparation for ingroup bias socialization strategies.*

This hypothesis was not supported. Individuals' utilization of bias preparation socialization strategies was not related to biased attitudes toward Black ($r = -.05, p = .56$) or Latino individuals ($r = .04, p = .63$), nor was it related to overall modern racism ($r = .11, p = .19$). Hypothesis Four: *Parents with higher levels of racial bias will be less likely to discuss strategies related to discrimination or preparation for other group bias.*

This hypothesis was supported. Parents who reported higher levels of bias against Blacks were less likely to engage in discussion of other group discrimination in both current socialization practices, $r = -.21, p = .009$, and future socialization practices, $r = -.27, p = .001$. Similarly, bias against Latinos was significantly and negatively related to discussion of other group discrimination in both current socialization practices, $r = -.17, p = .032$, and in future socialization practices, $r = -.200, p = .013$. Socialization practices incorporating discussion of discrimination against other groups were negatively and significantly related to modern racism, both currently, $r = -.337, p < .001$ and in the future, $r = -.530, p < .001$.

Hypothesis Five: *Parents will be more likely to endorse egalitarianism strategies if their children attend a less diverse school.*

This hypothesis was not supported. Neither current egalitarian socialization practices ($r = .10, p = .25$) nor future egalitarian socialization practices ($r = .11, p = .19$) were related to the diversity of the child's school.

Hypothesis Six: *Parents think their children's racial attitudes are the same as their own.*

This hypothesis was confirmed. We found that, of our sample of 136 who responded to the question “Do you think your child’s racial attitudes match your own? Why?”, 77% (n = 105) answered yes, they do believe their child’s racial attitudes match theirs. When asked to give a reason as to why they believe their child’s attitudes match, 88% (n = 119) of respondents cited an implicit reason such as “My child is a good kid” or “They are friends with everyone.”

Hypothesis Seven: *Socialization strategies described in the qualitative socialization measure will relate to racial attitudes.*

This hypothesis was partially supported. There was no relationship between those who answered “Bad Movement” and negative racial attitudes toward Black people, $r = .10, p = .23$ or Latinos, $r = .04, p = .67$. There was, however, a significant relationship between those who answered that they saw the Black Lives Matter movement as a “bad or negative movement” and scores on the Modern Racism Scale, $r = .35, p < .001$. There is no relationship between negative racial attitudes toward Blacks or Latinos and those who mentioned race in their responses to the Hate Crime vignette, $r = .05, p = .51$, and $r = .05, p = .53$, respectively. Similarly, there was no relationship between negative racial attitudes toward Blacks or Latinos and those who mentioned race in their responses to the Racial Slur vignette, $r = -.08, p = .33$, and $r = .03, p = .72$, respectively.

Chapter IV: Discussion

The goals of the current study were to examine White parents' racial socialization strategies and their relation to White racial identity and racial bias. Understanding racial socialization practices of White parents is important because, although there is a breadth of research on racial socialization for children of color, little research has been done to understand how White parents talk to their children about race. Based on previous identity research, we would expect that messages from parents are an important influence on the process of racial identity formation (Helms, 1990; Phinney, 1990).

White parents' racial socialization messages

The four socialization strategies of interest in this study were egalitarian (the belief that all groups should be equal/race does not and should not matter), cultural socialization (defined in this research as learning the history of other groups), preparation for and knowledge of outgroup bias (defined in this research as awareness of bias, discrimination, and oppression against racial outgroups), and promotion of mistrust (defined in this research as awareness of bias against one's ingroup). In line with previous research (Hughes et al., 2006; Pahlke et al., 2012; Pauker et al., 2015), White parents were more likely to engage in egalitarian socialization practices than any other forms of socialization. Previous research has indicated that White parents are highly unlikely to discuss any sort of cultural heritage with their children, instead relying on more subtle and indirect messages of race (Lesane-Brown et al., 2010). In addition, parents were likely to indicate that these egalitarian views are the most important for future socialization of their children. Because this approach is talks about race least explicitly, one explanation for the utilization of this approach to racial socialization is that White parents choose not to discuss race

or racial issues for fear of appearing racist (Hagerman, 2014; Pahlke et al., 2012). However, previous research suggests that by not explicitly discussing race with their children and by failing to explicitly correct a child's faulty assumptions, they may inadvertently perpetuate biased attitudes (Pahlke et al., 2012). This process occurs because children see racial differences and make general attributions based on those differences (i.e. Black and White people have different blood types or different levels of intelligence) if race and the social and historical reasons for racial differences in outcomes are not explicitly addressed (Bigler & Liben, 2006).

Our sample of White parents reported they were hesitant to discuss race with their children, with many saying they would only encourage discussions of race "if it came up", which is theoretically in line with the egalitarian socialization practice. Yet, when given vignettes in which the topic of race and race relations explicitly was at the forefront, a large number of respondents still failed to mention race in their discussion of the events. This finding aligns with Vittrup & Holden (2007)'s previous work. In their sample, White parents were explicitly told to include a discussion of race when reading and reacting to videos with their children. Yet, even when asked to explicitly discuss racial themes with their children, a large percentage (nearly 90%) of parents failed to include race in their post-video debriefing (Vittrup & Holden, 2007). Further research should look at the motivations of White parents in avoiding discussing race, even when explicitly told to do so.

As previously suggested, discussing race with children is important for correcting a child's faulty assumptions and their constructed meaning of racial differences (Bigler & Liben, 2006). However, it is also important to note that silence about race teaches children that it is a taboo topic (Pauker et al., 2015). By failing to address the issue of race and racial issues

explicitly, parents may be perpetuating systems of privilege (Hagerman, 2014) and bias (Bigler, Jones, & Lobliner, 1997).

Parental racial socialization and White racial identity

I found that parental racial socialization was somewhat related to White racial identity development. Particularly I found that one of the early statuses of White identity, reintegration, was negatively related to egalitarian socialization practices. The reintegration status reflects the view that Whiteness is superior at the expense of other racial groups; other groups are okay, but only from a distance (Helms, 1990). The negative relationship between these statuses and egalitarian socialization provides a telling insight to egalitarianism—although other groups should be considered equal, the view of equality should only happen after one’s White privilege is acknowledged. Although more research is necessary, these correlational results may suggest that knowing one’s racial identity but failing to acknowledge that racial group’s role in the social and racial hierarchy, particularly in the United States, may mean that one is less likely to talk to their child about treating those groups equally.

Although I did not anticipate that the contact identity status would be positively related to egalitarian views, I reason that an individual with the contact racial identity status may view race and racial factors more simplistically (Helms, 1995). Although an individual with the contact status may avoid discussions of race in their daily lives, when confronted with race or a racial situation, Helms’ theory suggests that due to a level of obliviousness the individual will likely downplay the role of race and adopt a “race does not matter” attitude.

Parental racial socialization and racial bias

I hypothesized that there was a relationship between high levels of racial bias and preparation for ingroup bias, perhaps because those who were high in bias against others were

also likely to believe to mistrust other groups and perceive racially ambiguous situations as biased. However we failed to find this connection with our quantitative measures. One potential explanation for the lack of relationship is that those who are high in racial bias are likely to see themselves as the top of the social racial hierarchy, and thus do not concern themselves with other groups' opinions or biases (for more, see research on social dominance theory; Unzueta, Everly, & Gutierrez, 2014). It also could be that there was not enough variability in the bias measures to tease apart the relationship to ingroup bias preparation.

However, there was a relationship between symbolic racism scores and the Black Lives Matter vignette, insofar as those who reported that they would tell their child that Black Lives Matter is a “bad movement” reported higher levels of symbolic racism than those who did not describe the movement using that rhetoric. I would suggest that because the symbolic racism scale taps into beliefs about meritocracy and the assessment that America is now post-racial, we would expect a relationship between that scale and negative attitudes toward a pro-Black movement. I believe these findings only strengthen the assertion that there was not enough variability in the ingroup bias socialization scale to detect a relationship.

Racial bias and discussion of other groups

This study found that although parents are not likely to discuss other group discrimination with their 8-12 year olds, those who reported lower levels of racial bias were more likely to find it important to discuss the societal prevalence of discrimination toward other groups with their child some time in the future. Previous research suggests, and our qualitative measures confirm, that parents often shy away from discussing race and endorse color-mute practices because they believe their child is too young to understand (Katz & Kofkin, 1997),

although we know that even young children can see and comprehend racial differences (Aboud, 2003).

Racial socialization and school factors

In line with previous research, I was unable to find a relationship between a student's school diversity (operationalized as percentage of non-White students within the school) and parental socialization practices. Previous research with children of color suggested a transactional relationship with socialization, such that a child's experiences helps to inform parental socialization messages (Hughes & Johnson, 2001), though that was not the case with this sample. A possible explanation for this lack of result could be that although one's school is racially diverse, the personal relationships a student may have at that school may be racially homogenous. Previous work has shown that close relationships (such as parents' friends) with non-White individuals predict a reduction in racial bias in children, whereas the racial diversity of a neighborhood has no impact on these attitudes (Pahlke et al., 2012). Furthermore, in a meta-analysis done in 2000, studies showed a wide variability in the level of interracial friendship groups in highly diverse schools (Joyner & Kao, 2000). This finding suggests that even though the opportunity for these friendships rose with the increase in school diversity, other factors including meaningful contact and acceptance from their own group were equally as important (Joyner & Kao, 2000). Similarly, we suggest that even in highly racially diverse schools, White students can maintain a level of social distance from non-White students, and thus not have an affect on the way that parents and children talk about race. In addition, it may be that the sample was too young for schools to impact racial socialization. It could be that adolescents are more likely to seek out those meaningful contact experiences with other groups, whereas elementary school kids do not (Joyner & Kao, 2000).

Transmission of racial attitudes

Although previous research suggests that the racial attitudes of parents and children do not match (Degner & Delage, 2013; Vittrup & Holden, 2007), parents often believe they do. In our sample, over 75% of respondents suggested that their child's racial attitudes matched their own. Of those, most used implicit, or unspoken, reasons for why they believed the attitudes matched. This assumption points to another reason White parents may adopt color-mute practices: they believe that further discussion with the child is unnecessary, because the child is not biased. The assumption that their child's racial attitudes match their own has been demonstrated in previous research (Pahlke et al., 2012).

Limitations

Although this study managed to address some of the gaps in the literature on White socialization, there are still several limitations. One of the limitations is that we only coded for one type of socialization in both the qualitative and quantitative measures. As a result, the analysis inadvertently ignores synergistic or compound results of using multiple socialization messages (White-Johnson et al., 2010). Future research should look at the multidimensionality of socialization. Furthermore, this study focused primarily on correlations to form and test theories about relationships. Future longitudinal research would be necessary to see how these socialization strategies affected racial attitudes and racial identity development in children.

Furthermore, a child report measure of racial attitudes and perceived racial socialization messages was excluded from the scope of this study, but would be beneficial to use in future research. I acknowledge that developmentally, ages 8-12 years old are a large range. It may be useful for future researchers to narrow the age range or look for developmental differences in socialization practices based on age.

Conclusion

This study serves to demonstrate the relationships among racial bias, racial identity, and racial socialization practices within White American parents. In accordance with previous research, we found that White parents strongly endorsed egalitarian socialization for their children, suggesting that all races should be treated equally (Hughes et al., 2006). It is important to note that this socialization strategy is not considered bad or harmful; in fact, it is the most commonly used socialization strategy across all racial groups (Hughes et al., 2006) and is related to both positive self-esteem (Stevenson et al., 1997) and positive academic outcomes (Caughy et al., 2002) in children of color. However, the results of this research suggests there is a thin line between the belief that groups should be treated equally, not based on their skin color and the belief that race should not be discussed. Colorblind/colormute socialization does not carry the same positive results; in fact, it may perpetuate racial biases (Bigler & Liben, 2006).

Chapter V: References

- Aberson, C. L., Shoemaker, C., & Tomolillo, C. (2004). Implicit bias and contact: The role of interethnic friendships. *Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(3), 335-347.
- Aboud, F., Mendelson, M., & Purdy, K. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*(2), 165-173.
- Aboud, F. E. (2008). A social-cognitive developmental theory of prejudice, In Quintana, S. M., & McKown, C. (Eds.) *Handbook of race, racism, and the developing child*. (pp. 55-71). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons
- Allport, G. A. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Baron, A. S. & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The development of implicit attitudes: Evidence of race evaluations from ages 6 and 10 and adulthood. *Psychological Science, 17*(1), 53-58.
- Bigler, R. S. & Liben, L. S. (1993). A cognitive-developmental approach to racial stereotyping and reconstructive memory in Euro-American children. *Child Development, 64*(5), 1507-1518.
- Bigler, R. S., Jones, L. C., & Lobliner, D. B. (1997). Social categorization and the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development, 68*(3), 530-543.
- Bigler, R. S. & Liben, L. S. (2006). A developmental intergroup theory of social stereotypes and prejudice. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior, 34*, 39-89.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 429-444.

- Carter, R. T., Helms, J. E., & Juby, H. L. (2004). The relationship between racism and racial identity for White Americans: A profile analysis. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 32*, 2-17.
- Casler, K., Bickel, L., & Hackett, E. (2013). Separate but equal? A comparison of participants and data gathered via Amazon's MTurk, social media, and face-to-face behavioral testing. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*(6), 2156-2160.
- Castelli, L., De Dea, C., & Nesdale, D. (2008). Learning social attitudes: Children's sensitivity to the nonverbal behaviors of adult models during interracial interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1504-1513.
- Caughy, M. O., O'Campo, P. J., Nettles, S. M., & Lohrfink, K. F. (2006). Neighborhood matters: Racial socialization of African American children. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1220-1236.
- Clark, K. B. & Clark, M. P. (1947). "Racial identification and preference among negro children." In E. L. Hartley (Ed.) *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Crystal, D. S., Killen, M., & Ruck, M. (2008). It is who you know that counts: Intergroup contact and judgments about race-based exclusion. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 26*(1), 51-70.
- Degner, J. & Dalege, J. (2013). The apple does not fall far from the tree, or does it? A meta-analysis of parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(6), 1270-1304.
- Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1267-1278.

- Doyle, A. B. & Aboud, F. E. (1995). A longitudinal study of white children's racial prejudice as a social-cognitive development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 41(2), 209-228.
- Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 67(2), 243-251.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. K. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464-1480.
- Hagerman, M. A. (2014). White families and race: Colour-blind and colour-conscious approaches to white racial socialization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(14), 2598-2614.
doi: 10.1080/01419870.2013.848289
- Hamm, J. V. (2001). Barriers and bridges to positive cross-ethnic relations African American and White parent socialization beliefs and practices. *Youth & Society*, 33(1), 62-98.
- Helms, J.E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and People of Color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki and C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms J. E. & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Attitude inventory, In J. E. Helms (Ed.) *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 67-80). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Henry, P. J. & Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology*, 23(2), 253-283.

- Hughes, D & Chen, L. (1997). When and what parents tell children about race: An examination of race-related socialization among African American families. *Applied Developmental Science, 1*, 200-214.
- Hughes, D. & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 981-995.
- Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology, 42*(5), 747-770.
- Hughes, D., Witherspoon, D., Rivas-Drake, D., & West-Bey, N. (2009). Received ethnic-racial socialization messages and youths' academic and behavioral outcomes: Examining the mediating role of ethnic identity and self-esteem. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*(2), 112-124. doi: 10.1037/a0015509.
- Hughes, J. M., Bigler, R. S., & Levy, S. R. (2007). The consequences of learning about historical racism among European American and African American children. *Child Development, 78* (6), 1689-1705
- Joyner, K., & Kao, G. (2000). School racial composition and adolescent racial homophily. *Social Science Quarterly, 81*, 810-825.
- Katz, P. A., & Kofkin, J. A. (1997). Race, gender, and young children. In Luthar, S. S., Burack, J.A., Cicchetti, D., & Weisz, J. R. (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Perspectives on adjustment, risk, and disorder*, (pp. 51-74). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Lasane-Brown, C. L., Brown, T. N., Tanner-Smith, E. E., & Bruce, M. A. (2010). Negotiating boundaries and bonds: Frequency of young children's socialization to their ethnic/racial heritage. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*(3), 457-464.
- Pahlke, E., Bigler, R. S., & Suizzo, M. A. (2012). Relations between colorblind socialization and children's racial bias: Evidence from European American mothers and their preschool children. *Child Development*. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01770.x
- Pauker, K., Apfelbaum, E. P., & Spitzer, B. (2015). When societal norms and social identity collide: The race talk dilemma for racial minority children. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6*(8), 887-895.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), 499-514.
- Phillips, L. T. & Lowery, B. S. (2015). The hard-knock life? Whites claim hardships in response to racial inequity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 61*, 12-18. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2015.06.008
- Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*(3), 301-322.
- Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A., & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development, 76*(2), 451-466.
- Sciarra, D. T. & Gushue, G. V. (2003). White racial identity development and religious orientation. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 81*, 473-482.

- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. (1969). "Ingroup and intergroup relations: Experimental analysis." In *Social Psychology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 181-188.
- Stevenson, H. C. & Arrington, E. G. (2009). Racial/ethnic socialization mediates perceived racism and the racial identity of African American adolescents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 15(2), 125-136. doi: 10.1037/a0015500.
- Trimble, J. E., Helms, J. E., & Root, M. P. P. (2003). Social and psychological perspectives on ethnic and racial identity, In Bernal, G., Trimble, J. E., Burlew, A. K., & Leong, F. T. L. (Eds.) *Handbook of racial & ethnic minority psychology*. (pp. 239-275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Vittrup, B. & Holden, G. W. (2010). Exploring the impact of educational television and parent-child discussions on children's racial attitudes. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 10(1), 192-214.
- White-Johnson, R. L., Ford, K. R., & Sellers, R. M. (2010). Parental racial socialization profiles: Association with demographic factors, racial discrimination, childhood socialization, and racial identity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(2), 237-247. doi: 10.1037/a0016111.
- Unzueta, M. M., Everly, B. A., & Gutiérrez, A. S. (2014). Social dominance orientation moderates reactions to Black and White discrimination claimants. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 54, 81-88.

Appendix A:
BETS or Black/White Evaluative Scale

How many Black / African American people are ... ?

	None or hardly any	Not many	Some	A lot	Almost all
1. happy	1	2	3	4	5
2. dishonest	1	2	3	4	5
3. generous	1	2	3	4	5
4. cruel	1	2	3	4	5
5. honest	1	2	3	4	5
6. awful	1	2	3	4	5
7. good-looking	1	2	3	4	5
8. selfish	1	2	3	4	5
9. nice	1	2	3	4	5
10. unkind	1	2	3	4	5

How many Latino / Hispanic people are ... ?

	None or hardly any	Not many	Some	A lot	Almost all
1. happy	1	2	3	4	5
2. dishonest	1	2	3	4	5
3. generous	1	2	3	4	5
4. cruel	1	2	3	4	5
5. honest	1	2	3	4	5
6. awful	1	2	3	4	5
7. good-looking	1	2	3	4	5
8. selfish	1	2	3	4	5
9. nice	1	2	3	4	5
10. unkind	1	2	3	4	5

How many White / Caucasian people are ... ?

	None or hardly any	Not many	Some	A lot	Almost all
1. happy	1	2	3	4	5
2. dishonest	1	2	3	4	5
3. generous	1	2	3	4	5
4. cruel	1	2	3	4	5
5. honest	1	2	3	4	5
6. awful	1	2	3	4	5
7. good-looking	1	2	3	4	5
8. selfish	1	2	3	4	5
9. nice	1	2	3	4	5
10. unkind	1	2	3	4	5

Hughes, Bigler, & Levy, 2007

Appendix B:

Modified Symbolic Racism Scale

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if Black people would only try harder they could be just as well off as White people.				
Irish, Italian, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Black people should do the same.				
Black leaders have pushed too much and too quickly for social changes.				
Black people are responsible for creating the racial tension that exists in the United States today.				
Discrimination against Black people exists in the United States today, limiting their chances to get ahead.				
Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Black individuals to work their way out of the lower class.				
Over the past few years, Black people have gotten less than they deserve.				
Over the past few years, Black people have gotten more economically than they deserve.				
Affirmative action policies discriminate against White people.				
The reasons behind instituting affirmative action in higher education and the workplace no longer exist.				

Modified from Henry & Sears, 2002

Appendix C:
White Racial Identity Attitude Scale

This questionnaire is designed to measure people's attitudes about social and political issues. There are no right or wrong answers. Different people have different viewpoints. So try to be as honest as you can. Beside each statement, click on the answer that best describes how you feel. Use the scale below to respond to each statement.

1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Uncertain, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I hardly ever think about what race I am.					
2. There is nothing I can do by myself to solve society's racial problems.					
3. I get angry when I think about how Whites have been treated by Blacks.					
4. I feel as comfortable around Blacks as I do around Whites.					
5. I am making a special effort to understand the significance of being White.					
6. I involve myself in causes regardless of the race of the people involved in them.					
7. I find myself watching Black people to see what they are like.					
8. I feel depressed after I have been around Black people.					
9. There is nothing that I want to learn about Black people.					
10. I enjoy watching the different ways that Blacks and Whites approach life.					

11. I am taking definite steps to define an identity for myself that includes working against racism.					
12. I seek out new experiences even if I know that no other Whites will be involved in them.					
13. I wish I had more Black friends.					
14. I do not believe that I have the social skills to interact with Black people effectively.					
15. A Black person who tries to get close to you is usually after something.					
16. Blacks and Whites have much to learn from each other.					
17. Rather than focusing on other races, I am searching for information to help me understand White people.					
18. Black people and I share jokes with each other about our racial experiences.					
19. I think Black people and White people do not differ from each other in any important ways.					
20. I just refuse to participate in discussions about race.					
21. I would rather socialize with White people only.					
22. I believe that Blacks would not be different from Whites if they had been given the same opportunities.					
23. I believe that I receive special privileges because I					

am White.					
24. When a Black person holds an opinion with which I disagree, I am not afraid to express my opinion.					
25. I do not notice a person's race.					
26. I have come to believe that Black and White people are very different.					
27. White people have tried extremely hard to make up for their ancestors' mistreatment of Blacks. Now it is time to stop!					
28. It is possible for Blacks and Whites to have meaningful social relationships with each other.					
29. I am making an effort to decide what type of White person I want to be.					
30. I feel comfortable in social settings in which there are no Black people.					
31. I am curious to learn in what ways Black people and White people differ from each other.					
32. I do not express some of my beliefs about race because I do not want to make White people mad at me.					
33. Society may have been unfair to Black people, but it has been just as unfair to White people.					
34. I am knowledgeable about which values Black people and White people share.					

35. I am examining how racism relates to who I am.					
36. I am comfortable being myself in situations in which there are no other White people.					
37. In my family, we never talk about race.					
38. When I interact with Black people, I usually let them make the first move because I do not want to offend them.					
39. I feel hostile when I am around Black people.					
40. I believe that Black people know more about racism than I do.					
41. I am involved in discovering how other White people have positively defined themselves as White people.					
42. I have refused to accept privileges that were given to me because I am White.					
43. A person's race is not important to me.					
44. Sometimes I am not sure what to think or feel about White people.					
45. I believe that Black people are inferior to White people.					
46. I believe that a White person cannot be a racist if he or she has a Black friend(s).					
47. I am becoming aware of the strengths and limitations of my White culture.					
48. I think that White people must end racism in this country because they					

created it.					
49. I think that dating Black people is a good way for White people to learn about Black culture.					
50. Sometimes I am not sure what I think or feel about Black people.					
51. When I am the only White person in a group of Black people, I feel anxious.					
52. Black people and White people differ from each other in some ways, but neither race is superior.					
53. Given the chance, I would work with other White people to discover what being White means to me.					
54. I am not embarrassed to say that I am White.					
55. I think White people should become more involved in socializing with Black people.					
56. I do not understand why Black people blame me for their social misfortunes.					
57. I believe that White people are more attractive and express themselves better than Black people.					
58. I believe that White people cannot have a meaningful discussion about racism unless there is a Black or other minority person present to help them understand the effects of racism.					
59. I am considering changing some of my					

behaviors because I think that they are racist.					
60. I am continually examining myself to make sure that my way of being White is not racist.					

Helms, 1990

Appendix D:

Parental Racial-Ethnic Socialization Behaviors Scale

Please respond with how often you directly or explicitly tell your child each of the following:

I directly or explicitly tell my child...	How often do you tell your child this?				
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
1. People are equal, regardless of their racial or ethnic background.					
2. About the discrimination people from <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups have experienced in the past.					
3. About important people in the history of <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups.					
4. To read books about the history or traditions of different ethnic and racial groups, other than our own.					
5. About the possibility that some people might treat him/her badly or unfairly because of our race or ethnicity.					
6. Other racial or ethnic groups are just as trustworthy as people of our own ethnic or racial group.					
7. People of all races have an equal chance in life.					
8. He/she should try to make friends with people of all races and ethnic backgrounds.					
9. About discrimination or prejudice against <i>our</i> ethnic or racial group.					
10. About discrimination or prejudice against <i>other</i> ethnic or					

racial groups.					
11. It is important to appreciate people of all racial and ethnic backgrounds					
12. Something unfair that he/she witnessed was due to racial or ethnic discrimination against <i>another</i> ethnic or racial group.					
13. In the past people from <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups were discriminated against because of their race or ethnicity.					
14. It is best to have friends who are the same race or ethnic group as we are.					
15. The importance of getting along with people of all races and ethnicities.					
16. Something he/she saw showed poor treatment of different ethnic or racial groups, other than our own.					
17. American society is fair to all races and ethnicities.					
18. People from <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups are sometimes still discriminated against because of their race or ethnicity.					
19. To learn about the history or traditions of <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups.					
20. People of our race or ethnic group have better opportunities than people of other racial or ethnic groups.					
21. People of different races and ethnicities have different values and beliefs.					
22. American society is not always fair to all races and					

ethnicities.					
23. It is a bad idea to marry someone who is of a different ethnic background or race than ours.					
24. Sometimes people are treated badly just because of their race or ethnicity.					
25. About the history of <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups in our country.					

Modified from Hughes & Chen, 1997

As found in Pahlke, Bigler & Suizzo, 2012

Appendix E:
Future Racial Socialization Goals

I will directly or explicitly tell my child...	How important do you think it is that you discuss this at some point in the future?				
	Not at all important	Not very important	Neutral	Somewhat important	Very important
1. People are equal, regardless of their racial or ethnic background.					
2. About the discrimination people from <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups have experienced in the past.					
3. About important people in the history of <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups.					
4. To read books about the history or traditions of different ethnic and racial groups, other than our own.					
5. About the possibility that some people might treat him/her badly or unfairly because of our race or ethnicity.					
6. Other racial or ethnic groups are just as trustworthy as people of our own ethnic or racial group.					
7. People of all races have an equal chance in life.					
8. He/she should try to make friends with people of all races and ethnic backgrounds.					
9. About discrimination or prejudice against <i>our</i> ethnic or racial group.					

10. About discrimination or prejudice against <i>other</i> ethnic or racial groups.					
11. It is important to appreciate people of all racial and ethnic backgrounds					
12. Something unfair that he/she witnessed was due to racial or ethnic discrimination against <i>another</i> ethnic or racial group.					
13. In the past people from <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups were discriminated against because of their race or ethnicity.					
14. It is best to have friends who are the same race or ethnic group as we are.					
15. The importance of getting along with people of all races and ethnicities.					
16. Something he/she saw showed poor treatment of different ethnic or racial groups, other than our own.					
17. American society is fair to all races and ethnicities.					
18. People from <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups are sometimes still discriminated against because of their race or ethnicity.					
19. To learn about the history or traditions of <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups.					
20. People of our race or ethnic group have better opportunities than people of other racial or ethnic groups.					
21. People of different races and ethnicities have different values					

and beliefs.					
22. American society is not always fair to all races and ethnicities.					
23. It is a bad idea to marry someone who is of a different ethnic background or race than ours.					
24. Sometimes people are treated badly just because of their race or ethnicity.					
25. About the history of <i>other</i> racial or ethnic groups in our country.					

Pahlke, Bigler & Suizzo, 2012